



Massey



March 1, 1976

:..**4** 

1. **Se** - Al

1

**Final Report** 

EVALUATION OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMS OF LEAA IN THE AREAS OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND STATISTICS SERVICES (NCJISS)

#### by

Philip S. McMullan, Jr. Janet L. Ries of the Research Triangle Institute with assistance of Midwest Research Institute

#### Prepared for:

- 4

Department of Justice Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Office of Planning and Management Planning and Evaluation Division Washington, D.C. 20531



### U.S. Department of Justice National Institute of Justice

·····

Ŀ,

N 10-

蕉

W.

•

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this c<del>opyrighte</del>d material has been granted by

Public Domain U.S. DOJ, LEAA

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

4

12



## RESEARCH TRIANGLE INSTITUTE CENTER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND RESOURCE PLANNING RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NORTH CAROLINA

### FINAL REPORT

RTI Project 26U-1189

<u>V</u> <u>Evaluation of the Accomplishments and Impact</u> of the Programs of LEAA in the Areas of Information Systems Development and Statistics Services (NCJISS)

### Ъу

Philip S. McMullan, Jr. Janet L. Ries of the Research Triangle Institute with assistance of Midwest Research Institute

MAR 2 1982

Acquisitions

March 1976

## Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Justice Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

Under Contract J-LEAA-009-76

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors of this report are pleased to acknowledge the assistance and cooperation of the many individuals who participated in this study. In particular, we wish to show appreciation to Dr. June Corneg, in the Office of Planning and Management of LEAA, for her patience and strong support as she provided overall guidance as well as invaluable advice and assistance throughout the project.

The authors would also like to express their appreciation to the team leaders, Mr. Brian Hoel, Mr. David Stuart and Mr. Ray Collins, and the other staff members of the interview teams: Mr. E. D. Dieckman; Mr. Milas G. Kirkpatrick; Ms. Patrician L. Levy; Mr. Robert B. Lewis; and Mr. Michael Worley. Their wholehearted cooperation and willingness to travel on short notice made it possible to complete the study in the short time available.

At the Research Triangle Institute, staff contributions were also made by Ms. Debra Kay and Ms. Kay Marr who edited the entire report. Ms. Cindy Whitaker contributed in both the analysis of survey data and in the typing of the report. Ms. Mari Frazier, Polly Jackson, and Shirley Young cheerfully typed the numerous draft and final copies of this report and other materials that were developed during the course of this study.

Finally, the authors would like to express special appreciation to Mr. Brian Hoel of MRI who was the project leader for the MRI subcontract and a valued contributor to all phases of the project both at MRI and RTI.

Β.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A

12

7

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

GMENTS	ii
ABLES	vii
	•
A SOMMARY OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
JUCTION	1-1
INAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS	1-1
OF NCJISS STATISTICS	1-2
Non-LEAA Federal Agencies	1-3
LEAA Headquarters State and Local Agencies	1-4
Statistical Documents	1-6
Survey Subscribers and LEEP Institutions	1-6
REASONS FOR THE EVALUATION	
DDUCTION	2-1
GROUND: 1920-75	2-1
RAM PLANS: 1976-77	2-6
Systems Development Division	2-6,
1. Comprehensive Data Systems	2-7
2. SEARCH Grants	2-8
J. Uther Grants	2-8 2-8
4. workshops and meetings Statistics Division	2-0
	- /
DESCRIPTION OF THE RTI/MRI STUDY	
DDUCTION	3-1
DATA COLLECTION .	3-2
ISIS AND EVALUATION	3-7
OD TATALAT TRANTOR TATADALA MYON OVONTAL	
CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SISTEMS	
DDUCTION	4-1
General The Analysis Approach	4-1 4-3
me marysis approach	4-J
L LAW ENFORCEMENT SYSTEMS	4-5
manpower and Kesource Allocation Systems	4-0
2. Nondispatching Computer-Aided Systems	4-8
Data Storage and Retrieval Systems	4-10
1. Master Name Indexes	4-10
2. Multifile Systems	4-13

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (con.)

			Pace					Page
			1060			Chart	THE THATTON OF THE HEE OF NOTICE DODICED DOCIMENTS	
	3.	Investigation-Oriented Systems	4-14	<b>A</b>	4	Chapte	er 5: EVALUATION OF THE USE OF NGJISS-FRODUCED DOCUMENTS	
	4.	Multipurpose Criminal Justice Information				Ι.	OVERVIEW	5-1
		Systems	4-17			<b>TT</b>	DA CYCROUND	5-1
	C. Con	nclusions - Local Law Enforcement Systems	4-18	B		11. ·	A The Needs for Criminal Justice Statistics	5-1
TTT	TOCAT AT		4-10		0		R. The Hypotheses for the Fyslustion	5-4
****		and STATE COURT INFORMATION SISTEMS	4-19 /_10	•			b. The hypotheses for the Evaluation	J4
	A. LUC	Porgon-Case Tracking Systems	4-19 Å-20			III.	NON-LEAA FEDERAL AGENCIES	5-6
	2	Court Management Information Sustance	4-20		•		A. Interview Procedure	5-6
	2.	Person-Case Tracking and Court Management	4-21	E E			B. Findings	5-7
	J.	Information Systems	1-23	*			C. Recommendations	5-8
	B. Sta	ate Court Systems	4-25	*			1. Improve Document Use	5-8
	1.	Court Activity Reporting Systems	4-24				2. Improve Series Use	5-9
	2.	Other State Court Systems	4-25	4			3. Increase User Interactions	5-9
	C. Cor	aclusions - Court Systems	4-27		9	T77	LEAL HEADOUARTERS PERSONNEL	5-9
	0. 00.		4	•		TA •	A Interview Procedure	5-10
IV.	· STATE CO	DRRECTION INFORMATION SYSTEMS	428				P Findings	5-10
	A. Con	rectional Data Storage and Retrieval Systems	4-28				D. Findings	5-11
	B. In	nate Tracking Systems	4-29				2. National Drighty Programs	5-11
	C. Cor	nclusions - Corrections Systems	4-31				2. Recional Chorations	5-12
V	STATEWIT	DE LAU ENFORCEMENT SYSTEMS AND COMPREHENSIVE DATA					A National Institute Components	5-13
v .	SYSTEMS	JE LAW ENFORCEMENT DIDIENO AND CONTREMENSIVE DATA	4-32				4. National institute components	5-13
		stevide Law Enforcement Systems	4-32		8		C. Conclusions	5-14
	B Con	nrehencive Data Systems	4-32		· · ·		D. Becommondations	5-15
	1	Coperal	4-33				1. Therefore Lipicen	5-15
		Findings	· 4-35				2. Indrease Analytical Canability	5-15
	 	Conclusions	4-35				2. Increase Analytical Capability 3. Make Data Available for Special Apalyces	5-16
	5.	CONCLUSIONS	4-30				5. Make Data Available for Special Analyses	5-16
VI.	COMMENTS	S, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4-36				4. Floduce up-to-bate bocuments	<u> </u>
	A. Con	mments and Conclusions	4-36			٧.	STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES	5-16
	B. Red	commendations	4-38	i.			A. Interview Procedure	5-16
	1.	Provide and Disseminate Timely, Accurate State-					B. Findings	5-17
· · ·		of-the-Art Information	4-38		•		1. Documents Most Frequently Held	5-17
	2.	Sponsor Activities to Promote the "Cross-					2. Respondent Classes Using Documents	5-18
	•	Fertilization" of Data Processing and Law					3. Responses Describing Use	5-20
		Enforcement Ideas	4–39				4. Responses Describing Nonuse	5-23
	3.	Enhance SPA Technical Assistance Capability	4-39				5. Responses Indicating Data Needs	5-26
	4.	Develop Evaluation Methodology to Insure					C. Conclusions	5-30
		Optimal System Use	4-39				D. Recommendations	5-31
	5.	Promote User Participation in System					1. Develop a Program to Assist Agency Data Analyses	5-31
		Development and Implementation	4-39			•	2. Increase the Division's Analytical Resources	5-31
	6.	Clarify and Expedite Dissemination of					3. Continue NCJISS Plans for a Data Repository	5-32
		Regulations and Guidelines	4-40					
÷	7.	Review Grant Evaluation and Reward Process	4-40					
	8.	Develop Standardized Classifications and			4 2		<ul> <li>A second se</li></ul>	
		Terminology for Criminal Justice Information						
		Systems	4-40					
					II			

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (con.)

### TABLE OF CONTENTS (con.)

	Page			•
VI. DOCUMENT EVALUATION A. Review Procedure B. Conclusions	5-32 5-32		č Te	ıble
VII. TELEPHONE SURVEY	5-33	P.	4-	·l Type of I Allocation
A. Survey Procedure B. Findings 1. Subscriber List Survey	5-33 5-34 5-34	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	4	·2 LEAA and Enforcement
2. LEEP Survey C. Conclusions and Recommendations	5–36 5–38	•		3 Type of In Storage an
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW GUIDELINES	A-1		4-	4 LEAA and M Enforcemen
APPENDIX 5: RTI AND MRI TEAM MEMBERS APPENDIX C: CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND	B-1		4-:	5 Type of Ir Storage ar
STATISTICS TERMINOLOGY GLOSSARY	C-1	<b>A</b>	4-(	5 LEAA and N

2

Interface: Local Law Enforcement Manpower/Resource 4-7 Non-LEAA Contributions to Local Law ent Manpower/Resource Allocation Systems. . . . . . . . . 4-9 nterface: Local Law Enforcement Data Non-LEAA Contributions to Local Law ent Data Storage and Retrieval Systems. . . . . . . . . . . 4-12 nterface. Local Law Enforcement Data Non-LEAA Contributions to Local Law Enforcement Data Storage and Retrieval Systems. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4-16 4-7 Type of Interface: Local Court Information Systems . . . . . . . 4-21 4-8 LEAA and Non-LEAA Contributions to Local Courts 4-9 Type of Interface: State Court Information Systems . . . . . . 4-25 4-10 LEAA and Non-LEAA Contributions to State Courts 4-11 Type of Interface: State Corrections Systems . . . . . . . . . . . . 4-28 4-12 LEAA and Non-LEAA Contributions to State Corrections Systems. . . 4-30 4-13 Type of Interface: Statewide Law Enforcement Information 4-14 LEAA and Non-LEAA Contributions to Statewide Law Enforcement 5-1 Use and Nonuse Responses of State and Local Agencies 5-2 NCJISS Documents and Data Series Received by State and Local 5-3 Classes of Respondents in State and Local Agencies. . . . . . . . . 5-20 5-4 Summary of Types of Uses of NCJISS and UCR Documents. . . . . . 5-21 5-5 Purpose for Use: Given on 47 of 61 Respondent Forms. . . . . . . . 5-22 5-7 Reasons for Nonuse: Given on 36 of the 61 Respondent Forms . . 5-25

#### LIST OF TABLES

Page

vii

### LIST OF TABLES (con.)

#### Table

5-8 Why Were You Interested in This Particular Publication? . . . . 5-35 5-9 LEEP Survey Summary ..... 5-37 5-10 Why Were You Interested in This Particular Publication? . . . . 5-37

Page

The purpose of this project, which was conducted jointly by the Research Triangle Institute and Midwest Research Institute, was to evaluate the effectiveness of the work the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) has undertaken during the past six years in the two areas: the development of criminal justice information systems and the production and dissemination of crime and criminal justice statistics. The objectives were to provide assessments of (1) the producer-consumer relationships between the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service (NCJISS) and the receivers and users of NCJISS-produced statistics and (2) LEAA support for criminal justice information system development. The conclusions and recommendations are summarized first for the information systems and next for the use of statistics.

Evaluation of 76 criminal justice information systems (chapter 4) showed that most of them are promoting rapid retrieval of more accurate information, and thus are greatly assisting criminal justice agencies in the performance of their functions.

LEAA funds have made decided differences in the rates of development of information systems. Many would not have been developed if LEAA funds had not been available. The timing of these funds was often more important than the amount; for example, a \$20,000 contribution to a \$200,000 locally funded system may have kept the development alive. The presence or absence of LEAA development funds did not appear to have influenced either the sophistication or the level of user satisfaction. Information systems appear to be most advanced in the law enforcement area; more of LEAA development funds have been expended in the law enforcement area than in courts or corrections areas. Rather than funds, the factors which appeared to most influence user satisfaction were the degrees of user participation in the design and user familiarity with the system.

#### Chapter 1

#### A SUMMARY OF THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### I. INTRODUCTION

#### II. CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS

LEAA technical assistance has been limited largely to sponsoring seminars, publishing informative materials, and providing funds for visits to other systems. Technical and technology transfer assistance have been provided most often by in-house data processing personnel, computer industry vendors, management consulting firms, aerospace industries, and academic institutions. Systems operators would have used LEAA technical assistance if it had been available when they were designing their systems.

Consumers of LEAA development support would like to have more and better information about other systems which are operating successfully, technical assistance in measuring system efficiency, clearer and firmer guidelines and regulations, and less administrative delay.

Based on the above conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

- Provide and disseminate timely and accurate information on successfully operating criminal justice information systems and on software packages appropriate for use by criminal justice system agencies.
- Sponsor more seminars for promoting the "cross-fertilization" of data processing and law enforcement ideas.
- Enhance the technical assistance capabilities of State Planning Agencies.
- Develop an information system evaluation methodology.
- Promote a high level of user participation in the development and use of information systems.
  - Clarify and expedite the dissemination of LEAA regulations and guidelines.
- Review the grant evaluation and award processes.
- Promote the development of classifications, definitions, and a standard terminology for criminal justice information systems.

The recommendations are amplified in chapter 4.

#### III. USE OF NCJISS STATISTICS

Evaluation of the use on NCJISS-produced documents and data services were based on personal interviews in state and local agencies, at LEAA headquarters and in non-LEAA federal agencies in Washington. Also, telephone interviews

were held with general subscribers to NCJISS-produced documents; and documents produced in the field were evaluated. Documents and services which the NCJISS Statistics Division provides have generally met the federal needs which they were originally designed to meet. When the NCJISS data series were initiated in 1972, they provided benchmark data for several subjects on which no others were available at the national level, thus those interviewed in Washington found the series to be invaluable. However, the documents and data series have not kept pace with the changing needs at the federal level. The documents are being used frequently in educational institutions, particularly those participating in LEAA's Law Enforcement Education Program.

There is no evidence that any of the NCJISS documents and data series were designed specifically to meet the needs of state and local agencies. Generally they meet few of these needs. If NCJISS is to meet the needs, the data series must give more complete coverage to state and local areas, the documents must permit realistic comparisons within and between states, and the states must have help in upgrading their capabilities to perform analyses using the data.

A, Non-LEAA Federal Agencies

 $\gamma$ 

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings in interviews with 14 non-LEAA agencies in the District of Columbia. The NCJISS-produced documents and data series are more strongly supported in this set of interviews than in the others. Most of the persons interviewed expressed needs for series relevant to their specific functions. Most do make use of the documents or the data series. The documents seldom are used as primary data sources for research and analysis; they are used most often as general reference sources. Only the victimization data are used for research and analysis, but the users have access to the raw data. Based on these conclusions, the following recommendations are made:

know about them.

Improve statistical series use by providing the Statistics Division with adequate staffing to produce and disseminate special reports at the requests of federal (or other) users.

Improve document use by providing brief summary documents pointing out the important findings, trend changes, or key statistics to the high level administrators who should

Increase user interaction between NCJISS and federal agency researchers and analysts.

#### B. LEAA Headquarters

The following conclusions were drawn from the findings in interviews with 18 persons in LEAA headquarters in the District of Columbia. The NCJISS documents are used within these offices. The frequency of use ranges from daily to one-time-only depending on the document and the needs of the office.

The victimization series is considered to be "a gold mine"; however, its present documentation needs to be improved and the NCJISS Statistics Division should increase its capability to perform special analyses with these data. The routine tabulations should be more in line with LEAA programs. The victimization survey is needed and the collection procedures are sound. The major complaints are that no analysis is made of the data to draw out implications for research and program planning and that tables in the documents do not show classifications of interest to most receivers of the documents.

The expenditure and employment data are used occasionally in all other LEAA offices and frequently in the Office of Regional Operations. Needed are timely, up-to-date data and regional breakdowns.

Criminal justice agency listings are used infrequently by the LEAA offices, except the Office of Regional Operations. They are most useful as sources of the approximate numbers of agencies in a region or state. Corrections documents, except for Children in Custody, were most useful for benchmark data when the series were first produced. Data showing trends and significant changes that are relevant to planning the corrections programs would be useful. Tabulations of the characteristics of women in prisons were specifically requested. The one court document on the list is used infrequently as a general reference. The Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) reports from the FBI are used widely in these offices.

The conclusions led to the four recommendations for improving the producerconsumer relationships and the Division's statistical capabilities and services.

> Increase liaison with LEAA research and program offices to enhance the relevance to and use of documents by the offices.

> > 1-4

Increase the analytical staff resources, and the number and quality of analytical studies in support of LEAA policy and program designs.

Continue to make all data from the statistical series easily available for special analyses, to publicize the availability of procedures for performing special studies, and to provide analytical services to LEAA and non-LEAA offices that have no analytical capability available to them.

Review its procedures for producing documents--in the expenditures and employment series and the criminal justice agency series in particular -- to insure that the documents are as current and timely as good management will permit.

State and Local Agencies These conclusions were drawn from interviews with over 100 planners, researchers, and system operators in state and local agencies. The NCJISS documents and data series were usually received, scanned once, and placed on a shelf for possible later reference but were not widely used by state and local agencies. Planners in state agencies most often use or attempt to use them to compare their states with others of a similar demographic mix. When they are unable to compare, they consider the data incomplete or the methods of tabulation inappropriate for their needs. Researchers and analysts need victimization data on their states, their local areas, or their regions to use with FBI crime statistics. From the conclusions evolved three recommendations to help NCJISS improve its services to state and local agencies.

Develop a program to assist state and local agencies in data analyses to fulfill the immediate need for straightforward examples of practical criminal justice analyses.

Develop a larger, analytically trained staff and/or obtain consultant assistance to draw from the data series inferences relevant to state and local criminal justice planning and analysis.

Replace the more bulky documents in some series with summary analyses.

Make criminal justice data in the repository readily accessible to researchers and analysts in states with advanced analytical capabilities.

с.

Recommendations in this section are amplified in chapter 5.

#### 2. Statistical Documents

From the 18 states, 100 documents were received for review and 47 were uaged relevant to the evaluation of the impacts of LEAA-produced statistics on the state-produced statistical documents. Conclusions based on the evaluations are presented here.

- With few exceptions, the judged quality of the documents was not high.
  - The quality of documents referencing LEAA/UCR documents was higher than it was for documents not referencing LEAA/UCR documents.
- The quality of documents referencing LEAA/UCR documents increases as the number of LEAA/UCR documents referenced increases.
- For all documents reviewed, references to only LEAA documents (UCR excluded) occurred 19 percent of the time.
- For all documents reviewed, some LEAA/UCR statistics were used in 38 percent of the documents.
- Documents referencing LEAA/UCR sources and using LEAA/ UCR statistics were judged to be of somewhat lower quality than documents referencing LEAA/UCR sources but not using LEAA/UCR statistics.
- Documents funded by LEAA were judged to be of higher quality than documents not funded by LEAA.

No recommendations were derived from this evaluation of state-produced documents.

E. Survey Subscribers and LEEP Institutions

The random samples of 300 subscribers to NCJISS publications and 50 persons in institutions participating in LEAA's Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) were interviewed in the telephone survey. The subscribers use the documents more than the personnel in state and local agencies do. Most of the LEEP participants were users. Uses for both groups were primarily general reference, research, and classroom instruction.

Recommendations based on both groups of respondents were consistent with those of local and state agency personnel. The main two were:

1-6

Include more narrative explanations of analyses, and

Include more interpretation of data.

Details are in section E of chapter 5.

This study is an evaluation of the effectiveness of the work LEAA has undertaken in information systems and statistics services over the past six years. This chapter is a review of those years and the objectives of the LEAA divisions with the primary responsibilities for leadership in two areas: the System Development Division and the Statistics Division of the National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Services (NCJISS).\* State and local developers of information systems and statistical services typically refer to statements of need expressed by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in the preambles to their plans and reports. A typical quote is:

America's system of criminal justice is overcrowded, undermanned, underfinanced, and very often misunderstood. It needs more information and more knowledge. It needs more technical resources. It needs more coordination among its many parts. Above all, it needs the willingness to reexamine the old ways of doing things, to reform itself, to experiment, to run risks, to dare. It needs vision.

The purposes of the review are to describe the federal context in which state and local developments occurred and to examine LEAA objectives against which accomplishments can be measured.

Efforts before 1955 to provide information about crime and the criminal justice system are described by the California Bureau of Criminal Statistics:

. . . generally limited to "summary reporting" through annual, quarterly or monthly reports . . . of the number of offenses, the number of persons arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and sentenced. . . . Because they are furnished by many separate independent agencies they tend not to provide uniform data nor do they permit other than gross evaluation of crime and delinquency.

In the early 1920's, a tremendous interest in . . . crime in the United States was generated . . . As a result, . . . studies, funded by private foundations, were undertaken. The first of these, the Cleveland Survey, was undertaken in 1919 with reports

\*Appendix C provides a glossary of the acronyms used in this report.

## Chapter 2 REASONS FOR THE EVALUATION

#### I. INTRODUCTION

#### II. BACKGROUND: 1920-75

published in 1922. The major surveys which followed were the Missouri Survey published in 1926, the Illinois Survey published in 1928, surveys of activities in New York State sponsored by the Legislature published in 1928 and 1929, and the Oregon Survey published in 1932. The pattern . . . was to . . . search first the police files to establish the base data on persons arrested and charged and then to trace them through each procedural step taken in bringing the case to . . . either release or conviction and sentence.

In 1931, the National Commission of Law Observance of Law Enforcement (known as the Wickersham Commission) made a comprehensive review of criminal justice in the United States . . . The Commission called upon the separate states to accept responsibility for their collection of criminal data and suggested a national center should be established to focus state data into at least a general national picture.

. . . In the following years . . . the Census Bureau . . . established a method of collecting individual information on prisoners admitted to and released from federal and state penitentiaries and reformatories in 1926. The International Association of Chief's of Police sponsored . . . the collection of police statistics in 1928-29. As a result, a recommendation . . . to obtain monthly summary data on major crimes from local police departments . . . was undertaken in 1930. Congress authorized the FBI to carry out this program and since 1931 these data have been published by the FBI as the Uniform Crime Report.

In 1932 . . . the Census Bureau inaugurated collection of data . . . accounted for dispositions of defendants in the courts by charged offense. and . . . for sentences imposed by the courts by convicted offense. At its peak this collection covered some 1,500 courts of general jurisdiction out of over 3,000 counties in the states . . . Incomplete, it tended to be inaccurate since there was no provision for supervision, audit or check-back on the figures . . . . There was only limited support . . . this effort was abandoned in 1946.

The need expressed by the Wickersham Commission for better criminal statistics in the states . . . caused some scholars . . . to suggest that a uniform criminal statistics act be developed which states could adopt as they adopted other types of uniform state laws. Dr. Thorsten Sellin of the University of Pennsylvania drafted such an act which was promulgated by the Commissioner on the Uniform State Laws in 1946. The act called for the establishment, within a state, of a central agency or bureau . . . for the development of reporting on all phases of crime and delinquency so that reliable information would be generated . . . Prior to 1955 no state had adopted this act. In that year the California Legislature enacted a law . . . based on this uniform act . . . . 2

Toward the end of the period in the above history, the first generation of computers and telecommunication systems was beginning to come into widespread use, particularly for defense-related research and development. Between 1955 and the 1968 beginning of LEAA, there were growing recognitions of the value of information systems and statistical services, the

need for complete and timely data on crimes and offenders, and the contribution that advanced computer and telecommunications technologies might have.

• • • with timely information, a police officer could • • • hold an arrested shoplifter for having committed armed robbery elsewhere. With . . . detailed background on how . . . offenders respond to correctional treatment, a judge could more intelligently sentence a second offender. With better projections of next year's workload, a State budget office would know whether and where to budget for additional parole officers . . . .

information systems . . . .

.....

\* •\_

1

An integrated national information system is needed to serve the . . . National, State, regional and metropolitan or county levels of the police, courts, and corrections agencies, and of the public and the research community. Each . . . has information needed by others; an information system provides a means for collecting it, analyzing it, and disseminating it . . . by voice, by teletype, or computer to computer.

Since law enforcement is primarily a local and State function, • • • the files should be located at these levels.3

However, few state and local criminal justice agencies had the needed technical and financial resources. Soon after LEAA was created in June of 1968 with a budget of \$63 million, applications began to be received from the states for funds to develop state criminal justice information systems. With this impetus and the interpretation of its responsibilities to Congress, LEAA made the development of advanced information and statistical services one of its important functions. With limited discretionary funds available, the agency recognized that it could not effectively produce a "top down" federally operated information system for the country. As LEAA Administrator, Richard W. Velde stated in 1974,

2 - 2

Criminal justice could benefit dramatically from computer-based

LEAA made a threshold decision very early in its existence that this effort could best be achieved by building up state and local

capabilities rather than establishing a massive in-house federal systems capability and then 'handing it down on high' to the several states. LEAA's role has been to serve as a catalyst and to provide financial assistance. That is still our mission.<sup>4</sup>

The somewhat limited LEAA mission was a product of the legislation which created and sustains it. This legislation created for the agency a primary role of providing service--primarily in the form of money--to states and local governments so that they could upgrade their criminal justice systems.

Most LEAA action funds were provided to the states us block grants to be distributed to state and local agencies to meet their own "needs." The remainder of the funds were for LEAA's leadership role, but a part of such discretionary funds was committed to mixing with state and local funds (block and general funds) to support approved programs. Thus, the funds available to LEAA to be independently innovative in information systems were quite limited. This situation LEAA still shares with other federal agencies (e.g., the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization), which are supporting traditionally local and state responsibilities. These agencies can influence the direction of state and local developments through guidelines related to federal grants, but they cannot create or require the creation of criminal justice systems which are interrelated and compatible across the Nation.

Only a few of these interviewed in state agencies recognized the limitations that federal legislation places on LEAA's leadership roles, but one SPA staff member commented: "Congress assumed the local people knew what to do--that they only needed money to do it. This just isn't true. They need new ideas as much as they need money."\* LEAA recognized the need for new ideas in criminal justice information systems, and one of the first activities initiated by LEAA to provide this leadership was Project SEARCH (now SEARCH Group Incorporated). This project was initiated because of the large number of requests for LEAA support of state and local criminal justice information systems and because of the expectation that undirected support would create

\*Unreferenced quotes such as this will be found throughout the narrative. They are not exact representations of a consensus of the issue at hand. In many cases, they are an evaluator's best recollection of a statement(s) used to illustrate a point when it appeared necessary or informative.

a concerr. that:

grams.5

from the states.

At the time the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 was passed, there were few operational criminal justice information systems and they were limited in their functions -- according to a 1968 survey conducted by one of the analysts in this study. <sup>6</sup> Seven states and 27 cities had management/statistics systems; eight states, two counties, and seven cities had real-time direct inquiry systems; seven states, two counties and two cities had message switching systems; and one city had an operational computerized command and control system. In contrast, after four years of LEAA funding there were 454 separate systems operating in 153 jurisdictions performing 75 separate functions by 1972.7

Although by 1974 LEAA had estimated that over \$300 million of LEAA funds had been devoted directly to criminal justice information systems, Administrator Richard Velde reported that this represented only 10 to 15 percent of the total of state and local government funds spent on all types of information systems over the five years of LEAA existence. 4 It is within the context of limited but growing contributions of LEAA funds for information systems and statistics services that RTI and MRI conducted this study of producerconsumer relationships between LEAA's NCJISS and the state and local criminal justice agencies.

2 - 4

unnecessary duplication of development and incompatible systems. There was

. . . each state might go off in its own direction, leaving us with a bewildering complex of independent and incompatible pro-

By placing \$600,000 in project SEARCH and involving six participating states, LEAA hoped to develop a demonstration project which would show all states how they could have interrelated, compatible systems for retrieving criminal histories throughout the Nation. Fifteen states eventually joined the project, the demonstration was judged to be successful, and the states decided to make the experiment an operational part of their information systems. Out of this experiment grew the concept of Comprehensive Data Systems and many of the standards recommended by the National Advisory Commission on

Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Documents related to these two activities over the years have significantly influenced the grant applications

#### III. PROGRAM PLANS: 1976-77

This section describes the objectives of the two NCJISS Divisions and the producer-consumer relationships which may take place with the receivers and users of their products--normally, the compiled statistics and the development support for information systems. The emphasis is on relationships between NCJISS and the potential state and local users of its products.

#### A. Systems Development Division

9.1

The Systems Development Division of NCJISS is responsible for planning, coordinating, and enhancing of national policy for information and communications systems in the criminal justice community through the development. testing, and implementation of innovative systems capabilities. These responsibilities are carried out in two major programs.

The first program attempts to provide national direction and leadership to developing state and local information and telecommunication systems.

Objective of Program 2.206: . . in FY 76 and 77 to assist states in improving the quality of decisionmaking at both operational and planning levels through continued improvements in criminal justice information and communications systems, including NLETS (National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System), the Organized Crime Index Project, SEARCH projects, full implementation of a Correction Education Network, and other efforts to upgrade the quality and efficiency of national systems.<sup>8</sup>

This objective is to be accomplished within the Division using 5.48 professional man-years plus 1.39 man-years of regional support. Funding was set at \$6 million in data systems funds and \$2 million in Part C (law enforcement) discretionary funds for FY 76. The larger amount is supporting Project SEARCH and other efforts to advance the state-of-the-art in information systems. The smaller amount is supporting the development of advanced systems in state and local areas.

The second program--the Comprehensive Data Systems (CDS)--attempts to improve the quality and quantity of state-collected criminal justice data and the consistency in data elements so that there will be compatibility across the states. The SAC (Statistical Analysis Center) element of the program is to provide a high level of professionalism in the data collection and analysis so that better management decisions can be made.

Objective of Program 2.207: . . . to assist states in development of state level capacity for collection, utilization, dissemination and evaluation of criminal justice statistics and information on all agencies within the state through continued support for CDS program in FY 76, and promote state level analysis of CDS information.9

This objective is to be accomplished within the Division using 2.40 professional man-years and additional support of regional specialists. Funding was set at \$2 million in data systems funds, \$11 million in Part C (law enforcement) discretionary funds, and \$8 million in Part E (corrections) discretionary funds. This program began in 1972 with the funding of \$12 million for FY 73. By March of 1975 there were 36 states participating. One of the Division's objectives was to raise this participation to 52 states by June 1976. The objective was contingent on five years of LEAA support; none of the states have had time to complete the first five-year planning and development cycle. Compared to the number of people and funds expended throughout the Nation for information systems, the resources of the Systems Development Division are not large. Although this study did not involve a management analysis of the Division, the impressions were that much of the available time was taken up in reviewing action plans and grant applications; there are very few face-to-face consumer-producer relationships. Both the Division and persons interviewed in the states said that there were few direct contacts between NCJISS and the operators and users of information systems. The Division exercises its leadership through CDS guidelines and grants, SEARCH

grants, other grants, and workshops, as discussed below.

1. Comprehensive Data Systems

Leadership through promulgation of (as yet unofficial) guidelines for CDS and review and approval of grant requests is performed by the Division. More direct contact with states is maintained by the system specialists and financial officers in the 10 LEAA regional offices. Regional systems specialists spend much time in the review and approval of plans and grants. They provide direct and appreciated assistance in preparing grant applications, but they spend little time in assisting states in carrying out their plans. As discussed in later sections, many states would like more technical assistance from LEAA regions or NCJISS in developing their systems and review of their progress.

2-6

#### 2. SEARCH Grants

SEARCH Group, Inc., is a primary mechanism for the development of prototype systems intended to be transferable to other states with similar needs. SEARCH also participates in projects in which a number of states are involved and in special technology transfer projects. The SEARCH Policy Committee is another outreach avenue for the Division: every state is represented by a member appointed by its governor. However, through 1974, committee membership tended to be heavily concentrated in law enforcement; few represented courts or corrections. Only one court administrator had been appointed by the state governors. One judge and two corrections representatives had been added by LEAA appointments. Also, the SEARCH representative in at least one state represented a Police Information Network, which was actively opposing the CDS plans of the State Planning Agency (SPA). Thus, it cannot be assumed that the appointed representatives were useful channels of information to all of the criminal justice agencies in a state.

#### 3. Other Grants

In addition to SEARCH funds for research and prototype development, the Division also funds a small number of other grantees to advance the state-of-the-art in criminal justice information systems. This includes such projects as a model state plan for telecommunications, an emergency communication system, advanced 911, fingerprint classification and transmission, and an updating of NLETS. The producer-consumer relationships between the Division and the states are very limited in these advanced developments.

#### 4. Workshops and Meetings

NCJISS supports a large number of ad hoc workshops and meetings in which state, regional, and Division people discuss mutual problems. The only one of these meetings that received special mention by the states was the 1975 SAC workshop; it received favorable comments from several who had attended.

In summary, the producer-consumer relationships between the Systems Development Division and the states are lacking direct contacts. In its program plans for FY 76 and 77, the Division proposes to increase this contact by working with and through the regional specialists. However, the

B. <u>Statistics Division</u> This Statistics Division is responsible for the collection, evaluation, analysis, publication, and dissemination of national criminal justice statistical series, for the coordination of and assistance for state statistical systems, and for the provision of statistical analysis support to other LEAA offices.

These objectives are to be accomplished in FY 76 with approximately 10 manyears of professional staff and \$15.422 million of data system funds. The expected results of greatest relevance to this study are that:

The products are intended to be equally useful to all levels of government and to the research and education community.

The statistical program established in 1970 has concentrated on the development of 15 on-going data series and has contracted most data collections to the Bureau of the Census. The series include such national efforts as the National Crime Panel (victimization studies of a random sample of citizer ), the Juvenile Justice Statistics Program, the Employment and Expenditur. Survey, and the National Prisoner Statistics. The Division is undergoing a change in management so the objectives and program responses are now under reassessment. Reportedly, the program emphasis will be shifted to analysis of incoming data from the statistical series.

There have been very few direct contacts between the Division personnel and the state and local systems or statistical analysis units. The need for more contacts was expressed in the program plan:

2-8

size of the staff and other responsibilities may not permit a major increase in site visits, so the leadership function may still depend largely on guidelines, grant review, funding, and progress reports.

Objectives of Program 1.108: . . . Continue in FY 76 and 77, the collection, analysis, and dissemination of statistical data required by all levels of government for developing, analyzing, implementing, and evaluating programs to reduce crime and improve the criminal justice system. 10

The publication and dissemination of these statistics and analyses will provide a valuable tool for state and local criminal justice planners to use in developing and evaluating programs to reduce crime and improve criminal justice systems. 10

It should be pointed out that while we cannot force state and local criminal justice planners and other personnel to use our data and analyses, we can direct our collection and presentation efforts to make the data that they need readily available in a timely manner. This will be accomplished through contacts with state and local criminal justice agencies and through the development and implementation of the Criminal Justice Statistics Repository.10

The Statistics Division has not yet taken steps to ascertain the needs of the states for assistance in the "coordination of and assistance for state statistical systems." To the extent that this has been done at all, it has been through the CDS program of the Systems Development Division.

In summary, the producer-consumer relationships between the Statistics Division and state and local consumers are limited almost entirely to the one-way dissemination of data in the Division's published documents. Thus, evaluation of these relationships is an evaluation of the impacts of the disseminated documents. There is greater exchange at the federal level, as reported in chapter 5.

Dallas County Judicial Information System, IBM Applications Brief, White 1. Plains, New York, July 1973.

- 2. Statistics, September 1972.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- June 18, 1968, pp. 4-10.
- Management, Management Division.
- Management, Management Division.
- Management, Management Division.

2-10

## REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 2

Offender-Based Criminal Statistics in 12 California Counties, California Department of Justice, Division of Law Enforcement, Bureau of Criminal

The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.

Richard W. Velde, "Progress in Criminal Justice Information Systems," Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Systems, Project SEARCH, San Francisco, California, May 1974, pp. 9-11.

Richard W. Velde, "Remarks before the National Symposium on Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Systems," Symposium Proceedings, Dallas, Texas, November 1970, p. 10.

6. Brian Justice Hoel, Law Enforcement Information Needs in Massachusetts, The Governor's Committee on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice,

7. 1972 Directory of Automated Criminal Justice Information Systems, LEAA,

8. MBO, FY 76 Program Plan: Objective 2.206, LEAA Office of Planning and

9. MBO, FY 76 Program Plan: Objective 2.207, LEAA Office of Planning and

10. MBO, FY 76 Program Plan: Objective 1.108, LEAA Office of Planning and

During November 1975, teams from the Research Triangle Institute (RTI) and the Midwest Research Institute (MRI) interviewed operators and users of information systems and statistical services in nine states to obtain facts, opinions, and documents with which to evaluate the effectiveness of LEAA's six years of support in the development of the systems and in the promotion of useful statistics on crime and criminal justice. To prepare for interviews in these nine states, September and October 1975 conferences were held in Denver, Colorado; Research Triangle Park, North Carolina; and Washington, D.C.; with LEAA regional specialists and with representatives from nine other states. In December and January, personnel in LEAA headquarters and in other selected federal agencies were interviewed. Thus, the methods of obtaining data for the evaluation were interviews with federal, state, and local government audiences and reviews of example documents produced by state and local agencies.

(chapter 5).

The evaluations are retrospective in the sense that the evaluators looked back over the past six years to reconstruct events from incomplete records and fallible memories. This less than desirable situation exists in part because, in its early years, LEAA and the Congress did not emphasize evaluation of LEAA programs and the state programs supported by LEAA through block grants. This situation is being corrected by the creation of the Office of Planning and Management and the Planning and Evaluation Division within this Office. However, the new emphasis on evaluation has just begun to have its effect in the preparation of guidelines and in the performance of special evaluations, such as this study. It has not yet resulted in the design of evaluation procedures and the collection of performance or impact measures which would permit a realistic "prospective" evaluation. Because the study had to be planned and the information collected from a

#### Chapter 3

#### DESCRIPTION OF THE RTI/MRI STUDY

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Using the collected information, RTI and MRI evaluated the criminal justice information systems (chapter 4) and the use of statistical documents

large number of states and local agencies over a two-month period, there were obvious limitations on the depth of the evaluation. Despite these limitations, it is believed that the conclusions in chapter 1 will be substantiated if a more carefully planned evaluation is carried out in the future.

#### II. THE DATA COLLECTION

The contract of September 1975 suggested the types of questions which were to be asked and the types of individuals who were to be interviewed in obtaining answers to the questions. The types of information to be obtained from the interviews were:

#### Identification of Information and Statistics Needs and Priorities

Determine the priority of needs for information, statistics, and information systems in 1968. What have been the responses to those perceived needs?

Identify programs that have been funded for the development of information systems and statistics, by title, purpose, level of funding, type of agreement. Insofar as possible, determine why a decision was made to fund these rather than other activities.

Locate and evaluate a limited sample of state and local government units that have not used LEAA data or have not had information systems support from LEAA to determine how these units differ from those which LEAA did support. Would the products of these organizations have been improved by use of LEAA help?

Identify types of data bases or information systems among units in the sample that were generated for local use only. What part did LEAA funds have in the establishment of these information banks or systems?

#### Evaluation of Information System Development

Describe data systems in use by organizations surveyed.

Assess use or development of information systems supported by NCJISS, including the telecommunications programs, as well as specialized programs for police, courts, and corrections agencies.

Evaluate selected projects in terms of their technical quality and the reliability and coverage of the data bases developed. Assess the development and utility of the Comprehensive Data Systems (CDS) programs. Selectively, through survey, etc., evaluate utility of CDS to state and local governments in: operating agency planning, management, SPA planning, general

3-2

purpose government decisionmaking; e.g., at level of local or state elected officials, city managers, budget officers, etc. It may also be necessary to include other state efforts supported through block grants to build information systems.

Determine whether organizations in the sample participate in SEARCH and at what levels; ascertain the usefulness and methods of application of SEARCH products.

## Evaluation of Statistical Systems and Programs

Assess the ability of state and local agency personnel to utilize statistical information in the planning and evaluation of criminal justice programs.

Determine how states, SPA's, and local governments have used nationally provided statistical data and what LEAA has done to make it available, usable, and understandable.

Identify the uses that top management, program managers, and research managers within LEAA have made of statistical data and their judgments of its utility, quality, and effectiveness in supporting their mission.

Determine what groups or individuals have actually become the final repositories for the LEAA data.

Identify what data state and local governments could have used if it had been available and whether LEAA could have supplied it. Determine why some recipients have not used LEAA data or established criminal justice information systems.

Determine state and local government personnel awareness of the broad array of data that is available from LEAA and whether they confine their usage to small parts of the information sent to them.

Obtain from a sample of the agencies surveyed a sample of plans and documents produced with or without the help of the LEAA and evaluate the use of LEAA-produced statistics in the documents.

In essence, these questions and statements first called for descriptions of the information systems and statistical services which were either in some stage of development or already operational in the places that were surveyed. Next, they required assessments of the needs which the systems and services were designed to meet, including LEAA's roles in the development of these needs. Then, information on the effectiveness of these systems and services was to be rated primarily by the assessments of users and the objective

3-3

evaluations of the interviewers. Finally, they called for recordings of the consumer-producer relationships between LEAA and the recipients or users of its services or products. The operator and user interviews were to include a subsample of information systems which had not been developed with LEAA support so that their effectiveness and utility could be compared to those supported by LEAA.

The interview procedures were also essentially directed by the contract tasks, and the procedures were followed with the exceptions noted following the statements of the tasks below.

#### Task 1

Convene in a location adjacent to the respondents involved, not less than three groups of from 8 to 10 persons each, any one group to represent personnel from three states. These group meetings will serve to furnish the information and format for many of the questions to be used later in developing a survey questionnaire.

Task 1 was completed by convening representatives from three states each in Denver, the Research Triangle Park, and the District of Columbia. The representatives invited were generally the SPA information specialist, the SAC director, and the SEARCH Group representative. Where these were not available or were combined in one or two persons, other representatives were selected by the SPA directors, and it was requested that they send an operator or user of a local information system or a regional planning unit representative whenever this was feasible. Regional information specialists were also directed to attend and 8 of the 10 were present. The states selected by RTI, MRI, and LEAA to attend were:

### Conference-Attending States

Colorado Washington Kansas

North Carolina Marvland Mississippi

District of Columbia New York Michigan

The selection of these and the nine states to be visited gave a judgmental sample based on the following criteria:

- 1. Minimal overlap with states in which the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) was performing its study.
- 2. Inclusion of states with both advanced systems and fledgling systems, as judged by NCJISS personnel.

- or the interview schedule.
- systems.

` • <u>-</u>

The funding sources considered during the initial selection process were: "LEAA grant funds" and "other funds," using the 1972 Directory of Automated Criminal Justice Information Systems. During the interviewing, attempts were made to distinguish between LEAA discretionary and block funds. No attempts were made to further subdivide the types of funds.

Information from the attendees at the three conferences and the contractspecified questions were the primary inputs into the design of the interview forms. Some information was also obtained from the attendees in response to the questions which later appeared on the final forms. Appropriate interview forms were later mailed to a number of the attendees; some of these were returned in time for use in the evaluation.

It was learned from the attendees that the nature, scope, and configuration for information systems and statistical services was so diverse within and between states that no questionnaire could be developed to elicit all of the desired information. (A regional information systems specialist reported that "a state criminal justice information system is whatever a state decides it is to be.") As a result, interviewer guidelines rather than questionnaires were developed. The resulting forms, presented as appendix A, were:

It then asks for information about the specific systems within the state, their operators and users, their funding, and LEAA participation in their development. Specific questions are also asked about the development of standards and goals, needs, and uses of data and statistical reports. These results were of use in deciding whether the predetermined interview schedule was appropriate; changes were made where warranted.

Form B - Criminal Justice Information System Operator Interview Checklist. This form was used when interviewing operators

3. Inclusion of states in all LEAA regions in either the conference

4. A reasonable representation of chiefly urban or rural states. 5. A reasonable representation of LEAA-funded and non-LEAA-funded

Form A - State or Regional Planning Agency and Statistical Analysis Center Checklist. This form contains a number of open questions designed to determine the history and significant events in the development of the information systems and statistical systems in a state or regional planning unit.

3-5.

of systems, as the name implies. Much more detailed information was elicited about the system, its functions, its funding, and its uses and users.

Form C - Criminal Justice Information System User Interview Checklist. This form was designed to determine the level of participation of the user in the system design, the type of use made . of its output, and the user's evaluation of the value of the output in performing his functions.

Form D - Criminal Justice Statistics Report Use Checklist. This form was used to determine which, if any, of the documents produced by the NCJISS Statistics Division were received and used by state and local personnel. A form was filled out only if the interviewee was familiar with at least one of the documents and if this person's duties would logically require that he make use of the type of data which the documents contain.

Interviews for collecting information on Forms A-D were conducted by RTI and MRI teams, as specified in Task 2.

### Task 2

Conduct a survey of State Planning Agencies (SPA) and local grantee criminal justice units in no less than nine states . . . . Several small teams of well-trained personnel will be needed for this phase of the work.

Each team leader and some of the members of the teams had experience in research or planning related to criminal justice information systems. The teams were not trained in any formal sense because the tight schedule of conferences and interviews allowed no time for such training. (Résumés of the evaluators are in appendix B.) However, members did review background documents, participate in the conferences, and contribute to the interview guidance form designs and the survey procedures.

Interviews were conducted with SPA's and state and local grantee criminal justice units in selected states representing organizations that have received LEAA grants, have applied but been denied LEAA grants, and have never applied for LEAA grants. Data were gathered primarily through personal interviews with key personnel. Nine states were selected for the interviews:

Louisiana Florida Texas

Interview States

Illinois Maine New Jersey

3-6

California Montana Missouri

systems.

Team members requested documents produced by the agencies. The documents received were examples of comprehensive plans and statistical reports on state crime and victimization studies.

#### Task 4

.

2.1

Obtain from the offices mentioned in Task 2 above, a sample of documents produced both with and without the help of LEAA funds. Procure from a small sample of non-LEAA-funded organization of similar character and function a group of the same kind of document outputs.

Documents were obtained, as required, from the LEAA-funded organizations. Similar documents could not be obtained from non-LEAA-funded groups. There were no state or local systems or services which were both non-LEAA-supported and producers of documents of any significance; only computer printouts of simple tabulated data were available from these. However, a number of LEAAfunded agencies produced non-LEAA-funded documents.

The final data were collected through interviews at LEAA headquarters and offices of other federal agencies, as requested in Task 3 (see Section III). Form D was used to determine if NCJISS documents were serving the needs of federal agencies. Open questions were used to elicit their comments or recommendations to NCJISS.

Given the limitations discussed in the introduction and the need for a rapid overall evaluation of the NCJISS impact on and effectiveness of state

The survey of Louisiana was performed in late October and served as a pretest of the instruments and procedures. Interviews in the remaining eight states were conducted during November, after receiving LEAA approval of the four

interview guidance forms. California, Missouri, and Montana were surveyed by a team from MRI; Florida, Texas, Louisiana, Illinois, New Jersey, and Maine were surveyed by two teams from RTI. The limited amount of training and the method of scheduling survey teams were unavoidable disadvantages in the survey. More consistent results and better analyses could have been obtained if the team member with the most knowledge about a particular type of system or service could have performed all of the interviews in, for example, local law enforcement

#### III. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

and local programs, it was neither practical nor feasible to design and carry out a detailed evaluation. The only feasible approach, within the three months and within the constraints of the contract, was to select general hypotheses to be tested within the stated objectives of the study and to gather as much information as practical with which to test these hypotheses. The hypotheses were based on the contract statements:

The basic objectives of this contract are to evaluate the effectiveness of the work LEAA has undertaken, in two areas during the past six years: the development of criminal justice information systems and of statistics about crime and criminal justice.

The objective of the study, then, is to provide an assessment of the producer-consumer relationship between NCJISS and the receivers and users of compiled statistics and of its support for information systems development.

The end results of this project will be both a documented assessment of the effectiveness and utility of the NCJISS programs as well as providing a basis for increased compatibility between what is being. produced by LEAA and what can be used by the intended audience.

The expected results of the analysis and evaluation were specified in Tasks 3, 5, and 6.

The data referred to in Task 3 were gathered from the SPA's and local grantee criminal justice units in nine states (Task 2) and from LEAA and non-LEAA federal agencies (implied in Task 3).

#### Task 3

Analyze data accumulated in Task 2 above to determine: (1) LEAA's capability for identification, retrieval, storage, analysis, publication, and dissemination of data on crime and criminal justice over the past six years, and (2) for the assistance provided in the development of criminal justice information systems. Information should be developed about the extent to which states, local government, and LEAA headquarters, have been effectively served, as well as about their capacity to use the information systems and statistical programs introduced, produced, or funded by LEAA.

This two-part task was performed as required and the results are presented for part (1) in chapter 5 and for part (2) in chapter 4.

#### Task 5

Retain at least three consultants knowledgeable in criminal justice planning, administration, and enforcement who will

evaluate the documents described in Task 4, above, for significance of content, creativity, applicability to law enforcement needs, foresightedness, and amount of use of LEAA data.

With the agreement of the contract monitor, this task has been performed by analysts experienced in criminal justice research, planning, and administration on the RTI and MRI staffs. The results of this evaluation of documents will be reported under separate cover.

#### Task 6

Write reports on all work, prepare a presentation for LEAA management.

A preliminary report on the results of the survey was presented to LEAA on January 5. This report was presented in draft on January 20. In January of 1976, Task 7 was added to the contract. It was the desire of the sponsor that a larger, more representative group of users and potential users of NCJISS-produced documents be interviewed. The task statements specified (1) that telephone interviews be planned and conducted for a random sample of 300 persons who subscribed to at least one NCJISS document and with 50 persons who participate in LEEP (Law Enforcement Education Program) and (2) that personal interviews be planned and conducted in 12 non-LEAA federal agencies in the Washington area. The purposes of the task were to permit random sampling of local and state users and to add the users from the university, research, and federal communities. The findings from the 12 agencies are in chapter 5; those from the 350 are summarized in chapter 5 and detailed in a separate report.

A. General

.

•

This chapter on criminal justice information systems is organized into six sections: section I provides a general description of criminal justice systems, their development, and the scope and limitations of the analyses which follow; section II presents an analysis of local law enforcement systems; section III presents an analysis of local and state court information systems; section IV presents an analysis of state correction information systems; section V presents a review of state law enforcement systems and of comprehensive data systems; and section VI presents a list of recommendations based on a synthesis of comments and suggestions provided by all individuals who were involved in the design, operation, and/or use of criminal justice information systems, and who were interviewed by RTI and MRI evaluators.

Within sections II-V the information systems have been subclassified according to the following functional characteristics:

II.	LOCAL	LAW	ENFORC
	Α.	Manpo	wer an
	• •	1.	Comput
		2.	Nondis
	Β.	Data	Storag
		1.	Master
		2.	Multif
		3.	Invest
		4.	Multip
III.	LOCAL	AND	STATE
	Α.	Local	Court
		1.	Person
		2.	Court
		3.	Person
	Β.	State	e Court
	• •	1.	Court
		2.	Other
	CULATI	CODI	
TA •	STATE	LOKE	CECITOR
	A.	Data	Storag
	В.	Lnmat	e,Trac

### Chapter 4

#### CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS

### I. INTRODUCTION

CEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS and Resource Allocation ter-Aided Dispatching Systems spatching Computer-Aided Systems ge and Retrieval r Name Index Systems file Systems tigation-Oriented Systems purpose Systems

COURT INFORMATION SYSTEMS ts n-Case Tracking Systems Management Systems n-Case Tracking/Management Systems ts Activity Reporting Systems State Systems

Mar

NS INFORMATION SYSTEMS ge and Retrieval cking

- Ϋ. STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND COMPREHENSIVE DATA SYSTEMS A. Statewide Law Enforcement
  - B. Comprehensive Data Systems

A brief description of each of these types of systems is presented at the beginning of each subsection. The tables which accompany the narrative summarize some of the pertinent features of the information systems and list the systems beginning with the most expensive in each subsection. A Criminal Justice Information System Glossary in appendix D lists each system's full name and location alphabetically by acronym. The descriptions, tables, and glossary should facilitate the reader's review of the many and diverse criminal justice systems which are covered in this chapter.

Although the specific features of the nation's criminal justice systems vary greatly according to the function and level of the operating agency and its volume of activity, the pattern of their development was not unlike that of any other private or public system which converted to computers in the past two decades. The pattern usually begins with a recognition that manual files are growing beyond the capacity of the system to store and rapidly retrieve them. The first stage is typically to convert manual files and procedures to computers, but to continue to perform more or less as before. In the second state, system managers are approached by vendors of computer equipment and software with ideas to expand the capability of the systems to perform new activities. This second stage may produce failures because the vendors do not understand or respond to the needs of the managers and the managers do not know enough about systems to express their needs in appropriate terms. If the system reaches the third stage, either the systems analysts or the management staff bridge the understanding gap and useful products are produced for analysis and planning. Systems analysts assume responsible roles in the organizational structure at this point. Users must then be trained in the value and use of the system before it becomes effective. If this occurs, a new set of varied requirements will develop and more flexible report routines and analytical software packages are added to meet these unexpected requirements. Assuming that the value of the system is then established, subsequent development includes enhancement or revisions as new computer generations are produced and new analytical techniques are developed.

4 - 2

In the criminal justice field, the relatively early development of statewide networks and of local law enforcement systems has had a major influence on the direction of all criminal justice information systems development in the states. At the state level, there has been a tendency for the law enforcement component to hold a commanding position in decisions regarding funding and the location of the components of the Comprehensive Data Systems (CDS). However, the courts and corrections components often object to programs, standards, and goals which they consider to be dictated to them by the law enforcement component. They call attention to the poor representation on coordinating committees of courts and corrections interests and raise objections to the lack of attention to their needs. Thus at this point in time RTI/MRI observed little activity in the area of OBTS/CCH for total criminal justice systems.

Although the need for more cooperation between criminal justice agencies has slowed the OBTS/CCH effort, it has not prevented the rapid development of a multitude of local and state law enforcement and court and correction information systems -- some of which may serve as components of an OBTS/CCH in the future.

B. The Analysis Approach

Each information system which is reviewed in the following discussion has been organized (for the purpose of analysis) into categories according to its salient features. Furthermore, each information system has been analyzed with respect to several broad criteria which were established to answer questions, such as:

- How is it used?
- systems?

Has LEAA funding and/or assistance supported systems which are different from those which did not receive such assistance?

What are the functions of this system?

Does it interface with any other local, state, or federal information

What prompted the development of this system? What factors influenced the design of this system? How do the system's users evaluate the system?

What was the extent and source of funding?

As stated earlier in this report, it is important for the reader to keep in mind the general limitations inherent in the following analyses. First, not all of the systems considered herein are completely operational, and operational systems are enhanced and modified on a more or less continuous basis. Wherever it is possible to isolate them, descriptive features of incomplete system components (such as level of funding and user's evaluation) are not included in the analysis.

Second, it was not always possible to get one, let alone multiple, user evaluation(s) of many of the information systems surveyed for this analysis. Thus, the summary of user evaluations of a particular system presented herein may be incomplete and biased. Occasionally RTI and MRI evaluators were unable to locate or interview key persons in the design of a certain system. This is the case particularly with systems which were designed several years ago. The systems personnel turnover rate in criminal justice information systems was found to be quite high.

Third, the reader is reminded that any quotes cited in the narrative are not to be considered as representations of a consensus on the issue at hand. Rather, in many cases the quotes are an evaluator's best recollection of a statement or statements made by one or more individuals and are employed to elucidate a point when it appears necessary.

Finally, the reader must be aware of the specific assumptions employed in the analysis and limitations of the data and findings presented in this report.

Funding information on all of the systems being evaluated was generally difficult to obtain and therefore is often incomplete and inaccurate. Any references to system "development costs" are based on an evaluator's attempt to piece together information from interview estimates, LEAA's Grants Management Information System, and occasionally from grant applications. Even if exact dollar amounts were available, a valid comparison of development costs for different systems necessitates controlling for such factors as: the geographic size, area density, number of personnel in, and persons flowing through each law enforcement agency; and the functions and level of sophistication of each information system.

When interpreting the narrative or the accompanying tables, the reader should keep in mind that a "significant" funding contribution indicates that without this contribution the system operators would not have been able to develop this system. The degree of significance was primarily dependent upon the relative availability of alternative sources of funds. Although such a determination is often related to the proportion of total development funds a funding contribution represents, the reader should not assume that a "minor" contribution is less than or a "significant" contribution is more than half of the development cost of an information system. Evaluators observed several instances where a funding contribution of 25 percent of the total development cost of a system constituted the most "significant" contribution to system developers in that all other funding source potentials have been exhausted. All of the systems in this chapter have been analyzed with respect to the types and sources of nonfinancial assistance which were directly provided to system operators in designing their systems. In general, nonfinancial assistance to system developers consisted of: site visits to other systems; technical assistance in selecting hardware and/or designing software; and the transfer of software concept, logic, and/or format from one system to another. Occasionally a system designer was indirectly assisted by his exposure to publications and seminars, etc.

At a minimum, each observation of funding amount and "significance," design assistance, and type of interface with other information systems will be noted in the tables for every criminal justice information system analyzed in this evaluation. Whenever available, more information is provided in the narrative portion of the report.

Local law enforcement systems can be placed into two categories: (1) manpower and resource allocation systems, which are primarily used for managing police operations such as vehicle dispatching or beat assignments, and (2) data storage and retrieval systems which range from indexes of individuals in the criminal justice system, input and accessed at one point only, to OBTS/CCH systems with multiple points of data entry and retrieval. The second category

4-4

#### II. LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT SYSTEMS

of systems has been developed to facilitate recordkeeping and to expediate retrieval of data for numerous purposes such as mandatory reporting regularements or apprehension of wanted persons.

#### Manpower and Resource Allocation Systems Α.

Many state and local law enforcement agencies use computers for the allocation of manpower and resources and for other agency functions which will be reviewed later. Discussed herein are the computer-aided dispatching and nondispatching systems used for distributing police personnel and vehicles.

1. Computer-Aided Dispatching Systems

RTI and MRI evaluators observed nine computer-aided dispatch (CAD) systems which were fully operational in 1975 or which will be so in 1976. Two of the nine, LOCATE (Oakland, California) and CAD (Jacksonville, Florida) were operational several years earlier than 1975. All except FLAIR actually dispatch law enforcement agency vehicles. (FLAIR, Fleet Location and Information Reporting, is an automatic vehicle-monitoring system which inputs the location and status to a manually operated control center that dispatches vehicles in St. Louis.) Table 4-1, part A, shows that some of these systems interface with other computerized files, i.e., wanted persons, warrants, etc. Some generate incident and activity reports.

The users of computer-aided dispatch systems are exclusively law enforcement personnel in the CAD operating agencies. Unlike the users in some other categories of systems surveyed in this evaluation, the users of CAD systems are pleased and dependent on the relatively new computerized assistance for vehicular dispatching. One user comments:

> Even with a 200 percent increase in calls for service over a 4-year period, with the CAD system the Jacksonville, Florida, police department has reduced response time from 12 minutes to 3 minutes with only a 10 percent increase in personnel.

In jum, it appears that the CAD is used "every second of the day" to enhance cperational effectiveness and that users, after less than a year in most cases, find computer-aided dispatching an indispensible tool in performing their routine duties.

SYSTEM NAME TYPE, AND LO

A. Dispatching

1. FLAIR, St. L 2. ECCCS, Los Ar 3. LOCATE, Oakla 4. CAPS, San Jos 5. CADOLIS, Peor 6. CAD, Jacksonv 7. CAD, Rockford 8. CATCH 1. Camd 9. CAD, Dallas. B. Nondispatchin 1. ADAM, Los Ang 2. Model, Trento

3. LEAS. Billing 4. PMIS, Rockford

Prior to designing their own system, most CAD operators sent representatives to observe other CAD systems. Some of these visits resulted in the transfer of the concept or the software of the operational system to the one under development (see table 4-2). For example, in the development of CAPS (Computer Assisted Public Safety), the San Jose police department looked at dispatching systems of Seattle, Las Vegas, and Huntington Beach (California); as a result, CAPS is a turnkey upgrade of the Seattle and Las Vegas systems. These visits and feasibility studies, when conducted, were often paid for by LEAA. The technical design expertise was (except for tangential contributions) provided by non-LEAA persons such as computer vendors or aerospace industry vendors, as in the case of ECCCS of Los Angeles and FLAIR of St. Louis. The CAD systems owe their existence almost exclusively to LEAA development funds; one exception was the system in Jacksonville where operators indicated that local funds were and are available to finance the system and that the system would not have been different with LEAA funds. The Jacksonville

4-6

## Table 4-1. TYPE OF INTERFACE: LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MANPOWER/RESOURCE ALLOCATION SYSTEMS

, OCATION	TYPE	ERFACE	CE		
			recerar		
			•		
Duis, MO ngeles, CA and, CA se, CA tia, IL ville, FL l, IL len, NJ TX	E E	- PEEEPEE	- P E - E E E		
<u>8</u>	•				
eles, CA n, NJ s, MT d, IL	P - 2 -	P  	P 	•	

NOTE: "E" means existing; "P" means planned.

system operators reported that the system required \$150,000 to design and develop and \$125,000 annually to operate. The Rockford, Illinois, and the Camden, New Jersey, systems required less than a quarter million dollars to develop. The Dallas, Peoria, and the San Jose systems required less than half a million dollars; and the Oakland and Los Angeles and the St. Louis systems exceeded a million dollars each to develop. Of the systems surveyed there is, however, no apparent difference in the users' evaluations which relates to the extent or source (LEAA vs. non-LEAA) of development funding.

Financial support was the only type of assistance provided by LEAA, or by LEAA-funded state and regional units, to agencies operating CADS.

#### 2. Nondispatching Computer-Aided Systems

In this subsection, the four computerized systems shown in tables 4-1 and 4-2, part B, are discussed. These systems assist in resource allocation through routine assignment of manpower and resources but do not provide computerized vehicular dispatching. While CAD systems improve the capability of a police agency for immediate response to service requests, the nondispatching computer-aided systems enable an agency to effectively assign manpower and equipment resources to beats. For the most part, these systems were developed before CAD systems.

All of these systems were characterized by a lack of interface with other systems and by users who were extremely satisfied and dependent on the outputs. For example, in Trenton, New Jersey,

> The city pressured the police department to reduce costs, and overtime costs were targeted for elimination. Based on the output of the Trenton system, overtime costs have been reduced through personnel assignments.

The four systems employ batch-processing for generating management reports on officers per shift, beat assignments, and frequency in performing traffic, criminal, and administrative activities. In general, they are technically less complicated and less costly to develop than CAD systems. Annual maintenance costs range from approximately \$5,000 to \$50,000 for the systems reviewed. An exception is ADAM, which aids the Los Angeles police department with vehicle deployment planning information--by providing proportional needs for manpower by geographic areas and detailed workload statistics. Being more sophisticated and serving a far greater universe of police and citizens, this system is understandably more costly.



Table 4-2. LEAA AND NON-LEAA CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCE RESOURCE ALLOCATION SYSTEMS

	DEVELO FUN	DES	SIGN AS	SISTAN	CE			
SYSTEM NAME, TYPE, AND LOCATION	Cost, thous. dollars	Sig- nifi- cant	Minor	None	Site /isit	Tech- nical	Tech- nology Trans- fer	Other
A. <u>Dispatching</u>	•				•	•		
1. FLAIR, St. Louis, MO	\$2,718	L	NL	· -	-	NL	NL	· _
2. ECCCS, Los Angeles, CA	2,472	L	NL		NL	-		-
3. LOCATE, Oakland, CA	1,701	L	NL	-	-	-	-	-
4. CAPS, San Jose, CA	1,027	NL	L	, <del>_</del> `	L/NL	<del></del> ·	NL	-
5. CADOLIS, Peoria, IL	797	L	NL	-	-	NL	NL	-
6. CAD, Jacksonville, FL	2.75	NL		L	L	-		$\mathbf{L}$
7. CAD, Rockford, IL (P)	241	L	NL	· <u> </u>	NL	L	NL	-
8. CATCH 1, Camden, NJ	132	L	NL	-	L/NL	$\mathbf{L}$	L/NL	-
9. CAD, Dallas, TX	?			_	NL	-	L	L
B. Nondispatching					•			
1. ADAM, Los Angeles, CA	\$765	L	NL	<u>.</u>		NL		-
2. Model, Trenton, NJ	117	L	NL	-		NL	-	-
3. LEAS, Billings, MT	4	NL	. —	L	-	`	· ·	. — .
4. PMIS, Rockford, IL	?	L		L	. –	. —	-	·

NOTE: "L" means provided by LEAA sources; "NL" means provided by non-LEAA sources.

4-9

. .

EMENT	MANPOWER/

The ADAM system was preceded by a system called LEMRAS which was designed by a major computer vendor and transferred from St. Louis in 1967 to Los Angeles and Kansas City. Los Angeles, Kansas City, and St. Louis have found the need for systems with better orientation to the needs of users and have discarded LEMRAS. The ADAM system thus represents an advancement in the state-of-the-art due to LEAA funding.

Trenton and Los Angeles acquired from LEAA \$100,000 and \$800,000, respectively, to develop their resource allocation model systems. Trenton's two unsuccessful efforts cost LEAA \$80,000 before a \$20,000 system was finally developed successfully. These two attempts at developing a resource allocation model were thwarted due to lack of continuity in project management. Both operating agencies acquired technical assistance from non-LEAA personnel. Two more limited systems (Billings, Montana, and Rockford, Illinois) were designed and developed in-house according to user specifications without LEAA financial and/or technical assistance. The Billings system was operational prior to LEAA's existence. The Rockford operators felt it "was part of the police department's duty to update their services" and, therefore, did not request any outside financial assistance. In spite of the wide variation in the sophistication and development cost of these four systems, the users indicated equal satisfaction with their respective resource allocation systems. In other words, the users evaluation of these systems did not appear to relate to the amount or source (LEAA or non-LEAA) of funding for resource systems.

#### Data Storage and Retrieval Systems Β.

Discussed herein are 22 data storage and retrieval systems, three of which are categorized as master name indexes, six of which are categorized as multifile systems, eight of which are categorized as investigation-oriented systems, and five of which are categorized as multipurpose criminal justice information systems.

1. Master Name Indexes

Of 22 systems surveyed, three were master name index systems developed to expedite retrieval of information from unwieldy card indexes or manual files. (More elaborate storage-retrieval systems usually have some type of name indexlocator file as the core of the data processing program.) They are all batch processing systems which became operational in 1974-75. Table 4-3, part A, shows

TYPE, AND A. Master Nam 1. DATUM, Pat 2. Microfilm, 3. LEIS, Jack B. Multifile 1. PIS, Ft. L 2. PIS, Pater 3. SAPIS, San 4. C<sup>5</sup>, Camden 5. ALECARS, L

justice information systems.

The three master name indexes list all people who have at some point come in contact with the police department. (For example, DATUM indexes all individuals in seven New Jersey cities who have been fingerprinted and points to the location of fingerprint cards.) Indicators point to the location of a manual or semiautomated file or hard copy which contains the complete records and/or more detailed descriptions of the individuals. Table 4-4, part A, and footnote shows that two of the index systems cost less than \$100,000 to develop and much less to maintain annually. Two were planned, designed, and maintained annually with local funds. In two cases, LEAA funds were used to purchase hardware and support initial system implementation. LEAA paid for all three index operators to investigate other systems; however, no technology was directly transferred and the operators designed their own unique index systems. The users (primarily police officers, occasionally noncriminal justice agency users such as employment bureaus) indicated great satisfaction in spite of the fact that index systems usually are the first computer applica-

tions in the agency and, therefore, frequently endure initial distrust and

4-10

Table 4-3. TYPE OF INTERFACE: LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT DATA STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS

	SYSTEM NAME, TYPE, AND LOCATION	TYPE Local	OF IN' State	<u>FERFACE</u> Federal	
Α.	Master Name Index	 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-
1. 2. 3.	DATUM, Paterson, NJ Microfilm, Rockford, IL LEIS, Jacksonville, FL	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Ē	- - E	
в.	Multifile				
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	PIS, Ft. Lauderdale, FL PIS, Paterson, NJ SAPIS, San Antonio, TX C <sup>5</sup> , Camden Co, NJ ALECARS, Lafayette, LA CJIS, Winnebago, IL		Р Е —	- P E -	

NOTE: "E" means existing; "P" means planned.

that only one system (LEIS) interfaces with other state or federal criminal

		DEVELO FUN	PMENT DING S	COST A OURCE	DES	DESIGN ASSISTANCE			
•	SYSTEM NAME, TYPE, AND LOCATION	Cost, thous. dollars	Sig- nifi- cant	Minor	None	Site Visit	Tech- nical	Tech- nology Trans- fer	Other
Α.	Master Name Index		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			•			· ·
1. 2. 3.	DATUM, Paterson, NJ Microfilm, Rockford, IL LEIS, Jacksonville, FL	\$294* 86 ?	L L L	?	- ? -	L NL L	- - -	-	
в.	<u>Multifile</u>								
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.	PIS, Ft. Lauderdale, FL PIS, Paterson, NJ SAPIS, San Antonio, TX C <sup>5</sup> , Camden Co, NJ ALECARS, Lafayette, LA CJIS, Winnebago, IL	\$1,500 688 120 70 50 ?	NL L NL L NL	NL NL	L - L L	NL    		NL NL - NL	  

Table 4-4. LEAA AND NON-LEAA CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT DATA STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS

4-12

NOTE: "L" means provided by LEAA sources; "NL" means provided by non-LEAA sources.

\*This figure reflects the total development cost for identical systems in Paterson and six other New Jersey Police Departments. Each system cost \$42,000.

skepticism from persons unskilled in data processing. An observed above, meet satisfaction with master name index systems was not related to either the total cost of system development or the source of development funds. A few users cited the inevitability of converting more manual files (i.e., wanted persons and warrants) for computerized storage and linking them to the initial master name index file. In fact, the next category of systems to be discussed are "multifile" data storage systems designed to facilitate more rapid retrieval of individuals' records on file at the operating agency. 2. Multifile Systems

The six multifile systems surveyed by RTI and MRI became operational in the late 60's and early 70's. They were characterized by six or seven of these component files: (1) offenses, (2) arrests, (3) warrants, (4) radio dispatch analysis, (5) traffic information (i.e., accidents), (6) complaints, and (7) stolen property such as vehicles and firearms. All six systems were developed to reduce manual files and to increase access to timely information. Most system operators cited the legislatively mandated reporting requirements or the availability of LEAA funds as the major impetus to initiating system development. Table 4-3, part B, shows that except for one system (SAPIS), these systems did not interface with state or local systems. Officers in the policy agency (including its district offices) were usually the primary users.

Table 4-4, part B, indicates that all but two (Paterson, New Jersey, and Camden County Computer Control Center) used local funds exclusively in planning, developing, and operating the systems. Most system operators studied other systems and employed concepts and file layouts in designing their own. Other operators designed their systems inhouse. Development costs ranged from \$20,000 to \$1.5 million. Maintenance cost the agencies \$20,000 to \$30,000 annually. In a few cases, a major vendor provided some technical assistance to system designers; LEAA did not provide technical assistance to any of the six system developers.

Except for one case (Winnebago County Sheriff's System) in which nonadministrative personnel were ignorant of the system's capabilities, the users indicated high degrees of use of, and satisfaction with, the systems. The level of use and/or satisfaction with these multifile systems did not vary according to either the level or source (LEAA vs. non-LEAA) of funding. In every

case except the Winnebago system, users cited close involvement with data processing personnel during all phases of the design, implementation, and operation of their systems.

### 3. Investigation-Oriented Systems

This category includes eight systems so grouped because the major function is to aid the investigations of current cases. The cities which these systems serve are all relatively large in population and the focal points for the more populated metropolitan areas. They have varied, transient, and semipermanent populations. These demographic characteristics, coupled with a generally increasing crime rate, dictated that an accurate and timely investigation-oriented system be developed for effective law enforcement. In the records management area, prior to the development of these types of systems, virtually tons of bulky paper files had to be maintained. The files were expensive to store and difficult to access quickly. Also before the advent of these systems, support for the officer in the field was minimal and sometimes nonexistent. Inquiries concerning suspect license numbers, vehicle identification, etc., were time consuming at best. Often information retrieved by the officer was incomplete so that, in the case of a wanted or dangerous person, the officer's job was difficult as well as life endangering.

The investigation components of these systems became operational between 1968 and 1975. The eight systems have data files on persons (missing, wanted, arrested, paroled, etc.), incidents, and/or stolen property which investigators can retrieve and match with other relevant data to track individuals and resolve incidents. Table 4-5, part A, shows that of eight systems listed. five of them interface with other local systems. A sixth is planning several interfaces for the near future. All systems required 3 to 5 years to develop and implement.

Table 4-6, part A, shows that for those six for which funding information was available, LEAA played a major funding role during all development stages. LEAA provided significant technical assistance to designers and operators of the PSIS, Long Beach system. Despite the complexity of investigationcriented systems, only three of them (PSIS, Long Beach; CRIME, Oakland; CABLE, San Francisco) used significant outside technical assistance in developing their systems. The PSIS and CABLE systems were based on several systems throughout

SYSTEM NAM TYPE, AND A. Investigat 1. PATRIC, Lo 2. CABLE, San 3. CPDS, Chic 4. PSIS, Long 5. AWDI, Los 6. CRIME, Oak 7. PIN, Oaklan 8. AFIS, Los B. Multipurpo 1. REJIS, St. 2. QUAD/NET AL and Rock 3. SECURE, Bat 4. ALERT II, K 5. MOTION, New

٠.

NOTE: "E" means existing; "P" means planned.

the country (CLEAR, Cincinnati; MOTION, New Orleans) after system designers made visits recommended by HUD\*, LEAA, and SEARCH members. In fact, "bits and pieces" of these systems, including the concept, logic, and implementation strategies, were transferred to PSIS. CRIME system developers (Oakland) enlisted two major electronics industry firms for their detailed system requirements.

According to available figures, the observed systems require between Users of these investigation systems are primarily law enforcement

\$11,000 and \$1 million annually to operate. Development costs were most difficult to isolate due to system complexity and the length of time for system development; however, they apparently range from \$500,000 to \$7 million. personnel (investigation and crime lab units) within the operating agencies. \*PSIS was one of the 10 HUD Urban Information System Projects supported by LEAA after the HUD project ended.

4-14

1E, LOCATION		• .	<u>TYPE</u> Local	OF IN State	TERFACI Federa	E
ion-Oriented os Angeles, CA Francisco, CA ago, IL Beach, CA Angeles, CA land, CA nd, CA Angeles, CA			- E P P E	- E E - - E	Ë E - - -	-
se			•		an shi • Ta	
Louis, MO LERT, Davenport, Island, IL	IA			E E	E	
ton Rouge, LA Kansas City, MO V Orleans, LA				E E	E	

Table 4-5. TYPE OF INTERFACE: LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT DATA STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS

### Table 4-6. LEAA AND NON-LEAA CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL LAW EN STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL SYSTEMS

		DEVEL	OPMENT	COST A	ND				
•		FU	NDING S	OURCE		DESIGN ASSISTANCE			
	SYSTEM NAME,							Tech-	
	TYPE, AND LOCATION	Cost,	Sig-					nology	
		thous.	nifi-			Site	Tech-	Trans-	
		dollars	cant	Minor	None	Visit	nical	fer	Other
									•
Α.	Investigation-Oriented								
1.	PARIC, Los Angeles, CA	\$6,645	L	NL	-	-	NL	NL	_
2.	CABLE, San Francisco, CA	6,375	L	NL	<u> </u>	NL	NL	NL	L
3.	CPDS, Chicago, IL	3,100	L	NL	-	NL	NL	_	L
4.	PSIS, Long Beach, CA	2,447	L	NL	-	Ľ	NL	L	L
5.	AWDI, Los Angeles, CA	1,800	L	NL	-		· ·		
6.	CRIME, Oakland, CA	217	L	NL	-	-	NL	_	
7.	PIN, Oakland, CA	UNKNOWN	L	-	<del></del>	-	·	_	, <b>-</b> .
8.	AFIS, Los Angeles, CA	UNKNOWN	-	'		NL	-	-	
в.	Multipurpose								
	<u> </u>								
1.	REJIS, MO-KS	\$4,500	L	?	?				L
2.	QUAD/NET ALERT, Davenport	, 560	L	?	?	NL	NL	NL	L
3.	SECURE Baton Rouge LA	450	T.	NT.	. <u> </u>	· _	-	-	
4	ALERT II. Kansas City MO	UNKNOWN	-	L	_	NI.		NT.	L
5.	MOTION, New Orleans, LA	UNKNOWN	• NL	L		-	NL	NL	- · ·

NOTE: "L" means provided by LEAA sources; "NL" means provided by non-LEAA sources.

4-16

NFORCEMENT I	DATA	
--------------	------	--

4

A

If the data include regional information, these same units in other law enforcement agencies are also users. Users of the Automated Worthless Document Index (Los Angeles police department) cited that fact that:

> 47 LAPD forgery investigators are able to clear approximately 16,000 cases per year at a cost of \$64.38 per case. AWDI is able to clear an additional 4,500 cases a year at a cost of \$40.47 per case.

In all but one case (Chicago police department system)\* users were unconditionally pleased with the effectiveness of the systems. 4. Multipurpose Criminal Justice Information Systems

The five systems in this category are characterized by two features -the users include representatives of police, courts, and correction agencies; and some of these systems actually "manage" the activities of more than one segment of the criminal justice system.

Kansas City's ALERT II was operational prior to the establishment of LEAA in 1968. ALERT II has itself been widely transferred. A major computer vendor promoted the transfer of the Kansas system almost in toto (including hardware specifications) to the QUAD/NET ALERT system in Rock Island, Illinois, and in part to MOTION in New Orleans. All except one of the systems (SECURE) have derived at least conceptual features from ALERT II. SECURE was designed inhouse, funded with 1968 local funds (\$240,000), and abandoned until LEAA funds (\$210,000) were available for the 1973 system design and implementation stages.

\*The major complaint about the Chicago police department system was not about the design but about downtime. Apparently any downtime is frustrating to the officers who are extremely dependent on the systems for performing their routine responsibilities.

Four of the five operational systems have at least partial online service, interface with both state and federal information systems, and serve

large geographic areas. (See table 4-5, part B). These four systems either have or will shortly have completed a CCH component. The fifth (SECURE, Baton Rouge) is a batch processing system. SECURE provides some users with crime and criminal information (police) and others with management information (courts, corrections); therefore, it is not currently designed to provide a complete CCH. Outputs of all systems consist of multiple statistical reports, lists, notices, documents, and dockets; thus many clerical procedures are eliminated.

(See table 4-6, part B.) Both the Kansas City and the New Orleans systems were funded exclusively with local funds. In 1972, the New Orleans police department's moderate computer capabilities were expanded with \$200,000 in city funds to accommodate MOTION's addition of online booking. The city's current operating budget allocates \$400,000 annually to maintain and operate the system.

OUAD/NET ALERT operators in Rock Island have received \$560,000 in LEAA funds, to date, to develop and maintain their system which is not fully operational. This is the only money which is available to the system operators.

The REJIS system serves most of the functions served by the ALERT systems. However, REJIS became "an independent organization" in 1973. It is the result of a consolidation of several discrete systems engineered primarily by the St. Louis metropolitan police and the LEAA regional planning unit with cooperation from several criminal justice agencies. REJIS and its separate components have received approximately \$4 million in LEAA funds.

Users of all of these systems are extremely satisfied with the systems' performance and output. They are reported to play indispensable roles in criminal justice agency routine operations. New Orleans and Kansas City personnel and investigation units observed that when their systems are down "the department operations are disrupted." Users of the ALERT II resource prolection component stated that "85-90% of crime activity projections for the following month are accurate." All but the MOTION users cited the need for training more police personnel to insure more adequate knowledge and use of their systems' capabilities. The various users of REJIS made significant contributions to the system design, except for the prosecutor's office which may adopt Washington's PROMIS. PROMIS has been an LEAA exemplary project. Once again, there is no apparent difference in the use of, or satisfaction with, the multipurpose criminal justice information systems surveyed that can be attributed to the level or source (LEAA vs. non-LEAA) of development funds.

с. Conclusions - Local Law Enforcement Systems

For 26 out of the 35 local law enforcement systems surveyed, LEAA provided at least some of their system development funds. Twenty-three of the 26 observed that without LEAA funds their system could not have been developed at all. In the few cases where LEAA money was not a significant factor, this was usually due to the availability of local funds; only rarely was it

determined that LEAA would not provide the requested assistance. Across law enforcement systems no significant difference was found between the level of satisfaction of users of these systems which can be attributed to the extent and/or source of funds (LEAA vs. non-LEAA).

Twenty-six system operators indicated that they required direct nonfinancial assistance in the design, development, or operation of their systems. Of these 26 respondents, 19 indicated that the development of their system required them to turn to non-LEAA sources for technical assistance, suggestions for other systems to visit, or guidance for technology transfer. Major computer vendors provided by far the most technical assistance, technology transfer, and suggestions for site visits. In a few cases aerospace and electronics industry representatives and management and system consultants played this role. Only infrequently did representatives of academic institutions provide such help. In several cases (6), system operators indicated that some information and printed materials, and general grant writing assistance, was provided by state regional planning units (RPU) or LEAA Regional Offices.

In response to RTI and MRI requests that operators and users "describe LEAA's present and/or suggested role in relation to the development and operation of (their) system(s) (and provide) general comments" to the interviewer, three respondents indicated that LEAA played no role in the past nor could they foresee a future role for LEAA.

Nine respondents indicated that except for making funds available, LEAA played and would play no role in the development and operation of their system. However, the other 26 system operators and users had several consistently observed recommendations to make with respect to LEAA's future role in the Criminal Justice Information field.\*

A. Local Court Information Systems

4-18

# III. LOCAL AND STATE COURT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

RTI and MRI evaluators surveyed 17 local court information systems. Three of them are person-case tracking systems which contain the information required \*All recommendations are made at the end of this chapter.

10 process a person at least through the entire court, if not criminal justice. socess. These systems include information on, and sometimes "manage," book-.ng, charges, future court appearances, jail release dates, probation notification, custody complaint, calendaring, and disposition. In many cases the users of these person-case tracking systems are representatives of law enforcement, public defender, prosecutor, prison, as well as court agencies.

The second type of system to be discussed herein is court management/information systems. RTI and MRI observed seven of these systems which handle the court-oriented data base in a manner which supports the necessary planning. organization, structuring and staffing, allocation of resources, direction of activities, organizational changes, and evaluations of these events. The users of these systems tend, more often than not, to represent strictly the court and court-processing agencies.

Finally there are seven systems which serve both the person-case tracking and court management/information functions. The users of these systems, like the person-case tracking systems, are usually representatives of many phases of the criminal justice system including police and prison personnel. All systems operators cited the need to reduce manual files and the recent "speedy trial" legislation as the major factors prompting the development of local court systems.

#### 1. Person-Case Tracking Systems

Only one of these systems is currently fully operational (JURIS). However, all three are characterized by their present lack of interface with any other information system. (See table 4-7, part A.) Table 4-8, part A, indicates that except for PROMIS, which serves a relatively large client population (Los Angeles), the person-case tracking systems surveyed were relatively less expensive to develop than the other types of court systems surveyed in this evaluation. In spite of the low relative cost of these systems, all but the JURIS system required extensive site visits, technical assistance, and technology transfer prior to their design.

In all three cases LEAA money played a significant role in promoting the development of these person-case tracking systems. LEAA did not otherwise participate in their design. The one exception is that LEAA played a direct role in funding a grant to adapt the programs and promote the transfer of PROMIS

TYPE, A. Person-1. PROMIS 2. SIPCF. 3. JURIS. B. Court M 1. CJIS. I 2. CMIS, C 3. CMIS, N 4. JARS, I 5. ACCMIS. 6. RCIS, S 7. TCS, Bi C. Trackin 1. CJIC. S

2. CJIS. B 3. CJIS, D 4. CIS, Co 5. CABLE, 6. CJIS, D 7. ACCPS.

from Washington to other sites such as Los Angeles. Among other things, representatives of the Los Angeles District Attorney's Office were able to attend intensive user transfer meetings which facilitated the modification of the system for their needs. Since these systems are not fully operational, user evaluations are not yet appropriate.

The seven court management information systems are characterized by several similar features. First, all but one became (or will become) operational between 1973 and 1976. Second, table 4-7, part B, shows that none of them except RCIS in St. Louis has any interface with other local, state, or federal

4-20

### Table 4-7. TYPE OF INTERFACE: LOCAL COURT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

SYSTEM NAME,	TYPE	TYPE OF INTERFAC					
PE, AND LOCATION	Local	State	Federal				
rson-Case Tracking Systems			· · · ·				
OMIS, Los Angeles, CA PCF, Hillsborough Co., CA RIS, St. Louis, MO	P 	- E -	- E -				
urt Management Systems							
IS, Duvall Co, FL IS, Camden Co, NJ IS, Mercen Co, NJ RS, Lake Co, IL CMIS, Hudson Co, NJ IS, St. Louis, MO S, Billings, MT		- - - E					
acking/Management Systems							
IC, Santa Clara, CA IS, Bexar Co, TX IS, Dallas Co, TX S, Cook Co, IL BLE, San Francisco, CA IS, Dade Co, FL CPS, Passiac Co, NJ	E - - P E	E E E - E	E 				

NOTE: "E" means existing; "P" means planned.

2. Court Management Information Systems

Table 4-8. LEAA AND NON-LEAA CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL COURTS INFORMATION SYSTEMS

	DEVELOPMENT COST AND FUNDING SOURCE				DES	DESIGN ASSISTANCE			
SYSTEM NAME, TYPE, AND LOCATION	Cost, thous. dollars	Sig- nifi- cant	Minor	None	Site Visit	Tech- nical	Tech- nology Trans- fer	Other	
A. Person-Case Tracking Syst	iems			•	,				
1. PROMIS, Los Angeles, CA	\$1,380	L	-	-	NL	NL	L	L	
2. SIPCF, Hillsborough Co.,	CA 342	L	?	-		NL	-	L	
3. JURIS, St. Louis, MO	261	L	NL		NL		-	-	
B. <u>Court Management Systems</u>	•								
1. CJIS, Duvall Co, FL	\$1,138	L	NL	-		· ·	-	-	
2. CM15, Camden Co, NJ	644	L	NL		NL	NL	NL	L	
3. CMIS, Mercen Co, NJ	434	L	NL	-		NL		L	
4. JARS, Lake Co, IL	404	L	NL	· _ ·	NL	NL	-	L	
5. ACCMIS, Hudson Co, NJ	280	L	NL		NL	NL	NL	-	
6. RCIS, St. Louis, MO	150	L	NL	-	NL	-	-		
7. TCS, Billings, MT	4	NL		L	-	NL	-		
C. <u>Tracking/Management</u> Syste	ems								
1. CJIC, Santa Clara, CA	\$3,828	NL	L	-	-	. <b>–</b> '		L	
2. CJIS, Bexar Co, TX	2,337	L	NL	-	L	NL		L	
3. CJIS, Dallas Co, TX	1,807	L	NL	-		. <b></b> '		L	
4. CIS, Cook Co, IL	1,035	L	?	· _ '	NL	NL		$\mathbf{L}$	
5. CABLE, San Francisco, CA	913	L	NL	<b>_</b> ·	-	NL	NL	· _	
6. CJIS, Dade Co, FL	510	L	?		$\mathbf{L}$		-	-	
7. ACCPS, Passiac Co, NJ	264	L	NL	-	NL	-	NL ·	L	

NOTE: "L" means provided by LEAA sources; "NL" means provided by non-LEAA sources.

4-22

4

۰ i

3

information systems. FCIS interfaces with a state court system on a very limited basis. Third, table 4-8, part B indicates that all of these systems, execut RCIS and CJIS in Florida, required outside technical assistance in the design and development stage.

Major computer industry vendors and software consulting firms were enlisted to provide technical assistance. No technical assistance was provided by LEAA or non-LEAA funded state or regional units. However, in three cases system operators indicated that the LEAA Regional Office system specialist was helpful in dealing with the contractor or provided general direction; and in one case the system operators cited the use of the SEARCH Group Code of Ethics. All of these systems but one (Traffic Court System, Billings, Montana) received significant funding from LEAA, without which system design and development would have been impossible. Of these systems receiving LEAA development money, only one (CMIS, Camden) suggested that local funds would have been available in the event federal funds were not.

In general, the court management information systems surveyed required between \$150,000 and \$1 million to develop. The exception is Montana's TCS system which was developed in 1971. Its development was earlier, and it has much more limited capability than the other court management information systems. Compared to the users of other types of court systems, the users of all but one (ACCMIS, Hudson County, New Jersey) of the court management information systems surveyed reported overall satisfaction with their system's performance.

3. Person-Case Tracking and Court Management Information Systems

The seven combined tracking and management systems surveyed by RTI and MRI evaluators are almost evenly divided into those which were operational in 1975 or 1976 and those which were operational between 1971 and 1973. Table 4-7, part C, shows that six of the seven systems are, or will soon be, interfaced with other information systems; and all seven systems are used by both court and noncourt criminal justice agencies. All these systems exhibit one or two important prerequisites for becoming the court component of a OBTS/CCH system. However, only the four earlier developed systems actually maintain noncourtrelated offender-based information. Table 4-8, part C, shows that all but two of these systems required significant outside assistance in the design and development stages. (CJIS, Dallas County Texas; and CJIC, Santa Clara, California).
This technical assistance was provided by non-LEAA personnel, primarily private consulting firms, with computer industry vendors playing an advisory role.

However, in all cases but one (CJIC, Santa Clara, California, where local funds were available), LEAA provided the significant development funds without which these systems would never have become operational. Ranging from \$500,000 to 3 million dollars with most around 1 million, these joint personcase tracking and court management information systems are for the most part more expensive to develop than the two types of court systems which were discussed in the preceding pages. As with the other court systems, the users indicate that these systems play (or will play) a "major role in court and case load management."

# B. State Court Systems

RTI and MRI evaluators observed only five state-level court systems which were at least partially operational, only two of which were fully operational. For the state court systems which are not complete, the information presented herein will be that which pertains only to the system components which are complete.

Like the local court systems, some state systems serve person-case tracking and/or court management functions. Other state-level systems serve a court activity reporting function as well.

1. Court Activity Reporting Systems

There were three court activity reporting systems observed. Table 4-9, part A, indicates that none of the systems interface nor are there plans to interface them with other information systems. Two systems have only batchprocessing capability. Furthermore, table 4-10, part A, shows that two of these systems were designed without significant outside technical assistance, technology transfer, or visits to other systems.

The CDR system in Florida was developed with an \$165,000 block grant from LEAA. The system developers employed only user specifications in designing their system. However, the users of the CDR system (primarily court administrators) are dissatisfied with the system's output.

The California JCSR system grew out of the state's involvement with SEARCH-sponsored symposiums and publications. It was developed with \$40,000 of state funds. The systems users are satisfied with the system's potential but admit to the need to "work out some of the bugs."

4-24

SYSTEM NAME TYPE, AND LC A. Court Report 1. TJCS. TX 2. JCSRS-SJIS. 3. CDRS, FL B. Other Activi 1. SWJIS. MO 2. ADCMIS, NJ

The Texas TJCS system cost \$275,000 to develop. The designers employed the assistance of local court system operators to develop workable report forms. The primary users of this system are the state legislators who are apparently satisfied with the accuracy, level of detail, and extent of information provided by the system.

In sum, the three systems each cost less than \$275,000 to develop, and LEAA funds played a significant role in the development of the two most expensive systems (CDRS, Florida; and the Texas Judicial Council System). 2. Other State Court Systems

The other two state court systems, SWJIS (Missouri) and ADCMIS (New Jersey), are more complicated than the activity reporting-type systems just described. SWJIS is a court management information system, ADCMIS is both that and a person-case tracking system. Table 4-10, part B, shows that SWJIS required significant outside guidance in the form of technology transfer, technical assistance, and visits to other sites. SWJIS designers employed all three types of assistance, but ADCMIS designers employed only technology transfer in the development of their system. The assistance to SWJIS was provided by LEAA indirectly through a LEAA-funded Data Processing Committee. However, the ADCMIS designers transferred software for management information systems directly from

# Table 4-9. TYPE OF INTERFACE: STATE COURT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

			•		
			TYPE	OF IN	TERFACE
CATION			Local	State	Federal
ing System		1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · ·
					•
CA			-	-	-
			-	-	. <del></del> *
ty Systems					

NOTE: "E" means existing; "P" means planned.

Table 4-10. LEAA AND NON-LEAA CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE COURT INFORMATION SYSTEM

	'DEVEL	OPMENT	COST A	ND				
	FU	NDING.S	OURCE	······	DE	SIGN AS	SISTAN	ICE
	•		•				Tech-	
SYSTEM NAME,	Cost,	Sig-					nology	7
TYPE, AND LOCATION	thous.	nifi-			Site	Tech-	Trans-	•
	dollars	cant	Minor	None	Visit	nical	fer	Other
	······	••••••••••						
A. Court Reporting System								
1. TJCS, TX	\$256	L	NL	-	-	_	NL	-
2. JCSRS-SJIS, CA	40	_	<u> </u>	L	-	-	~	L
3. CDRS, FL	?	NL	L	-	-	-	-	
D. Ohlers Astimity Custome								
B. Other Activity Systems								
1. SWJIS, MO	\$665	L	-	-	L	L	L	L
2 ADCMIS, NJ	416	L	NL		-	<u></u>	NL	-

NOTE: "L" means provided by LEAA sources; "NL" means provided by non-LEAA sources.

4-26

<b>TTON</b>	SI	STEMS

4

the New Jersey data center. At \$409,000 and \$664,000, respectively, ADCMIS and SWJIS were more expensive to develop than the activity-reporting systems described previously. All of the SWJIS costs and nearly all of the ADCMIS costs were covered by LEAA block grants. Absolutely no state funds were available to the SwJIS system operators.

The users of these systems are very satisfied with the systems' performance. One user stated that the system "enables the clerk to trace cases and pinpoint where delays occur and therefore to speed up case processing. (He) uses the system continuously to get cases ready for calendaring and. . . to prepare overdue transcript and motion reports."

C. Conclusions - Court Systems Twenty-two computerized local and state court information systems were surveyed by RTI and MRI evaluators. Twenty received some if not a significant amount of their development funds from LEAA. Of these 20, 17 operators stated that they could not have developed their systems without LEAA funds. Seventeen system operators employed direct technical assistance in designing or implementing their systems, and two of these received such assistance from LEAA. Usually system operators were aided by management and systems consulting firms and occasionally by major computer vendors. There does not seem to be a detectable difference in the user's evaluations

LEAA) of funding.

Local court systems appear to be more sophisticated than the state systems in that they frequently include person-case tracking as well as simply management and reporting capabilities. In any case, it is apparent that when compared) with the law enforcement information system developers, court information system developers have less well developed technology and examples with which to work in designing a court information system.

Finally, there seems to be little overt activity in the OBTS/CCH direction. SWJIS developers attempted to design a court component which would be integrated into a OBTS/CCH at a later date. However, members of both the California and Missouri judiciaries were adamant that under their state constitutions the judicial branch of state government would not be dictated to by the executive branch.

4-27

of these systems which can be related to the extent or source (LEAA vs. non-

pres

# IV. STATE CORRECTION INFORMATION SYSTEMS

RTI and MRI evaluators looked at 11 systems which are used in some capacity in the correctional process. Seven of these systems serve a data storage and retrieval function only in that they usually replace a manual record system and are used primarily for data support in case load management and activity reporting. Four of these systems are intended to serve an inmate-tracking function. As such they represent a recent development in prison management and are intended to be used daily to monitor intake and release procedures and to control many phases of prison operations,

## Correctional Data Storage and Retrieval Systems Α.

Five of the seven data storage and retrieval systems maintain information exclusively on juvenile offenders and runaways. Corrections personnel in several states surveyed by MRI/RTI evaluators stated that their state legislation mandates that juvenile systems shall not interface with other local, state. or federal information systems. (Respondents were not asked to reference the appropriate state statutes:) The two adult systems, PARS (New Jersey) and the Texas Clemency and Parole System, are also not interfaced with other information systems. (See table 4-11, part A.)

> Table 4-11. TYPE OF INTERFACE: STATE CORRECTIONS SYSTEMS

SYSTEM NAME. TYPE, AND LOCATION

TYPE OF INTERFACE Local State Federal

Δ.	Data	Storage	and	Retrieval	Swetom
A	Data	JULIAge	and	VELTENGT	JAPECT

1.	OFD-OBITS, CA JANUS, TX	•	-		-		
3.	Clemency/Parole, TX		-		-	-	
4.	AMS, MT		- 1		- '	-	
6.	FHIS, MT		_			_	
7.	PARS, NJ		-		-	-	
В.	Inmate Tracking System						
1.	CIS, IL		-	ł.	_		
2.	CAJUN, LA		-		-		
3.	ITS, TX		-		E.	-	
4.	JIDCSR, FL		-		_	-	

4-28

NOTE: "E" means existing; "P" means planned.

These systems are generally unsophisticated, having only batch processing capability and generating only periodic reports. The system users are usually legislators or personnel in the operating agency. All but one group of these users were very satisfied with the system's performance. Table 4-12. part A. shows that only the two newest systems (OFD/OBITS, California; and JPIS. Montana) required any significant technical assistance in their design and development. OFD/OBITS studied the systems of Connecticut, Illinois (Adult Corrections), Washington, D.C. (CRYSIS), Louisiana (CAJUN), Arkansas, Texas, and Ohio (Youth Commission). The eventual concept for OFD/OBITS was influenced by all of these systems and the SEARCH/OBSCIS report. These systems were identified from sources such as SEARCH contacts newsletters sent out by these systems, and other contacts made by state personnel. The JPIS system (Montana) uses the concept and logic of the Utah Juvenile Court Information System which was studied and recommended by the Montana SPA, after the SPA attended LEAA regional workshops. Four of the seven systems were developed with significant LEAA funds. The three systems which did not use any LEAA funds (AMS, FHIS, and PARS) were the three oldest systems and became operational between 1959 and 1970. However, in each of these cases, system operators indicated that "LEAA funds

would not have made a difference."

Inmate Tracking Systems в.

Generally, the seven correction and data storage and retrieval systems cost between \$40,000 and \$400,000 to develop. These correctional data storage and retrieval systems are relatively less expensive to develop than most similar systems in the law enforcement or court area.

LEAA has funded some of the least expensive (JPIS--\$40,000) and the most expensive (OFD/OBITS--\$760,000), and the users of all but one of these systems (PARS--New Jersey) are generally satisfied with the systems design and performance. Whether the extent or utilization of LEAA funds has produced correctional data storage and retrieval systems which are substantively different either in level of sophistication or level of use than those similar systems developed without LEAA money, could not be determined.

The four inmate tracking systems shown in part B of tables 4-11 and 4-12 are more sophisticated than the simpler data storage and retrieval

		DEVEL FU	OPMENT NDING	COST A	ND	DE	SIGN AS	SSTSTAN	
SYSTEM NAME, TYPE, AND LOCATION	SYSTEM NAME, TYPE, AND LOCATION	Cost, thous. dollars	Sig- nifi- cant	Minor	None	Site Visit	Tech- nical	Tech- nology Trans- fer	(
Α.	Data Storage and Retrieval	System		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · · ·	<del> </del>		
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. B.	OFD-OBITS, CA JANUS, TX Clemency/Parole, TX AMS, MT JPIS, MT FHIS, MT PARS, NJ Inmate Tracking System	\$760 388 235 47 40 3 ?	L L NL NL NL NL	NL    	NL NL L NL L L	NL - - - -		NI.  L 	•
1. 2. 3. 4.	CIS, IL CAJUN, LA ITS, TX JIDCSR, FL	\$2,032 827 496 ?	L L L ?	NL NL ?	NL - ?	L  	L - NL	 	

Table 4-12. LEAA AND NON-LEAA CONTRIBUTIONS TO STATE CORRECTIONS SYSTEMS

NOTE: "L" means provided by LEAA sources; "NL" means provided by non-LEAA sources.

6 × 7

4-30

\*\*\*\*

# E Other t i k

V. STATEWIDE LAW ENFORCEMENT SYSTEMS AND COMPREHENSIVE DATA SYSTEMS

## Statewide Law Enforcement Systems Α.

RTI and MRI evaluators observed only eight statewide law enforcement systems. Maine has just received a grant to begin work on several components of such a system, but as yet none exists.

Most state law enforcement systems are comprised of at least the following subsystems: wanted persons, stolen property (including vehicles), UCR, firearm information, traffic information, and message switching. Table 4-13 shows that systems are online and interfaced with other criminal justice information systems.

Table 4-13.	TYPE OF	INTI	ERFACE:	STAT	TEWIDE	LAW
	ENFORCE	MENT	INFORMA	TION	SYSTEM	<b>1</b> S

	() ·	· •						
	SYSTEM TYPE, AND	NAME, LOCATION	· · · · ·		TYPE Local	OF IN State	TERFACE Federal	-
	,			•				
1.	SCIS, NJ	· · · · · ·	• .* .		Е	Е	E.	
2.	CLETS, CA			a. **	E	E	Е	
3.	LCJIS, LA	× .			· 🛶 ·	E	E	
4.	FCIC, FL				E	E	E	
5.	MULES, MO				E	Е	E	
6.	MLETS, MT				P	· `	E	
7.	TCIC, TX				E	E	<b>6</b> 74	
8.	LEADS, IL			8 1. 4 1 2	-	Е	E	
*				147				1.1

NOTE: "E" means existing; "P" means planned.

The Texas and Louisiana systems are only partially operational. Texas has completed only its stolen-wanted persons, UCR, and message-switching components. Louisiana has completed only its UCR, identification, and correction modules.

Usually the wanted persons and stolen property components are the earliest subsystems to be developed. Components designed to be integrated into an OBTS-CCH system are usually the last ones to be developed.

MLETS (Montana) is the only statewide system serving primarily a message-switching function. MIETS does maintain license and vehicle information, but this is the extent of its data storage function at present.

4-32

All statewide systems but MLETS have a UCR component partially or totally complete. California's CJIS/CLETS has a CDS criminal history system component operated separately from the CDS Offender-Based Transaction System in the state. All system operators, except MLETS, indicate that work is currently being conducted on a CCH component. For those systems for which acceptable funding estimates are avail-

able, table 4-14 shows that between one and seven million dollars is required to design and develop the system. MLETS, serving a smaller population and exhibiting more limited capabilities than the other systems surveyed, cost only \$600,000 to develop.

LEAA funds have been significant in the development of seven of the . eight statewide law enforcement systems observed in this evaluation. Most, if not all, of the assistance employed by system designers of the eight statewide systems was inhouse expertise. Outside firms or technology transfer were present during the development of these systems on a limited

Florida's FCIC system was developed with \$1.6 million of state funds. basis only.

A notable example is LCJIS in Louisiana where individuals experienced both in data processing techniques and criminal justice processes comprised a unique organization (LCJIS). The organization in Louisiana has planned and designed almost every module in the LCJIS--including a complete OBTS-CCH system which is due to be implemented in late 1976 or early 1977. Because the users of these systems often represent several hundred criminal justice agencies throughout a state, it is difficult to obtain meaningful user evaluations of these systems. A few of the users interviewed for the California and Illinois systems indicated disappointment in the level of user participation permitted in the design of their system. Other than this observation, it seems that users who were considered in this evaluation are satisfied with the accuracy and level of detail pro-

vided by these systems.

3. Comprehensive Data Systems

1. General

CDS is an LEAA program funded by discretionary grants with the intent of leading the states toward criminal justice information systems which are uniform in format across the nation and compatible throughout the criminal justice system of the state.

				• •	DEVEI FU	OPMENT NDING	COST SOURCE	AND	DES	SIGN AS	SISTAN	CE
•	SYSTEM TYPE, AND	NAME, LOCATIO	N		Cost, thous. dollars	Sig- nifi- cant	Minor	None	Site Visit	Tech- nical	Tech- nology Trans- fer	Other
							•			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	COTC NT		· .		\$6 660	Ť			NT		NT	
⊥. 2∵	CLETS CA				6,230	I.	NT.		NI.			T.
2.	LCITS LA				1,800	т.	NI.	· .	I.	T.	Ť.	I.
4	FCTC. FL				1,600	NL		L		NL	_	_
5.	MULES. MO			•	972	NL	NL		. <del>.</del> .	NL	-	·
6.	MLETS, MT				600	L	NL	_			NL	•
7.	TCIC, TX			· ·	6	L	NL	··· ·	_	· <b>_</b>	-	L
8.	LEADS, IL				?	?		-	-	-		L

NOTE: "L" means provided by LEAA sources; "NL" means provided by non-LEAA sources.

4-34

\* 12 -15

1º=

O

Ţ

• •

 $\Theta$ 

 $\odot$ 

 $\mathcal{O}$ 

Most of the states surveyed have begun CDS programs. A partial UCR component is functioning in all of the states. With the exception of the Statistical Analysis Centers (SAC's), with their Management and Administrative Statistics (MAS) and Technical Assistance (TA) elements, the information system elements within and related to CDS may be developed by separate operating agencies as were described in earlier parts of this chapter. The information system elements are the CCH/OBTS systems and the related State Judicial Information Systems (SJIS) and correctional information systems (OBSCIS). It is the intent of the CDS program that the SAC unit will see that all of the related parts meet CDS guidelines and remain compatible. 2. Findings

 $\square$ 

Because of its involvement in the original Project SEARCH and its even earlier beginning of an offender-based tracking system, the California CDS is the most advanced of those observed. The California CDS is reported to be a fully operational system, although its components are not uniformly implemented statewide. This CDS is subject to considerable changes with major components being added or deleted as the need, political direction, or funding support dictate. The SAC funding was largely used to continue many of the functions of the already existing Bureau of Criminal Statistics. A demonstration OBTS system is operated within this Bureau, but the CCH component is being developed separately by the Bureau of Identification. Interviews within the California Department of Corrections and the Judicial Council disclosed that there is not yet full coordination between all parts of the criminal justice system in California. The correction system is not prepared to fully accept the guidelines of the CDS program as interpreted by the Bureau of Criminal Statistics. Similar problems of coordination in CDS development were observed in several other states.

Missouri has developed as three separate systems in the Kansas City region (ALERT II), the Saint Louis region (REJIS), and the balance of the State (MULES). Differences were observed between the three parts in both methods and data formats. The Department of Social Services (State corrections) was concerned that there is not one statewide system, and is unhappy about the money being spent by ALERT and REJIS to develop their own independent corrections systems. Court system operators exert their independence, declaring that they will decide what they are and are not willing to give to MILES.

Montana has an operational SAC, MAS, UCR, and TA program but has just begun to develop OBTS/CCH. Maine has not yet begun their programs to any extent. The operational elements of the other interviewed states are reported earlier in this chapter.

# 3. Conclusions

In the area of CDS, the interviewers observed a status which is difficult to put into categories. Because the CDS attempts to pull together information efforts in the total criminal justice system, it runs head-on into the traditional separation of powers and functions. Courts will not follow the dictates of a master plan which was developed primarily by and for the law enforcement agencies. Corrections will not freely cooperate with State Planning Agencies and Statistical Analysis Centers when the latter are poorly positioned in the state administrative hierarchy. Law enforcement information systems developed without LEAA funds are slow to cooperate with the newly developed guidelines.

Despite these problems which LEAA can overcome only with patience and firmness in exerting its leadership, it is concluded that the leadership exerted to date through the CDS program has had a positive influence on the direction which is being taken in state criminal justice information systems. The combination of discretionary funds, guidelines, and national standards and goals is moving the states toward a level of compatibility and interrelatedness which was not occurring prior to LEAA participation.

VI. COMMENTS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

# A. <u>Comments and Conclusions</u>

RTI and MRI evaluators surveyed 76 partially or completely operational criminal justice information systems for review in this report. Thirty-five of these systems were operated by local law enforcement agencies, 22 were operated by local and state courts, ll were operated by state correction agencies, and 8 by statewide law enforcement agencies.

Fifty-eight of the 76 systems operators indicated that some of the funds employed to develop the system were provided by LEAA. Of these 58, 52 system operators indicated that without LEAA's funding contribution to the development of their system, it could not have been developed. In other words, no other funding sources were available to these system developers.

4-36

Given the limitations of the data and analyses contained in this report, it is impossible to conclude whether the adequacy of a criminal justice information system is correlated to either its development cost, relative to other similar systems, or to the source of its development funds. In other words, on the basis of this survey of 76 criminal justice information systems, there is no evidence to suggest that for comparable systems, LEAA-funded systems are in any way different from non-LEAA-funded systems. According to the respondents surveyed in this evaluation, user satisfaction with a criminal justice information system is directly related to the degree of their participation in the survey of the surveyed in the survey of the degree of

with a criminal justice information system is directly related to the degree of their participation in the system design, and subsequent enhancements. System utility is enhanced when users are permitted a high level of input into determination of output characteristics such as report content, format, and frequency. Furthermore, when system documentation is available and simplified for persons unskilled in electronic data processing and when system designers conscientiously train operators and users, respondents tended to be more satisfied with their systems. Fifty-four of the 76 system operators indicated that they utilized some direct nonfinancial assistance in the form of site visits, technical assistance, and/or technology transfer in designing their information systems. Only 13 system operators obtained such assistance from LEAA personnel on either the federal, state, or regional level of operations.

Fifty-four of the direct nonfinancial as and/or technology tran tem operators obtained state, or regional lev However, many sys technical assistance i their systems. In add more ongoing technical they operate, expand, a To overcome this of available more information tion systems which is a for decisions on potent 1972 Directory of Autom Justice Information Sys current survey by Brand

To overcome this deficit most system operators proposed that LEAA make available more information in the form of a comprehensive directory of information systems which is accurate, up-to-date, and provides sufficient information for decisions on potential transfer. They did not feel this need was met by the 1972 Directory of Automated Criminal Justice Information Systems because Criminal Justice Information Systems were in the initial development stages then. The current survey by Brandon Applied Systems is anticipated by some system representatives to be incomplete because to their knowledge their systems did not participate in the survey. In addition, respondents frequently cited a need for a directory of software packages which are appropriate for use by different

However, many system operators indicated that they would have utilized LEAA technical assistance if more had been available to them when they were designing their systems. In addition, several system operators expressed a desire to have more ongoing technical assistance from LEAA or their SPA available to them as they operate, expand, and modify their systems.

criminal justice agencies, functions, and systems. Most of the systems surveyed stored volumes of data, but few had the software capability to generate the information in formats from which users could make meaningful operational or

A frequently heard request made by system operators was for more assistance management decisions. in measuring criminal justice system efficiency. This kind of information would be useful not only in design and transfer decisions, but in daily system utilization decisions as well.

Finally, there was general but widespread criticism of certain aspects of LEAA's administrative procedures. Respondents indicated dissatisfaction with constant changes in the publication and long delays in the finalization from draft status of guidelines in general and CDS specifically. Although official CDS guidelines came out in memo form in 1972, draft in 1974, and in final form in 1976, some law enforcement agencies obtained unofficial interim copies of April, June, and October 1975 revisions. Regardless of whether they are officially or unofficially released, constant revisions of guidelines are being obtained and acted upon by local law enforcement agencies. In most cases these guidelines are confusing and impede the efforts of such agencies in their efforts to plan and develop criminal justice information systems.

Furthermore, persons affiliated with the Alameda County Pilot 911 program cited problems and delays in project implementation which resulted from long LEAA delays in formally approving the 911 project application. Many other systems operators indicated that the development of their information system had been significantly delayed while they attempted to comply with LEAA's funding requirements and then wait for the grant review process to be completed. In some states operators must submit LEAA grant applications and awards to additional review processes by state and local agencies, planning units, and coordination councils.

On the basis of the preceding evaluation and comments made by survey respondents, the following recommendations are made.

## Recommendations в.

Provide and disseminate timely and accurate information on the state-of-the-art in criminal justice information systems. 1. LEAA should establish mechanisms that would enable them to serve as a

4-38

clearing house for all relevant information on criminal justice information systems. The greatest need is for a comprehensive directory of successful information systems and software packages that are appropriate for use by criminal justice system agencies. The directory should be accurate and up-to-date, and it should provide sufficient information for decisions on potential for transfer. The type of information circulated by LEAA on PROMIS was cited by several as the type of information on systems that is needed to make decisions.

LEAA should continue to sponsor demonstration projects and seminars to further aid system designs and operations. These measures would assist system designers in selecting a design and an approach to developing a system, in addition to promoting comparison between systems and helping those unfamiliar with software alternatives deal with private industry vendors. A summary of the general performance and cost characteristics of alternative brands of hardware and software would greatly facilitate selections.

Enhance the technical assistance capability of the SPA's. 3. LEAA should make available personnel with extensive technical expertise

in both law enforcement and computer applications to system designers. LEAA technical assistance would be welcomed in system design, grant application procedures, system implementation and interface problems, and project management. Also such help from LEAA would greatly aid system developers in their interactions with major computer vendors.

If this type of expertise is unavailable, LEAA should assure that appropriately trained experts can evaluate the soundness of system design and proposed project management prior to funding a grant applications.

use of information systems.

2. Sponsor more seminars in order to make the "cross-fertilization" Seminer of data processing and law enforcement ideas possible.

dearing house

4. Develop an information system evaluation methodology to insure optimal system design and use.

This type of methodology would assist system designers and operators in activities such as selecting efficient systems, operating them effectively, and justifying systems in requests for local operating funds.

5. Promote a high level of user participation in the development and

Criminal justice information system users must understand the system's

Scapabilities and limitations, and how the system can help them. System utility can be enhanced if users are permitted a high level of input into determining things such as report content, format, and frequency, if they have access to simplified documentation; and/or if they are trained to understand and use the  $\lambda$  capabilities of the system. LEAA should emphasize the importance of including users and operators in the planning and implementation phases of system development, in publications and seminars, and to regional system specialists and SPAs. Expedite the dissemination of, and clarify LEAA regulations and 6. guidelines.

LEAA regulations frequently lack clear direction and are finalized too slowly and disseminated inconsistently. As a result, law enforcement agencies are anxious to obtain even unofficial revisions of regulations, hoping to gain clearer instructions. LEAA should attempt to minimize such occurrences and thereby avoid the confusion which accompanies frequent changes in guidelines.

7. Review grant evaluation and reward process.

when

 $\Lambda J$ 

Many system operators indicated that the development of their information systems had been significantly delayed while they attempted to comply with funding 'requirements and then wait for the grant review process to be completed. This is particularly a problem in those states where LEAA funds must undergo additional review processes by local agencies, planning units, and coordinating councils, etc.

LEAA should reevaluate present funding restrictions, grant review, and award processes for possible simplication.

Promote the development of classifications, definitions, and a 8.

standardized terminology for criminal justice information systems. NY VO The titles in the 1972 Directory of Criminal Justice Systems are of Munited value in describing system features. In performing analyses of the systems surveyed for this evaluation, a great deal of time was spent devising appropriate generic classifications to facilitate the analysis. It is . recommended that LEAA prepare or support the development of standardized descriptive terms for the components and functions of all types of criminal justice information systems. This should greatly improve the exchange of information between operators and users of systems and should aid in technology transfer and evaluation.

This chapter presents findings on the use and the reasons for nonuse given by a sample of federal, state, and local agencies that receive statistics compiled by the NCJISS Statistics Division. The findings are based on the collection, compilation, and analysis of data on state and local receivers and users of LEAA data; interviews with LEAA headquarters personnel and with selected non-LEAA federal users; a review of documents produced by state and local agencies; and telephone interviews with a random sample of potential users. The document review and the telephone survey are detailed under separate covers. 1,2 This chapter begins with a background discussion of the needs for criminal justice statistics and continues with the findings from each separate task of the NCJISS statistical services evaluation.

The NCJISS Statistics Division was given its policy direction in section 515 of the Crime Control Act of 1973:

collect, evaluate, publish, and disseminate statistics and other information on the conditions and progress of law enforcement within and without the United States.3

The Division's program, described in chapter 2, has been influenced by several studies and conferences on the needs for criminal justice statistics.

The Needs for Criminal Justice Statistics Α.

The status of statistics at the beginning of the five-year period covered in this study is presented in the 1968 Needs Report published by the Bureau of the Census. 4 Three working groups had been convened by the Bureau to look into criminal justice statistics on law enforcement, courts, and corrections. The attendees were those judged at that time to be most knowledgeable of the / needs for statistics in the three areas. There were state and local representatives in attendance, but federal agencies were most heavily represented and the focus was on the needs for statistics at the national level. The conference reported that:

5 - 1

4-40

# Chapter 5

EVALUATION OF THE USE OF NCJISS-PRODUCED DOCUMENTS

# I. OVERVIEW

# II. BACKGROUND



On a national level, few statistics are published, and almost none of them reflect the local . . . criminal justice system . . . . However, there is a great deal of interest and activity . . .

Data on Federal and State prisoners are published by the Bureau of Prisons:

The Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts publishes statistics on the activities of the Federal court and probation systems;

The Federal Bureau of Investigation publishes data on offenses known to police and arrests;

Statistical information covering cases going through a sample of juvenile courts across the country are published by the Children's Bureau; and

Data are published by the Bureau of the Census on the finances and employment of State and local governments for police protection, courts, and corrections as well as on institutionalized persons covered in the decennial census.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has developed a National Crime Information Center . . . The Bureau of Prisons is planning to develop an improved and expanded National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) program . . . The Statistics Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has held hearings and has introduced legislation to establish a national criminal justice statistics center . . . Finally, the Social Indicators group of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, while not attempting to fill the statistics void itself, is interested in having it filled. They have prepared a paper on criminal justice statistics and are particularly interested in making an early start on victimization statistics.

After examining the needs derived from the law enforcement, courts, and corrections groups, the conference attendees concluded that statistics were needed to answer the following questions:

How much crime is there in the nation--particularly in the cities?

Who are the victims and what are they like?

Who are the offenders and what are they like?

What is the record of the criminal justice system in dealing with crime and with offenders?

What resources, financial and manpower, are devoted to the criminal justice system in relation to the size and kind of job expected of it and are these resources enough to do an effective job?

5-2

1. A series to present frequent (e.g., quarterly), national, state, and large city estimates of victimization by type of crime; type of crime reported or known to the police: type of charge for arrest made by police; disposition (or outcome) of arrest by type of charge; and time served under types of correctional supervision (probation, prison, parole) by type of charge for which convicted.

2. A series to present annual national and state data on characteristics of offenders--those arrested, tried, and enrolled in correctional programs and those arrested in large cities.

3. A series to present annual national, state, county, and city estimates of expenditures.

4. A series to present annual national, state, county, and city estimates of employment and payrolls.

5. A series to present annual national, state, county, and city data on workloads of courts, corrections, and police.

6. Other series to present at infrequent intervals (e.g., every 5 or 10 years) data on a large number of questions raised in the Needs Report in addition to those noted above.

Although all of the needs expressed above are not covered by the series now being produced by the Division and the Bureau, there are high correlations between these needs and the series. The needs not yet covered are primarily the offender-based tracking statistics being produced by the fledgling OBTS/CCH component of the CDS program in the NCJISS Systems Development Division. Another recommendation called for statistical standards and technical assistance programs to implement the standards. These needs have been addressed with respect to data elements by Project SEARCH and with respect to standards and goals by the National Advisory Commission report.<sup>5,6</sup> A technical assistance component of the CDS program could be the mechanism for

permitting cooperative work to begin among Federal, State, and local criminal justice agencies in the development of standardized terminology, classification, systems, recordkeeping systems, estimation and projection methods, and standards of quality.4

this recommendation.

The attendees recommended that the following statistical series be produced:"

However, the needed technical expertise is not widely available, and funds thus far expended for technical assistance by LEAA are not now accomplishing

Still another recommendation called for special research to produce data over and above those of the statistical series. Typical would be a study of the amount of recidivism, its social and economic antecedents, and the effectiveness of various correctional programs in reducing the incidence of recidivism. This evaluation did not investigate the LEAA research program to determine the extent to which this need is being met. However, it was possible to determine that the data for such research are being produced in a very limited number of local areas.

A final recommendation--that a directory survey be performed to locate, identify, and describe briefly every agency or institution in the criminal justice system--was the remaining expression of need directly related to the functions of the Division?

# B. The Hypotheses for the Evaluation

From the above descriptions of needs for statistics on criminal justice, the following hypotheses were developed by RTI for testing against the data collected in this study:

- 1. The statistical series and the resulting documents should be of greatest use at the national (rather than the state and local) level because they were designed to meet needs expressed at that level, and they would be used primarily to define the nature and scope of problems.
- Researchers and program/managers within LEAA should expect to find the reported data inadequate or inappropriate to their special program analysis or evaluation needs because most of the needs were expressed before LEAA programs had been developed.
- 3. Because the emphasis in the needs statements was upon national needs for national, state, and local data, there would be less use of the series at state and local levels.

User assessments were solicited to help test these hypotheses, to draw conclusions, and to formulate recommendations on how the services of the Division might be more effective. The NCJISS documents and data series assessed by the users are listed here by classes of data.

# General

1. Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics: 1973, July 74; 1974, Sept 75

5-4

- 2.
- 3
- 4. Report, 1970
- 6.

# Victimization

- 1.
- 3. Survey of Victimization
- 5.
- Cities, April 75

# Police

- 1. Uniform Crime Reports (FBI)
- - tration & operations)

# Corrections

- 1. Advance Report, Sept 75
- 73; July 75
- 3.

Expenditure and Employment Data for Criminal Justice Systems: 1968-69, Feb 71; 1969-70, Feb 72; 1970-71, Feb 73; 1971-72, Feb 74; 1972-73, Feb 75

Criminal Justice Agencies in (each LEAA region): Feb-June 1975 Criminal Justice Agencies in the United States: Summary

5. Criminal Justice Agencies in (each state): 1970, May 1972

Historical Statistics on Expenditures and Employment for the Criminal Justice Systems: 1971-73, Aug 75

Crime in the Nation's Five Largest Cities

Criminal Victimization Surveys in 13 American Cities, July 75

Crimes and Victims: Report on the Dayton-San Jose Pilot

Crime in Eight American Cities, July 1974

Criminal Victimization in the United States: Jan-June 1973, Nov 74: 1973 Advance Report, May 75

6. Criminal Victimization Surveys in the Nation's Five Largest

7. San Jose Methods Test of Known Crime Victims

2. Comparative Data Report: 1970, 1972 (state police adminis-

Children in Custody: A Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census: 1971, May 74; 1972-73

2. Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions: Dec 71, 72,

Capital Punishment 1971-73, June 75; 1974, Nov 75

Census of State Correctional Facilities 1974: Advance 4. Report, Sept 75

- Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, 1972: Advance Report, 5. Sept 74
- The Nation's Jails: A Report on the Census of Jails from 6. the 1972 Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, Aug 75
- 7. Local Jails: A Report Presenting Data for Individual County and City Jails from the 1970 Jail Census, Mar 73
- 8. 1970 National Jail Census, May 71

# Courts

1. National Survey of Court Organization: 1971 Feb 74; Supplement to State Judicial Systems, Nov 75

The results of user assessments are reported in sections III, IV, and V for non-LEAA federal agencies, LEAA offices, and state and local agencies.

# III. NON-LEAA FEDERAL AGENCIES

Initially this study, which began in September 1975, was intended to cover state and local agencies and LEAA offices. In January 1976, the sponsor added a broader group of receivers that included non-LEAA users of NCJISS documents and data at the federal level. The results of interviews with 18 persons in 14 agency offices in Washington are reported in this section.

## Α. Interview Procedure

The sample of agencies and individuals selected by the sponsor and RTI (unlike the random sample in the telephone survey task) included individuals who had received the documents and who had obvious needs for some of the data types within them. Telephone calls were made to confirm that these two criteria were met before scheduling interviews. These interviewed were individuals in the following agencies:

# Department of Justice

Bureau of Prisons, the Executive Assistant to the Assistant Director and the Education Administrator

Office of Public Information, Deputy Director

Office of Policy and Planning, the Executive Assistant and Researchers

Administrative Office of United States Courts Statistical Analysis and Report Branch, the Head and Researchers Department of Commerce Bureau of Domestic Commerce, Assistant to Director of the Office of Business Research and Analysis Food and Drug Administration, Statistician National Institute of Mental Health Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, Acting Deputy Chief Drug Enforcement Administration Policy and Planning Staff, Director Statistics and Data Services Division, Director Special Studies Section, Chief Brookings Institution, Researcher U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, the Head U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Consultant Interview Form D (appendix A) was used to record specific information and elabora-

tions about document use and the data series.

# B. Findings

of charge to federal agencies. pretty good" for high level policy analyses.

The documents and data series produced by NCJISS were much more strongly supported in this set of interviews than in any other set. Most of the individuals interviewed had expressed needs for the series -- needs that were appropriate to their functions--and they were making use of the applicable documents or data series. Several recommended that the documents be made available free

Several respondents indicated: "If the data were not available from this source, I would have to find another source or perform my own data collection." One stated that "very few policy decisions of (this office) are supported by hard data" and indicated that the victimization data had made possible at least a beginning toward changing that situation. Another was convinced that victimization data "is the only game in town" and that "it is

Victimization data were most often cited as sources of primary data for research and analysis. Other NCJISS data and documents were used primarily as general references; that is, they were used to quantify a point to be made in a speech, to give some quantitative basis for a program proposal, to assess

the reasonableness of a grant application, or in general statistical reports. For purposes such as these, there was little concern with lack of detail, with out-of-date information, or inaccuracies in disaggregated tables. There was a tendency to believe that the data were relatively correct in the aggregate and in the trend which they suggested.

Victimization data were being used for several analytical purposes. For example, they were being used to support proposed gun control legislation, which was reported to have received the endorsement of the President, and to assess the nature of commercial crime in support of a crime prevention program for businesses. These were uses of the data series, not of the victimization documents. The analysts had computer access to the data sets and were obtaining reports uniquely suited to projects or programs; they were using data from individual cities rather than the results from the national panel. Uses of the other data included:

> Expenditure and employment data used by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to respond to requests made by state legislatures and other groups.

All data series in general statistical reports used by agencies of the Department of Justice, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the Drug Enforcement Administration.

The Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics used by those developing new programs in specialized criminal justice areas.

The series on prisoners used by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

## Recommendations C.

The following recommendations are based primarily upon the observations of those interviewed.

1. Improve Document Use

The uses and values of the documents would be enhanced considerably if LEAA would provide brief summaries highlighting the important findings, trend changes, or key statistics for high level administrators who need to know them. These would help the staff to sell the value of hard data support for policy decisions. To accomplish this, the NCJISS analytical staff must be sufficiently knowledgeable of the functions of the principal receiving federal agencies to know what general findings would be important to them.

5-8

# . 2. Improve Series Use

mization studies should increase. nesses, and specialized federal programs. characteristics of prisoners.

. .

3. Increase User Interactions

The need for more producer-consumer interactions between NCJISS and federal agency researchers and analysts, as suggested by the previous recommendation, does not apply to all recipients of the documents. Managers and operators of national criminal justice programs are generally not able to specify needs beyond those satisfied by the present series; as other needs arise, they either turn to their research staffs or do without for lack of time. However, those with analytical and reporting responsibilities in the non-LEAA federal agencies can benefit from greater interactions with NCJISS. The user community should be identified and contacted.

The extent to which LEAA headquarters personnel have been effectively served by the NCJISS statistics was determined through interviews. At the initiation conference for this study, personnel from a number of LEAA offices gave background information for the evaluation. People from several offices indicated that the different parts of the agency had traditionally had

Data tabulated by NCJISS seldom meet the specific needs of the researcher or program analyst. For many, the more useful data elements are lost in aggregation. If the Division could provide timely special reports in answer to requests by federal (or other) agencies, the uses of series such as victi-

The victimization survey is of great potential value and needs to be strengthened and improved considerably, so that the results can be specialized for those who need to know, such as: insurance companies, other busi-

Data on persons in correctional mental hospitals (or mentally disordered offenders) and on juvenile courts would assist NIMH documents. The Drug Enforcement Administration would like to have data on drugs used by arrestees, drugs seized by police, and the amount of crimes committed by addicts. The Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor is interested in more data on women offenders and economic, social, and demographic characteristics. The Civil Rights Commission would like more details on racial and ethnic

IV. LEAA HEADQUARTERS PERSONNEL

little contact with each other; these people were of the opinion that the research program was not planned in concert with the operational programs and the operational programs had no input into the statistical programs. Thus it was hypothesized, as stated earlier, that the NCJISS statistical documents would not be used widely and frequently throughout LEAA headquarters. This hypothesis was generally not true. A number of the offices used documents to support their functions. However, not all users were completely satisfied with NCJISS products; these made several general recommendations to the interviewers.

# Interview Procedure

: · .

Persons to be interviewed were selected and scheduled by the contract technical moditor. Additional persons were added at the suggestions of persons originally selected. The research and program offices where interviews were conducted included:

Office of Congressional Liaison

Office of Public Information

Office of National Priority Programs

Office of Planning and Management: the Management and the Policy Analysis Divisions

Office of Regional Operations: Program, Planning, Analysis and Coordination Division and Enforcement Program Development Division

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice: Offices of Research and Programs, Technology Transfer, and Evaluation

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention: the JJDP Operations Task Group and the Research Institute

The persons interviewed were first given opportunities to comment generally on their uses of NCJISS documents and data. Then they were asked to comment on each document listed in Form D. (These comments often revealed that there was some general-knowledge use by those claiming that the documents were of no use to them.) Next, they were asked to disclose other data sources important to their functions. Finally, they were asked for recommendations for improving the products of the Division.

# Findings

As expected, the results of the interviews varied considerably within the types of offices.

5-10

1

By analysis, it was concluded that data series and documents are directed at the needs of the national research and analysis community of users and thus play small roles in the functions of LEAA management and administration. LEAA managers were generally aware of the documents and had reviewed them at some time for general knowledge.

The Congressional Liaison Office sees that all NCJISS documents are supplied to appropriate congressional offices, but the Congressional Liaison Office does not use them. The Liaison Office occasionally receives requests for information from Congress and has found that NCJISS has been very responsive to these special requests. The requests typically require special analysis of Uniform Crime Report (UCR) data. The Office is more interested in improving the quality of financial management data than in improving NCJISS data. The Public Information Offices keep all documents as reference materials for the preparation of speeches, press releases, and annual reports. This Office reports that better NCJISS responsiveness to its needs in the last year and one-half is due "to reorganization and improvement in the work." Telephone calls have been returned and quick responses have been given to special, hurried needs.

Those interviewed within the Office of Planning and Management did

not use the documents. Their functions do not require the types of data contained in the documents.

A very positive assessment of NCJISS was received from one respondent in the Career Criminal Program of the Office of National Priority Programs:

such as these.

Some of the data series were being used directly in the program in connection with the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. Much more frequent use of the victimization series was reported by those submitting grant applications which this office receives. There was a great need within the Career Criminal Program for the type of criminal history, offenderbased statistics, and recidivism studies called for in the 1968 Needs Study.

# 1. Management and Administration Groups

# 2. National Priority Programs

prior to the inception of the NCJISS series in 1972, there were no data available for analysis of programs

For other data and study needs, it was suggested that NCJISS discuss them with program personnel to determine whether NCJISS might assist more directly. This program needs data for specific areas and problems in addition to the national data which NCJISS now supplies.

Another respondent with research experience was much more critical of NCJISS contributions:

> the documents contain no analyses, are difficult to relate to programs which might be developed for classes of victims, and the NCJISS Statistics Division currently lacks appropriate disciplines or analytical experience to perform the required analyses.

His criticisms were directed at the documents rather than the data series; his interest was primarily in the victimization series. His assessment is stronger but consistent with the comments from the non-LEAA researchers and analysts interviewed.

# 3. Regional Operations

In the Office of Regional Operations, few of those responsible for review of grant applications used the documents. Other sources of data were of more value in determining the population served by the grant; the crime rates for comparable cities; and the size and nature of the criminal justice system being served. Expenditure data were of some value to the law enforcement component, but the data were out of date and had to be extrapolated to current years to be used.

Victimization data have had few direct uses within the Office of Regional Operations to date, but the Program, Planning, Analysis, and Coordination Division expected them to play an important part in the evaluation of the Impact Cities Program. This Division reported monthly uses of expenditure and employment reports, agency directories, and the Sourcebook. The reports are used at least monthly in the development of regional characteristics which help determine regional allocations of funds. The Division also reported that all of the Impact and Pilot Cities' reports received do use UCR data, demographic data, local government data, and victimization studies in their analyses.

The staff of the Program, Planning, Analysis, and Coordination Division of the Office of Regional Operations is concerned with the staffing and functioning of LEAA regional offices. It makes use yearly of the general

5-12

reports on employment and expenditures and on criminal justice agencies. The latter are of particular value to this staff. Victimization data are not used because the level of aggregation is too general for regional program planning; the UCR's are used instead when crime information is needed. This Office also needs more court data (e.g., volume, backlog, personnel, lapsed time in detention) which the judicial information systems should help to provide. Although the Office has used some NCJISS data extensively, there was a complaint: "NCJISS has a technician's viewpoint and not a planner's view." A general expression of need from the three staff members interviewed was for more interplay between NCJISS and the planning staffs. They report that there has been some improvement in this in the past few months.

4. National Institute Components

3r

It was expected that personnel in the Office of Research and Programs wculd be frequent users of NCJISS documents, but this expectation was not entirely realized. In the corrections component, the prisoner statistics were used for general knowledge and historical reference and they were being handed out to professional researchers with corrections interests. "They contain great benchmark data." Benchmark data from NCJISS was good "when we were in the dark." But now they have better ideas of their needs and classes of data which are important to them. The courts component was using several documents for needs analysis and general knowledge, but the National Survey of Court Organization was not particularly useful; data from research project surveys had been providing inputs for program planning. This Office had had minimal input into the preparation of the NCJISS statistical series. Although appropriate documents were being used in the three National

Institute offices or by their researchers, individuals expressed strong needs to be more involved in the design of surveys which bear on their areas of concern. They did not expect to depend on NCJISS for all benchmark and problem definition data. They would like to have NCJISS consider their needs when new or revised surveys are being considered. 5. JJDP Operations

Unlike other offices visited in LEAA, the research and program areas in Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) were collocated and appeared to be closely coordinated. Coordination apparently occurred in part

secause of lessons learned from lack of coordination between research and programs in other parts of LEAA. The research and program managers reported that ccoperation from NCJISS has been good and that they are able to influence the design of series directly related to the juvenile justice area. The document Children in Custody was being used frequently in need assessments and in planning research and programs; its design was in response to specific needs expressed by the Office to the NCJISS Statistics Division. This was the best example throughout the survey of a well-used document which resulted from a positive consumer-producer relationship prior to the design of the series. The Office desires and expects this to be a continuing relationship as needs change.

Other documents produced by NCJISS were less relevant to the operations of the Office, but they were being retained and each has been reviewed at least once. The victimization data supplied the conclusion that "juveniles are victims as well as offenders," but the series is not of continuing use in its present form. Expenditures and employment and criminal justice agency documents were of no use because they do not disclose information relevant to juvenile programs. The UCR's are used frequently.

Researchers were particularly interested in the development of Juvenile Offender-Based Transaction Systems and were actively participating with NCJISS in the review and development of this capability. This may have contributed to the finding (chapter 4) that juvenile corrections information systems appear to have developed more rapidly in recent years than adult systems have.

# C. Conclusions

It is concluded from the interviews within LEAA headquarters personnel that the uses of NCJISS documents and data series range from daily to onetime only, depending on the document and on the office needs.

The victimization series was considered "a gold mine" by several of those interviewed. However, those most supportive of its value were most critical of its present documentation. Without exception, those interviewed believed that the victimization survey was needed and that the collection procedures were sound. The major complaints were that data were not analyzed to draw out implications for research and program planning and that the tables in the documents do not show classifications which would be of most interest

5-14

to the receivers. Unlike those in the non-LEAA federal offices who can obtain detailed survey data for analysis, the LEAA offices have obtained only the documents. The LEAA personnel do not see themselves as data analysts. There were definite recommendations that the NCJISS Statistics Division increase its capability to perform special analyses, that the Division change the routine tabulations to bring them more in line with LEAA programs, and that details be negotiated with both the researchers and program managers in a particular area. The expenditure and employment data were being used occasionally in all other offices and frequently in the Office of Regional Operations. There were some complaints that the data were very out of date--did not cover the recent years of high inflation and rapidly rising expenditures on criminal justice. Regional breakdowns were requested. The documents listing criminal justice agencies were being used infre-

quently by the LEAA offices, except the Office of Regional Operations. The corrections documents, except for Children in Custody, were most useful only as benchmarks when the series were initiated. Studies by NCJISS or its consultants showing trends and significant changes of relevance to LEAA corrections programs would be well received. Changes in the format or data elements to show more specifics would make the documents more useful. The specifics would need to be worked out with corrections document users, particularly in research offices.

The one court document was being used infrequently as a general reference.

D. Recommendations

. .

The conclusions drawn from interviews with LEAA personnel led to four recommendations for improving the producer-consumer relationships and the Division's statistics capabilities and services.

1. Increase Liaison It is recommended that the Division increase its liaison with LEAA research and program offices so that it can increase the relevance of its documents to the needs of the Offices. 2. Increase Analytical Capability

It is recommended that the Division be allocated an increase in the analytical resources of its staff so that it can increase the number and quality of its analytical studies in support of LEAA policy and program design. This may be through increased staff and/or consultant assistance.

# 3. Make Data Available for Special Analyses

It is recommended that the Division continue with its plans to make all data from the statistical series easily available for special analyses, that the procedures for performing special studies be well publicized, and that the Division perform these services for LEAA and non-LEAA offices that have no analytical capability available to them.

# 4. Produce Up-to-Date Documents

It is recommended that the Division review its procedures for producing documents -- in the expenditures and employment series and the criminal justice agency series in particular -- to insure that the documents are as current and timely as good management will permit.

# V. STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

To determine the extent to which state and local criminal justice agencies have been effectively served by NCJISS-produced statistics, the producer-consumer relationships\* were evaluated by analyzing Form D personnel interview data on the reasons for use and nonuse of NCJISS documents.

# A. Interview Procedure

Within the selected states (page 3-7), interviews were held with 366 state and local agency personnel. These people were considered potential respondents because they were analysts, administrators, operators, or users of information systems (chapter 4). However, it was not known in advance whether they were or were not recipients of the 23 NCJISS and 1 UCR documents listed on pages 5-5 and 5-6. During interviews with the 366, RTI and MRI interviewers determined whether the interviewees were either receiving one or more of the 24 documents or performing functions which might logically be assisted by statistics contained in the documents. Unless it was obvious that neither was true, a Form D (appendix A) was shown to the person to determine if he had any knowledge or interest in the documents listed therein. Unless the person disclaimed all knowledge or interest, a form was completed by the interviewer with the information volunteered by the interviewee. In a few cases, the interviewee asked that the form be left with him to

\*The Statistics Division had reported no significant contact between its personnel and personnel of state and local agencies, and the agencies interviewed had agreed with the Division's assessment.

5-16

be mailed later to RTI or MRI. Of the 366 interviewees, 95 persons contributed to the preparation In the tables which report the results of the analysis, each of

of Form D's. Because the interviews were often with agency personnel in groups of two or more, comments from the 95 persons interviewed about their use of NCJISS documents were summarized on only 55 forms. An additional six forms were received from five persons in North Carolina and one in Mississippi, thus six of the 61 total Form D's (101 persons) used in the analysis were from the conference attending states. the 61 Form D's will be referred to as a single "respondent," even though more than one person is represented by some of the forms. A "response" in the tables will refer to a single comment about a single document or document series.

# B. Findings

the documents but would not give either purpose for use or reason for the tables which follow.

Table 5-2 shows the frequency with which documents are held by federal, state, and local respondents. The UCR police report series was reported on 65 percent of the completed forms. The most frequently reported general and victimization reports were the Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics (57%), Expenditure and Employment Data (56%), and Crime in the

Table 5-1 shows some of the summary characteristics of the 61 forms. Twenty-five of the 61 were obtained in California and Missouri, which are states with much more than average experience in criminal justice information systems and statistics services. An average of 10 out of the 24 documents on Form D were reported as received by the 61 respondents. In some cases the respondent would indicate that he had one or more of

nonuse for the specific documents. Reasons for use were given on 47 (77 percent) of the respondent forms and reasons for nonuse were given by 36 (60 percent) of the respondents. Each respondent who gave use or nonuse reasons was allowed to give more than one reason for each document. Thus, the number of responses will be greater than the number of respondents in

# 1. Documents Most Frequently Held

# Table 5-2.

# Table 5-1. USE AND NONUSE RESPONSES OF STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

AGENCY	Number of Form D's	Average Number of Documents	•	Number of H with at lea Indicatio	Number of Form D's with at least one Indication of		
LOCATION	Completed	Received		Nonuse	Use		
California	15	7.9		10	14		
Missouri	10	9.1		7	• 7		
Louisiana	6	8.5		4 ·	2		
Illinois	5	13.8		2	4		
Florida	5	13.0	•	2	4		
N. Carolina	5	11.2		4	5		
Texas	5	6.2		1	· 3		
N. Jersey	4	14.8		4	3		
Montana	3	10.0		1	2		
Maine	2	14.5	•	1	2		

# THE WEITER UND NOTION

Nation's Five Largest Cities (52%). The victimization and general classes tended to be more widely held than courts and corrections. The smaller number holding the corrections reports and the court report occurred because fewer coults and corrections agencies were included in the sample.

1.0

(10.0)

# 2. Respondent Classes Using Documents

1

61

Mississippi

All States

As suggested by the above distribution of reports held, there was unequal representation of respondents in the police, courts, corrections, and planning components of the criminal justice system in the data base. Classes of respondents are shown in table 5-3.

The police respondents were concentrated in large cities; they use crime data to assist in operational decisions. Primary users of UCR and victimization series (if it covers their particular city) often hold other reports but make little use of them. Courts and corrections personnel use the reports primarily for general reference. The planners, who made up the largest number of respondents, tended to receive and hold almost all of the documents either

# CLASS AND SHORT NAME\*

# General

47

0

36

ند نړ

- 1. Sourcebook of Cr Expenditure and 2. Criminal Justice 3. Criminal Justice 4.
- Criminal Justice 5.
- Historical Stati 6.

# Victimization

- Crime in the Nat 1.
- Criminal Victimi 2.
- Crimes and Victi 3. Criminal Victimi 4
- Crime in Eight A 5.
- Criminal Victimi 6.
- San Jose Methods 7.

# Police

1. Uniform Crime Re 2. Comparative Data

# Corrections

- Children in Cust 1.
- 2. Capital Punishme 3.
- Census of State Survey of Inmate 4.
- Prisoners in Sta 5.
- Local Jails . . 6.
- The Nation's Jai 7. 1970 National Ja 8.

# Courts

- 1. National Survey
- \*Complete names and i
- as being received.

NCJISS DOCUMENTS AND DATA SERIES RECEIVED BY STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

	Agen Recip	icy ients**
	No.	%
		· ·
minal Justice Statistics	35	57
Imployment Data	34	56
Agencies in (each LEAA Region)	30	49
Agencies in the United States	25	41
Agencies in (each state)	23	38
tics on Expenditures and Employment	18	30
	• • • •	
anla Time Lancash Citiz	20	50
on s rive Largest Citles	32	52
ation Surveys in 13 American Citles	31	51
is Dayton-San Jose Pilot Survey	28	46
ation in the United States	28	46
erican Cities	25	41
ation Five Largest Cities	25	41
		•
		· · · ·
Anto (FPT)	39	64
JOILS (IDI)		* ~
Report	6	T0
Report	6	10
Report ody	6 28 26	10 46 43
Ady Ady At Correctional Facilities 1974	6 28 26 25	46 43 41
Ady Ady At Correctional Facilities, 1974	6 28 26 25 22	46 43 41 36
Ady Ady At A of Local Jails, 1972 A of Local Jails, 1972	6 28 26 25 22 22	46 43 41 36 36
Ady Ady At Correctional Facilities, 1974 For f Local Jails, 1972 See and Federal Institutions County and City Jails	6 28 26 25 22 22 22	46 43 41 36 36 34
A Report on the Census of Tails	6 28 26 25 22 22 21 21	46 43 41 36 36 34 34
Report Ady at Correctional Facilities, 1974 a of Local Jails, 1972 a and Federal Institutions County and City Jails as: A Report on the Census of Jails 1 Cansus	6 28 26 25 22 22 21 21 19	46 43 41 36 36 34 34
Report Ady At Correctional Facilities, 1974 a of Local Jails, 1972 d and Federal Institutions County and City Jails .s: A Report on the Census of Jails .1 Census	6 28 26 25 22 21 21 19	46 43 41 36 36 34 34 31
Report Ady At Correctional Facilities, 1974 a of Local Jails, 1972 a and Federal Institutions County and City Jails A Report on the Census of Jails 1 Census	6 28 26 25 22 21 21 19	46 43 41 36 36 34 34 31
Report Report Ody It Correctional Facilities, 1974 of Local Jails, 1972 is and Federal Institutions County and City Jails s: A Report on the Census of Jails 1 Census	6 28 26 25 22 21 21 19	46 43 41 36 36 34 34 31
Report Ady Adv Adv Adv Adv Adv Adv Adv Adv	6 28 26 25 22 21 21 19	46 43 41 36 36 34 34 31

\*\*Number and percentage of the 61 Form D's on which the documents were listed

Table 5-3. CLASSES OF RESPONDENTS IN STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

	Agency Component								
CIRCLO OF RESTORDERS	Planning	Police	Courts	Corrections	Total				
Planner or administrator	15	4	4	2	e 25				
System operator	2	11	5	2	20				
Researcher or analyst	<u>10</u>	3		<u>_3</u>	<u>16</u>				
	27	18	9	7	61				

\*Each form is called a "respondent," but 101 individuals participated.

in their offices or in a nearby depository for general knowledge and historical references.

# 3. Responses Describing Use

When any of the 61 respondents stated that he had received one of the documents, he was asked to indicate the purpose for which the document was used. Twelve types of use were developed to categorize the user's responses. The results of this inquiry into document uses are presented in summary in table 5-4 and for each document class and individual document series in table 5-5.

Table 5-4 shows that the most frequent use of all of the documents is for "reference" or historical purposes. This use represented 44.3 percent of the respondents and 23.7 percent of the responses. Table 5-5 shows "reference" to be the leading use response for each class of document and for almost every individual document. It is followed in frequency by the similarly unspecific use class of "general knowledge." These results are in agreement with the general comments received by the interviewers and reported in a later section. Those interviewed normally informed the RTI and MRI interviewers that the documents are received, scanned for general knowledge, and placed on a shelf for later reference. The other type-of-use categories in table 5-5 are an indication of the types of later reference that were made.

TYPE OF USE  $\frac{1}{}$ 

÷ 4

Reference General Knowledge Planning Evaluation Needs Analysis Methodology Grant Application

Standards

Administration

Operations

Other

# TOTAL Responses

Some Use Given No Use Given

TOTAL Respondents

more purposes for use.

5-20

Resp	ondents	Respo	mses
Number of Users <sup>2/</sup>	Úsers as % of 61 Respondents	Frequency of <u>3</u> / Responses	Percent of Responses
27	44.3%	150	23.7%
12	19.7	109	17.2
24	39.3	89	14.1
20	32.8	67	10.6
8	13.1	56	8.9
19	31.1	51	8.1
10	16.4	35	5.5
7	11.5	30	4.7
9	13.1	17	2.7
4	6.6	16	2.6
11	8.0	12	1.9
n.a.	n.a.	632 •	100.0%
47	77.0%		
14	23.0		
61	100.0%		

Table 5-4. SUMMARY OF TYPES OF USES OF NCJISS AND UCR DOCUMENTS

1/ -- These are short titles of categories given in full on Form D, appendix A.  $\frac{2}{A}$  user is a respondent who holds one or more documents and provided one or

 $\frac{3}{4}$  A response is a single purpose for use of one document.

$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$									TYPE	OF RESPC	NOFO	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Class and Short-Name         Users         Werrs         Refer-         Knob-         Pilat         Werlds         Mothon         Infinition         Analysis         dology         Grant         ards         tion         Difter         Reep           PULCE AND COURT         1         1         1         2         1         1         2         1         1         2         1         1         2         1         1         2         1         1         2         1         1         2         1         1         2         1         1         2         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1	•	Res	sponde	nts		General				Se	Apply	<b>.</b>	Admin-			
PULCE AND COUNT.       32       7       12       8       12       14       8       6       6       4       3       4       5         1. Uniform Crime Report       32       7       12       8       12       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       1       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	lass and Short Name	Users	5	Non- Users	Refer- ence	Know- ledge	plan- ning	Evalu- ation	Needs Analysis	dology	for Grant	ards	istra- tion	Opera- tions	Other	Total Respons
1. Uniform Crime Report       32       7       12       8       12       14       8       6       6       4       3       4       5         2. Comparative Data       10       5       5       4       3       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       1       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	ULICE AND COURT .							······				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				·····
2. Comparative Data       3       3       2       1       1       2         3. Gourd Organizations       10       5 $\frac{4}{3}$ $\frac{2}{2}$ 1       1       2         Class Total       17       14       16       16       9       8       6       6       5       4       5         EMERAL       .       .       Source Organizations       25       9       6       5       7       6       3       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       3       2       3       3       2       3       3       2       3       3       2       3       3       3       3       3       3       2       3       3       2       3       3       3       2       3       3       3       2       3       3       3       2       3       3       3       3       3       3       3	. Uniform Crime Report	32		7	12	8	12	14	8	6	6	4	3	4	5	82
3. Court Organizations       10       5       5       4       3       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 </td <td>. Comparative Data</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>· 1</td> <td></td> <td>2</td> <td>· .</td> <td>•</td> <td></td> <td>6</td>	. Comparative Data	3		3		2	1			· 1		2	· .	•		6
Class Total       17       14       16       16       9       8       6       6       3       4       5       1         ENERAL       .       Sourcebook       25       10       15       5       5       6       4       1       3       1       3       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       3       2       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	. Court Organizations	10		5	5	_4	3	_2	1	1				· · ·		_16
GENERAL       25       10       15       5       6       4       1       3       4       1       3         1. Sourcebook       25       9       6       5       7       6       3       3       2       2         2. C.J. Agencies-Region       20       10       11       5       3       1       3       1       1         3. C.J. Agencies-US.       26       9       8       4       1       2       1       1       1       1         5. C.J. Agencies-US.       26       9       8       4       1       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 <t< td=""><td>Class Total</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>17</td><td>14</td><td>16</td><td>16</td><td>9</td><td>8</td><td>6</td><td>6</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>104</td></t<>	Class Total				17	14	16	16	9	8	6	6	3	4	5	104
1. Sourcebook       25       10       15       5       5       6       4       1       3       4       1       3         2. Expen./Empl. Data       25       9       6       5       7       6       3       3       3       2       3       2       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       2       3       2       3       2       3       2       2       3       4       1       3       4       1       3       4       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 <td>ENERAL</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>· ·</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 19</td> <td></td> <td></td>	ENERAL				· ·									1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 19		
2.       Expent/Empl. Data       25       9       6       5       7       6       3       3       3       2       3       2       2       2         1. C.J. Agencies-Region       20       10       11       5       3       3       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       <	Sourcebook	25		10	15 .	5	5	6	4	1	3	4	1	3		47
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Expen /Fmpl Dara	25		9	6	5	7	6	1	3	3	2	3	2	2	42
A. C.J. Agencies LED.       Let       L	C I Agencies-Region	20		10	11	5	3	· .	ĩ	ž	-	-	1	-	1	25
C. J. Agencies-State       14       9       9       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 <th1< th=""></th1<>	C 1 Agunatos-II S	26		0	8	1	- 1	2	1	1	, A. 1		*		1	1.6
C. C. A generics state       14       9       9       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 </td <td>C.I. Agencies-0.3.</td> <td>14</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>1</td> <td>· · •</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>.1</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td>10</td>	C.I. Agencies-0.3.	14		0	0	4	1	1	· · •	3	1		.1		1	10
0. historical Exp./Empl.       9       3       4       3       2       1       2       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 <th1< th="">       1       1       <th1< t<="" td=""><td>U.J. Agencies-Scare</td><td>14</td><td></td><td>9</td><td>2</td><td>Ţ</td><td>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,</td><td>· 1.</td><td>· .</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td></td><td>7</td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td></th1<></th1<>	U.J. Agencies-Scare	14		9	2	Ţ	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	· 1.	· .	2	2		7		1	
Class Total       52       24       20       20       10       13       9       7       7       6       7         DORRECTIONS       1.       Children in Custody       17       9       9       7       4       5       2       1       2       1       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	. Historical Exp./Empi.	9		9.		4			<u>ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ</u>			·	<u> </u>		<u></u>	
Jornel Filons         1. Children in Custody       17       9       9       7       4       5       2       2       1         2. Survey of Inmates       13       9       5       6       2       2       3       2       1       1         3. St./Fed. Prisoners       12       10       9       4       4       5       1       3       1       2       2       1         3. St./Fed. Prisoners       12       10       9       4       4       5       1       3       1       2       2       1       1         5. Facilities Census       12       13       7       5       3       3       1       2       1       1       1         5. Gapital Punishment       12       14       6       5       3       2       1       1       1       1         7. tocal Jails       11       10       2       4       6       2       4       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	Class Total	1.1.1			52	24	20	20	10	13	. 9	7	7.	7.	6	17:
1. Children in Custody       17       9       9       7       4       5       2       2       1         2. Survey of Innates       13       9       5       6       2       2       3       1       1         2. Survey of Innates       13       9       5       6       2       2       3       1       1         2. Survey of Innates       13       9       5       6       2       2       3       1       1         3. St./Fed. Prisoners       12       10       9       4       4       5       1       3       1       2       1       1         5. Facilities Census       12       13       7       5       3       3       1       2       1       1       1         5. Capital Punishment       12       14       6       5       3       2       1       1       1       1         7. tocal Jaits       11       10       2       4       6       2       2       3       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1<	ORRECTIONS								14	-					•	
2. Survey of Inmates       13       9       5       5       6       2       2       3       2       3       1       1         1. St./Fed. Prisoners       12       10       9       4       4       5       1       3       1       2       2       1       1         1. The Nation's Jails       12       9       6       5       5       2       2       3       2       1       1         5. Facilities Census       12       13       7       5       3       3       1       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 </td <td>. Children in Custody</td> <td>17</td> <td></td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>7</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3</td>	. Children in Custody	17		9	9	7	4	5	2	2		1				3
B. St./Fed. Prisoners       12       10       9       4       4       5       1       3       1       2       2       1         A. The Nation's Jails       12       9       6       5       5       2       3       2       1       1         S. Facilities Census       12       13       7       5       3       3       1       2       1       1       1         S. Gapital Punishment       12       14       6       5       3       2       1       1       1       1         J. tocal Jails       11       10       2       4       6       2       4       2       3       1       1       1         J. bocal Jails       11       10       2       4       6       2       4       2       2       3       1       1         J. bocal Jails       11       10       2       4       5       1       2       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	. Survey of Inmates	13		9.1	5	5	6	2	2	.3	2	3	1	1		30
4. The Nation's Jails       12       9       6       5       5       2       2       3       2       1       1         5. Facilities Census       12       13       7       5       3       3       1       2       1       2       1       1         6. Capital Punishment       12       14       6       5       3       2       1       1       1       1         7. tocal Jails       11       10       2       4       6       2       4       2       3       1       1         8. Nat. Jail Census       9       10       1       4       5       1       2       2       1       2       1       1       1         Class Total       45       39       36       22       14       18       9       17       7       5       1       2         VICTINIZATION       1       4       5       7       2       1       4       2       1       .       2       1       .       14       14       5       7       2       3       2       1       .       .       2       .       .       .       1       1 </td <td>. St./Fed. Prisoners</td> <td>12</td> <td></td> <td>10</td> <td>. 9</td> <td>4</td> <td>.4</td> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>1</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>3:</td>	. St./Fed. Prisoners	12		10	. 9	4	.4	5	1	3	1	2	2	1		3:
5. Facilities Census       12       13       7       5       3       3       1       2       1       2       1       1         6. Capital Punishment       12       14       6       5       3       2       1       1       1       1         7. bocal Jails       11       10       2       4       6       2       4       2       2       3       1       1         7. bocal Jails       11       10       2       4       6       2       4       2       2       3       1       1         8. Nat. Jail Census       9       10       1       4       5       1       2       2       1       2       1       2       1       1         8. Nat. Jail Census       9       10       1       4       5       1       2       2       1       2       1       2       1       1         0. Class Total	. The Nation's Jails	12		9	6	5	5	2	2	3	2	3	1	1		30
A. Instruction formula       I.2       I.4       I.6       5       3       2       1       1       1       1         6. Capital Punishment       12       14       6       5       3       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	Facilities Census	12		13	7	5	3	3		2	1	2	1	1 .		20
11       11       10       2       4       6       2       4       2       2       3       1       1         8. Nat. Jail       Class Total       9       10       1       4       5       1       2       2       1       2       1       1         Class Total       45       39       36       22       14       18       9       17       7       5       1       2         Class Total       45       39       36       22       14       18       9       17       7       5       1       2         VICTIMIZATION       4       5       7       2       1       4       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       3       2       1       3       2       1       <	Conital Punishment	12		14	6	5	3	2	-	1	. –	1	-	- · .	1	10
11       10       1       10       1       10       1       10       1       10       1       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10       10<	theal laile	- 11		10	2		6	2		2	. 2	3	,	3	-	2
6. Nat. Jail Census       9       10       1       4       3       1       2       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1 <th1< th="">       1       <th1< th=""></th1<></th1<>	Net wil Concus	11		10		7	с . с	. 1		2	1	- J - J	1			10
Class Total       45       39       36       22       14       18       9       17       7       5       1       2         VICTIMIZATION         1. Dayton-San Jose Pilot       15       13       5       7       2       1       4       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       2       1       1       2       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1       1	. Nat. Jail Census	. 9		TO	<u> </u>	_4		<u>_</u>	<u></u>		-		<u> </u>	÷	· · · · ·	
VICTIMIZATION         1. Dayton-San Jose Pilot       15       13       5       7       2       1       4       2       1         2. Victimization-13 Cities       15       16       5       3       2       1       5       3       2         3. Victimization-U.S.       14       14       5       7       2       2       3       2       2         3. Victimization-U.S.       14       14       5       7       2       2       3       2       2         4. Victimization-5 Cities       13       12       5       4       4       2       2       1       2         5. Crime in 5 Cities       11       21       7       2       3       2       4       1       2         6. San J. Methods Test       11       9       4       5       1       3       2       1         7. Crime in 8 Cities       10       15       5       4       3       1       2       1       1         Class Total       36       32       17       9       23       12       11       16       12         6 of Total Papapapapapapapapapapapapapapapapapapap	Class Total	•			45	39	36	22	14	18	9	17	7	5	1	213
1. Dayton-San Jose Pilot       15       13       5       7       2       1       4       2       1         2. Victimization-13 Cities       15       16       5       3       2       1       5       3       2         3. Victimization-13.S.       14       14       5       7       2       2       3       2       2         3. Victimization-U.S.       14       14       5       7       2       2       3       2       2         4. Victimization-5 Cities       13       12       5       4       4       2       2       1       2         5. Crime in 5 Cities       11       21       7       2       3       2       1       2         6. San J. Methods Test       11       9       4       5       1       3       2       1         7. Crime in 8 Cities       10       15       5       4       3       1       2       1       1         Class Total       36       32       17       9       23       12       11       16       12         6. Star J. Paperamete       150       109       89       67       56       51	ICTIMIZATION		•													
2. Victimization-13 Cities       15       16       5       3       2       1       5       3       2         3. Victimization-U.S.       14       14       5       7       2       2       3       2       2         4. Victimization-U.S.       14       14       5       7       2       2       3       2       2         4. Victimization-5 Cities       13       12       5       4       4       2       2       1       2         5. Crime in 5 Cities       11       21       7       2       3       2       4       1       2         6. San J. Methods Test       11       9       4       5       1       3       2       1         7. Crime in 8 Citles       10       15       5       4       3       1       2       1       1         Class Total       36       32       17       9       23       12       11       4         7       150       109       89       67       56       51       35       30       17       16       12	. Dayton-San Jose Pilot	15		13	5	7	2	1	4	°. 2'	1	•				
3. Victimization-U.S.       14       14       5       7       2       2       3       2       2         4. Victimization-5 Cities       13       12       5       4       4       2       2       1       2         5. Crime in 5 Cities       11       21       7       2       3       2       4       1       2         6. San J. Methods Test       11       9       4       5       1       3       2       1         7. Crime in 8 Cities       10       15       5       4       3       1       2       1       1         Class Total       36       32       17       9       23       12       11         Total by Type       150       109       89       67       56       51       35       30       17       16       12	. Victimization-13 Cities	15		16	5	3	2	.1	5	3	2					2.
4. Victimization-5 Cities       13       12       5       4       4       2       2       1       2         5. Crime in 5 Cities       11       21       7       2       3       2       4       1       2         5. Grime in 5 Cities       11       21       7       2       3       2       4       1       2         6. San J. Methods Test       11       9       4       5       1       3       2       1         7. Crime in 8 Cities       10       15       5       4       3       1       2       1       1         Class Total       36       32       17       9       23       12       11         Fotal by Type       150       109       89       67       56       51       35       30       17       16       12	. Victimization-U.S.	14		14	5	7	2	2	3	2	2.					2.
5. Crime in 5 Cities       11       21       7       2       3       2       4       1       2         6. San J. Methods Test       11       9       4       5       1       3       2       1         7. Crime in 8 Cities       10       15       5       4       3       1       2       1       1         Class Total       36       32       17       9       23       12       11         Ctal by Type       150       109       89       67       56       51       35       30       17       16       12	. Victimization-5 Cities	13		12	5	4	4	2	2	1	2					- 21
6. San J. Methods Test       11       9       4       5       1       3       2       1         7. Crime in 8 Cities       10       15       5       4       3       1       2       1       1         Class Total       36       32       17       9       23       12       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11       11	. Crime in 5 Cities	11		21	7	2	3		4	ĩ	2	e de la composición d		•		
Crime in 8 Citles     10     15     5     4     3     1     2     1       Class Total     36     32     17     9     23     12     11       Total by Type     150     109     89     67     56     51     35     30     17     16     12	San I. Mothode Test	11		- 0	4	5	1			2	No. 1					. 14
Class Total       10       15 $\frac{1}{5}$ $\frac{1}{4}$ $\frac{1}{5}$ $\frac{1}{12}$ $\frac{1}{1}$ $\frac{1}{1}$ $\frac{1}{1}$ Class Total $\frac{36}{150}$ $\frac{32}{109}$ $\frac{17}{9}$ $\frac{23}{12}$ $\frac{1}{12}$ $\frac{1}{12}$ Iotal by Type $\frac{150}{150}$ $\frac{109}{109}$ $\frac{89}{67}$ $\frac{67}{56}$ $\frac{51}{51}$ $\frac{35}{30}$ $\frac{17}{16}$ $\frac{12}{12}$	Crime in 8 Cities	10		15	5		2	1	2	2	1					. Li
Class Total $36$ $32$ $17$ $9$ $23$ $12$ $11$ Iotal by Type $\overline{150}$ $\overline{109}$ $\overline{89}$ $\overline{67}$ $\overline{56}$ $\overline{51}$ $\overline{35}$ $\overline{30}$ $\overline{17}$ $\overline{16}$ $\overline{12}$	. Crime In a cilles	10	1.5	· · ·			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		· • • • •			
Total by Type 150 109 89 67 56 51 35 30 17 16 12 6	Class Total			•	36	32	17	9	23	12	<. <u>11</u> -240	2 				<u>j</u> 14
	otal by Type of Total Responses	·		· · ·	150	109	89	67	56	51	35	30	17	16	12	63

3.25

Table 5-5

1

Table 5-4 shows that the most frequent uses other than "reference" and "general knowledge" are "planning," "evaluation," "needs analysis," and "methodology." Nearly 40 percent of the 61 respondents indicate that they use the documents for one or more of these purposes. It can be seen in table 5-5 that the UCR is the most popular document for these purposes. The next most popular in this respect are the Expenditure and Employment Data series and the Sourcebook.

....

Respondents who had received one or more documents were also asked to state reasons, if any, why the documents were not used. Nonuse reasons were given by 36 of the 61 respondents. Their nonuse reasons are summarized in table 5-6 and given for each document in table 5-7.

Table 5-5 also shows the number of users for each document and the nonusers. In this table, a nonuser is a recipient of a document (see table 5-2) who gave no purpose for use of the document. Note that 32 of the 39 recipients of the UCR gave at least one use for the document series. In contrast, only 11 of 32 recipients of Crime in the Nation's Five Largest Cities report any use for the document, and only 14 of 28 recipients of Criminal Victimization in the United States report a use. The Sourcebook and the Expenditure and Employment Data series are fairly well used by those receiving them and the types of use are varied. The "corrections" class of documents is less widely received by those interviewed; but it appears from the responses that they receive infrequent, but above average, use in "evaluation," "planning," and "standards" development.

The general pattern of use to be derived from the tables is best illustrated by the Sourcebook. Of the 23 documents distributed by NCJISS, this is the most widely received and used by the 61 groups of respondents (101 persons). It is received by 35 and used by 25. Out of 47 responses, 20 of the uses were "reference" and "general knowledge," 11 were "planning," and "evaluation," and the remaining 16 are spread over six types of use. All other NCJISS documents are either less often received, have fewer users, and/or have fewer total responses as to type of use.

# 4. Responses Describing Nonuse

# Table 5-6. SUMMARY OF NONUSE REASONS GIVEN

	Res	pondents	Responses 3/				
TYPE OF NONUSE $\frac{1}{2}$	Number of Nonusers	Nonusers as % of Respondents <u>2</u> /	Frequency of Response	Percent of Responses			
Not Applicable	18	29.5%	85	36.8%			
No Time Available	10	10.4	31	13.4			
Too General	8	13.1	28	12.1			
Out of Date	8	13.1	20	8.7			
Bad Presentation	4	6.6	12	5.2			
Incomplete	3	4.9	11	4.8			
No Use Suggestions	2	3.3	10	4.3			
Inaccurate	5	7.2	8	3.5			
Unreliable	2	3.3	7	3.0			
New Agency	· · · 1	1.6	4	1.7			
Not Interpretive	1	1.6	. 4	1.7			
No Trend Data	0	0	0	0			
Other	4	6.6		_4.8_			
TOTAL Responses	n.a	n.a.	231	100.0%			
Some Nonuse Given	36	59.0%					
No Nonuse Given	25	41.0					
TOTAL Respondents	61	100.0% ·		•			

¥ #

P

 $\frac{1}{2}$  These are short titles of categories given in full on Form D, appendix A.

 $\frac{2}{A}$  nonuser in this table is a holder of one or more documents who gives one or more reasons for nonuse.

 $\frac{3}{A}$  response is a single reason for nonuse of one document. In a few cases the respondent gave a purpose for use and also gave reasons for nonuse. In these cases a "nonuse" response means that the respondent wished to record limitations on the usefulness of the document.



 $\mathcal{P}$ 

	· · · ·					. 4 ( 2 <sup>0</sup> ,															
0											-										
	•••	<u>na da na k</u> ulan ku	99197 (39. Ja Al	842-66 72.00024,50238.			9020088, 84-149-4994				, <sup>3</sup> , t	, , 1	•	1							
						Tab	1e 5-7														
		F	leasons f	or Nonus	e: C1	ven on	36 of t TYPE OF	the 61 R	espondent SES	Forms	and to be a sub-second second of		·····		1997 - 1977 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979 - 1979	-			·		
lass and Short Name	Respond- ents	Non- Respond- ents	Not - Appli- able	No Time	Too Gen- eral	Out of Dale	Bad Presen- tation	Incom- plete	No Use Sugges- tions	Inac- curate	Unre- liable	Not Inter- pretive	New Agency	Other	Total Responses	<b>i</b>	In some water to prove the		ч.		
ICTIMIZATION . Victimization-5 Citie . Victimization-13 Citi . Dayton-San Jose Pilot . Crime in 8 Cities . Crime in 5 Cities . SanJose Methods Test . Victimization-U.S. Class Totals	s 12 es 10 10 10 9 7 5	20 21 18 15 16 13 23	8 3 6 7 4 3 <u>2</u> 33	1 4 2 1 2 2 1 13	i 1 1 1 1 1 1 7	1			1	) 1 1 <u>1</u> 6	2 1 1 <u>1</u> 5		1 1 1 1 	$\frac{1}{1}$	16 12 11 10 11 7 <u>7</u> 74	- 					
ENERAL . C.J. Agencies-U.S. . C.J. Agencies-Region . C.J. Agencies-State . Historical Exp./Empl. . Expend/Empl. Data . Sourcebook Class Totals	10 10 8 10 9 9	15 20 15 8 25 26	6 5 4 6 <u>3</u> -28	2 4 1 2 9	1 1 1 2 3 9	3 3 4 1 1 3 15	1 1 1 1 5	1 2 2 5	2 1 <u>1</u> 5		<u>_1</u> 1			1 · 1 	15 14 13 11 11 13 77		10000000000000000000000000000000000000				۲. 
ORRECTIONS Capital Punishment Children in Custody Facilities Census St./Fed. Prisoners The Nation's Jails Local Jails Nat, Jail Census Survey of Inmates Class Totals	11 10 9 7 6 5 5 5 4	15 18 16 15 15 16 14 18	5 2 3 4 2 1 1 1 19	2 2 1 1 1 <u>1</u> 8	1 3 1 2 1 1 1 10	1 1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 6	1 1 1 1 5	1 2 1 1 	1 1 2		1 1 <u>1</u> 3	•	2 1 1 1 5	12 14 9 8 7 6 5 <u>5</u> 66				х 	* * * * *	
POLICE AND COURT L. UCR 2. Comparative Data 3. Court Organizations Class Totals Responses by Type 2 of Total Responses	3 2 5	36 4 10	$     \begin{array}{r}       2 \\       1 \\       \frac{2}{5} \\       \overline{85} \\       37z     \end{array} $	<u>1</u> 1. <u>31</u> 132	2 2 28 12%	1 1 20 9%	$ \begin{array}{c} 1\\ \underline{1}\\ 2\\ \overline{12}\\ 5\% \end{array} $	$\frac{1}{1}$ $\frac{1}{11}$ $52$	<del>10</del> 42	¥ 3%	1 7 3%	$\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{4}{2\%}}}$	<del>4</del> 2%	ГГ 52	4 4 6 14 23T					<b>%</b>	
					1									•		an a					
						⊊ στημαθεσι τ' δ 2004		*			2			о С				P. 2		ľ	· ·

Table 5-6 shows that "not applicable" for any purpose was by far the most frequent response and was given by the largest number of respondents. Table 5-7 shows that the "not applicable" response was the most frequent for all document classes and for almost all individual documents. For the most part, the respondents explained that they had an interest in the subject matter but could not apply the presented material to their problems.

The two nonuse reasons which follow "not applicable" are "no time available" and "too general." These two reasons are spread fairly well across all documents except the two Police documents. "Out or date" is applied much more often to the general class of documents than to any others. All other nonuse reasons are infrequent or widely scattered.

The general pattern which emerges is seen by contrasting the UCR report with all others. Only 3 of 39 recipients of UCR documents gave a reason for nonuse (table 5-7) while 32 of 39 gave specific purposes for use (table 5-5). Results for the victimization class show a high percentage of nonusers among the recipients, and also a high percentage of recipients give reasons for nonuse. It can be seen from these results--and from the comments which follow--that the UCR documents have acquired a degree of acceptance which has not yet been accorded to victimization documents. Documents in the general, corrections and court classes appear to have a level of acceptance which is little better than that of the victimization class.

5. Responses Indicating Data Needs

. . .

8

The respondents were asked: Are there other kinds of data which you could have used if they had been available? The majority of those who answered wanted:

- Data applicable to and accessible from the state and local levels; а.
- A capability for breaking down data into special categories; Ъ.
- A capability to compare their agency, city, or state with others с. having the same needs and resources;
- d. Data that define the costs, benefits, and manpower needs of the complex criminal justice system and that define the flow of adult and juvenile offenders through the system, with emphasis on parole, probation, and recidivism; and
- Help in using statistical data already available. e.

Some 13 respondents requested data of all kinds on a state or local level; most of these are planners and administrators in regional or state criminal justice planning agencies, but some are operational personnel in police, courts, and corrections agencies. Generally, the request was combined with a need for comparative data at these levels.

State or Local Data. The Chief of a large SAC component explained:

We don't want national data--we want data on the state level regarding other cities with the same laws and the same level of professionalization.

would like to see how his city compares with other cities in crimes and expenditures; (I also need) jail comparisons (and) judicial comparisons.

Often a request would include a statement that specific information was needed on a local level and that comparison should be possible. The Executive Director of a regional planning unit noted:

Along with the emphasis on data applicable to the state and local

level, the respondents wanted individual access to raw data and the capability to manipulate data into special subcategories.

Special Categories. Seven respondents requested particular breakdowns of information from the UCR's, as this comment by a statistical management analysis with a Department of Public Safety illustrates:

> We need UCR data that contains special breakdown for Spanish-surnamed Americans or Mexican national origin. We also need UCR data on age, sex, and race that is capable of being cross-tabulated; the present format prevents analysis.

Information and particular formats for court, corrections, juvenile offenders, and victimization each were requested by four to seven respondents. Six carried this idea further, citing a need for regional data libraries. A program analyst with a state Council on Criminal Justice and a statistical analysis center chief both noted a need for state statistical centers. The latter indicated that LEAA should set up central repositories of ideas and information and meeting places in which to gain experience in computer analysis of data.

The Commander of a Police Department's Data Processing Division

We need a city victimization study for eight or nine counties, but one for the city alone would be useful.

System Data. Eleven expressed needs for information on the costs and benefits of various programs and on manpower. Often this was mentioned as part of the desire for more information on a specific topic:

> We need information on state variances on how probation is administered (by courts, or by executive branch structure), on cost comparisons, and on caseload ratios. (Statistical management analyst, Department of Public Safety)

We need better cost data; current data are highly suspect. (Department of Youth Authority)

Thus requests for cost-benefit data were usually accompanied by an admonition that it should be more current and accurate.

Eight respondents desire information showing the flow or trend of offenders and criminal justice needs. As a statistician in a department of mental health and corrections explained,

> I would rather have simple flow data for whatever institution or program the report is on.

The senior planner with a state law enforcement planning agency wanted

more data on tracking adults and juveniles through the criminal justice system including extended followup for purposes of determining recidivism rates.

Five respondents mentioned need for various forms of information on courts. These needs were summed by the director of a circuit court judicial

administration:

We need information concerning the time it takes for presentence investigation following a plea of guilty or finding of guilty prior to sentencing; time spent in incarceration compared by types of sentences/crimes; caseloads of judges in court of unlimited jurisdiction by type of case similar to California's weighted caseload system.

Correction data, requested by seven respondents, spanned a wide spectrum from prison ricts, to parole and probation, to recidivism. A statistician for a state department of corrections, cited needs for:

> institutional problem patterns, types of custodial need, parole and probation, parole changing patterns, and type of support.

> > 5 - 28

Recidivism data were explicitly requested by five of the seven respondents. There were frequent requests for data on administration of parole and probation. The administrator in a government and public services unit of a law enforcement commission, elaborated:

> (We) need research and data on various alternative means of measuring criminal justice effectiveness other than through recidivism--for example, family stability, job placement and maintenance, community acceptance. Statistics must be structured to develop a positively based standard. Recidivism is only a negative concept, a measure of failure.

Juvenile Data. Juvenile criminal justice system information was cited

by six respondents. Again, such requests were accompanied by the desire for:

comparative statistics regarding juveniles in other states, and more extensive juvenile data at the individual state level. (Director of Operation, County Juvenile Court)

Others requested information on how criminal justice institutions deal with

juvenile offenders.

-

We need accurate reports on juvenile detention facilities and juvenile justice system probation statistics

notes the senior social research analyst in a department of juvenile authority. Use Suggestions. A need for standard statistical measures and consistent terminology was cited by about seven respondents. The chief of an adult corrections department in a small state reported:

It would be useful to have standardized (normalized) statistics which permit smaller states (to adjust) for large population differences. For example, we need a standard age/sex scoring system. This could permit comparisons with other cities, counties, and states with different population characteristics.

A statistical analyst with a department of police, noted that "consistency of reporting data (is) a major concern." Another observed that in his area of juvenile justice there are "no standard definitions for juveniles; e.g., juveniles versus youthful offenders."

Respondents felt hampered in their use (and possibly judgment) of

statistical reports:

. 2.

We lack time and a sophisticated data analysis mechanism. (Director of Planning, regional planning unit)

Two demanded better interpretation and analysis of data. Several suggested state or regional conferences and seminars to instruct users on the availability of statistical reports and their possible applications.

Other Data Needs. A lack of rapport with LEAA was mentioned by some respondents:

> regarding Criminal Victimization Surveys in 13 American Cities--LEAA issues a press release comparing the cities; however, in the document itself LEAA cautioned against such comparisons. Therefore, it became necessary for the Regional Planning Unit to calculate its own comparison in answer to the press release.

Other more sporadic requests were for data on women in crime, effectiveness of police teams, crisis intervention, and socioeconomic variables related to crime.

Respondents were asked: How and by whom do you think these data should be produced? A number of state and federal sources were proposed by 39 of the respondents. State agencies proposed by 15 of the 39 were the state government (8), state criminal justice planning agencies (2), state courts (2), state police (2), and SAC (1). LEAA was proposed by 14 of the 39; however, this total should be slightly discounted because LEAA was often noted grudgingly ("LEAA sounds as good as anyone else"). Some of the respondents undoubtedly thought of LEAA when answering the questions merely because they had just filled out a questionnaire on LEAA's statistical reports.

# C. Conclusions

The NCJISS documents were not being widely used within the state and local agencies interviewed. For the most part, the documents were received, scanned once, and placed on a shelf for later reference.

Planners and administrators in courts, corrections, and police reviewed all reports, and they used the data when they had no other source, but their needs were for specific data on their geographic and functional areas. Criminal justice planners in state agencies often use or (attempt to use) the documents to compare their states with others of similar demographic mix. When they are unable to accomplish this, they report dissatisfaction: data incomplete or the methods of tabulation inappropriate for their needs.

Researchers and analysts would like to have victimization data to use with crime statistics. Unless the victimization data are available by Most respondents were relatively unskilled in the techniques of data

state, local area, or region, they find them of no use. Analyses were most often performed with UCR data and locally compiled crime statistics. analysis; however, most had responsibilities related to the improvement of the criminal justice system. They need guidance and training. They would like for LEAA to perform the research and the statistical analyses with the national data series, to report the results relevant to state and local criminal justice agencies, and to provide technical assistance, workshops, methodology reports, and training programs to upgrade the analytical capability of the agencies.

# D. Recommendations

· . ..

From the findings and conclusions evolved three recommendations to help NCJISS improve its services to state and local agencies. 1. Develop a Program to Assist Agency Data Analyses

The capability to use criminal justice data in meaningful analyses has not kept pace with the developments of computerized systems for producing the data. There is nothing comparable to Project SEARCH to assist the SAC's and analysts in the functional agencies in advanced methods of analysis. The immediate need, however, is not for more advanced analytical methods but to prepare relatively straightforward examples of practical analyses for analysts in training sessions, workshops, and publications. As the CDS's (particularly OBTS/CCH) for the total criminal justice system of a state become more widely developed, there will be a need to advance the level of the training.

2. Increase the Division's Analytical Resources

The NCJISS Statistics Division should have a larger, analytically trained staff and additional consultant assistance. This increased capability needs to be used to draw from the data series inferences relevant to state and local criminal justice planning and analysis. If there are important lessons to be learned by the states from the victimization studies. the corrections and court data, and the general documents, these should be determined by analysis at the national level and reported to the states.

5-30

Many people within the state criminal justice agencies would like better definitions of problems and needs. Few have the time or the ability to perform the correlations, trend analyses, or other required special studies or have the raw data needed to make many of the more pertinent studies. Summary documents with the analyses included could replace the more bulky documents in some series. In others, the local analyses may need more detailed information from a series.

# 3. Continue NCJISS Plans for a Data Repository

Criminal justice data in the repository should be readily accessible to researchers and analysts in those states with advanced analytical capability.

# VI. DOCUMENT EVALUATION

Pertaining to aspects of criminal justice systems, 100 documents in 18 states were received for review. Of the 100, 47 were judged relevant to the evaluation of the impacts of LEAA-produced statistics on the state-produced statistical documents.

# A. Review Procedure

Prior to beginning their work with the documents, three judges (two from RTI and one from MRI) reviewed the purpose and meaning of each item in a rating form and agreed on the evaluative criteria for each item. Then the judges met to compare each of their ratings of three documents and to resolve any large discrepancies. Finally, the three judges independently rated and evaluated each of the 47 documents.

The Document Review Rating Form has three major components: first, a series of factual questions, next a series of questions which call for judges' evaluations, and finally a series of ratings that summarize the information and evaluations in the other questions.<sup>1</sup> The questions were designed to elicit information from the documents under review. For example, question 18 is: To what extent are the data in the document used to determine criminal justice system priorities as indicated in this document? In reality, much of the data may eventually be used to determine priorities. However, if use was not indicated, the judge gave a low rating. Thus, the judged quality of the document does not necessarily reflect the extent to which the documents influence the activities engaged in by the agency producing the document.

Conclusions

5.

(m)

With few exceptions, the judged quality of the documents reviewed and evaluated was not high.

The quality of documents referencing LEAA/UCR documents is higher than it is for documents not referencing LEAA/UCR documents.

The quality of documents referencing LEAA/UCR documents increases as the number of LEAA/UCR documents referenced increases.

For all documents reviewed, references to only LEAA documents (UCR excluded) occurred 19 percent of the time.

For all documents reviewed, some LEAA/UCR statistics were used in 38 percent of the documents.

Documents referencing LEAA/UCR sources and using LEAA/UCR statistics were judged to be of somewhat lower quality than documents referencing LEAA/UCR sources but not using LEAA/ UCR statistics.

Documents funded by LEAA were judged to be of higher quality than documents not funded by LEAA.

Detail of the analysis, tabulations of the findings, and explanations of the conclusions are in the RTI report mentioned above: An Evaluation of Selected Criminal Justice Departments and their Utilization of LEAA Statistical Documents and Data.1

The telephone survey which was requested by LEAA was completed at the end of February. Unfortunately, the finishing of this survey did not permit a complete analysis of the findings. The major findings and conclusions are summarized in this report and additional tables have been forwarded to the sponsor under separate cover.

A. Survey Procedure

5-32

The conclusions based on the document reviews and evaluations and highlighted in a separate RTI report have been excerpted and presented here.

. VII. TELEPHONE SURVEY

A probability sample of 300 subscribers to 10 of the NCJISS-produced statistical documents was selected to determine the extent of usage of these

documents among subscribers. The 300 were contacted by telephone and asked to respond to a questionnaire specifically designed to elicit responses pertaining to usage of these publications. The 300 were subdivided for analysis into three categories: university, commercial, and other. The "other" category is primarily composed of state and local personnel in police, courts, or corrections agencies. "Commercial" includes private security agencies, commercial police forces, and vendors of criminal justice products and services. "University" includes staff, students, and others such as librarians.

A sample of 50 of the 1,025 Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) institutions was chosen to obtain an estimate of the extent to which these potential users of NCJISS documents were in fact recipients and users. This survey was also conducted by telephone using a questionnaire specifically designed for this potential user group.

## Findings B. . .

A summary of the findings is presented here. Data are available in computer-ready form for additional analysis if it should be desired by the sponsor.

# 1. Subscriber List Survey

Of the 300 subscribers, there were 247 respondents, or a response rate of 82 percent. Out of this 247, there were 23 who had not received the NCJISS documents or could not remember having received them. The findings in the remainder of this section are based on the responses of 224 receivers. Each person was asked questions about the specific document which caused him to be selected from the list of subscribers. Then he was asked the same questions about one other of the 10 documents on the survey list. Because most had subscribed to more than one of the documents, the results are based on almost 448 possible document responses.

The result of the first substantive question is summarized in table 5-8. The percentages in the table add to more than 100 because the respondents were allowed to give more than one reason for being interested in the particular publication. For example, the reasons "research" and "classroom instruction" were very often paired in the responses. Thus, it appears that from 20 to 30 percent of the documents are used by subscribers in the university community in both "research" and "classroom instruction." The documents are also used fairly often by subscribers in commercial and other communities in either

5-34

# Üse Response

Was doing research on pro Needed for classroom inst I do crime analysis Just interested in subjec Other

"research" or "classroom instruction." About 25 percent of the university and the commercial users were "interested in the subject" but had made no particular use of the documents. The "other" category of respondents, which most closely corresponds to the group interviewed in site visits by RTI and MRI, had 41 percent of their responses as "interested in the subject." The lower use percentages in "crime analysis" and "research" are consistent with the findings reported earlier in this chapter.

Most of the responses did not fit into any of the categories approved by LEAA and OMB for the telephone survey. These were varied and have not yet been subjected to detailed analysis. The respondents were asked to indicate whether the documents were used in the preparation of reports, scientific papers, or research. More than half reported that the documents were not used for any of these purposes, but about 30 percent reported use for one or more of these three. Over 40 percent of all uses were to provide background material on some subject. Another 40 percent did not remember how they had used the documents.

Several questions were asked to determine whether the respondents would recommend changes or improvements in the documents or in the data available to them. About 85 percent were either satisfied with the format or made no response when asked to comment on whether the format would be more useful in some other presentation, arrangement, or classification. Of the 11 percent who would like a change and made suggestions, the most frequent suggestion was that there be more narrative and more interpretation of data.

TABLE 5-8. WHY WERE YOU INTERESTED IN THIS PARTICULAR PUBLICATION?

	Percent of All Document Uses								
	University	Commercial	Other	Total					
ject	20	17	11	13					
ruction	29	2	11	14					
	4	5	1	2					
t	24	25	41	37					
	49	69	53	53					

When asked to indicate whether other types of criminal justice data would be desirable, 36 percent said "yes" and gave a suggestion. The suggestion included both types of data and improvements in documents. The suggestions made by more than 1 percent of the sample were:

- Information about private police activities,
- Updating of information presently available,
- More narrative and more interpretation of data,
- Better comparisons with other parts of the country,
- More information about probationers, and
- More information about victims.

The survey also determined that 43 percent of the subscribers had recommended NCJISS documents to others and that the uses by those to whom the documents were referred were primarily general reference (64 percent), research material (29 percent), and material for teaching (3 percent).

In a final question, the respondents were asked whether they had ever used any other services of LEAA and the NCJISS Statistics Division. One percent had received tapes and 4 percent had received other assistance. The remainder had not received assistance.

2. LEEP Survey

Fifty institutions were selected from a population of 1,025 LEEP institutions to determine whether or not they had subscribed to any of 10 NCJISS-produced publications. The results of the telephone survey of the 50 is summarized in table 5-9. The responses of the 38 user institutions are summarized in table 5-10.

Other questions in the survey showed that, in the general survey of subscribers, the report was used most often for "background" (37 percent), "research" (26 percent), and "reports" (18 percent). More than 70 percent had no suggestion on format. Those who had suggestions asked for more narrative and more interpretation of data (15 comments) and for comparisons with other parts of the country (9 comments). About 70 percent of the sample had other suggestions. The most often received were related to:

Category of Institution

Those using at least on Those not using any of Those not responding

Total

User Response Was doing research on p Needed for classroom in I do crime analysis Just interested in subj Other

Total

No response

5-36

# TABLE 5-9. LEEP SURVEY SUMMARY

S	Sample Count	Weighted Count	Weighted Percent
e publication	38	708	69%
the publications	6	135	13%
	6	182	18%
	50	1,025	100%
·····			

TABLE 5-10. WHY WERE YOU INTERESTED IN THIS PARTICULAR PUBLICATION

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
	Sample Count	Weighted Count	Weighted Percentage
roject	37	450.7	12.3
struction	111	2,250.8	61.5
	0	0	0
ect	26	672.1	18.3
	38	288.9	7.9
	0	0	0
	212	3,662.5	100.0
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

- Quality of performance of law officer,
- More information on victims,
- More current information.
- Comparisons with other parts of the country,
- Information on effects of incarceration,
- More narrative in documents, and
- Information about private police activities.

About 60 percent had recommended the documents to others. The persons to whom they were recommended used them as general reference (45 percent), material for teaching (32 percent), and research (23 percent).

Six LEEP institutions did not use any of the publications of interest. The six were primarily nondegree-offering institutions.

# C. Conclusions and Recommendations

The random sample of subscribers interviewed in the telephone survey make greater use of NCJISS documents than do the agency personnel interviewed in state and local criminal justice agencies. The university subscribers and LEEP participant institutions use the documents primarily as general references, but large percentages use them in "research" and "classroom instruction." Commercial establishments in the criminal justice field find the documents useful for general background for research and training programs. The other subscribers, including state and local agencies, gave less specific uses, and their uses in research and criminal justice analyses were less than those in the other two categories. In comparing use of the documents in "research" by university users with commercial and other researcher users, the different requirements of the groups should be considered. The university users have the option of selecting for their research projects those problems which NCJISS documents address directly. However, the commercial and other users must deal with current problems which may or may not be addressed by the NCJISS documents. This difference in need may account, in part, for the higher frequence of use in the university community.

The recommendations made by the respondents are consistent with those. reported earlier in this chapter for the local and state agency personnel. The most consistent recommendations were that the documents contain more narrative explanations of the data and analyses and that there be more interpretation of the data.

5-38

February 1976.

1.

 $\hat{C}_{1}$ 

- 2. Paper, RTI, March 1976.
- 3. August 1973.
- 4
- California, 1974.
- 6.

# **REFERENCES FOR CHAPTER 5**

Jay R. Williams, An Evaluation of Selected Criminal Justice Departments and Their Utilization of LEAA Statistical Documents and Data, RTI,

Ann Clemmer, Results of the LEAA Telephone Survey, Unpublished Working

Indexed Legislative History of the "Crime Control Act of 1973," Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Office of General Counsel, Washington,

Report on National Needs for Criminal Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Washington, D.C., August 1968.

5. Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Systems, Project SEARCH, San Francisco,

Criminal Justice System, National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Washington, D.C., January 1973.



# APPENDIX A

Interview Guidelines

A-1

Information Systems Participation

O P	ffice	ngana tanàna miningkang kaokang						•
O P	ffice		<del>y de contra de la cont</del> ec <del>ión</del> de la contra de la					
P	•			<del>ئىيە مەر بەر بەر بەر بەر بەر بەر بەر بەر</del>		Interviewe	r <u></u>	
P				•				•
	ersons H (List	Present	•	•	Title or Position		Agency Represented	Telephone
5		• • • • • • • •			•			•
·/			مغيبية بالمتنبعة ويطعنه			<del>1</del>	<mark>a han han san san san san san san s</mark> an ang san	
s)								
1			•	•				
·				<del>و ( به در به در در در در در در در در</del>		an a	<u>, an </u>	-
)(		مۇرىسىيۇرىي ، مىدىمۇ مەتىرى						
;)	4 A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A							
	p					A	n na	•
')	<u>باب ب</u> ید <del>میکند کار ایر دوه میر</del> .			******			line and the second states and the second states and the second states and	

Other persons who may provide information about this system.

	Name	Title or Position	Agency	Telephone Number	
(A)		2			
(B)	o				່. 
(())					

A-2

	Criminal Justic
-	(Please complete this
1.	Name of system
2.	Status of system
1	Sucton operator
J.	System Operator
. 4.	Title of system documenta (Please provide copy of s
5.	System functions or compo
6.	Date of system implementa
7.	Date, amount, and source
8.	Date, amount, and type of
9.	Total funding (please com
	Source of Funding
	•
. 10.	If LEAA funds were not us
•	
•	
•	

.....

	Place
$\vec{H}$	Interviewer
	Date
tice Information Systems	Participation
his form for each system	planned or developed)
<u>,</u>	
•	
	• •
ntation	
f summary document.)	
mponents (for example OB)	rs)
(	
•	
ntation	
ce of initial funding	
of initial LEAA funding	
•	
complete energy helers)	
comprete spaces berow)	
Amount of Funding	Type of Agreement and Funds
	<i>"</i>
•	
used, please give reason	ns.
, Pasers Stid Teggor	

A-3

		ana ana ao amin'ny tanàna mandritra dia mampikambana amin'ny tanàna amin'ny tanàna amin'ny tanàna amin'ny tanàn				
		na an a			1	5. Describe other importa
	1000 000	ces below continue on reverse if needed	1).			(Where did the idea co
11.	Services of system (please complete spa	ta or statistics.)				
	(PIGase blovide samples of			Ð	• • • • • •	
•	Clientele Areas Served &	Types of Service				
	Served Their Population	(including statistics)				
			• *	l III	на <b>в</b> . На в	
			-			
		and the second	•		•	
			-			
*					•	
					· .	6. Other Comments
						والمحارب المحارب والمحارب والمحارب
		1-the second helow)			*	
12.	Data included or accessed in system (p	lease complete spaces betown				
•		Compl	leteness	-		
	Geographis Areas Covere	ad <u>Source of Data</u> <u>of Da</u>	ata Base			
	Data identification		9/			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			%			
·			%	1	• •	
	د د د د د د د د د د د د د د د د د د د	an a			1	7. TECHNOLOGY. TRANSFER:
		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	%	c		ferred to or from anot
4	and the second	La quinte à reaction d'activité au l'apart d'activité activité de la construction de la construction de la const				Leve1
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				S	ystem Component Transf
13,	Interfaces with other systems;	(marring) to CPI				
а — <sup>1</sup> .		Type of Interface (Terminal Lo Oro,				
	Other Systems that are Interfaced	The second s			-	
		an a			_	
					10 · · · ·	
		)				
			$\phi_{21}$		-	
		and the second second and the second	-			
٦/	Describe the contributions or involv	rement of LEAA in the development of the	system.	•	• -	
14	DESCITE CONCENTRATION OF A					
					<u> </u>	/ Examples of level of tra
			<b></b>			
	G				-	
ي		A-4				
-1			4	<b>N Z N N</b>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

Ŧ

÷

.

ant aspects or events in the establishment of this system. ome from?) ۰. . . To what extent have components of the system been transther location. LEAA participation of Transferred from: Transferred to: participation fer1/ (agency & location) (agency & location) in transfer • ansfer are: concept, logic, software, hardware, etc.

1

A-5

.
Form B

Agency Contacted
Office
Persons Present (List)
(A)
(B)
(C)
(D)
(E)
(F)

# SYSTEM EVALUATION

		Date	
	Interviewe	er	•
Title or Position		Agency Represented	Telephone
<del></del>			
-			
		•	
•			
			، 1 يون • يون 1 يون • يون
			•
	•		
			•
B-1			•

Form B

, ç

### III System Evaluation

System Title	nite and the second		Acronym
Agency role wi	th respect to the	svs tem	

1. Rate the system (program) in terms of its overall support for your agency's mission Rating (use designated rating codes)\*

.

.G.

2. Rate the utility of the system with respect to:

Agency planning

(Describe type or level of planning)

ma'n	aż	em	en	đ
_	_	_	-	

operations

evaluation .

3. Assess the technical quality of the system

4. Considering the basic purpose of the system, rate its effectiveness.

5. What is the potential for transfer of the system to other user agencies in consideration of:

(a) the commonality of needs addressed by the system

(b) technical requirements of the system

		1			
6	Describe other relevan	et criteria fo	r ovelusti	70	
the	system, and rate the	system.	L EVALUALLI	.ug	
-	Criterion				
	GITCETION		, ,		
			: 	•	•
	Criterion	· ·		: -	
· '.			•		
•					•
		•			. • •
*	Rating Code				
	1 = very high				•
	2 = moderately high				
	3 = slightly high				
	4 = slightly low				
	5 = moderately low				· ·
	6 = very low				
				<i>p</i>	• •
For	Interviewer Use:			•	
	Primary Source Code				
	Secondary Source Co	ło			
	Secondary Source Coo	16		· ·	•
7.	Please describe, by s	source of fund	is, whether	funding for the	syste
WIL	i de (snouid de) incre	eașed or decre	ased in the	e iucure.	
		•	. 0	<u> </u>	
		Curren	11	Future level	(indi
	Source of funds	level of fu	inding	of funding	CIME
					nor
-		•	-		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
-		•			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			- •	

B-3

 $C^{3}$ 

Persons Present (List) (A) (b) (c) (c) (D) (E) (F) I. Identification of (Sections I and II statistics, etc.) consider that info systems, per se, a 1. In what year were provide a copy of 2. What are your curr 	nee.	ico	
Persons Present (List) (A) (b) (c) (D) (E) (F) I. Identification of (Sections I and II statistics, etc.) consider that info systems, per se, a I. In what year were provide a copy of 2. What are your curr 	OFT	1ce	
<pre>(A)</pre>		Persons Present (List)	
<pre>(B)</pre>	(A)		
<pre>(C)</pre>	(B)_		
<pre>(D)</pre>	(C)		
<pre>(E)</pre>	(Ď)		
<pre>(F)</pre>	(E)		
I. <u>Identification of</u> (Sections I and II statistics, etc.) consider that info systems, per se, a I. In what year were provide a copy of 2. What are your curr 3. Where are the curr	(F)		
I. <u>Identification of</u> (Sections I and II statistics, etc.) consider that info systems, per se, a I. In what year were provide a copy of 2. What are your curr			
<pre>(Sections I and II statistics, etc.) consider that info systems, per se, a 1. In what year were provide a copy of 2. What are your curr </pre>	r.	Identification of	
<ol> <li>In what year were provide a copy of</li> <li>What are your curr</li> <li></li></ol>		(Sections I and I statistics, etc.) consider that info systems, per se,	Í o a
<ol> <li>In what year were provide a copy of</li> <li>What are your curr</li> <li></li></ol>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
2. What are your curr 3. Where are the curr	1.	In what year were provide a copy of	
3. Where are the curr	2.	What are your cur	r
3. Where are the curr			-
3. Where are the curr		<u>"                                    </u>	-
3. Where are the curr			
3. Where are the curr			
3. Where are the curr			
3. Where are the curr			
	3.	Where are the cur	r
	х		
	• •		

. .

INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND DATA NEEDS INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

÷ .

						 I	)ate					·.
	-	Title o Positio	or on		л.,	Ag Repr	enc ese	y nteo	1	Te	lepho	one
	•	· · · · ·										
	:						:	:				
	:	, ·						:				
1						:		1				
												•
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					:			•		
a N	iee	ds and I	?rior	iti	es			•				

rmation systems are "means" to handle data. Information re dealt with in Sections III and IV of this form.)

your needs for data first described in a plan? (Please the plan)\_\_\_\_\_

ent needs?

ent needs documented? (Provide copies)\_

.

C-1

			0		8	What are the sources o
4.	To what extent are information, data, and statistics available to meet all these needs?				<b>U</b> •	you obtain the data?
Č/						
		•		•		
		• •				
8				a •		
		* *				
•	In what general areas (operations, administrative, cost and accounting			•	9.	What are your procedur be described in Form A
	performance measures, historical, planning, comparative, census, geographical social, etc.) do currently available data not meet your needs?				•	
				ананананананананананананананананананан		
					•	
		• •				
				3 		
	How have most of your data procedures been developed? To what extent have outside influences (e.g., availability of federal funds, mandatory reporting requirements) impacted on the evolution of effective data procedures in		.0		10.	Do you use the data in and what is being eval
	your organization?	•** 4	0			
					(	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		•			•	
Ţ	That are the data that you receive?			-	11.	Are there other purpos
		+ +		r r		
			4			
		-				
				•		
٠						1
•	C-2				3 I 1	
		34		a .		

ġ,D

es of data that you receive? Through what channels do a?

.

4

edures to collect data? (Formal information systems can rm A.)

a in evaluations of any type? If so, how are they used evaluated?

rposes for which the data are used? If so, what are they?

C-3

.

			4. 5	
				Comments:
LEAA Impacts on Meeting of Data Needs				
In the following three questions, consider the extent of LEAA direct and	ra, and a second se	1		
indirect influence with respect to: (a) identification of data needs by				
program area, (b) quality of planning and implementation of procedures	*			
data (statistics).				
What are the direct or indirect contributions of LEAA's support of the publication and dissemination of statistical documents and materials?			•	
publication and dissemination of statistical documents and materials.	* -		-	
		n no handrada	•	
	-		III.	Identification of Information Systems Needs and Priorities
			•	
			1.	In what year were your needs for information systems first described in a number of this plan.
			2.	What are your current information systems needs?
	and the second se	-		
Likewise, in what respect might LEAA have done more to meet criminal jus-				
tice agencies' and departments' data needs?	i da sera de la composición de la comp	e 0		
		2	· · ·	
			•	
	n di Bargari Katalan di Bargari Katalan di Bargari		<i>ु 3</i> .	where are the current needs documented? (Provide copies.)
				To what artant are available information evetems able to meet all thes
develop to better support your agency or department in the future?			. 4.	needs?
			•	
	San			
		*	•	
		0	•	
			* *	
A contract of the second se				
3			н	
A set of the set				
		e	•	
	*		Ø.	
	and the second se			
		Ð		<b>C−5</b>
	and the second se			
en e				
	19 S	A		

5. In what general areas (operations, administrative, cost and accounting, performance measures, historical, planning, comparative, census, geographical, social, etc.) do current information systems not meet your needs?

.

How have most of your information systems been developed? To what extent have outside influences (e.g., availability of federal funds, mandatory reporting requirements) impacted on the development of such systems within your agency or department?

6.

7.

Have you developed standards and goals for criminal justice information systems? If yes, how have you proceeded? (For example, use of task force committees, national standards and goals, other plans, etc.)

C-6

0

directly and through groups such as SEARCH Groups, Inc. (Project SEARCH) with respect to: (a) changes in priorities by program area such as police and courts, (b) quality of planning and implementation of systems, (c) utilization of system outputs, (d) system efficiency. Possible modes of influence include: (a) Block grant funding, (b) discretionary funding, (c) technical assistance, (d) promotion of technology transfer, (e) indirect influence through model programs, (f) guidelines, (g) reporting requirements, and (h) planning requirements.) 1. What are the direct or indirect contributions you have received from LEAA's support of information systems development? 2. Likewise, in what respect might LEAA have done more to meet criminal justice agencies' and departments' needs for information systems? > 3. If you have not received LEAA funds for your information systems, how might the systems have been different if LEAA funds had been used?

## IV.) LEAA Impacts on Information Systems Development

•

" ¬ - - (In the following five questions, describe the extent of LEAA influence,

C-7

67

4. What kinds of information system documents, services, and programs should LEAA provide to better support your agency or department in the future? . - -٠. 5. How does your agency use SEARCH products? , × Comments: ... **^\_** C-8 ?...**≟**} 0 1.4 •



FORM D

CRIMINAL JUSTICE STATISTICS SYSTEM STATISTICAL REPORT CHECKLIST

D-1

Agency Name and Address

		Respondent	's Nat	<u>ie</u>				<u>Title</u>	/Unit		<u>Tel</u>	ephone
1.	<u> </u>	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	· · · · · ·								 	
2.	·										 	
3.			•			· ·		-	-	•	 	
4.											 	
5.								-				
6;									,			
LIS	ST PERSO	NS NOT PRE	SENT L	THO MAY	PROVI	DE INPO	RMATION	ABOUT TH	IS SYSTE	н.		

Name	Title/Unit	Telephone
1.		•
2.		
3.		
••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	Interviewer	
	Date	

1. Is there a statistical section or branch in this agency? Yes No If yes, please identify it \_\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Do you have responsibility for performing the analysis of data (statistics)? Yes No \_\_\_\_\_\_\_



.....

This table is intended to organize our inquiry into the use of the statistical reports which are produced and distributed by LEAA. Our general interest is in determining whether LEAA statistical reports are being received and used in local and state agencies for example in: state and local policy recommendations and formulation; comparison or analysis with your own statistics; the formation of standards and goals for information systems, etc.; research and analysis; and preparing grant applications. And if not, why not? For comparative purposes, Part B of this table asks for similar information on use by your agency of state and locally produced statistical reports. Use the "comments" section at the end of Part B to describe the target audiences of documents cited in column 4, to comment on individual reports, or to give general opinions about LEAA statistics. Refer to the number of the statistical report cited (e.g., A.l.a).

		•			l Do You	2	Was	3 s Report Use	d	Example o in which Used for Pa	
	Sta and	atist 1 Pub	ical lica	Reports tion Dates	Have This? <u>(Yes/No</u> )	What is Final <u>Repository</u>	No Use <u>Code<sup>1/</sup></u>	How Often Code <sup>2/</sup>	Purpose <u>Code<sup>3/</sup></u>	(Give Tit) Numbe Obtain	
	Α.	LEA	A SI	ATISTICAL REPORTS							
		1.	Gen	eral							
			а.	Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice Systems, 1968-69, Feb. 7 1969-70, Feb. 72; 1970-71, Feb. 73; 1971-72, Feb. 74; 1972-73, Feb. 75	î;		:				
			ь.	Historical Statistics on Expenditures and Employment for the Criminal Justice Systems, 1971 to 1973, August 1975		1 			-		
			Ç.	Criminal Justice Agencies in the United States: Summary Report, 1970	•• 			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
			d.	Criminal Justice Agencies in (State), 1974 (One report for each state), May 1972	0					*-**	
			е.	Criminal Justice Agencies in (Regions 1-1) (One report for each LEAA Region), February-June 1975	0) 			• • •		•	
•			f.	Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statis- tics, 1973, July 1974; 1974, Sept. 1975		•		•	·		

7-2

200

Was Document Cited in Col 4 Funded by LEAA? (Yea/Nc.

5

٦

٠

. .

			1 Do You	2	Was	3 Report Use	d
Statist and Pub	ical Reports lication Dates		Have This? (Yes/No)	What is Final Repository	No Use <u>Code<sup>1/</sup></u>	How Often Code <sup>2/</sup>	Purpose Code <sup>3/</sup>
2.	Victimization	•					•
	a. San Jose Methods Tes Crime Victims	t of Known					
	b. Crimes and Victims: San Jose Pilot Surve	A Report on the Dayton- y of Victimization	•				
	c. Crime in the Nation'	s Five Largest Cities				•	
	d. Crime in Eight Ameri	can Cities, July 1974					· · ·
• •	e. Criminal Victimizati January-June 1973, N Report, June 1975	on in the United States ov. 1974; 1973 Advance					•
	f. Criminal Victimizati Nation's Five Larges	on Surveys in the t Cities, June 1975					
	g. Criminal Victimizati American Cities, Jul	on Surveys in 13 y 1975					
3.	Police	· .					
	a. Comparative Data Rep Police Administratio	ort, 1970, 1972 (State n & Operations)		* .			
	b. Uniform Crime Report	s (FBI)					
4.	Corrections						
	a. National Prisoner St	atistics					
	Prisoners in State Institutions on De July 1975	and Federal c. 31, 71, 72, 73,					
•	•					( <b>, </b>	

Б Ц

٩ 4 Example of Document in which Report is Used for Purpose Cited (Give Title and Page Numbers --Obtain Copy) 5 Was Docu-ment Cited Col 4 Funde by LEAA? (Yes/No) .

		1 Do You	2	Wa	3 s Report Use	ed	Enar 11 Vac
Statistical Reports and Publication Dates		Have This? <u>(Yes/No)</u>	What is Final <u>Repository</u>	No Use <u>Code<sup>1</sup>/</u>	How Often Code <sup>2/</sup>	Purpose Code <sup>3/</sup>	(Gi
a. National Prisoner Statistics (con.)							
Census of State Correctional Facilit 1974: Advance Report, Sept. 1975	ies,	· · ·					
Capital Punishment 1971-72, June 197 1973, June 1975; 1974, November 1975	75; 5	· · ·					
b. 1970 National Jail Census, May 1971							•
c. Local Jails: A Report Presenting Data Individual County and City Jails from 1970 Jail Census, March 1973	for the	:			<b></b>		
d. Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, 1972 Advance Report, September 1974	::		· · ·		······································		
e. The Nation's Jails: A Report on the C of Jails from the 1972 Survey of Inmat Local Jails, August 1975	ensus es of	•					
f. Children in Custody: A Report on the Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facility Census of 1971, May 1974; 197 Advance Report, September 1975	2-73			•			
5. Courts					:		
a. National Survey of Court Organization	1971						

đŕ.

 National Survey of Court Organization 1971, February 1974; 1975 Supplement to State Judicial Systems, November 1975

Ţ

\*

5 4 ample of Document in which Report is ed for Purpose Cited Give Title and Page Numbers --Obtain Copy) Was Docu-ment Cited in Col 4 Funded by LEAA? \_\_\_\_(Yes/No) 1

3

2

1

# Statistical Reports and Publication Dates

B. STATE/LOCAL STATISTICAL REPORTS AND SOURCES

• · · · ·

			-		•	
					<i></i>	
					•	
					: 1 % ·	······································
× 	· .			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	· · · ·	2004 A
	Ŷ	-				
			·			
	-					······
0	·,					
<u></u>						
	·	· · · · ·			Ó	
						· · · ·
			·····	· · ·		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
				·····	· · · · ·	
		· · · ·	· · · ·		· · · · ·	
					<del></del>	
				·····		

Do You	•	Was	Report
Have This? (Tes/No)	What is Final Reposito_y	No Use .Code <sup>1/</sup>	How Oft Code 2/
			0040
		•	
		••••	
			·
		•	
•			( <u>}</u>
<del></del> ,			
		· · ·	-
······································	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
		<del></del>	
	۶.		
	·		
	·····		
•		· 	
·			· · · · · ·
·			
· •		· ·	
			·
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
·			

 $\supset$ 

				1	\ <sup>₽</sup>
	4.14				
	4	ı		-	
		•			V
		*			
	· .				
	·			•	
	·	· · · ·		.	
				ľ	
		4	5		
		Example of Document			
		in which Report is	Was Docu-		
Use	ed	Used for Purpose Cited	ment Cited	1	
en	Purpose	(Give Title and Page	Col 4 Fund	eć 🕴	
	Code 3/	Numbers	by LEAA?		
	code	Ob Cach (Oby)	(Yes/No)		*
	· ·			F	
		•	· .		
-				-	
÷				-	
_				ti i	
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		- 1	
÷	· · · · ·			- [	
				_	
_					
			· · · · ·		
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
				-	•
		• 			
		•			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
-			<u> </u>	-	
	<del></del>			- 1	
				-	1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -
	······································			M	
÷.			t	- 11	and the second second second second second
<u> </u>		to the second	· · ·		
<b>~~</b> '		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·····	[	
			·····	]	
		•		2	
			•		
		•	•		
		6			
	•				
		•			
	and an international state	المراجعين فتصبحني والالعاد	·	]] -	
		particular de la construction Construction de la construction de la construction			
			•		
÷.,			n .		
е					
·		and the second secon			
			ے ہے۔ ب		
				•	an an an an an an an Araba 🔨 🐂 an

### C. PROPOSED LEAA DOCUMENTS

3.4

1. Are there other kinds of statistical data which you could have used if they had been available? (Specific examples as well as classes of data would be helpful here)

2. (If yee above) How and by whom do you think these data should be produced? (Give answer in 1, above)\_\_\_\_\_\_

.

D-6

0

11

3. Do you produce any documents which could have made use of the proposed statistics if they had been available? Yes 🗆 No 🗆

a. Title\_\_\_\_\_\_ b. Were these documents funded by LEAA?\_\_\_\_\_\_







### CODE LISTING

### Code 1/

- Data Sources Not Believed Accurate
   Data Not Complete
   Data Out of Date

- bata out of bate
   Level of Aggregation Too General.
   Methods of Data Presentations Do Not Meet Needs
   Methods of Analysis Are Not Believed to Be Reliable
   No Time Available to Review or Just Received

- No lime Available to Review of
   Agency Just Created
   Not Applicable for Any Purpose
   Lack of Interpretive Materials

### Code <u>2</u>/

- A Daily
- B Weekly C Monthly
- D Quarterly
- E Yearly
- F Less Frequent Than Yearly 1

Code <u>3</u>/

- 1. Analyses of Need and Problem Identification
- 2. Data for Grant Application 3. Planning
- 4. Administration/Management/Cost and Accounting

- Administration/Management/Cost and Accounting
   Operational Decisions
   Evaluation/Comparison
   Development of Standards/Performance Measures
   Methodology for State/Local Studies

   a. For Data Collection
   b. For Analysis
   General Knowledge/Professional Development
- 10. Reference/Historical
- 11. Other (specify)

 Lack of Trend Data
 Absence of Suggestions on Potential Use of Data 13. Other (specify)



# APPENDIX B

RTI and MRI Team Members

÷.

1

¥ .

RAYMOND L. COLLINS, Senior Analyst

Professional Experience

1969 to date. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina. 27709. Senior Analyst, Center for Development and Resource Planning. Projects directed or performed include assessment of impact of public services, preparation of a state planning data base, development of alternative strategies for allocation of public investments, design and implementation of program evaluation systems, mathematical programming of economic systems, regional input-output modeling and analyses, and assessment of impact of economic development. Assisted in economic development programming, long-range system planning and evaluation of public programs.

1966 to 1969. Research Triangle Institute, Senior Analyst, Operations Research and Economics Division. Projects directed or performed include computerized system simulation, management systems development, marketing systems analyses, computerized economic gaming, and preparation of estimates of national costs for pollution control. Also delivered research training courses in Iran.

1960 to 1966. Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation, Alsgah Forest, North Carolina. Senior Industrial Engineer. Responsible for economic evaluations and cost analyses. Specific assignments included optimization of container design, process variables in plant operations, and inventory practices. Directed and participated in several material handling studies, cost reduction, and planned projects.

1959 to 1960. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. Teaching Assistant (Industrial Engineering). Performed research in linear programming and network theory; taught time study and production control.

1954 to 1959. Aluminum Company of America, Massena, New York, and Badin, North Carolina. Industrial Engineer, Performed economic and operations analyses, cost reduction studies, job evaluations and analyses, and evaluation of manpower needs.

1952 to 1954. Air Force Finance Center (USAF), Denver, Colorado. Management Analysis Officer (for production control). Concentrated in methods improvement.

### Education

1/76

B.I.E., Industrial Engineering, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1952.

M.S., Industrial Engineering (Operations Research), North Carolina State University, 1961.

Other studies in computers - 1962, management theory - 1965, economics - 1967, and group dynamics and institutional development - 1970 and 1971.

### Selected Publications

Alternative Economic Structures for North Carolina: 1980. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, 1971, coauthor.

An Input-Output Model of North Carolina. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, 1971, coauthor.

A\_Process for Allocation of Public Services. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, May 1974.

Estimating Costs of Public Services. Research Triangle, Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, Mry 1973, coauthor.

"Input-Output Models in Public Planning," Symposium on the Evaluation of National Systems. Arlington, Virginia, November 17, 1971.

Impact of North Carolina Ports on the North Carolina Economy. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, March 1974, coauthor. A State Energy Management Plan for North Carolina, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, 1974, coauthor.

Alternatives in the North Carolina State Airport System, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, 19/5.

Professional Experience

٠...

٠...

.

Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, Missouri, 64110. Mr. Dieckman's fields of specialization are computer planning systems, evaluation of EDP functions and organizations, and most recently, evaluation of law enforcement programs. Since July 1972 he has been project leader on a major evaluation effort involving alternative police patrol strategies, police officer's allocation of time in the patrol function, quantification of police officer-citizen encounters, and determination of public perceptions of police service. In addition, he is currently concluding a study that addresses the reduction of crime against aging victims. A large segment of this program is concerned with security systems and special measures to increase personal and physical security. Mr. Dieckman has consulted with several metropolitan police departments in developing crime-specific programs to reduce robbery and burglary. He has also been involved in a variety of projects including: computer-assisted long-range planning projects for seven major institutions of higher education, a national corporation, two state agencies, a school district, and a metropolitan police department; EDP organization evaluation for two national corporations; development of training materials and support for a nationwide series of workshops on computer-assisted planning; an administrative analysis of state economic opportunity offices; a feasibility study for a federal agency clearinghouse function; a systems design for a river basin-wide water pollution study; the design of computer software to support six large public surveys; a major study of particulate pollutant generation from manufacturing industries; and preparation of a special. recreation demand allocation model for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Western Electric Company, Kansas City, Missouri. Prior to joining MRI in 1969, Mr. Dieckman had assignments in the Computer Systems Development Group, and operating supervisor and production control positions at Western Electric Company. He was a project leader in the development of a computerized merchandise management system which involved forecasting, entering of orders, maintaining stock records, generating billings, creating management information reports, and the analysis of sales statistics for a plant with \$100,000,000 annual sales.

### Education

B.A., Liberal Arts, University of Missouri, 1957. Graduate work at the Bell System Graduate Engineering Education Center, New York, New York.

# E. D. DIECKMAN, Manager, Police Foundation Studies

### BRIAN JUSTIN HOEL, Senior Public Systems Analyst

### Professional Experience

Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, Missouri, 64110. Mr. Hoel specializes in the development of large-scale police improvement systems, training programs, criminalistics support systems planning, and coordination of criminal justice functions. He is responsible for directing projects for local, state and regional criminal justice agencies. He recently completed the design of criminalistics systems for the States of Minnesota and Mississippi, assisted in the design of similar systems for Arkansas and North Dakota, developed a criminal justice training plan for Georgia, and is currently directing the development of criminal justice standards and goals for the State of Kansas.

Town of Brookline, Massachusetts. Prior to joining MRI in 1973, Mr. Hoel was project director/planner for a police improvement program. There he was responsible for developing a planning, programming, and budgeting system; rewriting rules, operational procedures and job descriptions; developing an automated information and patrol resource allocation system; and improving operational and training programs for the police department.

Governor's Public Safety Committee, Massachusetts. Prior to 1971, he was Assistant Director of the Governor's Public Safety Committee for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts where he aided in the development of the State's Comprehensive Criminal Justice Plan. During his four years with the Committee, he was responsible for implementation and management of major portions of the state's LEAA grant program. While a member of the Governor's Committee he reviewed the public safety sections of the Governor'r reorganization plan, conducted studies of law enforcement information and communication systems and of criminalistics services in the State of Massachusetts, and developed and implemented comprehensive multi-year plans for improvement of these systems.

Mr. Hoel was on the staff of The Christian Science Monitor from 1959 through 1967, serving as Assistant American News Editor and crime and political reporter, and was involved in the reorganization of key Monitor operations.

Northeastern University, Boston Massachusetts. Special Assistant to Mr. Elliot Richardson in the Department of Law Enforcement Programs, and instructor on national political issues at the Boston Center for Adult Education.

### Education

- B.A., International Relations/Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Graduate courses in Public Administration, Northeastern University, Boston Massachusetts and the University of Missouri, Kansas City.

### MILAS G. KIRKPATRICK, Survey Specialist

### Professional Experience

1973 to date. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709. Survey Specialist, Survey Methodology and Operations Department of the Statistics Research Division. Primary responsibilities include assisting in recruitment, training and supervision of field personnel. Other duties include progress report writing, coordination of data processing, and junior staff supervision. Participation in a list of selected Research Triangle Institute projects shown below:

1974: Assessment of the Social, Economic, and Environmental Effects of the Randleman Lake Project -- Responsible for recruiting, hiring, training and supervising field staff. Planned all data collection activities; coordinated data receipt, editing, and processing steps.

1974: Rural Regional Coordination Evaluation Study in South Carolina and Tennessee -- Responsible for recruiting, hiring, training, and supervising field staff. General supervision of all field operations.

1973 - 1974: Survey of Adolescent Alcohol Drinking Behavior and Attitudes -- Assisted in contacting high school superintendents and principals, gaining study cooperation, and collecting sampling data.

1974: National Evaluation of Upward Bound and Educational Talent Search Programs -- Primary responsibility in contacting high school superintendents and project directors, getting study cooperation, scheduling administrations, collecting sampling data, and conducting survey mail operation.

1973: A Study of the Correlation Between Drug and Alcohol Abuse and Leadership Techniques in the United States Army -- Assisted in data collection through group discussions with military personnel at United States and European military bases.

1973: National Study of New Towns/Planned Communities -- Supervision of data collection in the Chicago, Illinois and Minneapolis, Minnesota areas.

1970 - 1973. North Carolina Employment Security Commission, Raleigh, North Carolina. Test Research Analyst in Test Research Unit.

1969 - 1970. North Carolina Employment Security Commission, Morganton, North Carolina. Employment Interviewer.

Results Section.

1967 - 1969. United States Army Strategic Communications Center. Seoul, Korea. Non-Commissioned Officer in-charge, Methods and

B--5

### BRIAN JUSTIN HOEL, Senior Public Systems Analyst

### Professional Experience

Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, Missouri, 64110. Mr. Hoel specializes in the development of large-scale police improvement systems, training programs, criminglistics support systems planning, and coordination of criminal justice functions. He is responsible for directing projects for local, state and regional criminal justice agencies. He recently completed the design of criminalistics systems for the States of Minnesota and Mississippi, assisted in the design of similar systems for Arkansas and North Dakota, developed a criminal justice training plan for Georgia, and is currently directing the development of criminal justice standards and goals for the State of Kansas.

Town of Brookline, Massachusetts. Prior to joining MRI in 1973, Mr. Hoel was project director/planner for a police improvement program. There he was responsible for developing a planning, programming, and budgeting system; rewriting rules, operational procedures and job descriptions; developing an automated information and patrol resource allocation system; and improving operational and training programs for the police department.

Governor's Public Safety Committee. Massachusetts Prior to 1971. he was Assistant Director of the Governor's Public Sa. 'y Committee for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts where the aided  $\ln$  are development of the State's Comprehensive Criminal Juszice Plan. During his four years with the Committee, he was responsible for implementation and management of major portions of the state's LEAA grant program. While a member of the Governor's Committee he reviewed the public safety sections of the Governor'r reorganization plan, conducted studies of law enforcement information and communication systems and of criminalistics services in the State of Massachusetts, and developed and implemented comprehensive multi-year plans for improvement of these systems.

Mr. Hoel was on the staff of The Christian Science Monitor from 1959 through 1957, serving as Assistant American News Editor and crime and political reporter, and was involved in the reorganization of key Monitor operations.

Northeastern University, Boston Massachusetts. Special Assistant to Mr. Elliot Richardson in the Department of Law Enforcement Programs, and instructor on national political issues at the Boston Center for Adult Education.

B-4

### Education

B.A., International Relations/Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles.

Graduate courses in Public Administration, Northeastern University, Boston Massachusetts and the University of Missouri, Kansas City.

### MILAS G. KIRKPATRICK, Survey Specialist

### Professional Experience

1973 to date. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park. North Carolina 27709. Survey Specialist. Survey Methodology and Operations Department of the Statistics Research Division. Primary responsibilities include assisting in recruitment, training and supervision of field personnel. Other duties include progress report writing, coordination of data processing, and junior staff supervision. Participation in a list of selected Research Triangle Institute projects shown below:

1974: Assessment of the Social, Economic, and Environmental Effects of the Randleman Lake Project -- Responsible for recruiting, hiring, training and supervising field staff. Planned all data collection activities; coordinated data receipt, editing, and processing steps.

1974: Rural Regional Coordination Evaluation Study in South Carolina and Tennessee -- Responsible for recruiting, hiring, training, and supervising field staff. General supervision of all field operations.

1973 - 1974: Survey of Adolescent Alcohol Drinking Behavior and Attitudes -- Assisted in contacting high school superintendents and principals, gaining study cooperation, and collecting sampling data.

1974: National Evaluation of Upward Bound and Educational Talent Search Programs -- Primary responsibility in contacting high school superintendents and project directors, getting study cooperation, scheduling administrations, collecting sampling data, and conducting survey mail operation.

1973: A Study of the Correlation Between Drug and Alcohol Abuse and Leadership Techniques in the United States Army -- Assisted in data collection through group discussions with military personnel at United States and European military bases.

1973: National Study of New Towns/Planned Communities -- Supervision of data collection in the Chicago, Illinois and Minneapolis, Minnesota areas.

1970 - 1973. North Carolina Employment Security Commission, Raleigh, North Carolina. Test Research Analyst in Test Research Unit.

1969 - 1970. North Carolina Employment Security Commission, Morganton, North Carolina. Employment Interviewer.

1967 - 1969. United States Army Strategic Communications Center, Seoul, Korea. Non-Commissioned Officer in-charge, Methods and Results Section.

B-5

## MILAS G. KIRKPATRICK (continued)

### Education

B.S., Business Administration, Western Carolina University, 1967.

Graduate Courses in Statistics at North Carolina State University, Raleigh North Carolina, 1971.

### Professional Activities

North Carolina Public Personnel Association, member. International Association of Personnel in Employment Security, member.

### Selected Publications

Assisted in field data collection report preparation for the following projects:

"Assessment of the Social, Economic, and Environmental Effects of the Randleman Lake Project," Research Triangle Institute, January, 1975.

"Rural Regional Coordination Evaluation Study in South Carolina and Tennessee," September, 1974.

"Correlation Between Drug and Alcohol Abuse and Leadership Techniques in the United States Army," Research Triangle Institute, September, 1973.

B-6

"National Study of New Towns/Planned Communities," Research Triangle Institute, June, 1973.

Professional Experience

Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, Missouri, 64110. Mrs. Levy specializes in data compilation, interpretation and evaluation in criminal justice and other areas. She is currently playing a major role in the development of standards and goals for the criminal justice system in Kansas. In addition to her other work in regional and market economics, community development, consumer analysis and Edvertising, she contributed to a major project for the Police Foundation to evaluate experiments in patrol tactics performed by the Kansas City, Missouri Police Department.

During a prior appointment to the MRI staff from 1965 to 1969, Mrs. Levy was involved with regional and market economics as well as related sources and methodologies. Projects on which she worked included an extensive series of economic studies relating to a western railroad merger proposal, recreation resource studies for several states, a state-of-the-art review of water and air pollution control in solid waste disposal techniques and a tax study for the State of Missouri with emphasis on the state sales tax.

New Products Insights, Inc., Overland Park, Kansas. From 1970 to 1971, Mrs. Levy was Project Director where she directed various product probes in specific market areas for large consumer goods manufacturers. Project activities included test design, group interviews, data compilation, analysis and evaluation, and report preparation. She was also involved in creative generation of new product ideas and concepts.

Mrs. Levy also held short-term assignments with Mid-America Regional Council (1972) and the Institute for Community Studies (1970).

B-7

Education

÷...

- -

. .

B.A., Economics and Sociology, University of Missouri, Kansas City. Graduate study in Economics, University of Denver. M.A., Public Administration, University of Missouri, Kansas City (in progress).

Professional Activities

American Economics Association American Marketing Association

March, 1975

PATRICIA L. LEVY, Public Systems Analyst

### ROBERT B. LEWIS, Survey Specialist

### Professional Experience

1974 to date. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709. Survey Specialist, Survey Methodology and Operations Department of the Statistics Research Division. Assisting in sample selection, recruiting, training and supervision of field personnel and data management. Participation in a list of selected Research Triangle Institute projects shown below:

1974 - 1975: Maine Assessment of Educational Progress (Year 03 and 04) -- Developed instruction manuals and trained field staff, developed field data management procedures, and set up field editing and coding procedures.

 $\bigcirc$ 

1974 - 1975: Florida Statewide Educational Assessment -- Assisted in development of instructional materials and training of field staff. Primarily responsible for coordination of data collection activities, and preparation of all test materials for scoring.

1974: Social Contexts of Drinking Pilot Study; Boston, Mass. --Assisted in hiring and training of field staff. Coordinated data collection activities and editing procedures prior to coding. Supervised all field personnel. Responsible for coordination of data between field office and RTI's editing, coding, and analysis staff.

1972 - 1974. Low Income Housing Development Corporation, Durham, North Carolina 27702. Research Associate, Rural Housing Evaluation project. Assisted in questionnaire development and preparation for a southern rural housing policy study. Responsible for collection of primary and secondary data and supervision of field staff. Also responsible for coordination of technical and logistical support during field operations. Assisted in preparation of final reports.

### Education

12

B.A., History, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1972.

Short courses dealing with demographic analysis and statistical report writing, Applied Statistics Training Institute, National Center for Health Statistics, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 1973.

Graduate work in human health and ecology, School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, 1973.

Graduate work in educational research, School of Education, North Carolina State University, 1975.

B-8

ROBERT B. LEWIS (continued)

Professional Activities

Southern Regional Demographic Group, member. Population Association of America, member. Alpha Chi Sigma, member, officer 1971.

Selected Publications

"The Place I Belong; A Report on Southern Rural Housing," B. N. Smith, J. A. Fortney, R. B. Lewis, B. H. Wilson, et. al., Low Income Housing Development Corporation, December, 1973.

"Maine Assessment of Educational Progress (Year 03)," Research Triangle Institute, May, 1974.

March, 1975

Assisted in field data collection report preparation for the following

"Social Contexts of Drinking Pilot Study; Boston, Mass.," Research Triangle Institute, November, 1974.

PHILLIP S. McMULLAN, JR., Senior Member of Professional Staff

### Professional Experience

1973 to date. Research Triangle Institute. Research Triangle Park. North Carolina, 27709. Center for Development and Resource Planning. Program director for projects related to planning and evaluation, particularly in the areas of economic development and management science.

1971 to 1973. Research Triangle Institute, Senior Analyst, Office of Institute Programs. Program director for overseas research and evaluation projects.

1960 to 1971. Research Triangle Institute. Senior Analyst. Operations Research and Economics Divisions. Group Leader for systems analysis and evaluation projects in civil defense, health services, industrial operations. and overseas research.

1958 to 1960. System Analyst, Industrial Dynamics Department, Hughes Aircraft Corp., El Segundo, California. Designer of computer based information and inventory systems.

1956 to 1958. Management Analyst, Management Analysis Service, Office of Business Vice President, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

1952 to 1954. Engineer and Production Foreman, E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Kinston, North Carolina.

### Education

B.S., Mechanical Engineering, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, 1952. M.B.A., Industrial Management, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1958.

Advanced Studies, Industrial Management, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 1959.

### Professional Activities

Pi Tau Sigma (Engineering Scholastic) Beta Club Order of St. Patrick (Engineering Honorary) Operation Research Society of America Committee to Reevaluate Civil Defense, 1969 (Presidential Study Group) Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, 1970 (Consultant to the Civilian Panel)

Selected Publications

Economic Development Strategy, Phase I: North Carolina Economic Growth Management Study, Final Report FR-26U-952. Prepared for North Carolina Departments of Administration and Natural and Economic Resources, September 1974, coauthor.

Estimating Costs of Public Services, Research Memorandum RM-26U-776-1-2. Prepared for Office of State Planning, North Carolina Department of Administration, July 1973, coauthor.

Planning for Managerial and Technical Assistance to Business, Commerce and Industry in North Carolina. State Planning Division, Department of Administration, 1971, coauthor.

A Matrix for System Description: A Framework for Evaluation of Survival and Recovery Systems. Proceeding of the Systems Evaluation Symposium, Institute for Defense Analysis, 1971.

JANET L. RIES, Analyst

Professional Experience

1975 to date. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 27709. Analyst, Center for Development and Resource Planning. Plan and evaluate Federal, State, and Municipal public programs and administrative systems. Conduct a technical review of current programs for the State of North Carolina's Governor's Highway Safety Program as part of a project to create a planning, evaluation and record system coordinated at the local, regional and State level. Assist in the data collection and compilation for the National Highway Safety Needs Study.

1973 to 1974. Camil Associates, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. On-site Analyst and Interviewer for the Department of Labor WIN II Comprehensive Evaluation. Traveled extensively throughout the U.S. analyzing the administrative structure and interaction of the Employment Service and Welfare Department on the regional, state and local levels. In addition, sampled and conducted a Retrospective Case Analysis of individuals who had completed the program.

### Education

6/75

• •

~ ~

- ب

\* ...

\* ---

٠...

Selected Publications

"Attitudes Towards Government Spending on Welfare: A Multi-variate Statistical Stury," unpublished paper, Sociology Department, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. December 1974. "Employment Suitability Standards for Welfare Recipients," unpublished paper, City Planning Department, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, "The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974: A Case Study," Planning Comment Magazine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Issue Forthcoming. Summer 1975. coauthor.

B.A., Urban Studies, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Trinity College, Hartford, Connecticut, 1971-1973.

B-11

Tim

### DAVID H. STUART, Managerial Economist

### Professional Experience

1974 to date. Research Triangle Institute, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, 27709. Managerial Economist, Center for Development and Resource Planning. Projects include criminal justice planning guideline development, professional manpower supply and demand analysis, and educational program cost and market analysis.

1971 to 1974. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. Instructor of Management, Department of Economics. Taught courses in industrial management, managerial economics, business policy, and quantitative methods. Coordinated student research projects.

1969 to 1971. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Graduate Assistant, School of Business Administration. Taught undergraduate course in operations management. Developed cases for study in manager seminars.

1965 to 1967. Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Company, Raleigh, North Carolina. Traffic Supervisor, Traffic Department. Responsible for forecasting, planning, personnel relations, and general administration of a department consisting of over 300 switchboard operators and supporting personnel.

### Education

- B.S., Experimental Statistics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1965.
- M.E., Economics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1969.
- Ph.D., Business Administration, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. In progress.

### Professional Activities

Beta Gamma Sigma (Business Administration Scholastic) Blue Key (Scholastic and Campus Service) The Institute of Management Science The Academy of Management

### Selected Publications

Comprehensive Planning for Criminal Justice. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Research Triangle Institute, August 1974, coauthor. The Requirements for and Availability of Lawyers in North Carolina, 1970-1980, 26N-1016. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, Research

Triangle Institute, September 1974.

### Professional Experience

Midwest Research Institute, Kansas City, Missouri, 64110. Mr. Worley specializes in systems modeling, evaluation techniques, cost-effectiveness methodology, and experimental design. Recently, Mr. Worley was principal evaluator of the National Neighborhood Watch Program sponsored by the National Sheriffs Association. Currently, he is project leader of a study to develop the conceptual design of a personnel information system for the Kansas City Police Department. He has been active in the analysis of criminal justice systems including studies sponsored by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, the Northwest Missouri Law Enforcement Assistance Council, Kentucky Crime Commission, the Mid-Hudson Crime Control Planning Board, and the Florida Department of Law Enforcement. In these studies he has had responsibility for developing evaluation concepts addressing manpower needs, resource requirements, and long-range planning. Particular program areas of involvement have included developing master plans for upgrading the training and ed cational status of criminal justice personnel, evaluating crime laboratory operations, and providing technical assistance to local police departments.

Booz, Allen Applied Research, Inc., Combined Arms Research Office, Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas. Before joining MRI in 1969, Mr. Worley was a systems analyst with Booz, Allen. While with Booz, Allen, his major contributions were in the area of operations research and mathematical modeling applied to the evaluation of weapon systems. His experience included conducting cost-effectiveness studies and other trade-off analyses.

Wentworth Military Academy. Mr. Worley was a mathematics instructor at Wentworth Military Academy prior to joining Booz, Allen. His class work included teaching calculus, statistics, and mathematics of finance.

### Education

B.S., Education, Kansas State College, 1964. M.S., Mathematics, Kansas State College, 1965.

### Professional Activities

Mathematics Association of American Operational Research Society in American

### MICHAEL L. WORLEY, Senior Operations Analyst

B-13



# Appendix C

# Criminal Justice Information Systems and Statistics Terminology Glossary

.

,

A

.

1

# CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND

STATISTICS TERMINOLOGY GLOSSARY

Acronym		Full Name
ACIR	-	Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations
CCH	-	Computerized Criminal Histories
CCHS	-	Computerized Criminal History System
CCMS	-	Court Case Management System
CDS		Comprehensive Data Systems
CJI	· –	Criminal Justice Information
CJIS		Criminal Justice Information System
CJS	-	Criminal Justice System
CRI		Criminal Record Information
EEOC		Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
FBI		Federal Bureau of Investigation
HUD		Housing and Urban Development
ICAIS	هبه	Integrated Court Automation/Information System
IS/SS		Information Systems and Statistical Services
JJDP	-	Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
LAPD	-	Los Angeles Police Department
LEAA	<del></del>	Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
MAS	-	Management and Administrative Statistics
MIS	-	Management Information System
NALECOM		National Law Enforcement Communications
NCJISS	<b>-</b> 0	National Criminal Justice Information and Statistical Service
NCIC		National Crime Information Center

C-2

. . . .

. . . Ye

<b>A</b>	
Acronyn	1
NILECJ	' <b>-</b> '
NPS	_
OBSCIS	· ·
OBTS-CCH	IS –
OMB	_
ORO	4
ONPP	 
PROMIS	-
RPU	·
SAC	-
SCJIS	
SJIS	
SEARCH SPA	
TA,	-
U¢r.	-
	•
1 - 0 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1	. ·

ء سر

• •

.

4

7

-1

# Full Name

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal National Prisoner Statistics Offender-Based State Corrections Information System Offender/Based Transaction Statistics/Computerized Criminal History System Office of Management and Budget Office of Regional Operations Office of National Priority Programs Prosecutors Management Information System Regional Planning Unit Statistical Analysis Center Statewide Criminal Justice Information System State Judicial Information System System for Electronic and Automated Retrieval of Criminal History State Planning Agency Technical Assistance Uniform Crime Reporting

C-3



# Appendix D

# Criminal Justice Information System Glossary

11

•

CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM GLOSSARY

				CAD
Acronym	<u>Full Name</u>	Location		CADOLIS
ACCMIS	Automated Criminal Court Management Information System	Hudson County, New Jersey		CAJUN
ACCPS	Automated Criminal Case Processing System	Passaic County, New Jersey		CAPS
ADAM	Automated Deployment of Avail- able Manpower	Los Angeles, California		CATCH 1
ADCMIS	Appellate Automated Docketing and Case Flow Management Information System	New Jersey		CDRS
AFIS	Automated Field Interview System	Los Angeles, California		CIS
ALECARS	Automated Law Enforcement	Lafayette,		. CIS
	Communications and Reporting System	Louisiana	с. С. е.	CJIS
ALERT II	Automated Law Enforcement Response Team	Kansas City, Missouri		CJIS - CABLE
AMS	Aftercare Movement System	Montana		CJIC
AWDI	Automated Worthless Document Index	Los Angeles, California		CJIS
c <sup>5</sup>	Camden County Computer Criminal Control	Camden County, New Jersey		Стте
CABLE	Computer Assisted Bay Area Law Enforcement	San Francisco, California		CITE
CAD	Computer Aided Dispatch	Jacksonville,		
		Florida		CJIS/CLETS
CAD	Computer Aided Dispatch	Rockford, Illinois		
CAD - ECCCS	Computer Aided Dispatch Emerging Command Control Communication	Los Angeles County, California		CMIS
	System			CPDS
an garta da sera da se Sera da sera da				and a second second Second second

• 1

ė,

• • • •

D-2

d.

J=<u>Z</u>

. \*

# Full Name

Computer Aided Dispatch

Acronym

Computer Aided Dispatch/On-Line Information System

Corrections and Justice Unified Network

Computer Assisted Public Safety System

Criminal Apprehension through Computer Hardware

Case Disposition Reporting System

Clerks Information System

Corrections Information System

Criminal Justice Information System

Criminal Justice Information System

Criminal Justice Information Control

Criminal Justice Information System

Criminal Justice Information System

Criminal Justice Information System

Criminal Justice Information System/California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System

Court Management Information System

Chicago Police Department System

# Location

Dallas, Texas

Peoria, Illinois

Louisiana

San Jose, California

Camden, New Jersey

Florida

Cook County, Illinois

Illinois

Duvall County, Florida

San Francisco, California

Santa Clara, California

Dade County, Florida

Dallas County, Texas

Bexar County, Texas

California

Mercer County, New Jersey

Chicago, Illinois

 $\mathcal{O}$ 

D-3

		<ul> <li>A second sec second second sec</li></ul>				•
				na pro-	Acronym	. 5
Acronym	Full Name	Location		er som av er som er	LEAS	Law
CRIME	Computerized Retrieval of Identifiers and Modus Operandi	Oakland, California		Č Č	5- <b>₽Т</b> С	T 1
	Elements				1212	Law I Syste
CRISYS*	Correctional Records Information System	Washington, D.C.		and the second sec	LEMRAS*	Law 1 Allo
DATUM	Fingerprint Identification Index	Patterson, New Jersey**			LOCATE	Local
FCIC	Florida Crime Information Center	Florida •			MLETS	Monta
:	Tester Merce Information System	Montana	an a			Sysc
FHIS	Foster nomes information by com	St. Louis.			MOTION	Metro
FLAIRS	Fleet Location and Information Reporting System	Missouri			MULES	Misso
IDSCR	Inmate Data Collection and Statistics Reporting	Florida			NCIC*	Nati
ITS	Inmate Tracking System	Texas			NLETS*	Nati
JANUS	Juvenile Analysis of Data and Use	Texas			OFD - OBITS	Offe Info
JARS	Judicial Automated Records System	Lake County, Illinois	and a second		PARS	Popu
JCSRS - SJIS	Judicial Council Statistical Reporting System - State Judicial Information System	California			PATRIC	Patt
JPIS	Juvenile Probations Information	Montana			PIN	Poli
JURIS	Juvenile Uniform Referral Information System	St. Louis, Missouri			PIS	Poli
LCJIS	Louisiana Criminal Justice Informa- tion System	Louisiana	÷.		PIS	Poli
LEADS	Law Enforcement Agencies Data System	Illinois			PMIS	Poli
		this avaluation			PROMIS	Pros
* This syste However, it	em is not one of the systems surveyed dur is mentioned in the discussion of CJIS's	in Chapter 4.	•			
	muis also operated and used by the follow	wing six cities:	0		* This system	i is not

\*\*This system is also operated and used by the rozzorana Camden, Newark, Jersey City, Trenton, Elizabeth, and Atlantic City.

D-4

## Full Name

Enforcement Activities System

Enforcement Information em

Enforcement Manpower and Resource cation System

tion of Oakland City by Telemunications

ana Law Enforcement Teletype em

opolitan Orleans Total Informa-On-Line Network

ouri Uniform Law Enforcement em

onal Crime Information Center

onal Law Enforcement Teletype System

ender Data File/Offender Based prmation Tracking System

(lation and Admission Report em

ern Recognition and Information elation

ce Information Network

ce Information System

ce Information System

ce Management Information System

secutor's Management Information

Location

Billings, Montana

Jacksonville, Florida

Oakland, California

Montana

New Orleans, Louisiana

Missouri

California

New Jersey

Los Angeles, California

Oakland, California

Ft. Lauderdale, Florida

Patterson, New Jersey

Rockford, Illinois

Louisiana

\* This system is not one of the systems surveyed during this evaluation. However, it is mentioned in the discussion of CJIS's in Chapter 4.

D-5

Acronym	Full Name	Lo
PSIS	Public Safety Information System	Long Calif
QUAD/NET ALE	RT Four Communities Comprise a Network and Share the ALERT System	Daven Rock Illin
RCIS	Regional Court Information System	St. L Misso
REJIS	Regional Justice Information System	St. L Misso
SAPIŠ	San Antonio Police Information System	San A Texas
SCIS	New Jersey Statewide Communications Information System	New J
SECURE	System for the Enforcement and Control of Unified Criminal Justice Resources	Baton Louis:
SIPCF	Subject-In-Process and Case Flow System	Hills Florid
SWJIS	Statewide Judicial Information System	Misson
TCIC	Texas Crime Information Center	Texas
TCS	Traffic Control System	Billin Montar
TJCS	Texas Judicial Council System	Texas

# Location

Å

**6**1

'<sup>1</sup>'-12 4,

¢ \*

£. ÷ ¥ ,

Ł.

. 6

1

ng Beach, lifornia

avenport, Iowa ock Island, linois

. Louis, ssouri

. Louis County, ssouri

n Antonio, xas

Jersey

ton Rouge, uisiana •

llsborough County, orida

ssouri

kas llings, ntana

с 4

1.1.

