RMC Research Corporation
A Resource Management Corporation Subsidiary

Report No. UR-248

TASK 1 REPORT:

AN OVERVIEW OF DATA PRODUCTION AND HANDLING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

August 12, 1974

C. M. Harris, Project Director
A. E. Hass
C. T. Robertson
Frank Sanel, Consultant

Prepared for

Department of Corrections
District of Columbia

7910 Woodmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Report No. UR-248

TASK 1 REPORT:

AN OVERVIEW OF DATA PRODUCTION AND HANDLING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS -

August 1, 1974

C. M. Harris, Project Director
A. E. Hass
C. T. Robertson
Frank Sanel, Consultant

Prepared for

Department of Corrections
District of Columbia

CONTENTS

LIST OF EXHIBITS

1

INTRODUCTION

This report is the culmination of Task 1 of the RMC Research Corporation's study for the Department of Corrections of District of Columbia (DCDC), entitled "Development of a Data Improvement Program for Corrections Management and Planning," which is supported by a Part C Block Grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) of the United States Department of Justice. As described in the scope of work statement, this task was a "review of the contents of the data base which currently supports CRISYS (DCDC's Correctional Records Information System) and the methods and technique for retrieving data and producing predetermined outputs."

To carry out this task, members of the RMC team visited each of the operating institutions within the Department and with the help of Department personnel made a careful survey of record-keeping functions with a special emphasis on the role of automatic data processing (ADP) equipment in the collection and recording of such information. This approach provided our analysts with the necessary familiarity of each office and how it operated; in fact, we saw the "real world." We gathered information on the flow of data and the actual forms used in the process. Included in this work was a very detailed analysis of the Department's ADP system CRISYS, which has its origins in Project SEARCH (System for Electronic Analysis and Retrieval of Criminal Histories), first funded in 1969 by a grant from LEAA. The completion of Task 1 now sets the stage for Task 2 wherein we ascertain the actual needs of information users throughout the Department and determine if and how these are indeed being satisfied.

This introduction is followed by a detailed discussion of the actual operating level data collection systems, broken down by unit. Chapter 3 contains a summary review of ADP functions within the Department as embodied by CRISYS.

Finally, we conclude with a set of data-collection-oriented recommendations and some closing comments in Chapter 4.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals has made some very detailed recommendations on information systems within the entire criminal justice network, and it has been and will remain our intent to be guided in our work in large measure by these recommendations. The Commission was appointed by Jerris Leonard, then Administrator of LEAA, in October 1971, to formulate for the first time national criminal justice standards and goals (primarily) for crime reduction and prevention at the state and local levels.

The National Commission's report contains immediate requirements which should be placed on the storage and retrieval of information in the DCDC system; many are completely or partially satisfied already. Furthermore, the emphasis currently is on the development and implementation of a national Computerized Criminal History (CCH) system and an Offender-Based Transaction Statistics (OBTS) system. The broad field of corrections, ranging from institutions to community supervision programs, is increasingly attentive to needs for program evaluation data which frequently go beyond its own data-generation capability. Operationally, correctional agencies face problems of (1) gaining sufficient information on offenders to make program assignments; (2) keeping track of offenders as they shift from program to program and location to location; and (3) generating productive data on postrelease behavior. Offender classification data is similar to material generated before court sentencing with respect to background and environmental conditions. It adds data useful in determining treatment or program assignments from interview, testing, and observation. Accounting for offenders and knowing their status are complicated by the duration of correctional exposure and the mobility of offenders between program assignments.

Parole prediction methods have only recently emerged, and studies are now underway to determine the reliability and methodology for techniques and systems to predict workload, operate large logistical systems, and evaluate programs. As practitioners and policymakers revise the strategies for corrections, an increasing sense of urgency is evident to establish suitable measures of program effectiveness. Composite measures that assess programs (outputs) as a function of offender categories are required.

More specifically:

- The final refined DCDC information system must record the DCDC actions on all individual inmates and the institution within the DCDC or other agencies which would handle offenders as they enter and process through the DCDC.
- The system must incorporate procedures whereby any inputs, retrievals, modifications, or cancellations of data pertaining to an offender will be strictly limited to authorized personnel in order to provide reasonable protection of individual privacy.
- The system must
  - (a) standardize the format and data contents of input and output documents utilized by the DCDC and other agencies,
  - (b) provide data elements required by DCDC management personnel responsible for operating and administering the DCDC structure,
  - (c) commence recording data at the point where the offender first enters the corrections component, and
  - (d) update files as the offender is processed through the corrections structure.
- The information system must be so structured as to serve the dual purpose of an operational and a management information system.

The ultimate impact of such an approach would guarantee that:

- The long-range operation costs of the system will not exceed the current manual system through financial tradeoffs.
- The DCDC and other agencies will be able to record and retrieve accurate data in a timely manner.
- Accurate, objective evaluation of past and current programs will become possible.

2

OPERATING LEVEL DATA COLLECTION SYSTEMS

A. D.C. JAIL

(1) Functioning

The Records Office of D.C. Jail is the central processing point for all persons committed to the entire Department of Corrections. All persons are in-processed here and records are maintained on all inmates in the entire DCDC system, including the Jail, Lorton Reservation, Women's Detention Center, as well as those D.C. prisoners in federal institutions. There are approximately 750 inmates of the Jail at the present time, and approximately 300,000 file cards still kept for admissions prior to 1967.

The current staff is composed of 11 full-time employees and 17 inmates. When the new jail is completed, inmate labor in the Records Office will not be permitted. Inmates are not allowed to use the computer terminal, though they have access to the voluminous number of manual files.

(a) Admission/Location

Much time is spent on these two tasks. To enter the Jail, a person must be accompanied by an official commitment paper--essentially a court order with seal and valid signature--which provides legal identification and establishes the validity of the admission. The commitment paper can take various forms, but basically it is a court order giving the Jail custody of a person for a given period of time, whether to await trial or to serve an actual sentence. It sets up the conditions of bail (if any), the duration of sentence, and sometimes the place of commitment. At the end of each day, the number of commitments is checked against the head count as given on the court list to ensure accuracy.

(b) Releases

Releases are effected in the same manner as admissions. A release notification must be received, signed by the appropriate authority and listing the reason for release, whether it is on a temporary basis (as for an appearance in court) or on a permanent basis (as in a release at court). When a permanent release is made, the information is placed on the computer to update the location of an individual.

(2) Forms

(a) Internal Use

Much paperwork is involved in admitting a person to the D.C. Jail system; the eight steps include:

1. Receipt for Personal Property
2. Admission Fact Sheet
3. Fingerprinting
4. Key-Card File (3" x 5")
5. DCDC Number
6. Photographing
7. History Card (5" x 8")
8. Locator Card/Telephone File

The Admission Fact Sheet contains all pertinent personal and historical data on the inmate including past commitments, aliases, etc. Made in quadruplicate (though only two copies are necessary), the white copy is retained in the inmate's central file folder, while the yellow copy goes to ADP providing update and new information for the computer file. This information, along with the fingerprints, serves as the basis for cross-checking the key-cards and the fingerprint files for previous commitments and aliases and also contains the information inscribed on the history and locator cards. For a list of the information on the admission sheet, see Exhibit I, page 2-5.

Key cards are filed alphabetically and are separated into two groups: name cards containing a prisoner's true name, and alias cards containing all names under which he has been committed. Both cards contain the DCDC number, the fingerprint classification, FBI number, and dates previously committed to the jail. The alias card contains a cross-reference to the key-card and vice-versa.

A history card is also prepared on each inmate. It has the same information as the Admission Fact Sheet. (See Exhibit I for comparison.) Each time a prisoner goes to court, the date is stamped on the back of the card. Detainers are noted on the last two lines of the face of the card in red type. These cards are filed by DCDC number.

A 3x5 locator card contains an abridgement of the history card as shown in Exhibit I. The locator/telephone file contains cards on all inmates committed to the Jail and still in custody.

Worksheet

A running count of all inmates is kept on the worksheet which is broken up into one-week increments. Starting with a beginning count, all admits, releases, transfers, etc., are accounted for and checked against the court rosters sent over each day to ensure the proper numbers.

Commitments are broken down by sex and color, end intakes, sentenced and open cases, recommits, parole violators, conditional release violators, Bureau of Prisons, court returns, escapes, and D.C. General Hospital.

Releases are broken down by sex and color, expirations, court releases, fines paid, Lorton transfers, Bureau of Prisons, St. Elizabeth's, parole, conditional release, death, escapes, and immigration authorities. Court releases are further broken down by not guilty, ignored by Grand Jury, Nolle Prosequi, dismissed, bond, probation, returned to designated state, juvenile court, released by court, and released to U.S. Marshal.

(b) External Forms

Many monthly and quarterly reports are generated at the jail and most are sent on to the Director's Office, with a few copies sent to the U.S. Marshal's Office. They include:

1. Quarterly federal prisoner report
2. Monthly report of daily average populations
3. Monthly man-days report to U.S. Marshal's Office
4. Quarterly report immigration violators
5. Transmittal letter of commitment and/or release cards
6. Statistical report (monthly and yearly)
   - A. Population, sources of population, disposition of prisoners (totals and according to sex and color)
   - B. Comparative statement of new admissions and average daily populations

C. Average daily population (D.C., federal, and man-days)
D. Crime classification (sex, color, felonies, intoxications, misdemeanors)
E. Type of new commitments from court and disposition of court releases for month
F. Crime classification by age group for month
G. Sentences by crime classification
H. Sentences by age groups
I. Certified drug addicts for month
J. Crime classification of non-support cases and their individual breakdowns
K. Transfers to federal institutions
L. Psychiatric referrals for month

7. Average daily population report
8. Master worksheet--commitments, releases ——▸ running count
9. Identification report:

   Page I - prisoners committed:

   - intoxication
   - misdemeanors
   - felonies

   Further breakdown:

   - # of prisoners received
   - # of prisoners known as to DC Dept.
   - # of new prisoners
   - % of prisoners known to DCDC
   - color and sex

   Page II - information on fingerprints and photographs:

   - # takes, filed, and handled
   - etc.

10. Annual census
11. Annual inventory
12. Admission sheet
13. Expiration list

Exhibit I

INFORMATION VERSUS SOURCE

Information	Admission Fact Sheet	Key Card	History Card	Locator Card
DCDC #	x	x	x	x
Name	x	x	x	x
Aliases	x	x	x	
Prisoner Type	x		x	
# of Previous Commitments	x	x	x	
Commitment Date	x		x	x
Address	x		x	x
Race/Sex	x	x	x	
Birthdate	x		x	
Age	x		x	x
Nativity	x		x	
Marital Status	x		x	x
Church	x		x	
Read/Write	x		x	
Occupation	x		x	x
Veteran	x			
Disability	x		x	
Surrender Valuables	x		x	
Height	x			
Weight	x			
Eyes	x			
Hair	x			
Complexion	x			
Build	x			
Fingerprint Classification	x	x		
Fingerprint Reference	x	x		
Police I.D. #	x			
FBI #	x	x		
Driver's License #	x			
License State	x			
Narcotics User	x			
Alcohol User	x			
Welfare Benefits Received	x			
Latest Hourly Wage	x			
Detainer	x		x	
Case #, Offense, Bond Term, Date	x		x	x
Time in D.C.		x	x	
Time in U.S.			x	
Name/Address of Nearest Relative			x	
Housing Location			x	x
How Filed	Numerically in file folder by DCDC #	Alphabetically by name	Numerically by DCDC #	Alphabetically by name

(3) Problems/Tentative Solutions

(a) There is a need to consolidate the numbers by which an inmate is identified. Right now, he is referred to by several different numbers--PDID number, DCDC number, charge number, etc. With the exception of offenders such as immigration law violators, all persons receive a PDID number, so perhaps the system could switch to using the PDID number and reserve a certain block of numbers for the Jail to give to immigration offenders.

(b) At this point, it is very difficult to locate a person within the Jail system, since he could be at various housing locations, work locations, etc. Multiple sources are checked to determine where an inmate is, but these do not always yield the correct information. This difficulty of location could possibly be alleviated by tracking an individual by computer.

(c) The apparent breakdown of communication between the Parole Section and the Jail further hinders this location problem. Many files have not been updated when a person is placed on parole; consequently, the person's location is sometimes rectified only if and when he is recommitted. Coordination is badly needed between the subsystems of DCDC, and perhaps a standardization and clarification of basic operating procedures, e.g., which agency is responsible for the updating system.

(d) Since there is no central outprocessing area, there is no real certain check of whether a person has left the system, or whether he has progressed to a different section of the system. Possibly a check could be made monthly of the accurate location of individuals by compiling a computer run-out of individuals by location and then checking against the actual current roster or body count.

(e) There is an excessive amount of manual repetition of the same basic information into various forms and tallys. A good portion could be facilitated by computer.

B. WOMEN'S DETENTION CENTER

(1) Functioning

This office is maintained by one man. The basic operation is the same, but runs much smoother than the Jail. The same files are maintained, including key cards, history cards, etc.

(2) Forms

This office keeps a monthly running account of offense statistics by crime type, form of commitment, and sentence, plus some other summary statistics like average population and age.

(3) Problems

The same unnecessary manual auditing is done as at the Jail, and could be facilitated by the computer.

C. YOUTH CENTER #1

(1) Functioning

The Records Section of Youth Center #1 is composed of four people: a supervisor, two records clerks, and a dictating machine transcriber.

(2) Forms

a. Internal

1. Admission

When the center receives inmates transferred from the Jail, an arrival sheet is filled out on each individual and contains the following information: YE number, DCDC number, PDID number, inmate name, date of birth, court case number, sentence and date, court/judge, charge, date due in court, and the Corrections Parole Officer.

A Daily Movement Sheet is assembled throughout the day and serves the same purpose as the Jail's worksheet--that is, it keeps a running tally of the inmate population, starting with the opening count (at midnight), listing admissions, transfers and institutional changes, and ending with the adjusted closing count.

A quick access file card is completed on each inmate when he arrives at the Youth Center from the Jail. The card has several purposes; it is a cross-reference for inmate name, DCDC number, PDID number, dorm number and wing, a record of C&P caseloads, a record of dates for classification, initial hearing and institutional review hearings, and a summary record of commitment dates and (permanent) release dates.

2. Classification and Parole

Several forms are used during these procedures. For classification meetings, a classification docket is prepared listing each participating inmate

by name, C&P Officer, and DCDC number, with space for a comment (the inmate's classification and assignment). These meetings determine what is to be done with an inmate, his schedule, work, school, etc.

Dockets are also prepared for other types of boards before which the inmate appears--an Initial Hearing Docket, Institutional Review Hearing (prepared monthly), Parole Board Hearing Memo, and a Revocation or Special Hearing for Parole Violators.

b. Forms - External

Youth Center #1 receives one periodic report, the Weekly Population Report. This contains the following information on each inmate: name, DCDC number, commitment date, birth, institution, job, charge, police I.D., status, parole date, short-time date, and full-time date.

Youth Center #1 prepares two outgoing summary reports: the Quarterly List of Federal Prisoners, and the PROMPT (Program Management Performance Technique) Report. Since no federal prisoners will be at Lorton in the future, the first report is now obsolete.

The PROMPT Report is done monthly and contains statistics concerning population, admissions, and releases. Other administrative sections contribute statistics on staff, program/function assessment, and assignments. These data are similar to the information contained in the first three pages of Youth Center #2's PROMPT Report.

A number of other statistics are frequently asked but not calculated regularly--only on demand. They include:

- monthly breakdown by 5010e, 5010b, 5010c (how many of each);
- monthly breakdown of inmates by offense categories;
- quarterly breakdown by inmate age;
- monthly breakdown by parole violator;
- monthly breakdown by house violators;
- monthly breakdown by 5010e dispositions (how many received 5010b or 5010c or adult sentences or probation or releases at court);
- monthly breakdown by pending charges, detainers, concurrent adult sentences, consecutive adult sentences;
- monthly compilation of number of assaults on inmates by inmates (e.g., July 1, August 3, Total of 4);
- monthly compilation of number of assaults on staff by inmates (e.g., same as above);

- monthly compilation of number of escapes from furlough/institution (e.g., same as above); and
- average length of inmate stay at institution, including a breakdown by 5010b, 5010c, and offense categories (quarterly).

(3) Problems

A severe counting problem exists. After a youth has completed observation and diagnosis, he may be transferred to another facility. After sentencing, he is returned to YC #1 as a new commitment. However, if he remains at YC #1 until sentencing, he is not counted as a new commitment.

Ms. Rockwell would like to have a monthly printout of the next few months' parole dockets to facilitate planning at the Youth Center.

D. YOUTH CENTER #2

(1) Functioning

The Records Section of Youth Center #2 is composed of five people: a supervisor, two records clerks, and two dictating machine transcribers.

(2) Forms

a. Internal

Youth Center #2 uses a Daily Movement Sheet identical to that used in YC #1. This form is compiled daily at the control center, and the records office gets a copy.

As is common with each institution, a card is kept on each inmate for easy access. At YC #2 this is called a Reference Card. In addition, a Locator Card (in a Rolodex file) is kept on each inmate as well as an ID card.

b. External

As in all institutions, YC #2 receives a copy of the Weekly Population Report from ADP.

Youth Center #2 prepares three reports that are sent out of the center to higher administrators: The Quarterly List of Federal Prisoners, The PROMPT Report, and an Offense Breakdown Report.

The original of The Quarterly List of Federal Prisoners is filed in the records office and copies sent to D.C. Jail, the Budget Office (HQ), and the Industries Section (at complex).

Youth Center #2 records office has complete responsibility for The PROMPT Report. Several pages of graphic data (tracking of effectiveness measures for each institutional program or function) are prepared. At YC #1, the graphic section is filled out in the C&P office. Copies of the report are distributed to the following: Records Office file, Administrator of YC #2, Assistant Administrator for Operations, Assistant Administrator for Programs, and Assistant Director for Operations, and one copy is sent to each of six units providing input information.

Youth Center #2 records office prepares its portion of a weekly report as do all other institutions. This report contains information on assaults, escorted trips, furloughs, escapes, and shakedowns. Copies are sent to the Records Office file, the Administrator of YC #2, and the Assistant Director for Operations.

Each month an Offense Breakdown Report is compiled. This report shows the most serious offense for each inmate, the average length of stay by release category (institution to which inmate is released), the average length of stay by sentence structure, and the average length of stay for total releases. Five copies are distributed--one each to Records file, Administrator of YC #2, Assistant Director for Operations, Assistant Administrator for Operations, and Assistant Administrator for Programs.

E. MINIMUM SECURITY

(1) Functioning

This office is essentially a one-man operation, but one inmate provides additional assistance.

(2) Forms

An Arrival Sheet is filled out each time a new arrival enters Minimum Security. It is made out in quadruplicate, with copies going to each of the following: Classification and Parole, Finance, Medical, and Administration.

The next step consists of making out the following seven cards for each individual:

1. Mail and Visit
2. Pay Card
3. Short-Term Expiration Card
4. I.D. Card for Mail Office

5. Federal Card
6. Dormitory Card
7. Rolodex Control Card

Transfers are handled in the standard manner using SOP Form 2.

A Daily Movement Sheet is compiled in the same manner as the Youth Centers.

This office receives one periodic report, the Weekly Population Report, and sends out one report, the Daily Population Report, which is consolidated monthly, quarterly, and annually.

(3) Problems

The problem common to one-man offices is overwork. This could be alleviated by extended use of the computer for compiling reports.

F. MEDIUM SECURITY

(1) Functioning

The Records Office is headed by a GS-11 who controls four GS-8 record examiners and a clerk-typist. Their duties consist of records preparation and filing, appearing as court witness, property inventory, supply request, and operating a photo lab. All staff are full-time employees.

Medium and Maximum Security Records Offices are now separate. Medium Security maintains files on every inmate within the central facility or compound (Medium and Maximum Security); however, the inmate's permanent record jacket follows him if he goes to Maximum Security.

(2) Forms

a. Internal

The first form consists of a narrow strip which fits into a Cardex file and contains an inmate's name, DCDC number, and location (dormitory and squad). One strip is filled out for each inmate on arrival and inserted in the Cardex in alphabetical order by name. When the inmate leaves the institution, his strip is removed and discarded. This file provides quick access to each inmate's location within the central facility. This file is maintained even if the inmate is transferred to Maximum Security.

The second internal form is a Rolodex card which is filled out for each inmate as he enters the central facility. Called the Release Time Suspense

Card, this card is kept in chronological order by release date. It contains the inmate's name, DCDC number, release date, offense, sentence, detainer identification, and pending case identification.

A Commitment Card (record of court commitment) is filled out using the inmate's face sheet and other information contained in the inmate's permanent record jacket and is available for quick information access. The cards are filed by DCDC number.

A Transfer Order is used wherever an inmate is moved within the institution and is filled out by the moving agency. From these, a transfer record is kept and updated and provides a chronological history of all the inmate's movements.

b. External

Medium Security receives a copy of the Weekly Population Report containing the following information: name, DCDC number, commitment date, birth, institution, job, charge, police ID, status, parole date, short-time date, and full-time date.

This office prepares two periodic reports. The first is a Daily Population Report, which is also consolidated monthly, quarterly, and yearly. It is submitted to the Jail.

A List of Federal Prisoners is also prepared quarterly and is consolidated at the end of each fiscal year.

(3) Problems

There is too much duplication in the system now, and there should be more interest (possibly training sessions on using the data display and its details). Furthermore, Medium Security needs a full-time terminal operator and could use a hot line (direct line) to the Jail.

G. HALFWAY HOUSES

(1) Functioning

There are no records offices in the usual sense maintained at halfway house locations (for a listing of these, see Exhibit II). Instead, record jackets are kept in administrators' offices and updated manually whenever appropriate. In addition, Community Services at Headquarters keeps card files for active residents. To a large degree the various houses operate similarly, though they

Exhibit II

HALFWAY HOUSES

CCC #1
406 Condon Terr. SE
629-8651

CCC #2
456 C Street, NW
629-4985

CCC #4
2650 Firth Sterling Ave., SE
889-3454

CCC #5
1817 - 13th St., NW
462-8475

CTCY #1
1825 - 13th St., NW
332-5575

CTCY #2 (YCCP)
1719 - 13th St., NW
462-7805

RTC
519 C St., NE
546-7702

SHAW #1
1770 Park Rd., NW
667-2444

SHAW #2
1740-42 Park Rd., NW
667-6599

SHAW #3
2019 - 19th St., NW
387-5555

EFEC
701 Maryland Ave., NE
544-7200

WHHW
1816 - 19th St., NW
462-8982

of course vary somewhat in size and often even in purpose. For the most part the recordkeeping operations are quite similar in nature to those of Minimum Security at the Complex, except that houses do not have any CRT display terminals. This is not at all surprising since these units all operate effectively as work-release centers.

(2) Forms

The forms used are essentially the same as those used for Minimum Security.

(3) Problems

Though the halfway houses today do not make up a particularly large segment of the active non-parole population (now running approximately 9-10%), there is a very major movement to community-based residential treatment centers. They are becoming more acceptable to correctional, governmental, and judicial leaders who have long debated the viability of this method to serve both the offender and the community. Consequently, the necessity of upgrading and automating data collection procedures at the house will become more evident with the passage of time. This means, for one thing, the eventual installation of the terminals.

As the only key units still completely manual, the halfway houses suffer in comparison to the other units, primarily with regard to data transmission, especially in handling intra-agency transfers. Improving these data functions, particularly their introduction into the EDP cycle, would make house administrators more available for their key job of running the houses on a day-to-day basis.

The measurement of the (re)integration of the public offender into the community is certainly an ultimate target to which we must eventually direct our attention.

3

ANALYSIS OF THE CRISYS

This portion of the Task 1 report summarizes the observations and review of CRISYS System Manuals performed during June and July 1974, as currently implemented by the Office of Data Processing of the District of Columbia's Department of Corrections, and includes the projected implementation of concepts and techniques currently in planning or programming.

A. SYSTEM CONCEPT AND CONFIGURATION

CRISYS is primarily an on-line system, accessed through IBM 3270 CRT remote terminals, utilizing an IBM 370/58 mainframe with IBM 3330 Disk Storage devices for on-line data files. The file organization is ISAM. The Software Monitor which controls file query and display functions is an IBM-developed tool called FASTER and allows programming of specific display and update functions. In addition, the DCDC has an IBM System/3 - Model 10, which is used as a stand-alone (small) computer as well as a batch-type remote terminal accessing the 370/58.

From the DCDC's point of view, the purpose of this configuration is two-fold:

a. It enables a number of different users (MPD, DCDC, etc.) to utilize similar storage, retrieval, and computation techniques, and to thereby standardize computer methodology. This is, of course, beneficial to the DCDC.

b. The DCDC needs an on-line access to a system and, in addition, has developed a series of MIS-type reports produced on daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly cycles in a batch environment.

The system, as it currently exists, does seem to provide a working solution to these needs.

B. HARDWARE ANALYSIS

Evaluation

The system, as described above, is adequate for currently defined DCDC needs insofar as the main system is concerned. The System/3 has a very limited capacity (24K core is the maximum) as a statistics generator and severely restricts this primary function. It is adequate for use as a listing-type report generator; RPG, for example, is an appropriate programming language for this system.

An in-house hardware evaluation determined that a move to a larger version of the System/3 is desirable. Accordingly, a decision has been made to acquire a System/3 - Model 15, with a high speed printer, spooling capability, and increased core storage. This system will allow significant processing of batch MIS reports under the control of the DCDC.

Records personnel are using extensively the CRT terminals throughout the corrections system with great success. Some problems were encountered when the CRTs were first installed, as would be expected but, because of the ADP group's understanding of the human problems associated with the use of sophisticated computer devices, the period of transition from a completely manual system to one which is computer-based has been made relatively smoothly. Now, the ADP group has begun to "tighten up" the system to take full advantage of the possibilities offered by the use of this technology.

Recommendations

Since the decision to switch to a larger computer has been made, there are no additional recommendations in this area.

C. SYSTEM SOFTWARE ANALYSIS

Evaluation

The heart of the system software is an IBM generated, on-line monitor system called FASTER. This is a MACRO language and permits storage, retrieval, formatting, and display functions to be performed in a relatively straightforward fashion. The monitor takes care of the hardware I/O Channel-terminal interface requirements of the computer system. IBM has modified the FASTER monitor to allow the insertion of ALC instructions into the body of the FASTER code (FASTER MT). This has proven to be a significant advantage to ADP programming staff, in that it allows more precise coding. In addition, FASTER MT

Transaction Processing Description (TPD) modules can now be called from COBOL or PL/I and can call COBOL or PL/I routines. This is a great advantage over the original monitor.

When the need for an on-line system was established some years ago, a a study of available monitors was made, and FASTER was determined to be the most efficient monitor available at the time. Since then, periodic evaluations have been made, and FASTER MT is still judged to be the best monitor system for DCDC needs.

Recognizing that the DCDC was "locked-in" to this configuration, attention was given to the development of "utility" TPDs to handle basic storage, retrieval, and display functions. These generalized TPDs are "plugged in" to new processing programs (such as the Admissions System) without the necessity of redeveloping the MACROs needed for elementary formatting and storage of records. Emphasis on the use of the "high-level" programming languages COBOL and PL/I will also help to reduce development and implementation time and cost in future applications.

In this way, the ADP group reduces the number of FASTER MACROs required for any specific application. For example, one of the newest sets of TPDs involves an on-line admissions system. Generalized FASTER modules made coding the new system easier.

Recommendations

Recently IBM discontinued support of FASTER MT and has encouragd users to consider switching to CICS. In spite of the proven effectiveness of FASTER MT as a monitor, the ADP group must now consider conversion to CICS in the future, and in fact has begun to analyze the impact of this conversion process.

D. USER SOFTWARE (SYSTEM) ANALYSIS

Evaluation

The system, as conceptualized, is a good one. Use of the system is easy and straightforward. TPDs currently exist, or are under development, to handle all basic processing functions--admissions, transfers, updating based on additional or changed input, etc. There is also a multitude of rather simplistic batch-oriented MIS-type reports, produced on a periodic basis. Considering the constraints of the system configuration, both hardware and software, CRISYS can legitimately be considered successful. However, there are some loopholes--

primarily in the area of planning and use of CRISYS as a management information and research tool. A massive body of data, both current (active) and historical (inactive) is available for use. Little use, apparently, is being made of this data, other than to monitor and control inmate status and movement within the Corrections System. The existing MIS-type reports are superficial at best. No statistical techniques to evaluate the data, much less to utilize them to develop prediction models for future planning and action, are being used.

Recommendations

Initially, the DCDC should focus on using available data for other than "hardcore" use. Department functions concerned with planning should provide input criteria for development of new report types. Current batch reports can provide some statistical summaries. These reports, however, should not be utilized as "raw" or source information. They require verification and validation of the data, as well as some interpretation, specifically the institution of qualifying statements to ensure that reviewing staff understands the relevance and significance of the report data.

Since the DCDC is an "open" agency in the sense that it is constantly under scrutiny by other branches of government and the public, and since some of the information contained in the files is of a volatile nature, the DCDC has established both the necessity and feasibility of developing on-line displays of statistical/summary information (similar to but more comprehensive than the STIT), as opposed to or in conjunction with existing and future batch reports. This effort must continue if the Department information needs are to be fully satisfied. An immediate advantage to the implementation of a system of on-line reports would be the ability to provide "instant" response to "important" inquiries from the Mayor's Office, the Congress, or the White House. This would also improve communication of information to the MPD, the FBI, and the LEAA.

E. FILE/TERMINAL SECURITY AND ACCESS ANALYSIS

Evaluation

At present, the system is open to anyone who comes into possession of the CRISYS manual(s) and who can access a terminal. Some elementary logging of terminal activity is performed (FASTER provides for some tracking). The security of the system is based on a "need-to-know" philosophy which is dependent on human beings and not on computer-controlled authority. Access to the terminals is

controlled more through good-will than through security authorization. For example, the terminal located on the 9th Floor of 614 H Street in the Community Services area is controlled by its location behind a desk-type barrier with an Authorized Personnel Only sign. This effectively bars "easy access" to the terminal. However, there is a back door located immediately to the left of the terminal and opening onto the elevator landing. This door, especially on crowded or warm days, is often left open or unlocked. Although there are usually two Community Services staff members in the room, it is easily conceivable that unauthorized access to this terminal could take place.

Recently implemented is a method for controlling access to the data files through a TPD called AUTH. This TPD is required to allow access to the data files for updating purposes. The user enters the transaction code AUTH, his name, and his Social Security Number. The system checks this data against a table to determine the level of authorization allocated to the individual and returns with a message that the terminal is "unlocked." This allows the user to then proceed with authorized TPDs. The system will log transactions, TPDs used, by terminal and by user, and provides good security monitoring.

However, AUTH is somewhat cumbersome to use. In addition, a Social Security Number is not exactly privileged information. Anyone with a modicum of intelligence can obtain, either directly or indirectly, the Social Security Number of another person. Furthermore, the AUTH setup as currently implemented does not control the terminal once it has been unlocked. An example problem follows:

> Unauthorized use of the terminal after it has been unlocked. The prevention of this condition is the total responsibility of the unlocker. Should this condition occur, the unlocker will be held responsible, which means blamed for the occurrence. This, however, does not prevent the unauthorized access.

Another facet of security and access deals with the legibility of data, should it be accessed in an unauthorized manner. This facet addresses itself to the structure and contents of the daqa files themselves. At present, all files are stored in EBSCIDIC format. This means that all data are physically carried on the 3330 disks in letters and numbers. Any dump, or read-out of the disks, by anyone, would result in intelligible information displays (given the availability or knowledge of the alpha-numeric codes) showing all information about any inmate or former inmate (there are 30,000 records on file, of which only about 5,500 are for present inmates of the system), including real

names and aliases and other unique identification of any person in the system. This setup could result in illegal retrieval or modification of personal data.

There is potential access to terminals by current inmates, especially at the D.C. Jail. This procedure will be resolved when the new jail is completed, but does leave a hiatus of about two years, during which the current system must function.

In summary, although security and access has not been completely controlled, attention and consideration are being given to acceptable measures. There has been a valid rationale for not implementing full security precautions during initial system use. This was to ease the difficulties of transition from a manual to a computer-based system. New users, unfamiliar with computers, have a substantial resistance to using the machines. To smooth this process, people were encouraged to make extensive use of facets of the system. To facilitate this, few controls were placed on the actual access and use of the data files. Now that the DCDC records personnel have become familiar with and dependent on the computer to perform previously manual tasks, the ADP group has begun to implement security-oriented control and monitoring mechanisms to safeguard the integrity of the data.

Recommendations

An intensive study should be made of the security/access/integrity systems developed by military, police, and para-military agencies to provide for confidentiality of information. Using applicable portions of one or more of these systems could minimize both developmental and implementation time, as well as associated cost.

The feasibility of an AUTH-type TPD for information displays should also be examined. At present, security is focused on prevention of unauthorized updates. Display TPDs are uncontrolled.

Data scrambling techniques, either mainframe or terminal based, should be examined. Using a simple algorithm to distort the configuration of the data as it is stored on the 3330 disk is an easy way to prevent "dumping" of the data files. If, in addition to an algorith, the decrypting process is dependent on the user supplying a series of constants, committed to memory and modified on a periodic basis, unauthorized access (without knowledge of the "key") would result in failure to retrieve useful information.

It is important to remember, however, that the value of any security system is totally dependent on the continued usage, by authorized personnel, of

all components of the system. Any security procedure which impedes this process has invalidated its fundamental purpose.

F. DATA VALIDITY AND CLEANING

Evaluation

Some elementary editing of the data is performed by the system. In the historical record, for example, the system checks to see that the TO and FROM institutions correspond to previous entries. Date sequences are also checked. In addition, all movements within the system and all actions taken with respect to an inmate are supported by hard-copy paper. Therefore the sources for data validation exist. No defined "quality control" procedures presently exist to actually perform significant data checking and validation. Admission records (fact sheets) at the D.C. Jail are, for the most part, filled out by inmates. In addition, no "outside" validation of information supplied by the new inmate is accomplished, other than checking with the MPD and the FBI. If those records are incomplete or inaccurate, no attempt is made to obtain more accurate or complete data from other sources. What checking does take place is on a "spot" basis and is performed by ADP staff, to check on new or other Records personnel where they feel that inaccuracies are most likely to occur. However, there is no defined methodology to the validation process.

Recommendations

The ADP group should develop data validation schemes whereby weights are assigned to variables contained in the files and random samples of jackets are selected from each institutional facility and compared with information residing on the files. During this process, no correction of data should be performed until some estimate of the accuracy of the data contained in the jacket is made. This initial process will serve to estimate the "degree of fit" between the jackets and the information stored in the computer. This, in turn, will enable the ADP group to assess the resources required to update the data files. However, prior to continuing the validation/updating process, it is necessary to form an estimate of the accuracy of the source data. This can be partially accomplished through a series of interviews (by Records personnel) of a random sample of inmates--again drawn from each of the institutions comprising the corrections system. Through comparison with the material contained in the "jacket" and the computer files, an estimate can be drawn. To this, add the

input derived from similar comparisons with related but independently controlled files, such as files kept by the courts, the Parole Department, the MPD, FBI, and other agencies (SSA, Welfare, Health, etc.), insofar as this is legal, ethical, and feasible. The sum of this process will serve as a basis for validation of the accuracy and completeness of information retained by the DCDC. After evaluating the resulqs of this process, decisions can be made as to the desirability of proceeding with a formal data validation scheme for existing records.

For new records, those pertaining to first-time offenders, or offenders new to the CRISYS, a more straightforward method of validating the gathered data at the time of input to the system can be developed with a relatively minor amount of resource expenditure. Current methods for data validation in use by other, similar agencies, both governmental and private, will be of some benefit to DCDC. As with security procedures, much time and cost can be saved by utilizing systems developed by others to help solve DCDC's problems.

An additional point to consider is the restructuring of existing data files to purge them of invalid, non-essential, or unused data fields, with an eye toward eventual "matching" of data elements with other files (NCIC, WALES, etc.). Some thought should be given to the projected use of an IMS-type software interface which has the ability to access disparate data bases for common use by all interested parties. This type of interactive system allows for the cross-indexing of multiple data bases with one series of queries to the system.

As the use of sophisticated computer technology increases, logic dictates centralized, generalized access methods to data bases kept by independent organizations to provide for shared pools of informational data. In face, the DCDC is currently interfacing with the WALES in exactly this fashion.

G. CONTROL OF SYSTEMS OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

Evaluation

Access to and control of CRISYS, from a file use standpoint, is now performed by many different areas within the DCDC. The structure of the corrections system makes this inevitable. Technical control, which includes some form of control over the personnel accessing the system, has not been well defined at the present time. Due to this lack of organized control, a number of areas within the DCDC perform duplicative functions. Some of this is necessary to ensure that a "fail-safe" or backup system is immediately available and

working. However, some duplication is redundant. For example, Community Services receives "body counts" of the population at each of the community-based facilities by telephone each morning. When these data are compared with the STIT record, as displayed by the computer, though both theoretically provide identical information, the numbers displayed do not always match the "body counts" supplied over the telephone. One of these sets of figures should be validated and used by both Community Services and the computer--we lean toward the computer figures.

Another area of concern relates to the confidence to be placed in the computer-stored data. Mr. Harbin at the D.C. Jail, for instance, trusts the computer-stored data to a far greater extent than the material contained in his manual files. This is as it should be, but it has become apparent that at least some of the data contained in the computer is not the "best" obtainable.

Recommendations

The foregoing examples point up the need for a centralized control of system operations. Further, this need has been recognized by the National Advisory Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals in their publication on Criminal Justice Systems.

Page 43 - Access

> "The basic principle of access to the files maintained, at least in the context of the integrated network described here, is that the level maintaining the file should provide access. For on-line systems, the jurisdictional level holding the file should provide the communications medium and appropriate control mechanisms (software and hardware) to support either qualified access through inquiry, terminal entry, or computer interface."

This establishes the principle of a centralized control of a Criminal Justice System.

In the same publication, Chapter 7-Operations, pp. 96-97 concerns itself with three major issues relevant to optimum operation: quality of the data, completeness and accuracy of the data, and separation and isolation of the complete Criminal Justice files.

> "Quality of the data is best maintained through routine and regularly performed checks and audits. This provides assurance that the data available are complete, accurate, updated, and free from subjective evaluations. Intelligence file contents, for example, should be unavailable to the information system.

"Data will only be as complete and accurate as it was when it was supplied to the computerized system. The input material should be prepared on standard forms that permit no qualitative indicators, nuances, ambiguities, or other shy meanings that a computer simply cannot translate into storable form. Standards cited in the Police chapters of this report illustrate the clarity and fact-oriented reporting that are required.

"The separation of criminal justice information files from any similar or related files maintained by the law enforcement agency will do much to insure that data in the information system is both accurate and of good quality. At the same time, it will effectively prevent the misuse and possible degradation of the information system in matters pertinent to the right of privacy."

The most efficient way of ensuring both quality, accuracy, and completeness of the data is to provide for a centralized control of system operations, not only insofar as hardware and software is concerned, but specifically in the area of input to the data files. In this way, the integrity of the data can be maintained at the least cost to the DCDC.

The question of complete and accurate data is further explored by the National Advisory Committee in Standard 8.2 - Scope of Files - pp. 121-122.

Page 122

"To ensure privacy, it is essential that data be complete and accurate, not ambiguous or misleading."

Again, the most efficient method of ensuring this is to utilize the existing operations staff to provide direct control of data entering the system.

We therefore recommend that a study be made of the feasibility of consolidating personnel responsible for entering input into the system with the ADP group, which is responsible for development, implementation and maintenance of the CRISYS, in order that control of the system and specifically data control be vested in one organizational entity within the DCDC. This consolidation would raise confidence in the quality of stored data through efficient communication and coordination between system support staff and terminal operators, not normally achievable when organizational control is split between two or more entities.

4

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, RMC would like to present some preliminary recommendations along with two summary tables of DCDC information sources. The preliminary recommendations for the most part are simply summations of past recommendations that RMC came across during this initial task of the contract. We, however, respect views of the current information system users and therefore feel compelled to summarize their most pertinent recommendations along with some of our ideas at this time. The reader should be cautioned that these ideas are preliminary in nature and have not been analyzed in the context of the improved DCDC Planning and Management Information System.

The summary tables of information sources are presented to show where manually maintained information originates. The data elements currently available via CRISYS are compared with the manual data in these tables and some preliminary conclusions drawn. It is important to note that the manual data contains both quantitative and subjective (qualitative) information whereas almost all the CRISYS information is quantitative by individual. This difference is particularly true with regard to parole information. The last table presents information that to the best of our knowledge is only available through CRISYS.

Both the preliminary recommendations and the DCDC data source summation will be critical to analysis of how the users needs being developed in Task 2 are to be satisfied.

A. RECOMMENDATIONS

Our recommendations have been divided into three groups for sake of clarity. The first group contains those recommendations which are of a system-wide nature and pertain more to general departmental procedures than do those of any specific office. The second is made up of those pertaining directly to

the recordkeeping functions while the third is composed of computer-oriented recommendations. Within any one grouping the specific order and presentation should in no way be considered meaningful.

It is not our intention to insist that the Department be bound to make the indicated changes, but rather our hope that a reasonable dialogue be provoked. We have also compiled an interesting table showing the exact sources of particular kinds of information and this is presented following. This turns out to be a revealing presentation which will be very useful in our later work.

SYSTEM-WIDE

1. Standardize the identification number used to refer to an individual across the criminal justice system. Use the Police Department identification number (PDID) for all people who first enter the system through the Metropolitan Police Department. For all others (such as illegal immigration cases) create a special numbering system whose inception in action would be communicated to the Police and Courts. One such possibility would be to use the format I#####.
2. Make it very clear throughout the Department whose responsibility it is to enter what information into the system.
3. Wherever possible eliminate the need for manual compilation of quarterly, monthly, and annual data reports.
4. It is recommended that a study be made of the feasibility of consolidating personnel responsible for entering input to the system with the ADP group.
5. Make everybody who has anything whatsoever to do with data handling, retrieval, and information handling fully aware of the information already available from CRISYS. One gets the distinct impression that many problems currently facing information processors could be eliminated over night if everybody knew what everybody else was doing.

RECORDKEEPING

6. Standardize the order of documents in an inmate's judgment commitment folder and record and jacket across all institutions.
7. Standardize quick access cards for inmates across institutions. There is a surprising lack of uniformity in this regard.
8. Special emphasis should be placed on the efficient handling of parole information. One example should be the computerization of parole dockets by institution and program.

COMPUTER

9. Produce more timely and well-thought-out computerized breakdowns (say, monthly) of offenses by institution and program.

10. Contemplate the computerization of some of the portions of the PROMPT (Program Management Performances Technique) reports with particular emphasis on population measurements over time and related parameters.

11. Basic fiscal and budget information should be as completely computerized as possible.

12. An additional point to consider is the restructuring of existing data files to purge them of invalid, non-essential, or not used data fields, with an eye toward eventual "matching" of data elements with other files (NCIC, WALES, etc.).

13. DCDC should continue the development of on-line displays of statistical/summary information as opposed to or in conjunction with existing and future batch reports.

14. An intensive study should be made of the security/access/integrity systems developed by military, police, and para-military agencies to provide for confidentiality of information. An examination should also be made of the feasibility of an AUTH-type TPD for information displays. Data scrambling techniques, either mainframe or terminal based, should also be examined.

15. The ADP group should develop data validation schemes whereby weights are assigned to variables contained in the files and random samples of jackets are selected from each institutional facility and compared with information residing on the files. However, prior to continuing with the validation/updating process, it is necessary to form an estimate of the accuracy of the source data. This can be partially accomplished through a series of interviews (by Records personnel) of a random sample of inmates--again drawn from each of the institutions comprising the corrections system.

B. DCDC DATA SOURCES

DCDC currently generates and maintains a considerable amount of information on individuals within the corrections system. This workload requires a significant amount of human resources drawn from the Department of Corrections and is expected to increase substantially when the new jail commences operation and the 17 inmates currently allowed to assist the jail's records office are lost. This resource burden coupled with the need for more aggregate corrections information dictated that RMC take a look at the current data (both manual and computer based) in an attempt to develop more efficient procedures for meeting the current data requirements while maintaining or improving the overall accuracy of the information. The information presented at this time is but a first step in the analysis leading to the accomplishment of this objective.

The manual data sources are presented in Exhibit III. Also, shown in this table is a comparison of which of the data elements are carried in CRISYS.

Exhibit IV presents a listing of the information that at first glance appears to be unique to CRISYS. The following paragraphs are some observations with regard to the information contained in Exhibits III and IV.

1. While it appears that the Jail possesses a substantial amount of information in comparison to the other facilities, this is not really the case. Since the Admission Fact Sheet contains the bulk of information and is retained in the inmate's central file folder, this information is actually passed on to each of the facilities when the inmate and his file folder are transferred.

2. Because of this above fact, the percentages of commonality and uniqueness are somewhat misleading. These figures place emphasis on the source of the data provided rather than on the availability of the data. The 9% commonality figure seems to imply that only 9% of the data is available from all installations, while that is not really the case. Nine percent of the information is repeated in each installation; a substantial amount more is available at each installation though not uniquely generated from that particular source.

3. The common bits of information appearing (repeating) in all institutions are as follows:

   Name
   Race/Sex
   DCDC #
   Offense
   Term
   Sentence
   Parole Eligibility
   Full Term
   Short Term
   G.C.T.
   J.G.T.

   Unique to the Jail are:

   Veteran
   Scars
   Treatment
   FBI #
   Time in D.C.

   Unique to YC #1:

   YE #

4. While the personal information is very detailed and factual (amenable to data processing), the parole information tends to be highly subjective and arbitrary.

5. The youth centers do not generate any new information on the standardized forms, though they, of course, yield non-standardized reports on psychological analysis and observation of the inmates.

6. While all offices contain forms yielding the basic demographic information on all individuals, detailed personal, medical, marital, and educational information is only available from the Jail face sheet.

7. While the number of dependents is listed on CRISYS, this type of family information is noticeably lacking on any of the forms generated. Any indication of the quality or type of family or neighborhood environment is missing. Though this important influence may be taken under consideration by the Parole Section in a non-standardized way, these important parameters should be more readily available.

8. While much information is collected during the admission process, no detailed interview of the inmate is made until he has progressed to the parole cycle. It would appear that this kind of in-depth knowledge of the individual would be useful during all segments of the criminal justice system.

EXHIBIT III

INFORMATION VS. SOURCE MATRIX

	D.C. Jail								Y.C. #1			Y.C. #2				Medium				Minimum		Halfway Houses		
	Admission Fact Sheet	Key Card	History Card	Locator Card	Fingerprint File	Photograph File	Transfer Order	Court Lists	Arrival Sheet	File Card	Transfer Order	Reference Card	Locator Card	I.D. Card	Transfer Order	Strip-Cardex File	Release Time Suspense Card	Commitment Card	Transfer Order	Arrival Sheet	Transfer Order	Arrival Sheet	Transfer Order	CRISYS
Personal																								
Name	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	xx
Aliases	x	x	x		x													x						x
Address	x		x	x	x																			x
Race/Sex	x	x	x	x	x		x	x			x				x			x	x		x		x	x
Birthdate	x		x		x				x			x						x				x		x
Age	x		x	x		x												x		x				x
Nativity	x		x		x	x																		x
Church	x		x																					x
Veteran	x																							x
Disability	x		x																					x
Height	x				x	x												x						x
Weight	x				x	x												x						x
Eyes	x				x	x												x						x
Hair	x				x	x												x						x
Complexion	x					x												x						x
Build	x					x												x						x
Driver's Lisc. #	x																							x
Lisc. State	x																							x
Narcotics User	x																							x
Alcohol User	x																							x
Time in D.C.	x																							
Time in U.S.	x				x																			
Scars/Marks					x	x																		
Treatment	x																							x
Academic																								
Read/Write	x		x																					x
Years/Educ.	x																							x
Employment																								
Occupation	x		x	x	x	x																		x
Latest Hourly Wage	x																							x
Welfare Benefits Received	x																							x
Family Information																								
Marital Status	x		x	x														x						x
Name/Address of Nearest Relative	x		x																					
Offense History																								
Prisoner Type	x		x																					x
# of Prev. Commts.	x	x	x							x		x												x
Commit. Date	x		x	x																				x
Surrender Vals.	x		x																					x
Fingerprint Class.	x	x			x	x																		x
Fingerprint Refs.	x	x			x																			x
Police I.D. #	x								x	x														x
DCDC #	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x	x		x	x
FBI #	x	x			x				x	x								x						
Y.E. #									x															
Housing Location			x	x				x		x						x								

EXHIBIT III (Cont.)

	D.C. Jail							Y.C. #1			Y.C. #2			Medium			Minimum		Halfway Houses		
	Admission Fact Sheet	Key Card	History Card	Locator Card	Fingerprint File	Photograph File	Transfer Order	Court Lists	Arrival Sheet	File Card	Transfer Order	Reference Card	Locator Card	I.D. Card	Transfer Order	Strip-Cardex File	Release Time Suspense Card	Commitment Card	Transfer Order	Arrival Sheet	Transfer Order	Arrival Sheet	Transfer Order	CRISYS
Judicial Information																								
Detainer	x		x	x				x				x					x	x						x
Case #	x	x	x	x					x			x												x
Offense	x	x	x	x		x			x			x					x			x				x
Charge	x	x								x	x							x			x			x
Bond	x	x	x	x													x	x						x
Term	x	x	x	x					x			x					x	x		x				x
Sentence	x	x					x		x		x	x			x				x		x		x	x
Date	x	x	x						x			x												x
Type Court	x	x						x	x															x
Court Date	x	x																						x
Scheduled Release Date	x	x							x															x
Attorney		x						x	x															x
Judge		x						x	x			x	x											x
Parole																								
Final Hearing												x												x
Min. Release Date												x				x								x
Expiration		x										x												x
Parole Eligib.							x				x	x		x					x		x		x	x
Case Pending																x								x
C&P Officer							x						x											x
Full Term							x				x			x			x	x	x	x			x	x
Short Term							x				x			x			x	x	x	x			x	x
Parole Term																	x		x					x
Violations																								
P.Wt. Issued																	x							x
P.Wt. Served																	x							x
Viol. Time Start																	x							x
Received																	x							x
Received Fm.																	x							x
New Full Term Date																	x							x
New Short Term Date																	x							x
Released																	x							x
G.C.T. Credited							x				x			x			x	x		x			x	x
J.C.T. Credited							x				x			x			x	x		x			x	x

Percentage information common to all offices = 9%.

Percentage unique to each office (where nonzero): Jail = 4%
Y.C. #1 = 1%
CRISYS = 40%

Exhibit IV

INFORMATION UNIQUE TO CRISYS

Status
Dependents
Social Security number
Number of charges
Date entered Federal status
Date removed from expansion
Commitment status
Convicted offense
Minimum sentence
Maximum sentence
Further hearing date

Last movement type program participation

- Education
- Vocational
- Theory
- Counseling
- Number of months in program
- New skill acquired in institution
- Monthly salary
- Accrued wages
- Number of escapes
- Last escape date
- Number of absconds
- Last abscond date
- Cadre

Preliminary hearing data

- Multiple data flag
- Next eligibility date
- Last hearing date
- Last hearing disposition
- Last hearing case number

Initial hearing data

- Multiple data flag
- Next eligibility date
- Last hearing date
- Last hearing disposition
- Last hearing case number

Rehearing data

- Multiple data flag
- Next eligibility date
- Last hearing date
- Last hearing disposition
- Last hearing case number

Violation hearing data

- Multiple data flag
- Next eligibility date
- Last hearing date
- Last hearing disposition
- Last hearing case number

Continued hearing data

- Multiple data flag
- Next eligibility date
- Last hearing date
- Last hearing disposition
- Last hearing case number
- Number of days under parole officer supervision
- Degree of supervision
- Number of times paroled during current incarceration
- Inactive supervision date
- Employment upon release
- Hourly wages upon release
- Date of last interview

END