

LOAN DOCUMENT

RETURN TO:

NCJRS

P. O. BOX 24036 S. W. POST OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024

FINAL REPORT:

Model Evaluation Program

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

August, 1976

NCJRS

JUL 6 1977

ACQUISITIONS

This project was supported by 75-NI-99-0097 awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

42300

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| II. BASIS OR RATIONALE..... | 1 |
| III. OBJECTIVES, TASKS & METHODS..... | 2 |
| IV. EVALUATION APPROACH..... | 3 |
| 1. Structure..... | 3 |
| 2. Evaluation Selection..... | 3 |
| 3. Evaluation Implementation..... | 4 |
| A. Descriptive Study of Criminal Justice System in Jacksonville..... | 5 |
| B. Correctional Master Plan..... | 5 |
| C. Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program..... | 6 |
| D. Minority Recruitment Project..... | 7 |
| E. Assessment of Project & services for Dysfunctional Youth in the Duval County School System..... | 8 |
| F. Witness/Juror Utilization Study..... | 9 |
| G. Descriptive Study of LEAA Process in Jacksonville 1969-1976..... | 9 |
| H. Miscellaneous Evaluation Projects..... | 9 |
| V. EVALUATION FINDINGS..... | 10 |
| VI. SELF-EVALUATION..... | 10 |
| 1. Positive Accomplishments..... | 11 |
| 2. Evaluation Constraints..... | 14 |
| VII. RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 16 |

APPENDIX A

- A.1 Juror/Witness Utilization Study
- A.2 The Law Enforcement & Criminal Justice Information Systems
- A.3 Correctional Master Plan
- A.4 Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program
- A.5 Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program - Evaluation Report Part 2
- A.6 Minority Recruitment Program
- A.7 Programs for Dysfunctional Youth

APPENDIX B

- B.1 Metropolitan Criminal Justice Evaluation Process:
 Issues and Discussion

42300
c1

FINAL REPORT:

Model Evaluation Program

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

August, 1976

This project was supported by 75-NI-99-0097 awarded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

FINAL REPORT

Model Evaluation Project
Jacksonville, Florida
75-NI-99-0097

I. INTRODUCTION:

Model Evaluation Program (M.E.P.) funding for The Jacksonville Metropolitan Criminal Justice Planning Unit was approved on May 15, 1975. This one year grant award of \$84,712 enabled the continuation and expansion of an existing evaluation capability that had been in existence in the Office of Criminal Justice Planning for approximately two years. The M.E.P. project began on August 1, 1975. Full staffing of this unit was achieved on September 12, when the final evaluator was hired.

During the grant period, the Jacksonville M.E.P. developed a descriptive study of the local Criminal Justice System; conducted a comprehensive evaluation of the local jail and correctional system; evaluated the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program (in two separate studies); evaluated the Minority Recruitment Project; assessed programs and services for dysfunctional (pre-delinquent) youth in the Duval County School System; conducted a juror/witness utilization study; conducted follow-up studies of two previous evaluations, and completed several other evaluation-oriented tasks during the grant period. A model metropolitan criminal justice evaluation process was also developed during this period.

II. BASIS OR RATIONALE:

The lack of practical information on which to make objective decisions has led to a process of action through crisis or political pressure in many areas of the Criminal Justice System in Jacksonville. The lack of objective evaluative data, rather than a preference for the crisis induced decision-making, appears to have been a primary reason for this lack of objective, analytical decision-making. It was therefore assumed that, by expanding and up-grading the evaluation capabilities of the Criminal Justice System in Jacksonville, a more rationale-change process would result. This

process, in turn, was expected to improve those projects/programs which were evaluated within the local system. These improvements were expected to result in a net overall improvement in the Criminal Justice System in Jacksonville.

Another important reason for participation in the Model Evaluation Program was the need to clarify the role and functions of the local (city, county, regional) Criminal Justice Evaluation Units. It was believed that through self-study and evaluation, that a general evaluation process and an appropriate role for local evaluation capabilities could be developed and generalized to other areas of the country.

It was on this basis that the Jacksonville Model Evaluation Program began operation.

III. OBJECTIVES, TASKS AND METHODS:

Among the specified or implied objectives of the Jacksonville M.E.P. were the following:

1. To increase and up-grade the evaluation capabilities of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (O.C.J.P.) in Jacksonville.

The previous evaluation capability of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning consisted of one evaluator and a research assistant. M.E.P. funding enabled the unit to expand by funding a unit supervisor, another evaluator, another research assistant, two part-time consultants, and a unit secretary. Previous staff limitations resulted in a project-level evaluation focus. The increased staff capability was expected to enable this unit to develop a broad focus which included program and sub-system level evaluations. It was believed that such a broad-based capability would be more likely to meet the information needs of the decision-makers within the Jacksonville Criminal Justice System.

The availability of professional consultants was also expected to improve the quality of evaluation unit efforts. The consultants were expected to provide general Technical Assistance as well as specialized in-service training to unit personnel.

2. To have a positive impact on the Criminal Justice System in Jacksonville.

It was expected that objective evaluative data would provide system policy-makers with better information on which to make decisions. Evaluation recommendations, if accepted and implemented by the leadership of the Criminal Justice Systems, were expected to generally result in a more effective system in Jacksonville.

3. To develop an effective evaluation process that can be generalized to other local areas of the country.

It was assumed during the early stages of this project, that many local Criminal Justice Planning Units were in the beginning stages of developing an evaluation capability. Through careful monitoring of the evaluation experiences in Jacksonville, the development of a proposed process, generalizable to other local areas, was expected. Therefore, at the completion of each evaluation, a critical in-house review was conducted, to isolate problems, implement changes and to refine the evaluation process.

IV. EVALUATION APPROACH:

1. Structure - The personnel of the Jacksonville Model Evaluation Program were organized into two (2) teams under the director of the Evaluation Unit Supervisor. Each team consisted of one (1) evaluator and one (1) research assistant. General direction was provided by the Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning.

The independence of each team varied depending on the scope of the evaluation being conducted. Both teams were assigned to work on broad-based evaluations that required increased manpower. If two smaller evaluations were scheduled, each team functioned independently on separate evaluations. The Evaluation Unit Supervisor was responsible for task coordination and assignments.

2. Evaluation Selection - A flexible evaluation selection process was utilized during the Model Evaluation Program, in an attempt to meet the information needs of the Criminal Justice policy-makers in a timely fashion. On three occasions (Correc-

tional Master Plan Study, Drug Abuse Program Evaluations and the Juror/Witness Utilization Study) the evaluation unit was requested to do evaluations by administrators within the system. Since all three requests were within the scope of the Model Evaluation Program objectives, appeared to be of sufficient importance to system decision-makers, and in light of the voluntary nature of such requests, all three evaluation requests were honored.

Other Model Evaluation Program evaluations were selected on the basis of in-house review. These projects were selected on the basis of a preceived need for evaluation data in each respective area. Discussions were then held between evaluation unit personnel and the individuals responsible for the operation of each project/program.

Approval was obtained from the school system administration to conduct the study of Programs and Services for Dysfunctional Youth. No permission was necessary to evaluate the Minority Recruitment Project, since the evaluation unit has authority to evaluate LEAA funded projects/programs.

The primary factor in evaluation selection was the preceived need on the part of system decision-makers for evaluative data. Other criteria considered during the selection process included: anticipated degree of cooperation expected; project/program's in-house evaluation capabilities; availability of data (feasibility); length of time that project/program has been in existence and existence of prior evaluations and/or audits.

3. Evaluation Implementation - A general implementation process was followed in each evaluation. When a project/program was selected, an initial meeting was scheduled with the administrator(s) of that project/program to discuss preliminary evaluation matters. During this meeting: agreement was sought on what where to be the objectives of the evaluation; data sources were identified; plans to provide initial evaluation feedback were developed; a general timetable was developed; and the review and dissemination process was defined. Following this preliminary step, either the evaluator responsible for the Evaluation or the Evaluation Unit Supervisor,

developed a formal research design. This design specified the objectives of the evaluation, listed the data that would be needed to meet these objectives, and develop specific methodology to obtain such data. This design was often adjusted during the course of the evaluation as a result of various problems/ constraints that became evident after the start of the data collection process.

An adequate review of the implementation process must focus on each specific evaluation. Therefore, the major highlights of each evaluation will be noted below:

A. Descriptive Study of the Criminal Justice System in Jacksonville - This study was designed to provide basic descriptive information on the organizational structure and client flow through the local Criminal Justice System. This report described the operations of the major Criminal Justice Agencies and organizations. It also included a resource list which categorized agencies according to their function and listed basic identifying information (address, phone number, etc.) and a brief description of each agency.

Aside from the basic informational value of this study, it also served as a training aid to orient new personnel to the Criminal Justice System in Jacksonville.

Data was collected from in-house records and from telephone and individual interviews. No formal recommendations were made during this study. However, the study did document the fragmented nature of the prevention sub-system and the need for increased coordination in this area. The study also encouraged increased citizen participation in the operation of the local Criminal Justice System.

B. Correctional Master Plan - A federal court lawsuit, criticizing many of the conditions and practices in the Duval County Jail, resulted in a federal court order, mandating numerous changes in the jail operation. Since many of the requirements of this order focused on short-range improvements, a need became apparent in August, 1975, to develop a comprehensive, long-range plan for the local correctional system in Jacksonville. The Office of the Sheriff initially requested funds from the

Jacksonville City Council to obtain consultant services to conduct such a study. However, in light of the available resources within the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, the city council recommended that this study be conducted by this office. During the second week in September, a formal request was made by the Sheriff to acquire the services of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning to conduct this study.

The design for this evaluation was adapted from the Guidelines for Planning and Design of Regional and Community Correctional Centers for Adults, developed by the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture in Urbana, Illinois.

Specific activities within this plan included: a projection of future detention and correctional populations in Jacksonville through the year 2000, a profile of incarcerated inmates at the jail and correctional institutions, a community resources analysis, a feasibility study of available alternatives to incarceration and an analysis of the existing local correctional organizational structure. (Study recommendations will be listed in the appendix of this report).

A wide review and dissemination process followed the release of this plan. Local correctional officials, the Jacksonville Area Chamber of Commerce and the Jacksonville Council for Citizen Involvement all held meetings to review the Master Plan findings and recommendations. The report was also distributed to media representatives and received considerable publicity.

C. Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program (JDAP) Evaluation - Prior to being asked to conduct the Master Plan study, the Evaluation Unit was requested by their Executive Director to evaluate the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program. The evaluation unit agreed to conduct this evaluation. However, involvement in the Correctional Master Plan tied-up all the evaluation unit personnel. In order to begin the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program evaluation, two staff members from the Coordination Unit of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning were loaned to the Evaluation Unit to begin the Jacksonville

Drug Abuse Program evaluation. This 'third team' focused on the administrative structure of the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program and the Residential Facility. The remaining components of the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program were evaluated by a team from the Evaluation Unit, after the Master Plan was completed. This, Part II, evaluation focused on the Out-Patient and Methadone Components of the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program.

Numerous recommendations were made during these studies of the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program. (See appendix for list of recommendations) These recommendations were communicated to the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program's administrators in writing. A feedback meeting was also held to discuss the findings and recommendations with JDAP officials. The Evaluation Unit also provided the JDAP with the part-time services of one of the unit's research assistants, to serve in a consultant role to explain evaluation recommendations and assist in the implementation of such recommendations. This research assistant served in this role for approximately three weeks.

D. Minority Recruitment Project Evaluation - This evaluation was initiated by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning as a result of the questionable effectiveness of this project. One team was assigned to this evaluation and the study was conducted at the same time that Team II was evaluating the remaining components of the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program.

This evaluation began with an initial meeting with the Project Director of the Minority Recruitment Project. Shortly after this meeting an evaluation design was written that specified the objectives and methodology for this study. In addition to studying the strengths and weaknesses of this project, the evaluation developed a proposed Model Minority Recruitment Process. This 'model' process was based on current literature in the area of minority recruitment.

At the completion of this evaluation a meeting was held with representatives of the Minority Recruitment Project and the Sheriff's Office. Due to disagreement

on some of the findings and recommendations and some inaccurate statements in the report, release of the report was postponed six (6) weeks. This postponement was designed to enable the Project Director to correct the deficiencies within the project. At the completion of this period a monitoring report was completed, by the Federal Fiscal Specialist of the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, which documented the project's progress in correcting these deficiencies. A copy of this monitoring report was included in the final minority recruitment evaluation report.

E. Assessment of Programs and Services for Dysfunctional Youth in the

Duval County School System - This study was also initiated by the Office of Criminal Justice Planning, as a result, in part, of the fact that Duval County Schools were found to have the third highest rate of student suspension in the nation. A meeting was held with school administrators in January, 1976 and permission was obtained to conduct this study. Due to the manpower needs of such an effort, both teams were assigned to work on this study. A comprehensive approach was utilized to evaluate all problems/needs that related to providing adequate services to meet the need of dysfunctional (pre-delinquent) youth. Data was utilized from two levels: general data was obtained at the administrative level and from a representative sample of schools through interviews with principals, teachers and service personnel. Information was also obtained on specific programs in other areas of Florida and the nation.

A draft summary containing the preliminary findings of this report was made available to participants at a conference on Crime Prevention and the Schools, which was held in Jacksonville in April, 1976. A final draft of this report was completed in May and given to the Superintendant of Schools for review. This review was completed in the last week of June and summary copies of the final document were sent to members of the Duval County School Board and other interested parties. Formal meetings with School System personnel regarding this report have not taken place as of yet due to apparent time constraints and minimal interest on the part of the

school administration.

F. Witness/Juror Utilization Study - In June, 1976, the Chief Judge of the Fourth Judicial Circuit Court requested the services of the Evaluation Unit to conduct a study of the Witness and Juror processes in this circuit. Interest in this study arose from numerous complaints by jurors concerning inadequate parking facilities. Initial discussions with the Court Administrator of this circuit indicated that the existing juror management system could be having an effect on juror parking problems. The similarities of the juror and witness processes enabled the focus of the evaluation to be expanded to include study of both the juror and witness utilization processes.

Two documents that were recently produced by the L.E.A.A. (A Guide to Jury System Management and A Guide to Juror Usage), were heavily utilized in developing the design methodology for this study. Data collection instruments, provided in these documents, were revised to reflect the characteristics of the local system.

At present, the Chief Judge and other officials of the court system are reviewing a draft of this report. A meeting is tentatively scheduled to be held on the first week in September.

G. A Descriptive Study of the L.E.A.A. Process in Jacksonville 1969-1976 -

A study has recently been initiated which is designed to describe the local L.E.A.A. process to date. This study is seeking to determine: which components of the Criminal Justice System received the greatest(least) proportion of L.E.A.A. funds; the purposes for which L.E.A.A. funds were used (services, construction, training, etc.); any changes or trends in the use of L.E.A.A. funds; any factors which determine whether an L.E.A.A. project was or was not institutionalized; and whether ways may be suggested to more effectively use L.E.A.A. funding in the future.

This study is expected to be completed in September, 1976.

H. Miscellaneous Evaluation Unit Projects -

(1) Technical Assistance to Transient Youth Center Project. Assistance was

provided to develop a follow-up questionnaire and procedures on youth who are served by this project.

(2) Follow-Up study on evaluation on the implementation of the Health Education Act of 1973 in Duval County. This evaluation was completed in August, 1975. This follow-up was conducted to determine the degree to which evaluation recommendations have been implemented.

(3) Post-Correctional Master Plan Reports. Reports were prepared to develop more specific information on areas addressed in the Correctional Master Plan. A detailed cost analysis was developed to define the cost data presented in the Plan. Another report was prepared which provided more specific data on a proposed Pre-trial Release Service Unit. A report was also written in April, describing the degree to which evaluation recommendations had been implemented.

(4) Follow-Up Study on the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program. This evaluation was completed earlier in this project.

(5) Study of how the Criminal Justice Enforcement Information Systems Data can be better utilized for planning purposes. This report documents gaps in the present data base of these information systems. Suggestions are made to improve the use of existing data in order to develop improved summary and historical data for planning purposes. This study is presently in draft form. This draft report has been reviewed by personnel of the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) and additional information is being developed by the CJIS staff to support the recommendations made in this report. It is anticipated that this report will be presented to the CJIS Steering Committee for review in September, 1976.

V. EVALUATION FINDINGS:

Each formal evaluation contained a number of recommendations which were designed to rectify problems/needs documented during the evaluations. (See appendix A for a summary of each evaluation's recommendations). The format for reporting recommendations

was similar in each evaluation, with the exception of the Juror/Witness Utilization Study. Rather than listing specific recommendations in this study, a series of alternatives were developed to meet each documented need. This less dogmatic approach was used in this study as a result of the complex nature of the needs within the Juror/Witness management system. This approach was also believed to be more appropriate in light of the political nature of the Judicial System and the lack of strong centralized leadership among the judges of the Fourth Judicial Circuit. This approach encouraged a discussion of alternatives and placed the responsibility for determining the best alternative on the judicial decision-makers.

In general, an attempt was made in each evaluation to avoid making recommendations that were impractical and/or unrealistic. If a long-range recommendation was made it was qualified as such. If the 'best' alternative appeared either financially or politically unrealistic an attempt was made to note these constraints and, if appropriate, present a 'next best' alternative which may have a higher likelihood of being implemented.

VI. SELF-EVALUATION:

1. Positive Accomplishments - The evaluation efforts of the Jacksonville M.E.P. generally appear to have been highly effective. It is difficult to relate any positive changes in the Criminal Justice System directly to an evaluation. However, subjective analysis of the impact of Jacksonville evaluations indicates that the M.E.P. activities have had at least an indirect positive impact, if not a direct impact, in improving certain areas of the local Criminal Justice System. While it is obviously too early to determine the ultimate impact of these evaluations on the system, some reports appear to have influenced positive change. For example, the Correctional Master Plan (probably the most significant study conducted by this project) appears to have influenced the decision to construct a new Juvenile Detention Facility which

will enable the present Juvenile Detention Center to be utilized as an adult intake facility. This plan has also stimulated enabling legislation that would permit separation of the responsibility for correctional programs and facilities from the Office of the Sheriff to either the Mayor or a Correctional Authority. Other Master Plan recommendations have either been implemented or are in the process of being implemented.

The Minority Recruitment Evaluation appears to have influenced, to some degree, the decision not to continue L.E.A.A. funding of this project. Other less significant evaluation recommendations have already been implemented by Minority Recruitment Project officials.

A follow-up study of the Drug Abuse Program evaluation indicates that most recommendations have been implemented. Since the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program had another evaluation conducted by a private firm and several in-house management reviews it is impossible to attribute these changes to the M.E.P. evaluations. It is believed, however, that M.E.P. evaluations at least reinforced the recommendations made by other evaluators and indirectly influenced, to some degree, many of the changes that took place in the JDAP's operations.

The study on Programs and Services for Dysfunctional Youth, in the Duval County Schools does not appear to have influenced any significant changes as of yet. Some evaluation recommendations appear to be in the process of being implemented. However, it is believed that these changes would have taken place had there not been a M.E.P. evaluation in this area. Future feedback briefings with school officials are being planned by evaluation unit personnel. Whether these briefings result in any other recommendations being implemented remains to be seen.

The recently Juror/Witness Utilization study is presently being reviewed by judicial decision-makers. The suggested alternatives appear to have been positively received by the Chief Judge and the Court Administrator. A formal meeting to discuss this study is anticipated in the near future. Our impressions indicate that this

study will be positively received by court officials and will result in changes that will improve the present juror management system.

Several improvements appear to have been made in developing an effective evaluation process:

A. Evaluation Selection - A flexible approach has been developed to select projects/programs to be evaluated. By choosing new evaluations shortly before a current evaluation is completed (approximately one month), there appears to be an increased likelihood of generating relevant information for system decision-makers.

A rigid evaluation schedule would decrease the likelihood of providing relevant information.

B. Preliminary Evaluation Activities - During the past year, an attempt was made to place increased emphasis on the preliminary phases of the evaluation process. Particular importance was placed on the initial evaluation meeting(s) with the officials of the projects/programs being evaluated. Emphasis was also placed on the careful development of an evaluation design, prior to the start of evaluation data collection. This concern for the initial steps of the evaluation process appears to have improved the quality of work and resulted in less problems after the evaluation begins.

C. Evaluation Philosophy - An attempt has also been made to view evaluations more positively and to visualize evaluative data as a management tool. This emphasis has resulted in less dogmatic recommendations on the part of the evaluation unit. Instead, of attempting to dictate change, we have tried to present alternatives that the decision-maker may consider to rectify documented problems/needs. An attempt has also been made to avoid using 'criticizing language' when discussing problems and needs within a particular project/program.

D. Implementation Strategy - This past year has resulted in an increased appreciation for the importance of developing an effective implementation strategy. A greater amount of staff resources have been allocated to post-evaluation activities.

A number of supplemental reports have been developed to expand the information contained in the main evaluation report. Evaluation staff have also been more active in coordinating feedback meetings to assure the evaluation results are properly communicated to system decision-makers. The result of this emphasis appears to have increased the chances that evaluation results will be given adequate review and consideration.

2. Evaluation Constraints - While the Jacksonville evaluation process appears to have been generally effective, a number of problems developed which hampered a more effective effort:

A. Personnel Turnover - A high degree of staff turnover, particularly during the first part of the year, resulted in some disruption of evaluation activities. Two evaluation unit staff members (the original secretary and research assistant) received promotions to other units within the Office of Criminal Justice Planning. Three other staff members, our first evaluator, another secretary and another research assistant resigned during the project period. The performances of these staff members were not satisfactory and their resignations were encouraged.

B. Personnel Performance - While the performances of most evaluation staff were excellent, deficiencies were evident in a number of other unit staff. A seven day training program was implemented in April, 1976, primarily in an attempt to up-grade the abilities of one of the unit's evaluators. While the training appeared to be relevant and well presented, the performance of this evaluator (presently employed) remains below satisfactory. As mentioned before, the performances of three other staff members (who have since resigned) have been unsatisfactory.

Two possible causes for this difficulty are: (1) lack of adequate screening and review of applicants during recruitment and (2) possible low salary scale (evaluator's salary is \$12,060/year) which failed to attract more competent applicants.

C. Use of Project Consultants - Two part-time project consultants were hired to provide technical assistance and training for evaluation unit staff. These con-

sultants traveled to Jacksonville from Tallahassee (Florida State University) one day per week during the first month of the project. Consultant activities centered on development of a general information process and research design for the Correctional Master Plan. After the first two months of project operation, it became evident that minimum benefits were being realized from the consultant's services. Having access to the consultants one day per week required that they be brought up to date on project activities during the past week. This was time consuming and left little time for actual consulting services. While consultant input was deemed valuable, the benefits did not appear to justify the costs. Therefore, the services of the consultants were terminated in November, 1975.

D. Lack of Communication Between Teams - At the completion of the Correctional Master Plan, a unit self-evaluation was conducted. During this review it was noted that there was minimal communication between teams, concerning each team's activities. This resulted in some duplication of effort and a lack of team awareness of the total effort. Good communication was particularly important to maintain when both teams were working on a single evaluation.

To improve communications between teams, weekly unit staff meetings were instituted. These meetings served a secondary purpose of facilitating team decision-making and problem solving. These unit meetings appeared to be effective in improving over-all unit communication.

E. Institutionalization of Evaluation Unit - One purpose of the M.E.P. was to help develop permanent evaluation capabilities. Funding to continue the Jacksonville M.E.P. is assured for one year through use of LEAA funds. Whether the project will continue beyond this one year period is unknown. Funding through LEAA action monies is not likely. The likelihood of the unit becoming a permanent part of the city structure is also unlikely due to present city austerity policies. Therefore, it appears that while the M.E.P. was able to prolong the future of the Jacksonville Unit, no meaningful progress has been made in making this a permanent component of the

Local Criminal Justice System.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS:

An objective of this project was to develop, on the basis of self-evaluation and experiences during the past year, a general evaluation process that could be generalized to other metropolitan areas in the nation. The discussion below will summarize the major issues associated with the development of an effective local process. (A detailed discussion of this topic can be found in Appendix B of this report).

The most logical structure for the implementation of evaluation projects appears to be at a local level. The role of the state evaluation unit should be one of coordinating and providing technical assistance to local units. Evaluations of statewide programs could also be carried out at a local level, providing that a consistent evaluation design is developed for local units by the state unit. A more adequate on-going evaluation capability can probably be achieved through a permanent evaluation capability as opposed to development of numerous contracts with private vendors.

The scope that a local evaluation unit takes will depend upon their resources, objectives and the information needs within the Criminal Justice System. This scope may vary from project, program, or system level evaluations. The evaluation unit may also decide to focus on evaluating impact, process, or a combination of the two. Which focus is taken will depend on several factors: time constraints, user needs, availability of data, competency of staff, resources, and the evaluation unit's established policies and tradition.

The first step in the evaluative process involves pre-evaluation planning. Paying adequate attention to this stage can avoid many problems that can arise during the course of the evaluation.

Metropolitan evaluation units will rarely have the resources to conduct sophisticated experimental research. However, such evaluations may actually have

less impact than less sophisticated efforts. The evaluation manager should be willing to rely on 'soft' data and non-experimental evaluation designs until additional resources become available. An evaluation design that can be implemented on a two month timetable should be realistic in most project-level and some program-level evaluations. Such a time schedule should be a goal of local evaluation capabilities.

Metropolitan evaluation units will rarely have access to electronic data processing capabilities. Such resources, while desirable, should not hinder the development of an effective evaluation capability. Most local evaluations will not generate the volume of data that will require electronic data processing.

The evaluation process should pay special attention to the post-study implementation strategy. During this stage the evaluator may assume a role of a resource person, consultant and/or educator. The implementation strategy should include a plan to effectively communicate evaluation results to information users.

The evaluation unit should also strive to follow-up on evaluations at a specified interval(s). Such follow-up can provide evaluation managers and agency administrators with valuable information.

APPENDIX A

JUROR / WITNESS UTILIZATION STUDY

FOURTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
DUVAL COUNTY, FLORIDA

ROUGH DRAFT
for
Review And Discussion Only

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
JULY 1976

A. JUROR SYSTEM

The following alternatives or options may be considered independently. These alternatives are not intended to be conclusive or authoritative because of limitations in the study.

Need: There is a need to develop an alternative jury management system to achieve more flexibility, economy, and efficiency of juror utilization that is presently being realized.

Alternative 1: Traditional Jury Pool

Alternative 2: Daily Service Jury Pool

Alternative 3: Modified Existing System

Alternative 4: Establish a "call-in" procedure to provide a small number of "stand-by" jurors that can be used if needed. (Can be adapted to any of the above alternatives or the existing system).

Need: There is a need to reduce and standardize the size of jury panels.

Alternative 1: Use the modified federal panel formula (number of jurors plus total number of possible challenges plus a 5% safety factor) to determine a standardized panel size for various types of jury trials.

Alternative 2: Standardize panel size on the basis of a longitudinal study of panel size and average number of challenges for the various types of jury trials.

Need: A more centralized jury management system is needed to coordinate juror usage between divisions.

Alternative 1: The clerk's office should appoint a Jury Manager whose full-time responsibility would be the administration of the court's juror management system.

Alternative 2: Appoint a Jury Manager as part of the Court Administrator's Office.

Alternative 3: In-service training can be utilized to upgrade skills of court personnel working in jury management through conferences, workshops, consultants and available publications.

Need: An on-going and centralized data collection system is needed to provide accurate information on which to operate an efficient jury management system.

Alternative 1: The juror summons could highlight the limited courthouse parking, provide jurors with information concerning public transportation and "Spirit Special" shuttle service; and should encourage use of public transportation.

Alternative 2: Jurors should be informed of city policy regarding towing cars away and should be instructed to seek court assistance for handling parking tickets obtained while in juror service.

Alternative 3: Contingency plans should be developed for escorting jurors from the courthouse to their automobiles, public transportation, or home after working hours.

Alternative 4: Paid parking for jurors.

Need: There is a need for a comfortable juror lounge. The size of the lounge is contingent upon the jury management plan and the number of jurors required.

Alternatives: Utilize space that will become available on the fifth floor when the Sheriff's Office moves to develop a jury lounge which allows for 20 square feet per person to accommodate a maximum of:

1. 300 jurors* (6,000 square feet) for the existing system;
2. 225 jurors (4,500 square feet) for modified existing system;
3. 175 jurors (3,500 square feet) for traditional jury pool; and
4. 100 jurors (2,000 square feet) for daily service pool.

Need: To increase the percentage of summoned jurors who show-up for jury service (present show-up ratio is estimated at 30% to 40%).

Alternative 1: Amend local rule to include specific uniform policy for excusing prospective jurors.

Alternative 2: Amend local rule to delegate authority for granting excuses to the Jury Manager.

Alternative 3: Grant temporary exemptions under certain conditions, and schedule alternative times when a juror may complete his jury obligation.

* These projections for numbers of jurors were generated to include 10 percent increase for jurors who request to be excused for the first day of service plus an additional 10 percent for predicted increase based on a population growth rate of 11.5 percent by the year 2000.

Alternative 4: Consider stricter enforcement of laws governing failure to honor jury summons.

Alternative 5: Consider excusing jurors by mail using forms enclosed with jury summons.

Need: There is a need to consider options which have been found to better utilize juror time.

Alternative 1: Judges ask all preliminary questions and specific questions submitted by attorneys in advance to the judge and to opposing counsel.

Alternative 2: Judges ask all basic questions, attorneys ask specific questions of jurors.

Alternative 3: Consider reducing voir dire time by enacting a local rule to utilize standardized information forms to be completed by jurors after they are qualified and distributed to the judge and attorneys prior to voir dire.

Alternative 4: Increased efforts should be considered to begin trial and voir dire starts at their scheduled time to eliminate juror waiting time.

Alternative 5: A comfortable juror lounge should be provided for jurors who are waiting to serve.

Alternative 6: The reasons for the unpredictable delays, such as last minute settlements, last minute plea changes, etc., should be communicated to jurors by court personnel. Whenever possible, jurors should continue to be temporarily excused when delays occur and scheduled to return later in the day or another day.

Need: There is a need for increased orientation of jurors.

Alternative 1: Send basic orientation information (maps, parking information, compensation data, etc.) to the juror with the summons to appear.

Alternative 2: Provide orientation handbook and/or orientation films for juror use during waiting periods of jury service.

Alternative 3: Require court personnel to have a formal information/orientation presentation when juror begins service.

Alternative 4: Distribute juror badges after jurors are qualified.

Need: Increase the representation of eligible potential jurors.

Alternative 1: The Duval Legislative Delegation should introduce legislation to permit use of multiple citizen lists to develop broad-based community representation.

Alternative 2: Consider enactment of local rule to permit periodic purging of permanently ineligible jurors.

Alternative 3: Consider passage of measures to provide for a literacy requirement for jurors and exemption for those who cannot meet this requirement, as is done in the Federal Courts System.

Need: There is a need to increase compensation for jurors.

Alternative 1: The Duval Legislative Committee should present a legislative bill to raise pay to jurors to the \$20 a day level currently being paid in the federal system.

Alternative 2: Legislative measures could be introduced to adjust juror compensation to periodic upward increases in wages and cost of living index.

B. WITNESS SYSTEM

Need: There is a need for increased compensation for public witnesses.

Alternative 1: Duval Legislative Delegation should consider support of legislation to increase compensation from \$5/day and 6¢/mile to \$10/day and 10¢/mile.

Alternative 2: Duval Legislative Delegation should consider support of legislation to provide funding to compensate witnesses at a rate of twice the minimum federal wage of \$2.20 per hour. (As recommended by the National Advisory Council on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals).

Need: The Law Enforcement officers need to be adequately compensated for off-duty time spent testifying.

Alternative 1: The Duval County Sheriff's Office should reimburse officers at their regular salary rate for off-duty time spent in court as witnesses.

Alternative 2: The Duval Legislative Delegation should consider support of legislation to increase the level of compensation for law enforcement officers who are required to testify during off-duty hours.

Need: Improved accommodations for witnesses are needed in the Duval County Courthouse.

Alternative 1: Utilize jury deliberation rooms as witness lounges during non-jury trials.

Alternative 2: Utilize hallway space at the east end of the second floor to construct a witness lounge for the Felony Division of the Circuit Court.

Alternative 3: Renovate under-utilized witness lounge across from room 217 for use as office space and return to using previous witness lounge across from courtrooms 4 and 5 for witnesses.

Alternative 4: When increased space becomes available, require that at a minimum, witness lounges be available for each court division, and on each floor where there is a courtroom.

Need: There is a need for increased orientation of witnesses in the Fourth Judicial Circuit.

Alternative 1: The Fourth Judicial Circuit should consider development and use of a witness orientation handbook.

Alternative 2: The Fourth Judicial Circuit should consider the establishment of a witness assistance program to encourage witness cooperation and assist witnesses during various stages of the judicial process.

CONCLUSION

The present decentralized juror system consists of three separate jury pools, handled independently by County, Circuit Felony and Circuit Civil Divisions. There are rare instances when the divisions share jurors, a practice known as pool-swapping. The present plan supplies judges with panels, assures good utilization of juror time Tuesdays through Fridays, and adapts itself to space limitations at the courthouse.

However, jurors are being overcalled; only 44 percent of the total number of jurors were actually challenged or sworn. Low juror utilization rates on Mondays lowered the average juror usage rate to 46 percent for the two weeks May 24 - June 4. The rate improved to an average of 78 percent when a modified pool was used the week of June 7 - 11. Current scheduling permits a clustering of court events on Mondays and Wednesdays rather than continuous operation throughout the week. Because of inadequate facilities, there is a good deal of people movement and problems of transportation, parking, and accommodations continue to plague jurors.

Alternatives should be considered to address major needs such as development of a centralized jury system; reduction in requested panel sizes; development of a data collection system; improved orientation with information on the juror process, transportation and parking; development of a juror lounge; and improved scheduling.

Major needs of the present witness system have been identified as increased compensation for witnesses, including police officers; improved and augmented accommodations for waiting at the courthouse and improved orientation procedures. These improvements should result in a more efficient, responsive and accommodating witness system.

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION
SYSTEMS:

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE DATA BASE FOR PLANNING
PURPOSES

ROUGH DRAFT
for
Review And Discussion Only

AUGUST, 1976
OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

SUMMARY

The Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Information Systems, presently contain a wealth of raw data that could significantly improve the information needed for planning purposes. The Information System also holds a great deal of potential for development of predictive models and sophisticated data analysis.

Several suggestions have been proposed to improve accessibility and upgrade the existing data capabilities of the Information System. These suggestions include:

1. More accurate entry of data into the Information System;
2. Centralized coordination of Information System operation through more active direction from the Criminal Justice Steering Committee;
3. Providing closer linkage between the various systems of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Information Systems;
4. Increased generation of summary data;
5. Increased communication and information sharing on the part of user agencies and other Criminal Justice agencies.

CITY OF JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA

1975 - 2000

CORRECTIONAL MASTER PLAN

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

No other social problem area in the United States is in more urgent need of coordinated and uniform planning than that of adult corrections.

The purpose of this study is to define the various short-term and long range needs of the adult correctional system in Jacksonville and to suggest structural and pragmatic remedies to meet these needs. Underlying this entire process is the goal of developing an effective correctional system which would require limited appropriation of financial resources.

This study presents various alternatives to the response of institutional incarceration to criminal behavior in such a manner as to reflect the public's need for protection from anti-social behavior, and the public's responsibility of providing the offender with an opportunity to adjust and become a productive member of the community.

The following is a list of recommendations resulting from the findings of this study:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Administration of correctional services for adults should, in the long-term, become a responsibility of the State Department of Offender Rehabilitation; in the short-term, a Department of Corrections, under the executive branch of the City of Jacksonville, should be created. Correctional facilities for adults, presently under the structure of the Office of the Sheriff and Department of Human Resources, should be transferred to the proposed Department of Corrections.
2. The Chief Judge of the Fourth Judicial Circuit should consider implementing a 10% Bail Plan to eliminate the discriminatory effects of the current bail system.

3. A new community-based work-release center (in addition to the Fairfield facility) is needed to house approximately seventy (70) offenders. Efforts should be made to obtain an existing structure (motel, apartment building, warehouse, etc.), which could be renovated to avoid costly new construction.
4. Residential space is needed to house approximately 10-20 pre-trial defendants released conditionally. Staff are needed to provide residential care and supervision of approximately 20-30 non-residential pre-trial defendants. Consideration should be given to contracting with an existing community service agency to implement this program.
5. The Jacksonville Correctional Institution should be utilized as a "last-stop" facility for those inmates who are evaluated to be in need of a secure institutional setting, or who are unable to adjust to a community-based program. Non-dangerous offenders (misdemeanants, alcohol and drug related offenders, and passive mentally ill offenders) should be placed in specialized community-based treatment programs to maximize their chances of successful rehabilitation.
6. Work release as a rehabilitative tool, should be expanded to enable participation of a larger portion of the incarcerated offender population in Jacksonville. Fixed policies eliminating certain categories of offenders should be revised to enable selection of work release participants on an individualized basis. Streamlining of the screen-

ing process should be considered to permit client referrals from J.C.I. and the proposed diagnostic and classification unit.

7. The R.O.R. program should be continued and expanded to include persons accused of third degree felony violations. Such accused individuals should be screened and evaluated to determine the appropriateness for Release on Recognizance. Screening reports should be provided the judge at the time of First Appearance (Bond Hearing) by the staff of the Pre-trial Release program.
8. The misdemeanor citation should be continued and expanded to the maximum extent possible.
9. The Chief Judge of the Fourth Judicial Circuit should consider implementing a Community Bail Program to provide an alternative to the traditional bail system and to increase citizens in the Criminal Justice System.
10. An effective misdemeanor probation program is needed in Duval County. Responsibility for supervision of misdemeanants should be returned to the Parole and Probation Commission either through a repeal of HB 1806 by the Florida legislature or through a contractual agreement between the City of Jacksonville and the Commission.

11. The Fairfield Work Furlough facility should be utilized solely for handling work furlough inmates. Trustees housed at Fairfield should be evaluated and placed on work-release status to the maximum extent possible.
12. Serious consideration should be given to discontinuing the farm operation at J.C.I. Farm Equipment, cattle, swine, food processing buildings and equipment should be sold by the City of Jacksonville through a public auction.

Functional and philosophical changes should be implemented to develop a variety of training and rehabilitative programs at J.C.I. to the maximum extent possible.
13. To provide adequate medical services, it would require an additional physician (for the Prison Farm), or two (2) physician assistants (one located at the jail; one located at the Prison Farm), under the supervision of the existing doctor.
14. The job development/placement functions at Walnut House should be consolidated with the job development and placement services available at Fairfield. All such services should be centrally administered and used to provide needed services to all inmates in the Jacksonville Correctional System.

15. The Duval County Jail, as presently designed, can house a maximum of 321 defendants and remain in accordance with State minimum standards.
16. A moratorium should be placed on future construction at the Jacksonville Correctional Institution. J.C.I. will be able to house offenders requiring secure incarceration through the year 2000. Future facilities for local offenders should reflect the community-base correctional center concept.
17. An aftercare capability is needed in Duval County to prepare local incarcerated offenders for release and to assist in their reintegration into the community.

● Evaluation Report:

JACKSONVILLE DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

This evaluation was originally intended to focus on the Residential Facility of JDAP. However, once the evaluation was begun it had to be expanded to include the administration and the Division of Community Services. What happens in these areas of the program greatly affect the operation of the Residential Facility.

The ineffectiveness and problems facing the Residential Facility are largely the result of ineffective leadership, supervision, and a lack of written policies and procedures, which stem from the administration. This evaluation documents major weaknesses in the overall operation of the Residential Facility, Administration, and the Division of Community Services.

The evaluation Team concluded that major changes are needed in the administrative as well as programmatic areas of the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program.

Those recommendations are as follows:

DEMOGRAPHIC & DESCRIPTIVE DATA

1. The Residential Program should develop specific measurable criteria for client success. Graduation from the program should be contingent upon successful completion of these objectives.
2. The program should classify clients more specifically in terms of their termination status and develop criteria for successful program completion progress.

FINANCIAL DATA

3. The Director of the JDAP should request an audit by the City Council auditor's office on an annual basis to ensure compliance with generally accepted accounting principles.

ADMINISTRATION

4. The Program Psychologist should be placed in the Division of Client Services.
5. The Prevention and Education Unit should be placed in the proposed Division of Community Services.
6. The Information Services Unit should be re-named the Evaluation Unit and placed under the direct supervision of the Director. The Evaluation Officer should remain under the Director and serve as a consultant to both the Director and the Evaluation Unit.
7. The Division of Client Services should be responsible for all treatment components of the JDAP. The Jail-Based Treatment Unit, the Out-Patient Drug-Free Unit and the Communications Unit should be relocated in the Division of Client Services. The Division of Central Intake and Consultation should be re-named the Division of Central Intake and Community Services. This division should become responsible for such functions as Legal Affairs, Prevention and Education and Central Intake.
8. The Director of the JDAP should hold Division Chiefs/Supervisors accountable for the effective operation of their respective units. The performance of administrative officers should be closely monitored. A unit's continued ineffectiveness should be deemed unacceptable and a change of command in such a unit should take place.
9. The Director should establish as one of his top priorities the need to improve communication between: administration and line staff; Cli-

ent Services Division and the Community Services Division staff; and among the JDAP staff in general.

10. The Chief of the Client Services Division and the Chief of the Division of Community Services, along with Unit Supervisors in each division, should meet to identify common problems and establish the means for improving communication and cooperation.
11. The JDAP Evaluation Unit (presently called Information Services Unit) should make periodic reviews and evaluations of the JDAP to ensure that all Federal funding criteria and State Licensing regulations are being met.
12. That client files and client file cabinets at the Residential Program should be identified and marked "Confidential."
13. That the Director should see to it that the rules regarding confidentiality are communicated to criminal justice agencies and assure that such rules are continually enforced.
14. Policies and Procedures should be developed for all units of the Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program. Policies and procedures should be clear, concise, and comprehensive.
15. The residential facility should institute the use of a permanent log book including the names, admission dates, and termination or release dates of all clients who have been residents at the center. Increased efforts should be made to ensure accurate reporting of these dates and timely submission of

- weekly posting reports. A client card file should be instituted at the Residential Program to provide a cross-reference to the log book.
16. A report should be sent by the job developer to the facility supervisor when a client receives a job stating the expected salary. A report should also be sent monthly to the facility supervisor and the JDAP fiscal officer showing the number of clients working, the number of days worked, the amount of salary earned, the amount of money that the center should have received, and a notation of any special conditions. Counselors should be responsible for relating any special conditions to the facility supervisor and job developer.
17. A ledger book should be maintained at the Residential Program, showing the amount owed and/or paid to the program by each client. Responsibility for collection of client fees should be placed with the facility supervisor or his specified designee. No collections should be made in the form of cash. Clients should be required to return to the facility with their paychecks on the day of payment. Paychecks should be presented to the collector for verification. Payments should be made to the program on the same day in the form of a money order or check.
18. Counselors at the Residential Program should begin immediately to complete all necessary case records on a timely basis and to ensure that the treatment file of each client is reviewed every thirty (30) days by the program's Chief Therapist.
19. Periodic sessions should be held by the program's evaluation component with program counselors to ensure their understanding and correct completion of

necessary records. Program counselors should receive feedback concerning their input and the outcome of in-house evaluation efforts.

20. All sign-in/sign-out records should be initialed by a program counselor when a client leaves and when he/she returns to the program.
21. Reasons for termination and release of clients from the program should be more clearly defined in order to provide more comprehensive information regarding client success ratios.
22. Program counselors should begin to conscientiously attempt and document follow-up efforts at designated intervals. This follow-up should include a check with the local Sheriff's Office to determine whether the client has been arrested on a drug charge subsequent to leaving the JDAP. Re-admissions to the JDAP should also be determined when compiling success rate data.
23. The administration of the JDAP should immediately begin to develop a timetable for implementation of program objectives which would provide a basis for periodic in-house evaluation.
24. Specific and measurable objectives should be developed for the JDAP and updated on a yearly basis to provide guidance for all program staff and for the program itself.

PERSONNEL

25. Job descriptions, job titles, and job qualifications for all JDAP positions should be reviewed. Discrepancies between actual JDAP positions and City Personnel descriptions should be rectified and brought into accordance with City of Jacksonville Personnel procedures, and continue to be reviewed and rectified.

26. The Director should establish and require personnel evaluations of all JDAP personnel at least twice annually. Where such evaluations indicate unsatisfactory performance, the evaluated staff person should be given a specified period of time in which to achieve a satisfactory level of work performance.
27. Staff in-service training is a strong part of the program and should be continued. The Director should assure that his administrative staff receive at least 40 hours a year of training.
28. Professional personnel have the minimum qualifications of a college degree, plus two years of experience in social services, rehabilitation, or a related field; or a Master's degree in the social or behavioral sciences.
29. Paraprofessional and non-professional personnel should have experience and training in the drug rehabilitation field. Such background should be obtained in a drug program other than the one in which they are employed.
30. Ex-clients of the JDAP should be engaged in gainful employment for a minimum period of six (6) months before accepting staff or volunteer positions in the Drug Abuse Treatment area.
31. The Account Clerk III position at the Residential Program duplicates the functions of other positions and should be abolished.
32. Personnel records should be reviewed by the Director or his designee for thoroughness and accuracy.

33. Salaries for all personnel should be competitive with other parts of the Criminal Justice System as well as with comparable occupation groups of the private sector of the local economy.

Personnel who
are consistently unable to maintain a satisfactory level of performance
should either be placed in a position that reflects their abilities, or
terminated.

34. The number of professional counselors should be lowered to four. Three to four paraprofessional staff should be hired to supervise the facility and clients, and provide other functions which do not require professional expertise.

PROGRAM SERVICES

35. A new sewage disposal plant, capable of meeting the needs of the residential facility should be built.
36. An improved drainage system is needed.
37. The Green Acres Motel sign should be removed to prevent travelers from venturing into the facility and creating a security problem.
38. There is a need for a well-planned and comprehensive recreational program at the Residential Program. In-house and community recreational activities should be developed.
39. A structured information/education program is needed to educate the resident and decrease the amount of client idleness.

40. The residential Program should utilize both the Therapeutic Community and Transitional Center approach to provide individualized treatment to clients. All clients should initially be placed in the Therapeutic Community modality. Within three (3) weeks most (approximately 90%) clients should move into the Transitional Center modality. Those few clients (approximately 10%) who are unable to make this transition should remain in the Therapeutic Community until they progress to where they can successfully make such a transition.
41. Clients admitted to the Residential Program should participate in an initial orientation program. This program should include a discussion of program expectations, development of treatment goals and a review of program rules and regulations.
42. The Residential Program should place a greater emphasis on job, educational and vocational counseling, as required by Federal regulations. Psychotherapy should be used to supplement this approach for those clients in need of such therapy.
43. Self-help courses should be instituted as an adjunct to counseling. These courses could be offered on communication, studying, understanding other people, etc.
44. All clients, after an initial period of orientation, should participate in either a work or school program. Such clients should also become involved in community activities to the maximum degree possible.

45. Procedures for urinalysis testing are needed to assure that clients are regularly tested and to prevent switching of samples.
46. Policies and procedures for resident discipline are needed. Disciplinary procedures should be clearly stated and firmly enforced.
47. The three phases of the client treatment program should be stated in measurable objectives with specific time limits for each stage.
48. To assure objectivity in evaluating clients, the development of the Goal Attainment Scale should be a separate responsibility of one staff member. Grading of the Goal Attainment Scales should be the responsibility of another staff person.
49. The Daily Client Schedule should be more structured and specific.
50. The Residential Program should establish written policies and procedures to establish a follow-up service program for discharged clients.
51. In order to ensure efficient and effective handling of job development the program should hire an assistant job developer. It is unrealistic for one person to cover the entire program and meet all the objectives in the job description.
52. Clients should not be restricted from working or attending school as a disciplinary measure. Other disciplinary alternatives should be utilized. Clients should be encouraged to attend school and/or work on a regular basis.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS

53. A viable volunteer program should be initiated to involve the public in the JDAP and to provide additional manpower. Volunteers should be carefully screened, adequately trained, and carefully supervised.
54. The JDAP Advisory Board has the potential to become a strong asset if utilized properly. Keeping in mind that the Board operates only in an advisory capacity, the Director should continue to keep the Board knowledgeable and informed about the operation of the JDAP: encourage the Board to make recommendations to the Director on issues of policy and the future direction of the program; and to utilize the Board in improving community relations and obtaining community support.
55. Working agreement between JDAP and ancillary agencies should be reviewed and, if necessary, rewritten to assure that these relationships are maintained as cooperatively and efficiently as possible. Agreements between JDAP and ancillary agencies should be reviewed on an annual basis.
56. The Residential Program should strive to develop positive working relationships with the major social institutions, organizations and agencies of the community. At the management level, the JDAP should involve representatives from the community in development of program policy and inter-agency procedures.
57. The Prevention and Education Component of JDAP should develop a program to educate the community to the drug problem and ways that the community can assist in reducing drug abuse. Community support and assistance should be elicited to the maximum degree possible.

ROUGH DRAFT
Review And Discussion Only

EVALUATION REPORT (PART 2)
JACKSONVILLE DRUG ABUSE PROGRAM

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING
JACKSONVILLE, FLORIDA
May, 1976

VII SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Methadone Treatment

1. No Jacksonville Drug Abuse Program clients should be permitted to loiter outside of the Methadone Clinic.

2. Rules and regulations for the methadone program should be posted in clear view for all to see each time the client enters the clinic. Rules and regulations pertaining to client behavior must be adhered to. Policies that specify actions to handle client rule violations should be developed and distributed to all personnel. These policies must be adhered to.

3. The Medical Director should develop a closer working relationship with clinic counselors as well as clients.

4. The overall morale of the entire methadone program needs to be improved to instill a higher degree of professionalism in all center staff.

5. Staff orientation should be standardized for all new employees. Written copies of all policies and procedures should be distributed to all new employees. Detailed job descriptions containing the specific responsibility the staff member is expected to accomplish should also be provided new personnel.

6. Client orientation should be the initial phase of program participation. Client orientation should demonstrate the importance of the counseling aspect of the methadone program. Clients must be made aware of all rules, regulations, and ramifications of any rule violations during orientation.

7. The lines of communications between all staff members must be improved. A weekly staff meeting for the purpose of staffing clients should be implemented. Lines of communication between the administration of the program and the counselors should be improved. General weekly staff meetings should be held to increase communication.

8. The administration should provide more feedback to the counselors concerning their complaints and suggestions. The counselors need to feel they have input into the program's operations.

9. A current organizational chart should be presented each staff member to assist them in understanding the chain of command of the program.

10. As changes occur in the organizational structure of the program as well as the policies and procedures of the program, all staff members should be notified of these changes.

11. The take home privilege phase of the methadone program must be continually evaluated.

12. The program in general should become more strict with regards to the access of the methadone.

13. A procedure should be developed with the Sheriff's Office that would allow female clients at the prison farm to receive their daily dosage.

14. Ancillary agencies should be utilized to a greater extent. Strengthening relationships should be an overall JDAP objective. An administrative aide should be assigned the sole responsibility of public relations.

15. There should be more counselor time devoted to counseling functions.

16. Client flow should be standarized.

17. Counseling should be given greater emphasis and clients should be required to attend a minimal number of sessions per month.

18. The nursing staff should deal only with medical situations. All clerical work should be done by clerical help.

19. Nurses should not be permitted to change clients dosages. The Medical Director should assume total responsibility for the dosage change.

3. OUT-PATIENT DRUG FREE UNIT

1. Continue to upgrade the Communication Center facility.
2. Continue to increase active recruiting and referral projects.
3. Strive to open new out-reach facilities in areas of the city that are currently without a much needed out-reach center.
4. Establish up-grade working relationships with ancillary agencies.
5. A positive working relationship should be developed between the CDAP and the public school system.
6. A secretary should be assigned solely to that unit.
7. The unit supervisor should be assigned strictly to the supervision of the unit and their recruiting projects.
8. The Juvenile Detention Center Program should be developed to the greatest extent possible.
9. Staff meetings for all counselors for the sole purpose of staffing clients should be held weekly.
10. Continue to standarize the pay scale among counselors performing the same function.
11. Records concerning client contact should be standardized.

C. CLIENT RECORDS

In reviewing client folders, many observations were made about the availability and quality of client data being collected. Generally, the forms and procedures for client intakes are well organized. Client confidentiality is projected throughout the process and a minimum of forms have been designed to provide information for a myriad of monitoring agencies.

The following are some recommendations that will facilitate the collection of client information:

1. The intake form should be coded so that the person who is filling it out just checks boxes. This will eliminate varied responses to the intake questions. Information Services staff is planning to convert the present intake sheet into this form - this should be done as soon as possible.
2. All intake forms completed before June, 1975 on clients from Ribault High and the Communication Center should be redone.
3. Polydrug use should be defined other than "use of a lot of drugs" (for example, polydrug use could be defined as the use of drugs in two or more of the major drug categories.)
4. Major drug types (narcotics, stimulants, depressants, cannabis, hallucinogens) should be used instead of drug brand names or slang terms. A complete drug list should be compiled for easy reference by intake workers.
5. Intake forms should be updated at least every six months by counselors to show changes in school, employment and drug information.

6. Files that show no drug use in the intake form should explain the rationale for acceptance of this client into JDAP.

7. There should be a cover sheet in every client folder showing a running account of dates the client has been admitted, transfered, re-admitted or terminated. The current system of attaching numerous "consent forms" and "client interchange forms" to the front of the folder is confusing and cannot be used for easy reference.

8. Termination "with program approval" currently contain cases that are successful and those that have been transfered to another agency. Intra-agency transfers should be separated from the "with program approval" category to show which client have been successfully terminated from JDAP and which ones have been transfered.

FOOTNOTES

1. Methadone Treatment Manual - U.S. Department of Justice LEAA, NILECJ
June, 1973 - U.S. Government Printing - Pg. 3
2. Community Crime Prevention - National Advisory Commission on Criminal
Justice Standards and Goals - 1972 - U.S. Government Printing - Pg. 75
3. Standards Manual for Drug Abuse Treatment and Education Programs - The
Florida Drug Abuse Program - 1973 - Pg. 24
4. Same as 3
5. Same as 2
5. Same as 1 - Pg. 13

SUMMARY REPORT:

URBAN LEAGUE

Minority Recruitment Program

SUMMARY & RECOMMENDATIONS

The following report was presented to representative of the Urban League, the Sheriff's Office, and City Personnel at a meeting on February 10, 1976. Due to a lack of consensus concerning the results, the following findings were discussed with the Executive Director of the Urban League on February 26, 1976. As a result of this meeting, formal release of this report was postponed six weeks to enable the project to take the necessary action to correct the deficiencies documented during the evaluation. At the end of this period, an intensive monitoring of the Minority Recruitment Project was made to determine the degree to which the project had remedied the documented deficiencies.

The following constitutes a summary of the major findings that were made during this evaluation period (December, 1976 - February, 1976). Following these findings is a list of recommendations. Most of the fiscal and contractual recommendations have since been implemented (see attached monitoring report):

FINDINGS:

1. Follow-up material on graduates of the program, (attrition information) was not available at the program site and had to be obtained by the evaluation unit from the Office of the Sheriff's Personnel Department.

2. Contracts for program employees were requested but only that agreement between the program and the janitorial service was made available. None will provide for professional staff, i.e., program director, tutors or counselors. However, the Executive Director of Urban League explained, in a

later conversation, that MRP personnel sign-in and are supervised during work hours.

3. Records of contacts and participants could not be distinguished individually.

4. Not all documents requested and received were up-dated, i.e., one was called Project Prep which reflected erroneous information for date requested. Another case was a list called Persons Passed Test which was not dated, nor did it distinguish police candidates from corrections candidates or other candidates.

5. The program showed no evidence of established published standards, i.e., class attendance policy, class rollbook, employee job description, requirements for entering the program or staff meetings or review policy.

6. Inaccurate records on program participants showed no follow-through on persons listed but who did not continue tutorial classes, i.e., Project Prep Daily Intake List, dated November 3, 1975 to November 30, 1975.

7. Numbers claimed to have been program participants are questionable because they did not tally when the evaluation team interviewed some (23) of the persons claimed.

8. Quarterly Progress reports have not been consistently submitted on time to the State Bureau of Criminal Justice Planning through the local Criminal Justice Planning Office.

9. Previous monitoring recommended that contracts should be in effect for each vendor/individual scheduled in the Professional Services Category,

i.e., janitorial services, each educational specialist and the Jacksonville Urban League.

10. Also recommended in previous monitorings was the fact the Urban League should bill or invoice the project upon check request time for services rendered. The billings should include number of hours professional services were rendered for that period, time period involved, and the rate to arrive at the invoice total.

11. Adequate time and attendance records should be maintained for educational specialist since they work on an hourly basis.

12. Travel expenditures as well as all other expenditures must have as part of vouchers the original billings, this is true for all transactions except payroll, since T/A records are maintained.

13. The most recent grant and current grant had appended it three (3) special conditions; two of which should have been satisfied by the project. Since action was not taken, the State Planning Office threatened to cut off funds within 30 days unless satisfactory response was received. With assistance of the Criminal Justice Planning Office (Jacksonville) compliance was put into effect.

14. The necessary expertise in the director's management of the MRP was not found in the structure or the function of the program. Required rapport with the Sheriff's Office and other offices was not reflected in effect, i.e., failing to have follow-up material of graduates on hand, and failure to render state reports on time. Accountability was lacking or poor in terms of student

attendance of tutoring sessions, availability of professional contracts and comprehensive folders for all participants. Expectations, plans or innovations to improve future programs were not offered during the meetings held with the Director.

Based on the above findings, the following recommendations are offered to upgrade the effectiveness of the minority recruitment effort in Jacksonville, Florida:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The Executive Director of the Jacksonville Urban League, the Project Director for this grant, should hold the Chief Administrative Officer of the Minority Recruitment Program accountable for the efficient and effective operation of the entire program.

2. Program administration should maintain organized dated records of persons who:

- (a) were contacted for the program,
- (b) participated as a student,
- (c) applied for civil service tests,
- (d) took periodic civil service tests,
- (e) passed and failed civil service tests,
- (f) applied, showed and/or did not show for physical examination,
- (g) took and passed or failed physical examination,
- (h) applied, showed, took and passed or failed oral examination, (polygraph),
- (i) applied for employment in the O.S. and was elected and/or rejected, resigned or dismissed and,
- (j) became inactive contacts.

3. Place greater emphasis during recruiting, counseling and training on the benefits that can be derived from a law enforcement career.

4. Broaden the premise on which the program is based to go beyond tutoring and include placement of minority police officers. Amend the measurable objectives to reduce the quantity of general participants to insure recruitment of quality candidates. Candidates should be screened to assure that they meet the eligibility requirements for employment in the office of the Sheriff, i.e., within weight limits, background eligibility, a record of acceptable job/school attendance, perserverance and interest.

5. Provide written contract to all tutoring personnel and other professionals employed under the LEAA grant project. Operate the program within the guidelines of awarded contracts and comply with the special conditions and other directives prescribed by LEAA. Document all program expenditures with original vouchers on items of travel, rentals, communication, purchases and services.

Bill or invoice the project upon check request time for services rendered. Billings should include number of hours professional services were rendered for that period, time period involved, and the rate to arrive at the invoice total.

Maintain adequate time and attendance records for educational specialist since they work on an hourly basis. Travel expenditures must have as part of vouchers, the original billings, this is true for all transactions except payroll, since T/A records are maintained.

6. Establish formal written standards for persons desiring to participate in the Minority Recruitment Program. Requirements for entrance and participation in the program should be up-graded in terms of general education, background, class participation and genuine interest in the professional area of law enforcement.

7. Examine the program for Law Enforcement Careers employed by the Southside Skills Center to determine the feasibility of incorporating parts of that program in the Minority Recruitment Program.

8. Keep a running attendance record of each participant in an organized roll book of each tutor.

9. Increased emphasis should be placed on the practical aspects of police work. Field experiences should be made available to provide the applicant with input in making a career decision.

10. Provide special training to participants who indicate a deficiency in oral expression. Provide the opportunity for applicants who work to participate in Minority Recruitment Program in the evening.

11. Broaden the base of classroom discussion by inviting other representatives from the Criminal Justice System (prosecutors, public defenders, judges, administrators, planners, etc.) to speak at MRP sessions.

12. Remove names of inactive persons on current lists of Daily Intake Participants.

13. The Minority Recruitment Program and black community need to show a new tolerance for the processes involved in obtaining placement in the

Office of the Sheriff. We suggest that all principal parties aggressively participate in efforts and planning to accommodate improved conditions.

14. It is suggested that City Personnel Department locate a minority group psychometrician or another person who is qualified and will volunteer his services, to review personnel tests to identify statements or words that may discriminate against minority applicants.

15. In conformance with standard P015.01 Minimum Standards and Goals, Florida Criminal Justice System, Educational Standards for the Selection of Police Personnel, it is recommended that hiring practices favor the employment of candidates who have one or more years of college instead of favoring those person who have less than one year of college.*

16. The evaluation team recommends that the applicants be made aware of existing municipal agencies (Community Relations Council, Civil Service Board, etc.) that may hear an appeal when the applicant feels a decision was not justified.

17. The Director of the MEP should take the initiative to assure that announcements about upcoming examinations are communicated in writing to the MRP by City Personnel.

18. The MRP Director should request that attrition information about MRP participants be made available to the MRP from the Office of the Sheriff.

19. Sheriff's Office Personnel should have information available to them regarding recent court action and minority employment such as in Pittsburgh and Chicago so that they will be cognizant of possible ramifications.

20. The official personnel in the Office of the Sheriff must show empathy and understanding to potential minority group candidates.

* This recommendation is in due respect to the 4% lapse factor in hiring policies, and no hire policy presently in effect.

ASSESSMENT REPORT:

PROGRAMS FOR DYSFUNCTIONAL YOUTH

In the Duval County School System

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

VIII SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study is to determine the general needs within the Duval County School System as they relate to crime prevention and the reduction in the number of dysfunctional pre-delinquent youth. A comparison is made between the existing Duval County School System and recognized standards/programs/concepts which relate to the schools role in crime prevention. The identification of needs is based on these comparisons. Recommendations are offered to reduce the level of functioning.

Many of the needs and recommendations are general in nature. Further analysis is warranted to determine the specific response to the identified needs.

The recommendations vary in terms of the feasibility of implementing such changes in the near future. Several recommendations are oriented toward changes in policy and/or philosophy. These should be viewed as totally feasible. Others will require substantial financial resources to implement and should be viewed as goals which will require a longer period of time to fully implement:

Recommendations:

(1) Alternative programs for students who are pregnant, present behavioral problems, are disinterested in school, or who have financial problems should be developed/expanded to discourage these students from leaving school.

(2) To reduce the rate of voluntary drop-outs from junior and senior high schools, the public school system should discourage parents from

permitting their children to drop-out of school. Students 16 years of age or older who do not need parental approval to drop out of school should be given increased counseling about the consequences of leaving school and should be encouraged to remain in school until they graduate.

(3) The Duval County School Board should revise the policy on student suspensions by substituting the words "may suspend" for the words "shall suspend" in order to provide school principals with discretion in handling disciplinary problems.

(4) The Duval County School Board policy on suspension should be revised to differentiate between the seriousness of student offenses. Students who commit acts of violence or law violations should be handled differently from students whose offenses are non-violent and non-law violations.

(5) Truancy and attendance related offenses should be handled by alternatives to suspension to assure that such behavior is not reinforced by exclusion from school.

(6) To reduce the rate of school suspensions in Duval County, school administrators should continue to develop alternatives to suspension which include, but are not limited to: in-school suspension, remedial services, social/psychological counseling, family involvement/counseling, and motivational therapy.

(7) The Duval County School System should expand support services (social work, psychological, remedial reading, guidance, etc.) to a maximum degree possible with priority given to the early elementary level.

(8) The school system should consider using paraprofessionals, clerical personnel and/or volunteers to do many of the mechanical tasks that do not require the expertise of a professional guidance counselor. The

guidance counselors should, in time, devote a greater percentage of their work day to providing individual and group counseling and other direct services to students.

(9) School administration should continue and expand the efforts underway by the Exceptional Child Program to provide specialized in-service training to enable the classroom teachers to up-grade their abilities to work with dysfunctional students.

(10) The ratio of VT/SSW staff should not exceed 1:2500 or 1:3000 for attendance follow-up and social services. A long range goal is to reduce the ratio to 1:500 for direct social work.

(11) The Duval County School System should consider establishing as a goal, the National Association of School Psychologists recommended ratio of one school psychologist to 3,000 students.

(12) The school system should consider a system-wide assessment of student needs which could be met by recruiting qualified volunteers. A pilot program perhaps in cooperation with Volunteer Jax might then be implemented to recruit volunteers to fill specific needs. To be effective, volunteers should be trained, supervised, and insured. An evaluation should be made of the pilot project after a year to determine how the volunteer program should be expanded/improved.

(13) The administration of the Duval County Public Schools should attempt to reallocate any additional future resources to provide for increased efforts at the early education level and should jealously guard against reduction of resources during these important early years.

(14) All elementary schools should implement programs which guarantee

that every student who does not have a severe mental, emotional, or physical handicap, will acquire functional literacy in English before leaving the elementary school. Primary emphasis should be focused on efforts in grades 1-3 since students attain 80 per cent of their potential for learning by age 8.

(15) The school system should provide alternative classroom instruction, individualized teaching styles, alternative curriculum and motivational therapy to those students who are not responding to traditional classroom instruction and who do not presently qualify for existing alternative programs/services.

(16) Students with no desire and/or ability to pursue a bachelor's level degree should be placed in a vocationally oriented, job training track to assure that they are prepared for the labor force upon graduation from the public schools. To implement this objective, vocational education resources should be provided to meet the need of non-college preparatory students.

(17) Career awareness programs should be made available in as many as possible of the 65 elementary schools which are presently without such programs.

(18) The Florida Legislature should consider adding classroom training as a prerequisite for obtaining Teacher Certification.

(19) Teachers with a demonstrated inability to handle disciplinary problems in the classroom should be required, by the principal, to attend in-service training sessions to improve their skills in classroom management. Classroom teachers who have a documented and irreversable deficiency in the area of classroom management should not be retained by the Duval County School System.

(20) In-service training for school personnel should include cultural and class awareness training to aid in better understanding the behavior and attitudes of minority group and lower class students.

(21) Each school principal should strive to develop a philosophy in their school which will instill in all teachers a positive attitude toward their students and a concern for their well-being. This philosophy should discourage the development of negative labeling practices and actions which could foster the development of negative self-concepts on the part of the students.

(22) Due to the importance of individualized instruction for problematic students, every effort should be made to decrease the size of classes in Duval County Schools.

(23) The school system should consider expanding the base of student input and student participation in the rule and decision-making processes in the school, beginning at the elementary level and increasing in the upper grades.

(24) Each secondary school should identify an adult staff member that would serve as a student ombudsman, to serve as an advocate for student needs and to mediate student grievances. The student ombudsman should be recommended and approved by the student population.

(25) Parent effectiveness training should be made available through the community schools program and should be expanded to the maximum degree possible.

(26) School administrators should encourage the expansion of parental involvement through local PTA and Local School Advisory Council (LSAC) organizations. Parent/citizen organizations should be involved in school policy making operations. School administrators should also utilize parents in the role of volunteers to help meet manpower shortages in the schools.

(27) Elementary schools should develop or expand orientation programs for the parents of first grade or kindergarten children. Such orientation should stress the importance of parental involvement in the child's educational process, should encourage the parent to develop a learning environment in the home, and should orient the parent to the goals, resources, and capabilities of the public school system.

(28) To increase parental involvement, schools should hold open house at least twice during the school year and should implement a system-wide plan to schedule parent-teacher conferences at regular intervals so that parents of elementary and junior high students have a opportunity to learn first hand about each student's progress and ways of assisting with problems.

(29) To meet the differential needs of dysfunctional youth in the Duval County School System, the school system should make maximum use of existing community resources.

(30) The Duval County School System should develop, in cooperation with the Social Service Community, a standardized and simplified referral policy. Such policy should designate a particular person in each school who will act as a liaison between the school and community resources. The Social Services Community should likewise communicate to the schools, basic information regarding each agency, i.e. eligibility practices, services provided; fee schedules, etc.

(31) Community education should be recognized as a part of a comprehensive crime prevention strategy and given support and assistance by community agencies, the public, and the school system policy-makers.

APPENDIX B

METROPOLITAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE EVALUATION PROCESS:

ISSUES AND DISCUSSION

Evaluation Section
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Jacksonville, Florida
August, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------|----|
| I. | STRUCTURE..... | 1 |
| | A. Local vs State Responsibility..... | 1 |
| | B. Permanent vs Contractural Evaluation Capability..... | 2 |
| II. | SCOPE OF EVALUATION..... | 4 |
| | A. Level of Evaluation..... | 4 |
| | B. Focus..... | 5 |
| III. | EVALUATION PROCESS..... | 7 |
| | A. Pre-Evaluation Planning..... | 7 |
| | B. Research Design..... | 8 |
| | C. Data Collection..... | 10 |
| | D. Data Analysis..... | 12 |
| | E. Post-Study Implementation Strategy..... | 13 |
| | F. Evaluation Follow-Up..... | 15 |
| IV. | SUMMARY..... | 17 |

METROPOLITAN EVALUATION PROCESS

I. Structure

A. Local vs State Responsibility

The placement of evaluation responsibility at a local level has several distinct advantages and disadvantages. An advantage of the decentralized approach lies in the familiarity of the local evaluation unit with local administrators and local problems. Discussion concerning evaluation priorities require an analysis of local problems and issues. Program evaluators based locally should have a general knowledge of the evaluation needs within the various components of the Criminal Justice System. Another advantage of locally-based evaluation responsibility centers on the importance of developing working relationships with the users of evaluation data. A positive working relationship and effective communication are necessary to assure that evaluation information is relevant to the users and that results and recommendations are properly communicated to policy-makers. Another advantage of a local focus, centers on the type of methodology that is needed. A local focus will often simplify the study methodology and avoid costly data processing and statistical analysis.

A disadvantage of the local approach lies in the evaluation of programs which are state or national in scope. If evaluative data is desired on a state/national project it becomes necessary for all local evaluators to have similar research designs. Coordination of such evaluations would likely be better managed at a state/national level; leaving the local units responsible for design implementation.

This should not rule out the possibility of evaluating state/national programs at a local level. Due to local variations in programs, this may prove

valuable to provide accurate evaluative data on the effectiveness of that program in a particular geographical area.

While limitations exist in adopting a local approach, there appears to be more advantages than disadvantages to the local approach. Standardization problems which arise when evaluating state/national programs at a local level can be avoided. This can be accomplished by:

1. Having local jurisdiction responsible for conducting evaluations and having state/federal units responsible for coordination and technical assistance to locals.
2. Making each level of government responsible for evaluating programs that are controlled by that level (state/state, local/local, federal/federal).

B. Permanent vs Contractural Evaluation Capability

A metropolitan evaluation capability may either have a permanent evaluation capability or may contract with private vendors. There are advantages and disadvantages of both approaches. However, most metropolitan jurisdictions are likely to find the permanent capability to provide more flexibility at less cost.

(1) Contractural Capability

Contracting with private vendor has the advantage of enabling the metropolitan jurisdiction to obtain the most specialized and best qualified vendor to conduct a particular evaluation. It also eliminates the need for permanent evaluation positions which may be difficult to obtain as a result of government austerity policies.

There are also negative aspects to the approach. Contractural arrangements with private vendors will usually prove more costly than conducting an evaluation with permanent personnel. A private vendor will often come from outside the jurisdiction, thus necessitating an orientation to the local system.

Developing a working relationship with users of evaluation data and obtaining needed cooperation may also prove more difficult to the outside contractor than

for the permanent evaluation staff.

(2) A Permanent Capability

The permanent capability appears to provide greater flexibility while maintaining more cost effectiveness than the contractual approach. A permanent capability will avoid having to enter into competitive bidding and obtaining time-consuming bureaucratic approval each time a new study is initiated. The permanent capability increases the likelihood that that unit will become institutionalized under the local governmental structure thus insuring continuity of evaluative data over time.

The diversity of programs in the Criminal Justice System may prove troublesome for a permanent evaluation unit. However, lack of specialization in a permanent capability can be remedied by staffing this capability with generalists with sound research skills. Specialized information may be obtained through literature reviews, technical assistance, and from specialized organizations (American Bar Association, International Halfway House Association, National Sheriff's Association, etc.). Specialized knowledge may also be obtained on a voluntary basis from local resources (University Professors, Administrators in the system, other evaluation capabilities). While the risk of preconceived bias is probably greater with this permanent capability, this disadvantage should be controlled by having a high caliber professional staff.

II. Scope of Evaluation

A. Level of Evaluation

There are three basic levels that an evaluation may take:

- 1) Project-level evaluation
- 2) Program-level evaluation
- 3) Sub-system evaluation

Which level of metropolitan evaluation capability chooses to pursue, will depend on several factors:

- 1) Evaluation resources
- 2) Objectives of the evaluation capability
- 3) Information needs within the Criminal Justice System

A small evaluation capability may be limited to focusing solely on project-level evaluations due to limited resources. Such a capability, if attached to a LEAA metropolitan or regional planning unit, may decide to focus solely on LEAA funded projects. If an evaluation capability has a general mandate to evaluate projects/programs within the criminal justice system, including non-LEAA funded areas, then the unit may determine evaluation priorities on the basis of the information needs of the policy-makers within the system. A metropolitan evaluation capability should not attempt such a broad focus if they have inadequate resources to deviate from LEAA project level evaluations. Likewise, if the evaluation unit has not developed credibility outside of the sphere of the LEAA process, then development of such a broad-based focus may be premature.

If the evaluation capability has adequate resources and has achieved credibility within the system, then they should develop a broad, flexible target area. This flexibility to conduct system-wide evaluations should increase the likelihood that evaluations will be conducted that best meet the information needs of the

decision-makers within the system.

B. Focus

A major question facing evaluators is whether to focus on process, impact or a combination of the two.

1) Impact Evaluation - Most criminal justice evaluators are expected to rate the effectiveness of various projects/programs within the criminal justice system. They are asked, "Did that project/program reduce crime?" or "Did it have an impact on the system?"

Such questions are frequently asked of project/programs with poorly defined evaluation measures and a scarcity of data on which to determine the impact of the project/program. Determining the actual impact of the project/program under study in a relatively short period of time, may prove impossible. The evaluation manager, as a substitute for true impact data, may choose an intermediate focus which can serve as a less definitive indicator of a project's impact. For example, improvements within the Criminal Justice System (better efficiency, better trained personnel, increased communications, etc.) may be used as an intermediate indicator of the project/program's impact on crime reduction.

2) Process Evaluation - In light of the constraints involved in focusing on impact, Metropolitan Evaluation Units may choose to focus instead of the process that projects/programs use to reach their goals and objectives. While process evaluation is similar to program monitoring, it differs primarily in terms of depth and comprehensiveness. A "management audit" is a good example of a process level evaluation. Process evaluation can focus on a wide variety of organizational factors: structure, relationship between resources and objectives, information system capability, adequacy of policy/procedures, adherence to and implementation of standards and goals, nature of external relations, etc. This differs from project/program monitoring which generally focuses solely on the project's measureable objectives and any reasons why such objectives are not being met.

Process evaluation should also focus on the adequacy or inadequacy of impact data. Recommendations can then be made and technical assistance provided to assure that impact data will become available in the future.

3. Combined Approach - Many evaluation units would prefer to maintain a high degree of flexibility in deciding whether to conduct impact or process evaluations. Impact data may be readily available in one project and not another. By focusing intensively on the project's past and present process, general statements regarding the project's/programs intermediate impact may be made. Thus, a combined impact/process evaluation may be possible.

Several factors would influence whether the evaluation unit should focus on impact or process evaluation.

- (a) Time Constraints - Impact evaluations would usually be more complicated and time-consuming than process evaluation.
- (b) User Needs - The users of the evaluation data may desire either impact or process data.
- (c) Availability of Data - Impact data may not be available.
- (d) Competence of Staff - Evaluation personnel may not have the expertise to objectively determine a project's impact.
- (e) Resources - Manpower and/or funding may prohibit lengthy study of a particular project/program.
- (f) Tradition - The established evaluation capability may find that changing the focus of their evaluation may be difficult if they have conducted one type of evaluation over time.

The above considerations will influence the type of evaluation focus that may be taken. The fact that such constraints exist, gives support to a flexible approach to evaluation focus. Evaluating these numerous factors and constraints before deciding on a design will increase the relevance of the evaluation and avoid numerous methodological problems after the evaluation is started.

III. Evaluation Process

A. Pre-Evaluation Planning

Pre-evaluation tasks should include a general assessment of the information needs within the system. Key decision-makers should be polled to determine their most important information needs. If the evaluation capability has a specific focus (LEAA, law enforcement, etc.) then it is likely that only those decision-makers in that particular area may need to be polled. Determining evaluation priorities through such a flexible process should increase the likelihood of timely evaluation results. A metropolitan evaluation capability should develop such a flexible decision-making approach and avoid rigid evaluation schedules.

The LEAA, in studying the intensive evaluation process, has isolated three conditions which much be satisfied before design of an evaluation begins. The conditions are:

1. "Those who will use the evaluation results must agree on definitions of the program's or project's activities, the conditions it is supposed to change, and the kinds of outcomes expected.
2. The key assumptions on which the program is based must be stated in forms which can be tested objectively.
3. Program or project managers must spell out at least one clearly defined use for evaluation information in making a decision or in initiating administrative action." 1

Analysis of these conditions will influence decisions concerning evaluation priorities. If a particular project/program is federally funded through the LEAA or other agency, it is likely that the project, as a condition of funding, has specified measureable objectives and a logical set of expectations. The Metropolitan Evaluation Unit may therefore decide to focus its effort on evaluating LEAA projects/programs while providing Technical Assistance to im-

prove the evaluability of non-LEAA areas.

Meeting the pre-evaluation conditions requires communication between evaluation and project personnel. The evaluator needs input to determine the actual goals and objectives of the project since the formal and informal objectives may not coincide. The evaluator also needs input concerning the administrator's information needs, to assure that evaluation data will be relevant. Two way communication will also orient the administrator to the evaluation process, educate the administrator to the value of evaluation data, and achieve consensus on how evaluation results will be disseminated.

B. Research Design:

An area of seemingly never-ending debate focuses on the minimum degree of design sophistication. Clausen, in discussing the concept of "reality testing" states, "In many programs, however, decisions have to be made at least partly in terms of administrative pressures. If this is so, and if one wishes to conduct research which gives the basis for inferences about decision-making, a concern with administrative policy and administrative pressures must be built into the research design." ²

Strict adherence to sophisticated designs may prove troublesome to the metropolitan evaluation manager. Various problems may arise:

1. The evaluation unit may not have the resources to implement sophisticated evaluation designs.
2. The information needs of the system may not warrant rigorous research designs.
3. Expectations of the evaluation unit in terms of quantity of evaluations may make such long-term studies unfeasible.
4. Projects/programs may not have developed necessary data base to facilitate rigorous research.
5. Information needs of system decision-makers may be developed through soft research approaches.

Some preliminary literature in the field has tried to determine which

type of research has had the most impact on the system. Of six (6) studies that have proven impact, it was determined that:

1. Impacting studies had varied methodologies.
2. Heaviest impact resulted from studies with the crudest designs.
3. These studies tended to focus on system changing rather than offender changing.
4. Impact may occur more readily from the work of researcher-planners than from the work of researcher specialists.
5. Interaction with or the cooperation of other agencies is usually an essential ingredient in such change." 3

While the characteristics of only six impacting studies does not enable firm conclusions to be drawn, the significance of this preliminary data is obvious. It tends to indicate that strict adherence to classical research design may not result in the highest degree of system change. In light of the less than adequate resources in most metropolitan criminal justice agencies, a less rigorous (and less costly) research approach should initially be considered.

Other reasons for adhering to a less rigorous approach include:

"The non-experimental study appears more suited to executive decision-making styles and tempos, and its versatility gives it the lead in a variety of problem-solving situations. Before the experiment can be brought to bear, the important decisions have often been made and the center of interest is now new problems in new areas.

Non-experimental studies are usually quick of execution and generally inexpensive as compared with experiments. Also, they pose less of a threat or burden to operating staff, and they facilitate communication with practitioners since the concepts, techniques and manner of reporting are closer to common experience."

One should not assume that non-experimental research designs are easier to implement:

"Some aspects of non-experimental studies are disadvantageous. Their value is determined to a large extent by the experience, judgment and objectivity of the researcher. Improperly used, they may create more confusion than enlightenment. Their procedures lack standardization, their reliability is uncertain, and their interpretation is sometimes difficult. Many of these characteristics are more

troublesome to researchers than to administrators. The latter are constantly faced with unreliable and uncertain data in their decision-making processes and they are more accustomed to acting on such information, though often with questionable effect." 4

Non-experimental research can include comparisons of:

- "1. Real conditions versus ideal conditions
2. Real conditions versus published or official standards
3. "Before" status versus "after" status
4. Real outcome versus expected outcome
5. Comparison of agency reactions to participants and behaviour (agency actions such as probation revocation, arrest and convictions)
6. Participants cost versus actual costs." 5

Any one or a variety of the above comparisons may be necessary during an evaluation to meet the information need of the decision-makers. Again, careful study of evaluation objectives and available data should be made before finalizing the evaluation design.

C. Data Collection

A scarcity of data to meet design objectives is a common problem faced by evaluators. Often, data that is specified in a grant or in a project's operating procedures is non-existent or is not generated in the designed form. The evaluation manager can consider one of the following approaches to deal with evaluation problems:

1. "The evaluator can provide additional technical assistance to program operating personnel.
2. The evaluator can request action by project managers or sponsors.
3. The evaluation design can be altered.
4. The evaluation can be terminated." 6

Requesting that the project change their procedures and/or data collection system may be viewed as inappropriate on the part of the evaluation unit. The evaluation unit may be over-stepping its bounds by becoming too involved in

policy-making and project administration.

A more desirable alternative would be for the evaluation unit to alter the evaluation design. This may be accomplished without having to jeopardize design objectives. Alternative sources of data may be found that can provide needed data. For instance, a evaluation design may desire to measure client movement by using data that is generated from client summary reports. If this information is not available and/or is not accurate, the evaluation may draw a random sample of client records to track client flow. While this data may not be as desirable as summary data on all clients, it may enable less specific generalizations about client movement.

There are various methods available to the evaluator to collect needed data. They include:

1. Participant observation.
2. General observation.
3. Surveys
 - a) Mailed
 - b) Telephone
4. Interviews
 - a) Structured
 - b) Unstructured
5. Literature Review
6. Compilation of existing data
7. Controlled experimental data

The evaluation process should develop a flexible approach that enables alternative methods to be used to meet design objectives. In determining alternative solutions to meet evaluation problems the evaluation manager "...must reassess the situation, estimate the costs and benefits of the options, and see that decision-makers are presented with options as quickly as possible." 7

If the evaluation limitations are so great that the design objectives can not be met, the evaluation manager may either terminate the evaluation; may

terminate the evaluation and provide the needed technical assistance to insure that the needed evaluation will be available in the future; or may continue with the evaluation, focusing on those evaluation objectives that are attainable and including in the evaluation recommendations that will upgrade the needed data to insure that other design objectives will be attainable in the future. The latter alternative appears to be the most desirable. Often, preliminary data or descriptive information on a project's/program's operation is useful to decision-makers. While the data may not meet initial expectations, it may be viewed as an initial step toward development of adequate evaluation data. Such a preliminary data also communicates to decision-makers the reasons for limited data and ways to counter these limitations.

D. Data Analysis

The data analysis process begins by organizing the data that has been collected. This organization can vary from a summary of responses in table form to more sophisticated statistical manipulation.

The organized data can then be weighed against comparison data (standards, model programs, historical trends, control groups, etc.) to arrive at specific conclusions regarding needs/problems, within a particular area of study. Any recommendations made on the basis of study conclusions should take into consideration all viable alternatives to meet a particular need or problem. More than one alternative may appear viable, in which case the advantages and disadvantages of each alternative should be presented to the users for consideration.

Many metropolitan evaluation capabilities do not have access to, or funds for, electronic processing of data. This should not deter the evaluation manager from pursuit of evaluation objectives. Survey data from local projects/programs rarely reach an N which requires electronic data processing to analyze. Due to the limited focus of most local (city or county) evaluations, manual tabulation

may actually prove less costly and less time consuming than electronic tabulation.

Electronic data processing does enable more sophisticated analysis of data to determine cross-comparisons and statistical analysis. However, such analysis may not be needed to meet the information needs of the decision-makers. Rarely do users of the evaluation data desire that project/program assumptions be proven statistically.

While not having access to data processing equipment should not be an obstacle to the accomplishment of evaluation objectives, the utility of such equipment should not be underestimated. Easily retrieved data may save the evaluator considerable time and effort. Computer resources may also be needed if the evaluation unit becomes involved in general research and long-range planning.

E. Post-Study Implementation Strategy

One of the most important, and often most neglected, steps in the evaluation process is the post-study implementation process. Evaluators often distribute final copies of an evaluation report and consider further activities the responsibility of administrator and/or policy makers. Frequently these decision-makers fail to schedule implementation meetings and the final result is an evaluation that has little or no impact.

Evaluation will most likely have an impact if it is relevant to the information needs of the policy-makers, if the preliminary stages of the evaluation were properly addressed, if the evaluation results are accurate, if the evaluator assumes an appropriate role during the post-study phase of the evaluation, and if the evaluator develops an effective implementation strategy.

1) Evaluator's Role

The evaluator's role in the implementation stage of the evaluation process

is complex and sensitive. If the evaluator aggressively pursues implementation of evaluation recommendations he is likely to be criticized for becoming overly involved in policy-making activities. If he chooses not to become involved at this stage he runs the risk that the evaluation will not be given adequate attention. Therefore, the evaluator needs to find middle-ground where he can assume a role that encourages serious consideration of evaluation results and recommendations without having to lobby or assume the characteristics of a policy-making role.

Appropriate roles which an evaluator may assume during this phase include: resource person, consultant, and educator. These roles are not mutually exclusive. There are many similarities and a certain amount of overlap between them. The differences are primarily a matter of degree. An evaluator may also assume more than one role during this phase. For example, the evaluator may be used as a resource and asked to conduct a more specific or more comprehensive analysis of a particular area addressed in the evaluation report. He may then assume a consultative role and suggest various preferred courses of action that the decision-maker may pursue. Once a particular strategy is decided, the evaluator may be requested to educate other groups about the advantages of the chosen alternative.

2) Implementation Strategy

Two primary questions arise during the implementation stage of the evaluation process: 'Who should be informed of evaluation results?' and 'How should evaluation results be communicated?'

The question of who will be given evaluation results should be discussed during the preliminary phases of the evaluation. The dissemination process should be mutually determined by the evaluation manager and agency administrator. Formal policy of the evaluation unit may require that certain individuals or groups be provided copies of evaluation reports. If this is the case, such policy should be communicated to project/program administrators prior to the start of the evaluation

process.

Evaluation results can be communicated in various ways: orally, in written summary form, in complete form, or a combination of the above. Individuals directly responsible for implementation of evaluation recommendations should be briefed orally and provided a complete copy of the evaluation results. A summary report should be made available if the users are desirous of such. Other individuals or groups, not directly involved in implementation, should be given a summary copy of the report and be provided a complete copy if requested.

F. Evaluation Follow-Up

If a metropolitan area has a permanent evaluation capability, it may be desirable for that unit to follow-up on completed evaluations. A follow-up can determine the degree to which evaluation recommendations were implemented. Such a follow-up is of primary value to the evaluation manager. It provides the evaluator with feedback concerning the potential impact an evaluation may have had on a particular project/program. It may also highlight weaknesses in the evaluation process or inappropriate recommendations that may have been made. Such problems may then be corrected in future evaluations. Follow-up evaluation also serves to focus additional attention on a previously completed evaluation. This may be of particular importance if the evaluation report was not adequately studied or acted upon when first released. Follow-up information may also prove beneficial to project/program administrators by providing them with objective information concerning the progress they have made in implementing evaluation recommendations.

There are at least two negative aspects of conducting follow-up evaluation. The time it takes to conduct the follow-up may divert evaluation personnel from conducting new evaluations. However, this difficulty may be minimized by conducting short-term, cursory follow-ups. Since evaluation personnel will already be familiar with the particular program, it will be easier to document implementation or non-imple-

mentation of evaluation recommendations. Input from agency staff interviews may also be used to determine project/program change. Such a cursory follow-up should be accomplished within a two week period.

The second negative aspect arises as a result of the potential bias that the evaluator may have when following-up on his own evaluation recommendations. It may be difficult for the evaluator to see that a particular recommendation may not have been appropriate. However, a professional evaluator should be able to maintain a level of objectivity which would enable a critical analysis of the evaluation process as well as the degree to which the evaluated program has implemented recommendations.

IV. Summary

The most logical structure for the implementation of evaluation projects appears to be at a local level. The role of the state evaluation unit should be one of coordinating and providing technical assistance to local units. Evaluations of state-wide programs could also be carried out at a local level, providing that a consistent evaluation design is developed for local units by the state unit. A more adequate on-going evaluation capability can probably be achieved through a permanent evaluation capability as opposed to development of numerous contracts with private vendors.

The scope that a local evaluation unit takes will depend upon their resources, objectives and the information needs within the Criminal Justice System. This scope may vary from project, program, or system level evaluations. The evaluation unit may also decide to focus on evaluating impact, process, or a combination of the two. Which focus is taken will depend on several factors: time constraints, user needs, availability of data, competency of staff, resources, and the evaluation unit's established policies and tradition.

The first step in the evaluative process involves pre-evaluation planning. Paying adequate attention to this stage can avoid many problems that can arise during the course of the evaluation.

Metropolitan evaluation units will rarely have the resources to conduct sophisticated experimental research. However, such evaluations may actually have less impact than less sophisticated efforts. The evaluation manager should be willing to rely on 'soft' data and non-experimental evaluation designs until additional resources become available. An evaluation design that can be implemented on a two month timetable should be realistic in most project-level and some program-level evaluations. Such a time schedule should be a goal of local evaluation capabilities.

Metropolitan evaluation units will rarely have access to electronic data processing capabilities. Such resources, while desirable, should not hinder the development of an effective evaluation capability. Most local evaluations will not

generate the volume of data but will require electronic data processing.

The evaluation process should pay special attention to the post-study implementation strategy. During this stage this evaluation may assume a role of a resource person, consultant and/or educator. The implementation strategy should include a plan to effectively communicate evaluation results to information users.

The evaluation unit should also strive to follow-up on evaluations at a specified interval(s). Such follow-up can provide evaluation managers and agency administrators with valuable information.

Footnotes

1. Weidman, Donald R., et al, Intensive Evaluation for Criminal Justice Planning Agencies, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice; July, 1975
2. Clausen, John, "Reality Testing: Theory and Experience in Research Formulation", in Report of Technical Assistance Project Workshop on Research in Social Problem Areas, San Diego, California, April 15-18, 1962; p. 56
3. Adams, Stuart, Evaluative Research in Corrections - A Practical Guide, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administrator, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, March, 1975.
4. Ibid; p. 53
5. Ibid; pp. 44-45
6. Weidman, Donald R., et al, Intensive Evaluation for Criminal Justice Planning Agencies, U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice; July, 1975
7. Ibid; pp. 20-21

