

U.S. Department of Justice  
Office of Justice Programs  
National Institute of Justice



# National Institute of Justice

R e s e a r c h R e p o r t

## *National Assessment Program: 1994 Survey Results*



150856

---

# About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice, a component of the Office of Justice Programs, is the research and development agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. NIJ was established to prevent and reduce crime and to improve the criminal justice system. Specific mandates established by Congress in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, and the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 direct the National Institute of Justice to:

- *Sponsor special projects and research and development programs* that will improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and reduce or prevent crime.
- *Conduct national demonstration projects* that employ innovative or promising approaches for improving criminal justice.
- *Develop new technologies* to fight crime and improve criminal justice.
- *Evaluate the effectiveness of criminal justice programs* and identify programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- *Recommend actions* that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments as well as private organizations to improve criminal justice.
- *Carry out research on: criminal behavior.*
- *Develop new methods of crime prevention* and reduction of crime and delinquency.

The National Institute of Justice has a long history of accomplishments, including the following:

- Basic research on career criminals that led to the development of special police and prosecutor units to deal with repeat offenders.
- Research that confirmed the link between drugs and crime.
- The research and development program that resulted in the creation of police body armor that has meant the difference between life and death to hundreds of police officers.
- Pioneering scientific advances such as the research and development of DNA analysis to positively identify suspects and eliminate the innocent from suspicion.
- The evaluation of innovative justice programs to determine what works, including drug enforcement, community policing, community anti-drug initiatives, prosecution of complex drug cases, drug testing throughout the criminal justice system, and user accountability programs.
- Creation of a corrections information-sharing system that enables State and local officials to exchange more efficient and cost-effective concepts and techniques for planning, financing, and constructing new prisons and jails.
- Operation of the world's largest criminal justice information clearinghouse, a resource used by State and local officials across the Nation and by criminal justice agencies in foreign countries.

The Institute Director, who is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, establishes the Institute's objectives, guided by the priorities of the Office of Justice Programs, the Department of Justice, and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of criminal justice professionals to identify their most critical problems. Dedicated to the priorities of Federal, State, and local criminal justice agencies, research and development at the National Institute of Justice continues to search for answers to what works and why in the Nation's war on drugs and crime.

150856

NCJRS

SEP 1 1995

ACQUISITIONS

# National Assessment Program: 1994 Survey Results

Tom McEwen

150856

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

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 [redacted] material has been granted by  
Public Domain/OJP/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the [redacted] owner.

A Final Summary Report Presented to the National Institute of Justice

June 1995

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
Office of Justice Programs

**National Institute of Justice**

Jeremy Travis  
Director

Carolyn Peake  
Project Monitor

This project was supported under award number OJP-92-C-005 awarded to the Institute for Law and Justice by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Opinions or points of view expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

**NCJ 150856**

The National Institute of Justice is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

# National Assessment Program: 1994 Survey Results

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b> .....	1
Overall Results .....	1
Responses to Problems .....	4
Survey Methodology .....	5
<b>Chapter 2: Violence, Drugs, and Firearms</b> .....	10
Violent Crimes .....	10
Drugs .....	17
Firearms .....	24
<b>Chapter 3: Agency Initiatives</b> .....	27
Community Policing .....	27
Programs for Youth .....	31
Jail and Prison Crowding .....	38
Alternatives to Incarceration .....	49
<b>Chapter 4: Special Issues</b> .....	58
Cultural Diversity .....	58
Crimes Against the Elderly .....	62
Persons with Mental Illness .....	62
Information Systems .....	70
<b>Chapter 5: Research and Evaluation Priorities</b> .....	75

# National Assessment Program:

## 1994 Survey Results

### 1. Introduction

#### Overall Results

Results from the 1994 National Assessment Program (NAP) survey of over 2,500 directors of criminal justice agencies indicate great concern about the impact that violence, drugs, firearms, and troubled youths are having on society and the criminal justice system. In this regard, the views of the directors probably epitomize those of most Americans today. But because these directors deal with these problems on a day-to-day basis, their opinions are valuable in pointing out the needs of their agencies and in identifying programs and strategies that might be effective in addressing these prevailing important issues.

Police chiefs point to problems in combating violent crimes such as homicides, rapes, assaults, domestic violence, and child abuse. Prosecutors reflect on the difficulties in obtaining convictions for gang-related crimes in which victims and witnesses are reluctant to testify. Judges point to the backlog of cases in their courts and the increase in trials in some jurisdictions. Directors of probation and parole agencies are concerned about alcohol and drug treatment programs and the impact of new initiatives—such as day reporting centers and boot camps—on the workloads of an already overburdened staff.

Respondents to the 1994 NAP survey repeatedly expressed concern about young people, both as victims and offenders. A police chief from a large western city wrote, "Numerous social problems, especially with young adults and juveniles, have caused an escalation in the level of violence that youths are willing to commit on each other." Another chief commented, "The national phenomenon seems to be an exponential increase in youth violence and criminality, for which no one seems to have a feasible solution." A judge in a southern State had similar comments about the "dramatic rise in youth crime demonstrated by marked increases in transfers from juvenile court to adult court."

Use of firearms in crimes committed by juveniles and adults was yet another problem cited by many respondents. One police chief wrote about firearm involvement in 40 of the city's 49 homicides in 1993. Another stated that whereas last year showed an overall decrease in crime, "the

number of violent crimes has increased, including cases involving firearms." In total, 83 percent of the responding police chiefs and sheriffs indicated that crimes committed with firearms contributed to workload problems in their agencies.

Finally, alcohol abuse and illegal drug abuse continued to clog the criminal justice system with offenders. Respondents across the system gave comments on the impact these offenders have had on their agencies: "Alcohol and drug abuse plays a major role in the majority of our cases of crimes against persons." (police chief) "Seventy percent of inmates are here due to drug-related commitments; 65 percent are repeat inmates." (jail administrator) "Drug prosecutions are easily the largest contributor to our workload problems." (prosecutor) "Drug-related cases (especially possession, possession for sale, and small quantity sales) have overwhelmed the system. The congestion compounds caseload management at the misdemeanor and felony levels. These low-level drug cases account for 40 to 50 percent of our felony caseloads." (public defender) "The major problem is the doubling of criminal cases without an increase in the number of judges. Drug crimes and related crimes represent a major factor in the increase." (superior court judge) "There continues to be a significant increase in workload resulting from drug-related cases. They involve more forfeiture hearings and more motions to suppress evidence than in the past. As a result, courtrooms are in use more often along with court reporters, the judge's time, and our law clerk's time." (trial court administrator) "In recent years the upsurge in arrests for drug offenses coupled with stagnant staffing levels has created major workload problems." (probation agency director)

Criminal justice agencies face many other problems and needs that were identified in the 1994 NAP survey and are discussed in this report. How can police respond better to an increasingly culturally diverse society? To what degree are today's jails and prisons crowded? What kinds of programs have police departments established for at-risk youths? How are criminal justice agencies responding to mentally ill offenders? What kinds of information systems should agencies establish to support their activities?

Although survey results cannot provide solutions, they do indicate the extent to which heads of agencies believe their efforts need improvement and key areas in which strategies need to be established. Some problems, such as gang-related crimes, appeared primarily in populous jurisdictions.

This report also includes comments provided by respondents about their problems and needs. The comments for a given topic are not isolated

statements but are representative of observations by several respondents on the same subject. Stated another way, if only one respondent made a particular remark, it is not included in the report; if several respondents made similar remarks, then a representative comment is included. The researchers view the comments as important because they clarify the nature of the problems and experiences of respondents reflected in the quantitative results.

### **Responses to Problems**

The 1994 NAP survey results show that criminal justice agencies have taken a variety of steps to combat their workload problems and have implemented many responses that may have a positive effect on reducing crime. Clearly, the most frequent response by sheriffs and police chiefs was the introduction of community policing activities into their agencies. As detailed later in this report, over 80 percent of the responding police chiefs stated that their departments have implemented community policing activities. Community policing means that police and citizens are joining together to provide a more comprehensive and united effort to solve local problems. Under community policing, police departments have established foot patrols, neighborhood substations, resident officers, and other related strategies.

Many departments have also implemented programs within schools, such as D.A.R.E.<sup>®</sup> (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) and GREAT (Gang Resistance Education And Training) programs, to educate students about drug abuse and the adverse effects of gangs. Other police department initiatives discussed in this report include gun turn-in programs, special public housing enforcement efforts, asset forfeiture efforts, cultural diversity training programs, at-risk youth initiatives, and gang enforcement.

Other criminal justice agencies have been just as active as police departments. Prosecutors work with law enforcement agencies on combating gang-related crime, with prosecutors in several large cities establishing special gang prosecution units. Many prosecutors have also established victim and witness assistance programs. Activities under these programs include providing information to victims on their rights, informing victims about criminal justice processes, notifying victims and witnesses about the status of investigations, and referring victims to service agencies. Judges in many jurisdictions have special drug courts for expediting drug cases through the system, overseeing treatment services for drug offenders, and holding these offenders accountable. To deal with increasing numbers of convicted offenders, many States and jurisdictions have expanded

correctional programs, including day reporting centers, halfway houses, boot camps, and electronic monitoring programs.

The next section provides details about the methodology employed in conducting the 1994 NAP survey, which covered the entire criminal justice system with a total of 2,585 completed surveys and over 10,000 individual comments.

One portion of each survey asked respondents to comment on the extent to which several specific types of crimes contributed to workload problems in their agencies. The results of this section were particularly beneficial in identifying the major impact that violent crimes, drugs, and firearms play in shaping the workload of the criminal justice system. Because of their overriding importance, Chapter 2 is devoted to a detailed discussion of workload problems associated with these issues. In addition, Chapter 2 presents information on a variety of programs and strategies initiated by criminal justice agencies specifically to combat these problems.

Chapter 3 extends the discussion to other initiatives in criminal justice agencies, including community policing, youth programs, alleviation of jail and prison crowding, and alternatives to incarceration. In Chapter 4, other issues of concern are addressed, such as identifying and handling prisoners who have infectious diseases (tuberculosis and AIDS), serving culturally diverse populations, combating crimes against the elderly, responding to the needs of mentally ill offenders, and developing information systems to support agency activities.

A key section of the 1994 NAP survey asked respondents to list their priorities for future research and evaluation. Chapter 5 provides the results for each type of criminal justice agency.

### **Survey Methodology**

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) conducts the NAP survey approximately every 3 years to determine the needs and problems of State and local criminal justice agencies. At the local level, surveys are mailed to police chiefs, sheriffs, jail administrators, prosecutors, public defenders, judges, trial court administrators, and probation and parole directors. At the State level, surveys are sent to the attorneys general, commissioners of corrections, State court administrators, and directors of probation and parole. Prison wardens also participated in the 1994 NAP survey.

The survey instruments were divided into major sections on workload, staffing, and operations and procedures. These sections were

tailored to the responsibilities of the agencies. Police chiefs and sheriffs were asked, for example, about their activities aimed at drug problems, field operations activities, investigative activities, and several special activities to combat crimes committed with firearms and other violent crimes. Jail administrators were asked about crowding issues, jail alternatives, and classification. Topics in the survey for prosecutors, judges, and trial court administrators included issues related to case timeliness, diversion and sentencing alternatives, pretrial practices, and courtroom procedures. Probation and parole agency directors were asked about diagnostic tools, contracted services, and monitoring programs. All survey instruments included sections on staffing and training needs.

Within each section, respondents were provided lists of specific topics or activities and asked to indicate the extent to which improvements were needed in their current efforts to address each topic. For example, the 10 topics listed under the "Responses to Drug Problems" section in the survey for police chiefs included asset forfeiture, civil enforcement, directed patrol activities, organized crime units, citizens programs, enforcement tactics in public housing areas, and street-level "buy-busts" efforts. Respondents were asked to indicate whether their current efforts needed little or no improvement, moderate improvement, or major improvement. Analysis of these responses resulted in the identification of existing programs and initiatives in need of significant improvement.

Respondents without a particular program or activity could indicate whether they wanted to establish such a program or activity. This approach allowed for identification of programs and strategies that were desired by agency directors.

Throughout the survey instruments, open-ended sections were included for respondents to write comments on their problems and needs in particular areas as well as experiences with programs already established. These comments proved invaluable in supporting the analytical results. Throughout this report, representative comments from surveys are included to expand on the analytical results.

Surveys were sent to the criminal justice agencies in a selected sample of 411 counties. All 211 counties having populations greater than 250,000 residents were selected, along with a random sample of 200 counties having populations between 50,000 and 250,000 residents. Exhibit 1, which contains the response rates by type of agency, shows an overall response rate of 69.1 percent and a total of 2,585 completed surveys.

Several items in exhibit 1 (page 8) should be clarified. Police chiefs were selected by determining the city in each county with the highest population according to the 1990 census.<sup>1</sup> Police chiefs and sheriffs received the same survey instruments, with a screening procedure employed to identify the sheriffs with law enforcement responsibilities. The 347 sheriffs identified in this manner usually had law enforcement responsibilities in the unincorporated areas of the county. Exhibit 1 also shows that 264 of the 411 counties had trial court administrators. These administrators typically are responsible for the administration and management of the court, relieving judges of these activities and providing them with more time to concentrate on cases. Judges and trial court administrators received identical survey instruments. An accompanying letter asked both the judge and the administrator to complete individual surveys because of the different perspectives of the two functions.

Exhibit 1 also shows a total of 546 surveys mailed to probation and parole agencies. The reason for this high number is that some counties have separate agencies for probation and parole, so two surveys were necessary for these counties. Finally, the prison facilities selected for the 1994 NAP survey resulted from reviewing the directory of correctional facilities compiled by the American Correctional Association.<sup>2</sup> The directory lists every juvenile and adult institution by State, with an indication of the security level (minimum, medium, close, and maximum). All adult male and female prison facilities at all security levels were included in the survey.

For local criminal justice agencies, the response rates varied from 44.4 percent for judges to 82.2 percent for chiefs of police. The low rate for judges was due partially to the fact that trial court administrators received the same survey in those counties having administrators. Over 50 percent of the counties were represented by either the judge or trial court administrator.

Two other points are important in understanding the results presented in this report. One is that survey responses were received

---

<sup>1</sup>One county did not have any police chiefs and the sheriff handled all law enforcement responsibilities. For this reason, the number of surveys mailed to police chiefs totaled 410 surveys, even though there were 411 counties in the sample. Other exceptions can be seen in the exhibit because, for example, two small counties did not have their own jail facilities and three counties were served by prosecutors from neighboring counties.

<sup>2</sup>See the *1993 American Correctional Association Directory: Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies and Paroling Authorities*. (American Correctional Association, Laurel, Maryland).

between October 1993 and February 1994. Because the survey started in 1993, respondents were asked for background statistics for the prior year of 1992, which would be the most recent year of complete information. These 1992 statistics appear in relevant portions of this report.

The second point is that because respondents were guaranteed anonymity in their responses, this report contains no references to individual agencies. The researchers believe they obtained more candid remarks about problems and needs with this approach. In many instances, however, the size of the jurisdiction or the general geographic area along with a respondent's comment is indicated because this information serves to provide a better understanding of the statements provided.

---

**Exhibit 1**  
**Response Rates for the 1994 NAP Survey**

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>Number of Surveys Mailed</u>	<u>Number of Surveys Returned</u>	<u>Response Rate Percentage</u>
<u>Local Surveys</u>			
Police Chiefs	410	337	82.2
Sheriffs	347	265	76.4
Jail Administrators	409	315	77.0
Prosecutors	408	271	66.4
Public Defenders	303	183	60.4
Trial Court Administrators	264	150	56.8
Judges	367	163	44.4
Probation and Parole	<u>546</u>	<u>368</u>	<u>67.2</u>
Total Local Surveys	3,054	2,052	67.2
<u>State Surveys</u>			
State Court Administrators	51	35	68.6
Attorneys General	51	40	78.4
State Probation and Parole	62	54	87.1
Corrections Commissioners	51	43	84.3
Wardens	<u>470</u>	<u>361</u>	<u>76.8</u>
Total State Surveys	685	533	77.8
Total NAP Surveys	3,739	2,585	69.1

---

## **2. Violence, Drugs, and Firearms**

The themes of violence, drugs, and firearms dominated the responses and comments from the 1994 NAP survey. These issues are, of course, related. Numerous examples can be given in which violent crimes with firearms have taken place over drug disputes or the need for money to purchase drugs. On the other hand, violent crimes include incidents in which drugs and firearms may not be present, such as many domestic violence and assault incidents. The relationships among these three issues are important to keep in mind in understanding the results of the 1994 NAP survey.

The remainder of this chapter contains sections on violence, drugs, and firearms. Within each section, survey results are provided to the extent to which these issues are creating workload problems for criminal justice agencies. Initiatives from these agencies to combat these problems are also discussed within each section.

### **Violent Crimes**

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which several specific violent crimes—assaults, homicides, rapes, domestic violence, and child abuse—contributed to workload problems within their agencies. The emphasis was on problems, rather than just workload, because all these crimes obviously create workload for the agencies. Problems can occur for a variety of reasons, including increases in the number of reported offenses beyond available resources, increases in the amount of time required to handle these cases, changes in laws requiring different responses to crimes, or implementation of new initiatives throughout a jurisdiction. The key question was whether criminal justice agencies have been able to handle the workload adequately or whether they have experienced problems.

Exhibit 2 (page 11) shows the results of questions about workload problems created by violent crimes, as answered by police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors, public defenders, and judges. At least 65 percent of every responding group experienced significant workload problems related to every type of violent crime. Further, police chiefs and sheriffs identified workload problems associated with domestic violence incidents as their primary concern. Virtually all police chiefs and sheriffs indicated that domestic violence contributed to workload problems. Over 91 percent of the responding prosecutors cited domestic violence and child abuse cases as contributed to workload problems in their offices. Homicide shows an interesting pattern. As a workload contributor, it was ranked lowest by police chiefs and sheriffs, but high by public defenders and judges.

---

**Exhibit 2**  
**Violent Crimes Contributing to Workload Problems**

<u>Type of Violent Crime</u>	<u>Police Chiefs</u>	<u>Sheriffs</u>	<u>Prosecutors</u>	<u>Public Defenders</u>	<u>Judges</u>
Assault	97.6	95.4	79.4	74.3	69.9
Child Abuse	90.6	93.5	92.1	82.1	79.1
Domestic Violence	99.1	97.0	91.1	82.5	84.7
Homicide	68.7	65.3	88.0	86.4	83.7
Rape	77.4	73.7	87.7	79.1	74.5

---

By way of comparison, several other types of crimes were not considered to be workload problems by most agencies. For example, carjackings were indicated as workload problems by only 20 percent of the responding police chiefs and by 15 percent of the prosecutors. Only 18 percent of the judges reported asset forfeiture cases as creating workload problems.

Jail administrators were asked the extent to which arrests for violent crimes contributed to crowding problems in their jails.<sup>3</sup> The results are that 81 percent of the jail administrators rated these arrests as contributors, second only to arrests for drug charges, reported by 83 percent of the jail administrators.

Comments from respondents offer insights into possible causes of violence and reasons for the workload problems created by them:

Alcohol is involved in over 90 percent of our assault, rape, and domestic violence cases. (police chief)

---

<sup>3</sup>Jail administrators usually are concerned with crowding problems in their jails rather than workload problems created by different types of offenders. The NAP survey did not ask jail administrators about individual types of offenders but instead asked about crowding problems created by persons arrested for violence offenders. Chapter 3 contains more information about crowding problems in jails and prisons.

Deterioration of home life has resulted in the increase of child abuse, domestic violence, and rape. (police chief)

Domestic violence, child abuse, larceny, and robbery cases are increasing due to drug abuse, and in our area many people are unemployed and the pressures of keeping a job are putting people under a lot of stress. (police chief)

Over the past few years we have experienced a significant increase in robberies and assaults. We feel the largest contributing factor to this increase is drug use. (police chief)

Our society is becoming more and more violent, and there seems to be a total disregard for the sanctity of human life. (sheriff)

Our criminal justice system is currently operating without the ability to maintain any defendants in pretrial detention due to a federal court prison cap on the local jail population. This cap has effectively caused the whole system to be out of balance for several years, and presently there are over 40,000 outstanding bench warrants for defendants who either failed to appear or delayed prosecution by showing up when they knew they had exhausted the patience of the witnesses. In effect, this cap has generated the escalating violent crime on the streets of the city by not properly dealing with defendants early in their criminal careers. (prosecutor)

Police chiefs and sheriffs cited several other reasons for workload problems, including gang activities in their jurisdictions, increases in the number of reported violent crimes, changes in arrest policies for domestic violence, and changes in State laws mandating greater police action.

Two representative comments in regard to gangs were as follows:

Gang-related homicides and assaults consume an inordinate amount of time because of the difficulty of interviewing reticent witnesses, victims, and suspects. Fear of retaliation is a major inhibitor, precluding

more crime clearances and successful prosecutions. We have encouraged the establishment of reward funds and have arranged for tip-lines but have not had a great deal of success in obtaining pertinent information. (police chief)

Most of the violent crimes are gang-related. They are difficult to investigate due to lack of cooperation. Most of the gang problems are over drug selling territories. (sheriff)

Comments on increased reporting focused on changes in laws and public attitudes in reporting violent crimes:

"The State legislature routinely passes new legislation creating unfunded mandates for the criminal justice system. An example is the 1985 passage of a domestic violence prevention act in our State. While well intended, it created an enormous increase in workloads for law enforcement, prosecution, and the courts. The legislation includes mandatory arrests, service of various orders, mandatory arrests for violation of the orders, and mandatory incarcerations." (police chief)

Increased reporting by the public in child abuse, sexual assaults, and family violence has greatly increased our workload. (sheriff)

In 1989, our officers responded to 44,794 calls related to domestic violence. . . We project that we will respond to 68,921 calls by the end of 1993. This is an increase of 65 percent during the past 5 years. The factors that have contributed to this workload problem rest in the dynamics of domestic violence and societal problems that lead to a breakdown in the family and chaos in the home. (police chief)

Several police chiefs gave comments on investigations of domestic violence and the dropping of charges after investigation. One police chief wrote, "One problem we experience in handling family violence cases is the complainant dropping charges after investigators have applied their time to statements and the warrant process in general."

Several comments discussed the time required to investigate and prosecute child abuse cases:

Child abuse cases are more numerous and require above-average follow-up investigation time. Prosecution is also more time-consuming. (police chief)

Child abuse cases have been on the rise for several years due to a 'good touch, bad touch' outreach program in schools. (sheriff)

Major increases in our efforts in child abuse, neglect cases, and sexual assault have been a significant workload problem. Dilemma: the better we do, the more cases we have reported. (sheriff)

Comments from prosecutors focused on the challenges of dealing with violent crimes and actions they have taken to handle violent crimes more effectively:

The prosecution of child molestation cases takes a tremendous amount of resources from my office. We can process 40 theft or drug cases in the time 1 child molestation case takes. For this reason no single person in my office can be expected to handle all the molestation cases. I previously tried to handle the vast majority personally. Now they are evenly distributed among my entire staff.

Domestic violence cases create a large share of our workload problems. In addition to prosecution of contempt orders issued pursuant to the domestic violence act, our office prosecutes numerous other crimes caused by domestic violence such as rapes, child abuse, assaults, and homicides. Two assistant prosecutors assigned to the juvenile unit prosecute contempt proceedings. A single assistant prosecutor specializes in the prosecution of rape and child abuse cases, with the assistance of the head of the trial division.

For sexual assaults and child abuse, we have used a team concept and have hired a victim-witness director with two staff members to help with victims.

We have had increases in several areas but they are particularly dramatic in violent juvenile crime and drug cases. In an effort to alleviate workload problems, we have created specialized units in the area of civil forfeiture, gangs, domestic violence, and driving under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

In domestic violence cases, we encounter a recurring problem with victims who lose interest in prosecuting the offender, resulting in a large number of dismissals for lack of victim cooperation. In response, we expanded victim support services by volunteers in the community. However, the problem persists.

Several public defenders gave comments about increased workload in their offices in regard to violent crimes:

The shift to heavy prosecution and little plea negotiation of domestic violence, rape, and sex assault cases creates a heavy workload. The lessening of evidentiary rules related to child victims has made the prosecution so sure of their ability to prevail on borderline cases that a high risk of false convictions exists.

Mandatory sentencing for assault, drug, and firearm cases has caused an increase in the number of jury trials. As a result, we have had to increase staff and provide additional training.

Domestic abuse cases are approached by prosecutors and judges as 'I don't want to read about myself in the newspapers.' Therefore, some 'simple' cases have to go to trial. Prosecutors and judges have no concept that in these cases, there are two sides to the story.

Our workload has been affected in recent years by the increase in drug cases, cases involving firearms and gangs, as well as the State's increased use of the death

penalty. We have also been affected by an increase in prosecutions in child sex abuse cases and drunken driving prosecutions. The office has responded in recent years by adding staff attorneys.

Police chiefs and sheriffs also mentioned several anti-violence initiatives in their jurisdictions:

We are involved in a task force to investigate child abuse cases in conjunction with the Welfare Department. (sheriff)

We have created a Domestic Violence Squad (DVS) to address this problem with the hope of breaking the cycle of abuse. DVS detectives respond to domestic violence incidents when requested by beat officers and also conduct follow-up work on all cases in which an arrest is made. They maintain contact with victims and also conduct public presentations to hopefully prevent a person from becoming a 'repeat victim' of abuse and to advise citizens of the assistance that is available in the community. (police chief)

The department is reviewing new approaches to child abuse cases, including a new form for reporting child abuse, a child advocacy center where different agencies involved in investigation will coordinate their efforts, and a joint response program to hospital emergency room cases. The domestic violence prevention project involves teams of police officers and domestic violence counselors doing follow-up investigations of reported incidents. (police chief)

In summary, violent crimes were viewed as major contributors to workload problems in local criminal justice agencies. The problems appeared to involve the increased reporting of these crimes, the time required to investigate, and the difficulties in prosecuting these offenders. Criminal justice agencies have been proactive by developing responses to the problem of violent crimes within their agencies and in coordination with other agencies.

## Drugs

### *Extent of Workload Problems*

As with violent crimes, drug possession and drug sale offenses are also creating workload problems for agencies in the criminal justice system, as reflected in exhibit 3. Over 85 percent of the responding police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors, public defenders, and judges indicated workload problems from drug possession and drug sale offenses. In addition, 83 percent of jail administrators cited drug arrests as a contributor to crowding problems.

---

**Exhibit 3**  
**Drug Crimes Contributing to Workload Problems**

<u>Type of Drug Crime</u>	<u>Police Chiefs</u>	<u>Sheriffs</u>	<u>Prosecutors</u>	<u>Public Defenders</u>	<u>Judges</u>
Drug Possession	94.6	94.6	91.4	87.7	83.6
Drug Sales	91.9	89.7	92.5	93.8	86.2

---

Based on the comments from respondents, the volume of drug cases appears to be the primary reason for the workload problems. A sheriff from a medium-sized county in an eastern State wrote bluntly, "Our workload problems are a result of the overwhelming number of cases that are a direct or indirect result of drugs."

Several judges and trial court administrators also provided comments on specific workload problems associated with the adjudication of drug-related cases:

The major problem is the doubling in numbers of criminal cases without an increase in the number of judges. Drugs and related crimes—murder, burglary, etc.—represent a major factor in the increases. (judge)

The nature of criminal complaints is becoming more aggravated. Most crime is related to drug use. If we

don't do something about drug abuse at a very early age, our problems will be insurmountable. (judge)

Drug activity is the one factor most affecting our court. The county lacks local effective options to deal with drug-related crimes. (judge)

The biggest workload problem is the extended trial (frequently 8 to 12 months), typically organized crime or heavy drug distributor cases that take considerable resources and create a backlog of other cases that otherwise would be settled. (trial court administrator)

We have a large number of drug sales cases within 1,000 feet of a school, which carry mandatory jail sentences after indictment. To alleviate some of this workload, we have set up a pre-indictment plea program where the prosecutor has more flexibility in plea negotiations and is not bound by mandatory sentencing guidelines. (trial court administrator)

#### *Drug Enforcement Activities by Police Departments*

The drug problem has dominated police operations to such an extent during the past few years that over 75 percent of all responding police departments currently have each of the following activities:

- Asset forfeiture efforts (98 percent).
- Programs in public schools to increase awareness of drug abuse (96 percent).
- Street-level "buy-bust" efforts (94 percent).
- Directed patrol activities (93 percent).
- Neighborhood Watch efforts focused on drugs (91 percent).
- Organized crime unit with responsibilities for drug enforcement (85 percent).
- Civil enforcement (77 percent).

In addition, 72 percent of police department respondents stated they had special drug enforcement efforts in public housing areas.

Respondents did not express strong needs for major improvements in these existing approaches. For example, only 7 percent said their public school programs needed major improvement. Only 19 percent indicated the need for major improvements in their Neighborhood Watch efforts focused on drugs. All other activities fell between these two figures.

The only approach police chiefs questioned were programs for citizens on patrol to prevent drug trafficking. Thirty-seven percent said they had such programs; 30 percent said they were needed in their jurisdictions; and 33 percent expressed no interest in citizen patrol programs.

Police chiefs and sheriffs described special efforts aimed at reducing drug problems:

As with many other jurisdictions, we have been experiencing an increase in drug-related crime, especially violent crime. In an effort to impact on street-level narcotics activity, we have implemented the STAND (Stand Together Against Neighborhood Drugs) program. This initiative has met with some success, but it is very manpower-intensive. Our ability to address other pressing problems has suffered because of the commitment to this program. (police chief)

Problem-oriented policing efforts involving police officers, code enforcement inspections (housing), public works (streets, traffic, and lighting), parks and recreation (landscaping and recreation), city attorney (abatement and civil suits), county health (drug treatment), mental health (counseling), housing rehabilitation loans, employment training, and school resource enhancements have focused on four neighborhoods plagued by street drug dealing and drug-related criminal activity. The efforts have met with moderate success. Some displacement has been identified when enforcement efforts are increased in each area. (police chief)

The major problem we are experiencing is that drug offenders, including traffickers, are not spending

sufficient time in incarceration after conviction. We are told that they are being released to keep violent criminals in jail. However, the amount of crime activated by illicit drug sales is a major problem. Further, the juvenile justice system is incapable of dealing with those juveniles who repeatedly violate drug laws. We do appear to have successes with our drug education programs and our community-oriented policing efforts. Law enforcement cannot be held solely accountable to eliminate illicit drugs. (police chief)

***Drug Treatment Programs***

Whereas police and sheriff's departments have primary responsibility for drug enforcement efforts, other criminal justice agencies are more directly involved with treatment of drug offenders. Exhibit 4 shows responses from key groups who were asked to rate the adequacy of drug treatment programs in their jurisdictions.

---

**Exhibit 4**  
**Adequacy of Drug Treatment Programs Respondent Group**

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>Jurisdiction Currently Has Drug Treatment Program</u>	<u>Current Drug Treatment Program Needs Improvement</u>
Prosecutors	252 (93.0%)	207 (82.1%)
Public Defenders	171 (93.4%)	158 (92.4%)
Judges	150 (92.0%)	126 (84.0%)
Trial Court Administrators	135 (90.0%)	115 (85.2%)
Probation and Parole Directors	288 (78.3%)	232 (80.6%)

---

The majority of respondents indicated that their jurisdictions had drug treatment programs as alternative sanctions. However, more than 80 percent indicated that improvements were needed in the system to provide treatment services. In fact, 69 percent of the public defenders said treatment programs needed major improvements—an opinion echoed by 54 percent of the probation and parole agency directors, 46 percent of the prosecutors, 39 percent of the judges, and 35 percent of the trial court administrators.

Several respondents wrote comments about the treatment programs available in their jurisdictions. The comments generally reflected needs for expanded services in terms of the number of programs and beds, length of time offenders can remain in treatment, or availability for indigent offenders who are unable to pay even a portion of treatment costs:

Long-term, inpatient drug treatment is almost nonexistent. (prosecutor)

Current drug treatment slots are less than one-fourth of what they were 10 years ago. (prosecutor)

Because of the continuing high volume of drug cases, the court, district attorney's office, and public defender initiated a drug diversion program in August 1991. This allows defendants to participate in treatment and, upon successful completion of the year-long treatment program, the felony drug case is dismissed. Since the program began in August 1991, over 1,400 individuals have participated. Fifty-three percent are classified as active cases continuing in the program, 26 percent have been terminated from the program and face traditional prosecution, and 16 percent have successfully graduated. (prosecutor)

The main problem with drug and alcohol programs is the cost, even if minimal, that indigent clients cannot afford. (public defender)

The wait for drug treatment inpatient beds is 8 to 9 months, which makes it worse than a joke. (public defender)

We simply need more treatment programs for indigents in the area of alcohol and drug abuse. (judge)

Placing incarcerated defendants in inpatient drug/alcohol programs is generally accomplished only with significant delay due to unavailability of immediately available programs. (trial court administrator)

Biggest problem is finding residential programs which will accept drug-addicted defendants who cannot afford to pay. (judge)

Alcohol and drug treatment programs could be more effective with an increase in longer-term beds (such as up to 6 months). (trial court administrator)

Our pretrial diversion programs and drug and alcohol treatment programs have been very successful but need expansion in terms of personnel, beds, facilities, and equipment. (judge)

### *Drug Testing Programs*

Directors of probation and parole agencies were asked about their drug testing programs for probationers and parolees under their supervision. A total of 342 agencies (93 percent) indicated they had testing programs. Exhibit 5 indicates the frequency of tests by supervision levels.

---

**Exhibit 5**  
**Drug Testing by Supervision Level**  
**Probation and Parole Agencies**  
**(N=368 Agencies)**

<u>Supervision Level</u>	<u>Percentage of Agencies</u>			
	<u>Weekly</u>	<u>Monthly</u>	<u>Randomly</u>	<u>Test Not Performed</u>
Intensive Supervision	34.5	14.8	39.9	10.8
Maximum	15.6	19.6	55.0	9.8

Medium	2.8	15.7	72.1	9.4
Minimum	1.4	3.4	80.5	14.7
Administrative	0.0	2.4	26.4	71.2
Day Reporting Center	8.4	3.0	12.2	76.4
House Arrest	15.1	4.5	33.8	46.6

---

Probation and parole agency directors offered a mix of opinions on the value of drug testing. Typical comments from the directors follow:

We have found drug testing to be an effective tool in discouraging illicit drug use.

Drug testing is extremely effective and a useful supervision tool. It has increased the work of our substance abuse program because most people are using drugs even when their conviction is for a nondrug offense. We began drug testing in about 1986. In 1993 at least 17 percent of our urine samples were diluted, indicating to us that offenders were trying to beat the system.

Drug testing provides a valuable tool for the officer in supervising the offender. Typically, the offenders who continually have positive results are those having difficulty in other areas of community supervision and seem likely to recidivate.

Results are routinely used in the supervision of offenders and have been used in revocation hearings with no problems.

Our experience with drug testing has been positive. It proves to be a useful tool in client supervision.

Drug testing has been very effective in keeping drug use among offenders to a minimum.

It is a time-consuming job for the probation agent, thus not done as often as it should be. Results are often questionable, and many individuals confess to use of drugs which never show in the testing.

Drug testing has proven to serve as a deterrent. However, there is not a sufficient number of programs to refer abusing clients to.

If not administered properly, officers may become dependent on it and use it to validate 'good behavior.' That is, if the offender is clean, he must be doing well. This is not necessarily true.

## **Firearms**

Eighty-three percent of the police chiefs and sheriffs indicated that crimes committed with firearms contributed to their workload problems. Of particular concern was the availability of firearms to juveniles. A police chief from the Northwest commented, "Current law allowing possession of firearms by anyone 16 and older puts many weapons into the pockets and vehicles of juveniles." "There is an increase in the number of juveniles possessing and using handguns," wrote a chief from a western State. "The city just implemented an ordinance prohibiting possession of a handgun by any person under 21 years of age with a \$500 fine and 30-day confinement," he continued.

Among the more recent initiatives for removing guns from the street are gun "turn-in" or "buy-back" efforts in many cities. Thirty-seven percent of police respondents indicated they participated in these programs, and the majority of these departments were satisfied with their efforts. Another 37 percent said they would like to see such a program developed in their jurisdiction, whereas 26 percent stated they did not want such programs.

Overall, the views on gun turn-in programs were mixed, as indicated by remarks from police chiefs and sheriffs. Most positive comments were from urban metropolitan areas, whereas negative comments were mostly from suburban and rural communities:

Positive: Ran successful gun buy-back program in December 1992 and may repeat it in 1994. (police chief)

Positive: First gun turn-in program ever held was last month. Guns, ammunition, and explosives were turned in. Expect more next time. (police chief)

Positive: Have had success in gun buy-back amnesty programs funded by outside organizations. (police chief)

Positive: The department began a new program on December 14, 1993, called 'Real Cowboys Don't Carry Guns.' This program is designed to target juveniles and encourages them to turn in guns for their safety and community safety. The incentive given is a T-shirt and two preseason football tickets (for the city's professional football team). The program is to run until preseason begins in 1994. (police chief)

Negative: We tried a gun turn-in program and only received one gun. No criminals or gang members came forward. (police chief)

Negative: Gun turn-in programs are nothing more than media play. We have done a few with very poor results. (sheriff)

Negative: A gun turn-in program in this rural State would be viewed as ludicrous. Most people here do not view guns as 'bad,' as they are inanimate objects. Most children receive firearms safety in their local schools along with hunter education. (sheriff)

Negative: Gun turn-in programs are never going to take the weapons out of those individuals' hands that use them in a felonious manner. Those people who think it works are living in an imaginary world. (police chief)

Negative: I've responded that gun turn-in programs are not needed because I don't know of any criminals who turn guns in unless it is a 'no questions asked' program where they can effectively 'fence' stolen guns on the public tax dollars. It is my belief that such programs do not show an effective return given the resources they soak up and that they also give a false sense of progress and security to the public. (police chief)

In summary, police chiefs and sheriffs were very concerned about crimes involving the use of firearms and about access of juveniles to firearms. Their reactions to gun turn-in programs were mixed as indicated by the above comments. However, there was a lack of comments about other activities to decrease the access to and use of firearms. It should be noted that the survey did not inquire about other potential efforts, such as State laws limiting handgun access (e.g., by age) or requirements for background checks and waiting periods. The survey was conducted prior to the passage of the Brady Bill, which requires checks to be made prior to purchase of a firearm.

### **3. Agency Initiatives**

This chapter presents several programs and strategies considered important by respondents to the NAP survey. They have been grouped into four overall topics: community-oriented policing, programs for youth, efforts to relieve jail and prison crowding, and alternatives to incarceration.

Community policing aims to bring police and citizens together in a concerted effort to resolve community problems. Considered both a philosophy and an organizational strategy, community policing is becoming increasingly popular in law enforcement agencies to the point that a majority of departments (82 percent) reported having community policing activities.

An overriding result from the 1994 NAP survey indicates concern about today's youth. This concern was reflected in the numerical ratings given by respondents to topics related to youth and in comments by respondents about the need to address the problems of youth. Included in this chapter is a discussion of drug education programs in schools, efforts of police departments to prevent young people from obtaining guns, activities to prevent crimes in schools, programs for at-risk youth, and efforts to curtail illegal activities by gangs.

Another topic discussed in this chapter is jail and prison crowding. It is one subject in which comparisons can be made with results from the last NAP survey, conducted in 1990. Both surveys contained detailed questions about the extent of crowding in jails, and the recent survey indicates an easing of crowding conditions in many facilities. However, many jails continued to have crowding problems, and their efforts to alleviate these problems are discussed in this chapter.

Finally, a major initiative in many jurisdictions was to develop intermediate sanctions or a full range of correctional options. The alternatives discussed in this chapter include day reporting centers, electronic monitoring, boot camps, and work release centers.

#### **Community Policing**

Police chiefs and sheriffs were asked if they had community policing in their departments. Because community policing is a broad category, the survey did not attempt to determine the specific activities that comprised a department's community policing approach. (Indeed, community policing could be the subject of another survey of these agencies.) The survey results show that police chiefs and sheriffs strongly supported community

policing. Several offered comments on why their departments decided to embrace community policing and the steps needed to continue it.

### *Broad Interest in Community Policing*

Interest in community policing cut across the entire country in small, medium, and large agencies. Of the 337 responding police chiefs, 278 (82 percent) indicated that they had active community policing in their departments, and virtually all the remaining departments indicated that they wanted community policing. Sheriffs provided a similar result with 172 (65 percent) of the 265 responding sheriffs stating that they had community policing and 61 (25 percent) indicating that they wanted community policing in their departments.

It should be noted, however, that comments from the police chiefs and sheriffs clearly indicated that most community policing efforts were just developing and were confined to a few designated neighborhoods. Most comments mentioned foot beats, special units, and neighborhood substations as primary activities comprising their community policing efforts.

Some of the most interesting comments regarding community policing explained why the departments were interested in changing from a traditional/professional model of policing to community policing. The primary reasons given were to improve quality of life in the neighborhoods, to involve citizens in crime fighting activities (especially against drug problems), and to have a more concerted effort towards crime prevention. With regard to quality of life, one police chief wrote,

The workload increase for this department stems from neighborhood problems and quality of life issues rather than major crimes. We are adopting community policing in an effort to address these quality of life issues.

Other chiefs wrote comments on using community policing to address drug problems: "We have invested in community policing to better involve the public in solutions to our crack cocaine problems," and "We have been attempting to convince the community that drug problems are a community problem, not just a police problem."

Two chiefs cited broader problems as their reasons for introducing community policing:

The contributing factors to our workload have been greater availability of guns for juveniles; more sophisticated firearms in possession of criminals; decline in family cohesiveness in inner-city neighborhoods; availability of illegal drugs; and inadequate prison space. We are responding by shifting resources from traditional vehicle patrol to community policing.

During the past three years, we have experienced a dramatic surge in violent crimes, especially those committed by juveniles. Property crimes have increased as our local drug problem has come to the forefront as our major contributing factor to criminal activity. Subsequently, our caseload has dramatically increased. We are now implementing various forms of community-oriented policing strategies in our neighborhoods deemed 'high crime' in an effort to decrease these problems.

Ironically, some police chiefs and sheriffs stated that community policing had increased, rather than decreased, their departments' workloads. One police chief wrote, "The move to community policing and problem solving has also increased workload. As we become more responsive and credibility increases, we achieve more neighborhood involvement and workload increases."

### *Training and Personnel Needs*

A total of 293 police chiefs stated their departments had training programs for community policing, but 83 percent of these chiefs indicated that the training needed improvement. For sheriffs, 189 stated they had training, with 83 percent indicating that the training needed improvement. A total of 39 police chiefs and 44 sheriffs without community policing training would like to see the training develop in their agencies.

Several problems were indicated by the respondents in regard to their training efforts. One problem was simply making time available for the training sessions. Some respondents commented on mandated State and Federal training requirements that take precedence over topics such as community policing. Other police chiefs were concerned about "selling" community policing to officers: "Currently, the department is making a transition to community policing. The training challenge is to train and involve sworn members in the understanding and implementation of this

process in such a way as to make community policing eagerly embraced." "Problem solving is addressed in our community-oriented policing, and we are striving to get officers to think of themselves as problem solvers."

Police chiefs and sheriffs also commented on the need to have more officers in order to expand their community policing efforts. Typical comments follow:

An effort was made to implement community policing; however, due to manpower shortages, we were unable to continue. (sheriff)

Community policing is being vigorously looked into for further deployment, but due to manpower it is being postponed. (police chief)

We currently have one community-based, problem-oriented police team. We wish to replicate this team's efforts in other neighborhoods because it has been effective in reducing drug crimes, has reduced overall calls for police service, improved citizen perceptions of safety, and been effective in providing role models for adolescents. If resources become available, we would expand into neighborhoods where there is a large culturally diverse population. (sheriff)

Our citizens are concerned with community policing and seeing officers walking in their neighborhoods. However, our department now has 828 officers, as opposed to 975 officers 4 years ago. This reduction, coupled with an increase in calls for service, makes it difficult. (police chief)

In summary, police chiefs and sheriffs have been implementing community policing in their agencies and appear to be enthusiastic about its future. The two primary obstacles to expansion have been the need for better training on community policing and for increases in the number of officers to perform community policing activities.

## Programs for Youth

### *Drug Education Programs in Schools*

Police chiefs and sheriffs were asked about their departments' efforts in public schools to increase awareness of drug abuse. The results indicate that most departments had school programs in place and were satisfied with them. For example, 324 of the 337 police chiefs reported that these programs were in place, with the majority indicating the programs needed little or no improvement. Of the 265 responding sheriffs, 252 stated they had public school programs to increase awareness of drug abuse. They were slightly less satisfied with these programs, with 53 percent indicating the programs needed improvement.

Many police chiefs and sheriffs commented on the success of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.®) programs implemented by the departments in schools:

D.A.R.E.® program has been a positive bonus to the community and the department. (police chief)

I believe D.A.R.E.® is the best prevention program a department can conduct. (police chief)

The D.A.R.E.® program has worked well but should be continued past the elementary level. (police chief)

D.A.R.E.® is having a positive effect, but the total result cannot be determined until several years from now when the graduates are evaluated. (police chief)

Our department delivers the D.A.R.E.® program to all public school students, and students of private schools upon request. I feel the program has had a very positive impact on our youth. (police chief)

We have found that, from an education standpoint, a drug education program which covers grades K through 12 is much more effective than a program which targets only a few grade levels in elementary, middle, and high schools. (sheriff)

### *Preventing Youths from Obtaining Guns*

One of the greatest needs identified by police chiefs and sheriffs concerns programs to prevent juveniles from obtaining guns. Eighty-four percent of the police chiefs indicated a need to either improve existing activities or develop new efforts. More specifically, 216 departments reported having such efforts but 184 believed improvements were needed, and an additional 99 departments wanted to develop activities in this area.

Sheriffs responded with almost identical results. A total of 133 sheriffs stated they currently had such prevention activities, with 111 indicating a need for improvement. Another 110 sheriffs indicated they believed these activities needed to be developed.

Comments from the police chiefs and sheriffs offered only a few suggestions on specific activities. One police chief suggested a change in the State law that allows possession of firearms by any person 16 years or older. Another indicated that the department was developing a citizens academy with local civil groups that would include a focus on juveniles and firearms. One of the more innovative approaches, already mentioned in Chapter 2, is a southern city's juvenile-oriented gun turn-in program, which used the slogan "Real Cowboys Don't Carry Guns."

### *Combating School Crime*

Crimes occurring inside schools were mentioned as another area of concern for police chiefs and sheriffs. As one police chief commented, "It seems that schools have turned into dens of violence and intimidation. Learning is second to surviving the day and getting through without being assaulted." Several other respondents wrote about problems of fear and crime on school campuses.

Eighty-nine percent of police chiefs and 80 percent of sheriffs indicated their departments had special activities aimed at preventing crimes in schools, but the majority reported that improvements were needed in these efforts. Another 28 police chiefs (8 percent) and 38 sheriffs (15 percent) stated they wanted to develop activities aimed at preventing crimes in schools.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Some respondents indicated that the school system in their city or county had its own security force with responsibilities for prevention and investigation of school crimes. Their comments implied that the police department did not get involved in school crime and had no formal links with school security.

Many police chiefs and sheriffs provided comments about their use of school resource officers (SRO's) as their approach for dealing with school crimes. In general, the aim has been to "form positive relationships with students and also provide necessary law enforcement services to the campus." SRO's serve several functions, including counseling students, maintaining order in the schools, and teaching drug awareness and crime prevention programs. One police chief commented that compared to all the department's special activities, "our most successful program has been the placement of officers in all middle schools and high schools as teachers and counselors."

Other comments from police chiefs and sheriffs echoed these positive sentiments:

School resource officers are assigned to middle and high schools to form positive relationships with students and also provide necessary law enforcement services to the campus. (sheriff)

We have increased the number of school resource officers who, in addition to counseling duties, present drug awareness and 'just say no' programs. (police chief)

School resource officers have proven to be effective on several fronts. I believe that these officers are beneficial because they establish a relationship between students and police officers, especially when in middle school or earlier levels. (sheriff)

We have a very successful school resource officer program with officers in the high schools and middle schools, but we need more community-based programs that target at-risk youth between the hours of 3:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. (police chief)

Departments also reported using their community policing program to work with schools for reducing school crimes. Two different approaches were mentioned in survey comments. Some departments had an "Adopt-A-School" program in which an officer volunteered to work with a school in a variety of activities, including prevention and reduction of school crimes. Other departments included school involvement as part of their general community policing efforts. With this approach, several officers might be working with a school on prevention activities.

## *At-Risk Youths*

A recent study by the National Research Council described the problem of adolescents at risk as follows:

For more and more children and adolescents—especially those who are poor and those who must deal with the discrimination that often faces racial and ethnic minorities—the contexts of their everyday lives fail to provide the resources, supports, and opportunities essential to healthy development and reasonable preparation for productive adulthood. Disorganization of the key settings in which poor and minority young people live their daily lives—schools, neighborhoods, families, and, sometimes, the health care and law enforcement settings—poses a daunting challenge for their successful development during childhood and adolescence.<sup>5</sup>

The *at-risk youths* characterized by the above quotation are more likely to adopt "risky lifestyles" that lead to delinquent activities, such as drug use, promiscuous sexual activities, and gang associations. As a consequence, they attract the attention of law enforcement and the juvenile justice system, which unfortunately fails in many instances to provide adequate guidance for moving these youths back into the mainstream.

In the survey, police chiefs and sheriffs showed strong interest in wanting to develop or improve their strategies for working with at-risk youths. Seventy-four percent of the police chiefs indicated their departments had programs designed to serve at-risk youths. Another 70 police chiefs (21 percent) said they wanted to see these programs established in their departments. With sheriffs, only 53 percent had these programs, but 38 percent indicated interest in them. Overall, for both police chiefs and sheriffs, about 75 percent with at-risk youth programs indicated that improvements were needed in their efforts.

Comments from respondents reveal a variety of different activities for at-risk youths:

---

<sup>5</sup>Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, Panel on High-Risk Youth, *Losing Generations: Adolescents in High-Risk Settings*, (Washington: National Academy Press, 1993), p. 13.

- Use of D.A.R.E.<sup>®</sup> officers to develop a summer program aimed at at-risk youths.
- Use of Police Athletic League (PAL) to work with at-risk youths.
- Development of Project Future Force to send at-risk youths to summer camps sponsored by corporate contributions.
- Special focus on at-risk youths through community policing efforts.
- Development of Project New Direction to provide at-risk youths from ghettos with job opportunities in corporations.

### *Gang Prevention, Enforcement, and Prosecution*

Questions about gangs were included in the surveys for police chiefs, sheriffs, jail administrators, prosecutors, and wardens. The results show that gang-related crimes have presented special problems for all these administrators. Among police chiefs, sheriffs, and prosecutors, concern was expressed about the increase in gang-related crimes and difficulties in investigating these offenses. Jail administrators and wardens were concerned about classification procedures for identifying gang members and about staff training on how to control gang activities within their facilities.

According to the responses from police chiefs, gangs were a problem in most large jurisdictions and a growing problem in medium and small jurisdictions. Seventy-three percent of police respondents in jurisdictions with more than 250,000 residents stated that gang-related crimes were contributors to their workload problems. This compares to 55 percent in medium-sized jurisdictions (100,000 to 250,000 population) and 45 percent in smaller jurisdictions (less than 100,000 population).

Several respondents commented on their concerns about increases in gang-related crimes. One chief noted, "Gang activity is increasing steadily and we project it will be the principal cause of homicide and serious assault cases in the next few years unless it can be abated at this point." A sheriff stated, "We have an emerging gang problem that is close to becoming chronic. We had the first gang-related homicide associated with the trend during November 1993. Meanwhile local elected officials are reluctant to accept our evaluation of the gravity of the situation and to fund additional officers."

**Strategies to Combat Gang-Related Crime.** Survey results show that 90 percent of the police departments in large jurisdictions had special activities for combating gang-related crimes as compared to 82 percent of departments in medium-sized jurisdictions and 72 percent in small jurisdictions. However, the departments were not particularly pleased with their efforts, with about 80 percent wanting to see improvements in their activities for combating gang-related crimes.

Based on the comments from police respondents, specific approaches against gang-related crimes fell into two broad categories: street-level enforcement and educational prevention programs. A police chief from a medium-sized city stated, "Gang problems are becoming more and more an issue, and we have formed a gang task force to try to identify and attack problems. Gangs are leading to a lot of shootings and turf-associated crimes." Another chief wrote that the gang problem had increased to the extent that the department "recently disbanded our traffic unit to form a gang unit." Another wrote, "We assisted in the formation of a countywide Citizens Gang Advisory Council. The council has concentrated on several gang intervention and prevention programs but has been hampered by limited funding."

As an example of a school-related approach, one police chief said, "In response to increased gang activity, we are preparing to have school resource officers in the junior high schools by the fall semester of 1994."

One particular educational activity was noted by several respondents. The Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) program was developed in 1991 by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms in partnership with the Phoenix, Arizona, Police Department. Its aim is to educate seventh grade students in gang-prone areas about the destructive consequences of gang membership. The curriculum consists of eight lessons to familiarize students with cultural differences, equip students to meet their basic needs in ways other than joining gangs, explain the concept of crimes and their impact on the neighborhood, and describe the effects of drugs on neighborhoods. A curriculum is also available for the third and fourth grades. GREAT includes a summer recreation program designed to provide opportunities for "youths at risk" and to make them aware of alternatives to gang involvement.

Several respondents indicated that they have implemented a GREAT program as a means of discouraging adolescents from joining gangs. Interestingly, in virtually every comment, GREAT was mentioned in conjunction with a D.A.R.E.<sup>®</sup> program. For example, one police chief stated, "Along with D.A.R.E.<sup>®</sup>, we have implemented GREAT in our

schools." Another says "We are now participating in GREAT and D.A.R.E.® programs." It therefore appears that GREAT programs have been developed through expansion of D.A.R.E.® programs.

**Investigation and Prosecution of Gang-Related Crimes.** Gang-related crime was also an issue with prosecutors, especially in large jurisdictions. Fifty-eight percent of these prosecutors indicated that gang-related crimes contributed to their workload problems, compared to about 33 percent in the small jurisdictions. One prosecutor stated, "An explosion in gang crimes has caused most of our workload problems. A gang unit has been established which vertically prosecutes gang crimes."<sup>6</sup> In fact, survey results showed that 38 percent of the prosecutors in large counties have established specialized gang prosecution units. Only about 5 percent of the prosecutors in smaller jurisdictions have created these special units.

Several police chiefs and prosecutors commented on the difficulties in investigating gang-related crimes. For example, a police respondent wrote, "Gang-related homicides and assaults consume an inordinate amount of time because of the difficulty of interviewing reticent witnesses, victims, and suspects. Fear of retaliation is a major inhibitor precluding more crime clearances and successful prosecutions." These comments were reinforced by a prosecutor who wrote, "The primary problem with gang violence cases is the difficulty in both locating witnesses and convincing them to testify."

**Gangs in Jails and Prisons.** Jail administrators noted in their comments that identification of gang members is needed for effective classification, but identification is sometimes very difficult. Of the 315 responding jail administrators, 235 stated that their classification procedures included provisions for identifying gang-affiliated inmates, but 54 percent of these administrators indicated that their procedures needed improvement. Of those who had no such procedures, more than half said that they needed to be developed. Administrators also noted a need for staff training on how to control gang-related activities in their jails. Of the 224 jail administrators offering this training, 65 percent indicated a need for improvement. An additional 54 administrators (18 percent) said that training in controlling gangs needed to be developed for their jail staff.

Problems with gangs in prisons appeared to be greater than those experienced by jails because of the long-term incarceration of inmates. One warden stated emphatically, "Gang influence has been the most detrimental effect on prison operations in the last 25 years." Another wrote, "Gang

---

<sup>6</sup>Vertical prosecution means that the same prosecutor or group of prosecutors handles a case from initial appearance to final disposition.

membership and the threat of gang activity creates tremendous overcrowding in administrative segregation." A total of 298 of the 361 responding wardens stated that their classification procedures included identification of gang-affiliated inmates. Of these 298 wardens, 71 percent indicated that their classification procedures needed improvement. Another 38 wardens (11 percent) said that procedures for identifying gang affiliations needed to be developed. One warden, who was satisfied with the classification procedures, indicated that the real need was to develop effective programs to discourage gang activities in the prison. Staff training programs on how to control gang activities also needed improvement in prisons. About 300 of the prisons had staff training programs for controlling gang activities, but 71 percent indicated that improvements in the training were needed, and 45 wardens (13 percent) indicated that such training needed to be developed.

## **Jail and Prison Crowding**

### *Jails with Less Crowded Conditions*

The 1990 and 1994 NAP surveys asked jail administrators for information about the extent of crowding in their facilities. A key question asked how the average daily population (ADP) for the prior year compared to the rated capacity of the facility. For analytical purposes, this study considered a jail as "crowded" if it was operating at more than 110 percent of rated capacity. In addition, jail administrators provided the number of jail admissions for the prior year, their capital budget for jail construction over the prior 3 years, and the number of bed spaces added during the prior 3 years.

Because both surveys asked identical questions, the researchers could make comparisons between the two surveys (see exhibit 6). The exhibit shows a 7.4 percent increase in annual admissions over the 3-year period—an average of 14,398 admissions in 1989 (as reported in the 1990 NAP survey) compared to 15,457 admissions for 1992 (as reported in the 1994 NAP survey). This increase amounts to about 2.4 percent per year.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>The comparisons in this table should be used as an approximate guideline because the two surveys did not include the same jails. Further analysis shows that 148 jails responded to both the 1990 and 1994 surveys. These jails tended to be the larger jails because all counties exceeding 250,000 population were included in both samples. These 148 jails show the same trends as the above table. For example, for the 1994 NAP survey, bed spaces added during the past 3 years averaged 301 beds, compared to 236 for the 3 years before that. Jail admissions increased on average from 20,300 to 21,200 (4.4 percent). Total capital budgets doubled from \$11,394,000 to \$25,534,000.

---

**Exhibit 6**  
**Jail Admissions and New Cell Construction**

<u>Category</u>	1990 NAP Survey (1989 Data)	1994 NAP Survey (1992 Data)
Average annual jail admissions	14,398	15,457
Average capital budget for jail construction over past 3 years	\$8,750,000	\$19,500,000
Average number of bed spaces added during the past 3 years	159	220
Crowded jails	52%	35%
Jails with ADP less than 90% of rated capacity	10%	22%

---

According to survey results, capital budgets for jails have more than doubled. For the 3-year period 1987-1989, total capital budgets averaged about \$8,750,000 per jail, compared to \$19,500,000 for the next 3 years, 1990-1992. The impact of the capital budgets was reflected in the increase of 379 new beds per jail over a 6-year period. The more recent years of 1990-1992 show a higher rate of construction, averaging 220 new beds compared to 159 new beds for the prior 3 years.

The impact of construction was reflected in the following remarks from a jail administrator:

This jail expanded in July 1993 to a 300-bed unit. We are now able to house inmates one to a cell. Overcrowding is not a problem at this time and is not anticipated in the near future. We have the capability to 'double bunk' a cell without disrupting the operations of the facility.

A jail administrator currently in the middle of capital improvements offers insight into conditions prior to the additional cells:

Our crowding problems are currently being addressed through capital improvement projects. The wear and tear on the facility through age and crowding have caused problems in some areas, and the changes to more serious and violent offenders have added to the problems caused by poor design.

Construction was not the only reason given for the easing of crowding in many jails. Comments from jail administrators also mentioned imposition of a maximum capacity on their jails, establishment of weekend sentencing, and alternative sanctions as approaches for easing their crowded conditions:

Our crowding conditions significantly decreased once we had a maximum capacity established by the Federal courts and were given the authority to release within 10 percent of this cap. This allowed us to release inmates from within our system who were being held for misdemeanor crimes and lower-level felonies who were either unable to make bail or elected not to.

The jail weekend sentence program is a major success in helping to hold down the jail population.

Drug arrests were a problem until an intensive-supervision Release-On-Recognizance (ROR) program was created for drug offenders.

The sale, purchase, and consumption of drugs and associated violence have probably been the biggest contributors to our overcrowding problem. The county has undertaken extensive programs to help alleviate overcrowding, such as earned time, electronic monitoring, work release, and intensive supervision.

In the 1990 NAP survey, 52 percent of the jail administrators stated that they were operating under crowded conditions. The 1994 NAP survey shows a significant decrease in this category to 35 percent of the jails. Stated another way, jails operating at less than 90 percent of rated capacity increased from 10 percent of the jails in 1990 to 22 percent in 1993. In combination, these results show a significant easing of crowded conditions.

In summary, the results show:

- Jail admissions increased 7.4 percent over the 3-year period between the two surveys.
- Capital budgets for jail construction more than doubled during the period 1990-1992 compared to 1987-1989.
- For 1987-1989, jails added an average of 159 new beds to their facilities, as compared to 220 new beds for 1990-1992.
- Jail crowding has been eased at some jails because of the imposition of maximum capacities by the courts, establishment of weekend sentences, implementation of alternative sanctions, and other approaches.
- In the 1990 NAP survey, 52 percent of the jails responded that they were operating at more than 110 percent of rated capacity. In the 1994 NAP survey, 35 percent responded they were operating at this capacity.

### *Jails with Crowded Conditions*

For the 103 jails (35 percent) with crowded conditions, the survey asked respondents to indicate the extent to which several factors contributed to the problem. The main factors were arrests for drug offenses, arrests for violent crimes, probation and parole violators, length of jail sentences, and incarceration for persons convicted of felonies. Exhibit 7, (page 42) shows that every factor has been indicated by a majority of the jail administrators as at least a moderate contributor to crowding.

Several respondents with continuing crowded conditions gave specific reasons for their problems, of which the following are typical:

Overcrowding in this county's jails is not a new problem and is very similar to what has occurred in other major population centers for years. It's just been slow to come to the Midwest. Our difficulties involve a slowly growing community which has resulted in more arrests, more violent crimes occurring (probably due to increased drug activity and gangs), a reluctance of our council to build additional jail space, and a backlog of cases to be tried in our courts. . . . I believe we will

soon be forced to release inmates into the community. We need additional custody space along with more home detention and electronic monitoring programs.

**Exhibit 7**  
**Factors Associated with Jail Crowding**  
**(N= 103)**

<u>Crowding Contributor</u>	<u>Percent of Respondents</u>		
	<u>Major Contributor</u>	<u>Moderate Contributor</u>	<u>Not a Contributor</u>
Arrests for drug possession	53.0	41.0	6.0
Arrests for drug sales	51.0	43.0	6.0
Arrests for violent crimes	40.0	50.0	10.0
Domestic violence	9.1	59.6	30.3
Insufficient alternative sentence programs	17.8	34.7	43.6
Insufficient pretrial release options	21.8	33.7	41.6
Jail incarceration for persons convicted of felonies	30.3	42.4	22.2
Lack of community alternatives for mentally ill	15.2	43.4	36.4
Length of sentences to jail	23.2	45.5	28.3
Mandatory jail sentences for driving while intoxicated	24.2	40.4	31.3
Parole violations	24.0	48.0	27.0
Prison system delay in accepting convicted felons	34.7	19.8	38.6
Probation violations	29.0	55.0	16.0

Our jail has been battling jail overcrowding for the past 10 years. In the past 3 years, we have released 3,500 inmates back to the streets without serving their sentences.

This county has the highest arrest rate in the State, increasing 24 percent while the State average dropped by 5 percent. Also, to exacerbate the problem, the

court delays are the longest in the State—11 months from indictment to disposition. The State average is 8 months. This is coupled with a Federal drug grant for law enforcement (Weed and Seed), making the crowding more an issue. Resentment between police agencies leads to attempts to out-arrest each other, increasing drug arrests. There are no drug alternative programs in the county.

Crowding problems in State prisons were mentioned by several respondents as a primary reason for jail crowding. Typical comments describing this problem are as follows:

Probably the most significant problem is the State prisons not accepting sentenced and parole violation prisoners. Continuous dialogue with the State to accept their prisoners and court action helps a little (via attorneys).

Many State inmates are serving their entire sentences at our facility, and the State is often slow in taking others into the prison system. This has been a major crowding factor to us. To reduce crowding, we send inmates to other jails and utilize our pretrial and home detention programs as much as possible.

Several respondents commented on the difficulties in performing proper inmate classifications due to crowding conditions:

Our current classification program is exceptional. However, due to overcrowding and physical constraints, all aspects of the program cannot be implemented. For example, new inmates cannot be separated from the general population during the classification process.

Classification of inmates is very difficult due to the design of the building and overcrowding.

Our classification needs are hindered greatly by the overcrowding. If numbers were reduced, we would better handle these areas.

Several counties gave comments about their experiences with alternatives aimed at alleviating jail crowding:

Our county has developed extensive and comprehensive alternatives to incarceration in an effort to relieve jail crowding. However, continued increases in arrest activities, especially for drug-related offenses and persons arrested for new felonies while serving a term of felony probation, have outpaced our efforts for diverting other offenders.

Clearly, substance abuse seems to be the front-running factor related to overcrowding at this jail. It seems that even offenses that appear unrelated to drug or alcohol abuse are somehow rooted in such an abuse. An up-and-coming group seems to be adult children of alcoholics as well as substance abusers. A change we made in 1993, in conjunction with the state Division of Parole and the Memorial Hospital, is the introduction of a 'High Impact Incarceration Program.' The program provides substance abuse parole violators with a 60-day intensive counseling program in the jail and, upon successful completion, a conditional release with a 6-month aftercare program at the hospital.

## *Prison Crowding*

Crowding problems occur not only in local jails but also in State prisons. One result, as noted by jail administrators, is a backlog of sentenced inmates waiting for prison space to become available. To obtain more information about prison crowding, the NAP survey for wardens included a series of questions about the extent of crowding in their facilities and the reasons for crowded conditions. By way of review, a total of 361 wardens from minimum, medium, close, and maximum security facilities submitted completed NAP surveys for analysis, including 328 male facilities and 33 female facilities.

Of the 361 warden responses, 135 wardens (37 percent) reported that their prisons were crowded (i.e., they housed more than 110 percent of rated capacity). A total of 13 wardens indicated their inmate population size was at less than 90 percent of rated capacity; 147 wardens said their size was between 90 and 100 percent of rated capacity; and 54 wardens had inmate populations between 101 and 110 percent of rated capacity.<sup>8</sup>

Wardens with crowded conditions gave several reasons for their problems, including drug crime offenders (cited by 88 percent of the wardens), violent crime offenders (80 percent), longer sentences for offenders (78 percent), parole violators (72 percent), and insufficient alternatives to prisons (71 percent).

Comments from the wardens supported these conclusions and were similar to the particular reasons for crowding given by jail administrators:

Drug offenders with heavy sentences fill up about 75 percent of the available cells.

More offenders are being sentenced for violent crimes and more are given life sentences that are now 40 years or more without parole.

Essentially, the increasing number of drug-related offenders has backlogged the system to the point that hundreds of inmates who should be at reduced security facilities end up here. At the current time, there is nothing I can do to impact this problem.

---

<sup>8</sup>Twelve prisons (3.3 percent) did not respond to this question.

A drop in the number of parolees was emphasized in a warden's comment as a primary contributor to crowded conditions:

The number of violent criminals who are also substance abusers or drug sellers has increased. They are younger and more difficult to control. Consequently, they stay in prison longer as parole officials are not inclined to release them. There is nothing prison officials can do about the influx. We try to keep them separated through the classification process.

As with local jails, the prison systems have been active in adding new cells to their facilities to accommodate increases in inmates and to alleviate crowded conditions. Capital budgets averaged \$5,715,000 for the 3-year period 1990-1992, with wardens reporting an average of 87 new cells added to their facilities.<sup>9</sup> Interestingly, the currently crowded prisons have been more active in building, with an average increase of 107 new cells, as compared to 69 new cells for prisons without crowding problems.

In addition to wardens, NAP surveys were also sent to State commissioners of corrections. Their viewpoints are important because they have direct responsibility for assigning convicted persons to prisons, administering parole decisions, and constructing prisons. The Commissioner from an eastern State provided the following information about the State's decision to build new prisons:

According to the State's Commission on Crime and Delinquency, growth in the State and county prison populations since 1985 resulted from: (1) more offenders sentenced to correctional sanctions, (2) those offenders remaining under correctional supervision longer, (3) more offenders with substance abuse problems, and (4) more of the same offenders 'recirculating' in the correctional system. In response to increased population demands, the Department of Corrections has launched the largest prison expansion effort in the history of the commonwealth. This effort calls for the

---

<sup>9</sup> Because the survey did not ask about new facilities in the State, this average is only for expansion of these prisons.

construction of 7 new prisons with some 10,000 new beds by the end of the calendar year 1995.

The commissioner continued with a summary of other strategies aimed at alleviating crowding problems in the State:

Recognizing that construction alone will not solve the overcrowding problem, the State has launched a multifaceted strategy to address overcrowding at the State and county prison level. First, the commonwealth has encouraged the development of intermediate punishment programs at the county level through a \$200 million bond issuance. Second, the Commission on Sentencing has proposed revised sentencing guidelines that would encourage judges to place offenders in the least restrictive confinement options, ranging from intermediate punishments to county or state incarceration, which provides the most appropriate level of security for offenders based on their current and past criminal behavior. Third, correctional officials have been actively working with State legislators to enact legislation that would streamline the existing release process for nonviolent offenders so as to ensure that cell spaces are reserved for the most serious offenders.

Crowding problems have had an impact on several operational areas in prisons, particularly inmate classifications and inmate programs. The warden from an eastern State commented:

Prison crowding especially impacts negatively on classification of inmates for program needs. As the numbers increase, our emphasis shifts from treatment and programming to containment. Resources normally allocated to programs are diverted to security. Prison crowding, combined with the State's fiscal austerity, makes for an atmosphere of hard choices, and the first mission becomes confinement.

Improving inmate programs was an obvious concern to wardens, but the concern was even more pronounced by wardens of crowded prisons. For example, 70 percent of the wardens in crowded prisons believed their mental health programs needed improvement, compared to 55 percent of the other wardens. The same result appeared in recreational programs, with 50 percent of the wardens in crowded prisons saying they needed to improve these programs, as compared to 38 percent of the other wardens.

Prisons for females were not reported to be as crowded as their male counterparts, with only 7 of the responding 33 wardens in charge of female prisons indicating crowded conditions. However, female facilities appeared to be heading in the same direction as male facilities. Several wardens expressed concern about increases in the number of prisoners, the majority of whom were involved in drugs:

The rapid increase in the growth of female offenders is driven by increasing commitments in mandatory drug sentences. Many females are committed on split sentences, with a portion to serve and a portion on probation. It is not uncommon for women to be in and out several times on the same commitment, as probation violators.

Approximately 85 percent of the female inmates have a history of substance abuse. Whether directly convicted of a drug crime or committing crimes to support drug habits, these offenses account for our highest increase in population. Undoubtedly, there exists a direct correlation between availability of community-based treatment programs and the influx of offenders.

A warden at a female prison with an increasingly severe crowding problem summarized the impact:

Lines for everything are longer: inmate canteen, inmate meals, backlog to get into specialty programs, backlog for transfers to minimum custody facilities, and not enough disciplinary segregation space. Patience wanes, tempers flare. Staff are more stressed as inmates become more demanding of individual attention

and acknowledgment. Drug offenses, sex offenses, and more violent offenses by female inmates have increased. Punishment of sentence length and distant parole eligibility (if at all) builds a central core population. This core population has probably quadrupled in the last several years.

## **Alternatives to Incarceration**

Because of the crowding problems in jails and prisons, many States and localities have turned to developing a range of sentencing options that preserve incarceration for the most serious offenders. These options were designed to fill the void between the probation and prison options available in most jurisdictions. Alternatives covered in the NAP survey were boot camps, day reporting centers, electronic monitoring, and work release centers. Exhibit 8 through exhibit 11 (pages 54-57) show the results for different respondent groups concerning these alternatives.

Three key results follow from a review of these exhibits. First, in order of frequency, the alternative programs reported were work release centers, electronic monitoring, boot camps, and day reporting centers. These programs provide for intensive oversight of offender behavior. Second, public defenders believed more strongly than the other respondent groups that available options needed to be improved.

Finally, probation and parole agency directors were less likely than the other groups to want these alternatives. Based on their comments, their resistance may have been due to the likelihood of additional work for their agencies, which they perceived as already overburdened. Another factor may have been the difficulty of implementing the organizational changes that would be required with the introduction of new programs.

One difficulty in asking about alternatives is that an alternative may or may not be under the direct control of the responding agency. For example, boot camps are usually administered by the State department of corrections, and they may not be located in the respondent's jurisdiction. Responsibility for day reporting centers may lie with the sheriff's department, State department of corrections, community corrections agency, or probation and parole agency. Many day reporting centers are privately operated under contract with one of these agencies. Probation and parole agencies operate most electronic monitoring programs, with variations on whether the program is within the agency or contracted to a

private company. In summary, the survey results gauged how respondent agencies viewed alternatives available in their jurisdiction or State, regardless of whether the agency administered the program.

As seen in the following sections, another important result from the survey was that no clear pattern emerged from respondents' comments about the value of these correctional programs. Some comments supported an alternative, whereas others discouraged the same approach. It appears that jurisdictions were struggling to address problems of overcrowding and sentencing, which have created expectations for alternative programs. The expectations varied according to the responding agency. It is likely that the ambivalence is part of overall concerns about sentencing and correctional options that have not been strategically addressed.

### *Boot Camps*

Boot camps were seen as the most controversial of the alternatives, as judged by the percentage of respondents who did not want this alternative and by the diversity of comments. For example, 42 percent of the directors of probation and parole agencies indicated that they did not have boot camp programs and did not want or need them. This percentage was higher than for the other three alternatives (day reporting centers, electronic monitoring, and work release centers) for these directors. Judges and trial court administrators expressed stronger support for boot camps. Eighty-two percent of judges and 63 percent of trial court administrators indicated that boot camps were an available option in their State or jurisdiction, with about half of each group indicating a need for improvement in the boot camps. Less than 10 percent of the judges and trial court administrators stated they did not want boot camps as an option.

Directors of probation and parole agencies expressed concern about the effectiveness of boot camps and about the staff time required to monitor them. One director stated, "I personally feel that boot camps are a silly idea and a throwback to the '50's and '60's, with no demonstrated value in positively impacting our population of offenders. Day treatment programs with prescriptive interventions, e.g., structured learning, offer the greatest promise of success." Another director wrote that "boot camp aftercare has taken up half of the intensive probation slots and is not very effective." Other comments illustrated that workload concerns prevailed over the value of boot camps in a sanctioning system.

For example, several probation and parole directors wrote about the additional staff time required for supervision:

Both halfway house and boot camp supervision require extra staff hours that are not figured into staffing levels. Specialization into both of these areas must be used in order to ensure close supervision—the burnout rate with these employees is very high.

Our agency (speaking from the perspective of this district office) is involved in several programs such as boot camps, intensive parole supervision, and home incarcerations with electronic monitoring, which would be good programs if we had adequate staff to handle routine caseload work. As it stands, the programs cause significant workload problems when agents assigned to them must be granted reduced caseload allowances, placing a burden on the other agents.

Boot camp early releases have high contact requirements but are lowest risk.

Many judges also commented on boot camps. One judge expressed his unhappiness this way: "Boot camp has proved a disappointment because a lack of follow-up skill training and supervision has resulted in graduates committing additional crimes." Another judge wrote, "I think boot camps are a good idea, but our present emphasis tends to be on offenders who have already been through probation and jail. A better plan might be to use boot camp on first-time offenders who are 'just drifting.' "

Several respondents believed that boot camps might be beneficial but that more followup was needed for participants in terms of aftercare services. One prosecutor noted, "Our concern with 'boot camp' programs is that there is little evidence that they result in long-term behavior modification and they currently have insufficient followup." A public defender stated, "Shock incarceration (boot camps) has had poor success because of the lack of options and structure upon release."

### *Day Reporting Centers*

Day reporting centers provide a structured environment for convicted offenders in a nonresidential setting. The centers provide direct oversight of offenders by having them report to a specific location for several hours each day (or evening). The actual number of hours varies

according to the type of offender and the length of the sentence. Center activities typically include mental health and substance abuse treatment, literacy training, vocational training, anger management, and other participatory activities.

Exhibit 9 (page 55) shows that results were mixed in regard to day reporting centers. Fewer agencies had day reporting centers compared to the other alternatives. For example, only 28 percent of the probation and parole agency directors indicated that day reporting centers were available. However, respondents showed interest in day reporting centers as reflected by the relatively high percentages who indicated that day reporting centers should be developed. The percentages ranged from 31 to 46 percent for the respondent groups.

Only a few comments were received about day reporting centers, and these comments tended to say that the concept was interesting and that the jurisdiction was considering implementation of the alternative. A jail administrator noted that the sheriff's department had a day reporting center that has been "very successful in our jurisdiction . . . handling up to 750 clients per year."

### *Electronic Monitoring*

Electronic monitoring programs were another option available to the majority of jurisdictions responding to the survey. Electronic monitoring is a technology used to track the location of offenders by attaching an electronic bracelet to them. Offenders are usually required to remain in their residences during given hours. Generally, the offender cannot leave without the permission of the supervising agent. Electronic monitoring programs vary in terms of the number of required face-to-face contacts between the offender and supervising agent and the length of time the offender is in a program.

Exhibit 10 (page 56) shows the survey results for electronic monitoring. The percentage of respondents indicating availability of electronic monitoring ranged from 63 percent for probation and parole agency directors to 91 percent of the judges. Respondents differed on the need for improvements in electronic monitoring with just less than half of the probation and parole agency directors indicating needs for improvements compared to almost 80 percent of the public defenders.

Virtually all the comments from respondents supported electronic monitoring as a sentencing option. A prosecutor from a western State wrote, "House arrest with electronic monitoring has proven successful with

low risk probationers." A judge in the same State said "Electronic monitoring has been successful; it needs to be expanded."

Several jail administrators also wrote comments about electronic monitoring, with one sheriff in a medium-sized jail stating that "electronic home confinement has been key to preventing crowding in our jail." Another administrator from a large jail stated, "Our electronic monitoring is a good one, but it suffers from a lack of suitable candidates."

Finally, a State commissioner of corrections from a northeastern State commented on a successful electronic monitoring program operated by the State department of corrections, which started in April 1990. The program has served over 300 inmates since its inception. It requires inmates to live with a sponsor (generally an immediate family member), to seek and maintain employment, and to participate in treatment programs specific to their needs. The commissioner stated that a recent evaluation of the program's first 2 years of operation found that (1) 90 percent of the participants successfully completed the program, (2) the recidivism rate for participants (1 year followup) was 16 percent; and (3) the program was cost effective in comparison to other community corrections options.

### *Work Release Centers*

Work release centers were the final option on which respondents were asked to provide ratings and comments. Over 90 percent of each respondent group, with the exception of probation and parole agency directors, indicated that these centers were available as an option in their jurisdiction (see exhibit 11 page 57). With probation and parole agency directors, 54 percent reported it as an available option. Thirty-two percent of the probation and parole agency directors indicated that they did not want or need work release centers. These results were consistent with their views on the other three options.

Probation and parole agency directors were concerned about the quality of the services offered in and the supervision needs of work release centers, which are usually operated as contracted services. As one director wrote, "Work release centers are contracted, understaffed, and poorly run. The cost factor makes them no more than a dumping ground for normal inmates." Another director stated, "Prison overcrowding has meant that the day reporting and work release programs have increased faster than the community supervision component."

**Exhibit 8  
Boot Camps**

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>Currently Have Boot Camps</u>	<u>Current Boot Camps Need Improvement</u>	<u>Boot Camps Need to be Developed</u>	<u>Do Not Want/Need</u>
Prosecutor	188 71.2 %	70.2 %	70 26.5 %	6 2.3 %
Public Defenders	129 71.7 %	71.3 %	29 16.1 %	22 12.2 %
Judges	129 81.7 %	55.8 %	25 15.8 %	4 2.5 %
Trial Court Administrators	82 62.6 %	50.0 %	37 28.2 %	12 9.2 %
Probation and Parole Agency Directors	149 42.9 %	45.0 %	51 14.7 %	147 42.4 %

**Exhibit 9**  
**Day Reporting Centers**

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>Currently Have Day Reporting Centers</u>	<u>Current Centers Need Improvement</u>	<u>Day Reporting Needs to be Developed</u>	<u>Do Not Want/Need</u>
Jail Administrators	117 40.0 %	51.3 %	124 42.5 %	51 17.5 %
Prosecutors	124 48.1 %	71.0 %	80 31.0 %	54 20.9 %
Public Defenders	85 47.8 %	83.5 %	81 45.5 %	12 6.7 %
Probation and Parole Agency Directors	99 28.4 %	47.5 %	137 39.4 %	112 32.3 %

**Exhibit 10**  
**Electronic Monitoring**

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>Currently Have Electronic Centers</u>	<u>Current Electronic Monitoring Needs Improvement</u>	<u>Electronic Monitoring Needs to be Developed</u>	<u>Do Not Want/Need</u>
Jail Administrators	214 70.4 %	62.1 %	58 19.1 %	32 10.5 %
Prosecutors	223 83.5 %	63.7 %	28 10.5 %	16 6.0 %
Public Defenders	151 83.9 %	79.5 %	29 16.1 %	0 0.0 %
Judges	142 90.5 %	65.5 %	11 7.0 %	4 2.5 %
Trial Court Administrators	124 89.9 %	72.6 %	13 9.4 %	1 0.7 %
Probation and Parole Agency Directors	219 62.8 %	48.4 %	58 16.6 %	72 20.6 %

**Exhibit 11**  
**Work Release Centers**

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>Currently Have Release Centers</u>	<u>Current Centers Need Improvement</u>	<u>Work Release Centers Need to be Developed</u>	<u>Do Not Want/Need</u>
Prosecutors	241 91.6 %	55.6 %	17 6.5 %	5 1.9 %
Public Defenders	164 90.6 %	72.0 %	14 7.7 %	3 1.7 %
Judges	145 93.5 %	57.2 %	8 5.2 %	2 1.3 %
Trial Court	127 94.1 %	55.9 %	7 5.2 %	1 0.7 %
Probation and Parole Agency Directors	184 54.2 %	40.2 %	47 13.6 %	115 32.2 %

## 4. Special Issues

Results from the 1994 NAP survey identified several other issues of concern to criminal justice practitioners. These included (1) concerns among police chiefs and sheriffs about responding to culturally diverse populations in their communities, (2) concerns among police chiefs and sheriffs about the growing need to deal with crimes against the elderly, (3) continued concerns by correctional agency directors about identifying inmates with infectious diseases and providing treatment when necessary, (4) responses by all criminal justice agencies to the needs of mentally ill persons who come to their attention, and (5) development of adequate information systems to support activities in criminal justice agencies.

This diverse set of topics has been combined into this chapter. For each topic, results are given about the problems and needs of criminal justice agencies supported by specific comments given by respondents.

### Cultural Diversity

#### *Responses by Police Chiefs and Sheriffs*

Changes in the cultural diversity of many communities have required law enforcement agencies to change the way they address local needs. Police chiefs and sheriffs expressed concern in the NAP survey about how to develop initiatives to work with diverse groups. Of particular interest were communities where cultural and language differences exist, such as Hispanic, Native American, and Asian communities.

Analysis of the NAP survey responses showed that 299 police chiefs (89 percent) had strategies for working with different cultural groups in their communities. Almost 80 percent indicated a need to improve their strategies, with 61 percent wanting moderate improvements, and 19 percent wanting major improvements. An additional 29 police chiefs (9 percent), who did not have strategies, wanted to develop them.

Sheriffs expressed stronger needs, with 193 sheriffs (73 percent) having strategies to work with diverse groups and an additional 50 sheriffs (19 percent) believing that strategies needed to be developed. Of the 193 sheriffs with strategies, 57 percent believed that moderate improvements were needed and 15 percent wanted major improvements.

Several respondents commented on the differences between the composition of the community served and the composition of their police forces. The disparity was one reason given for barriers between police and

residents in the diverse communities, as indicated by the remarks of a sheriff from a northwestern State, "Our county consists of approximately 10 percent East Indian population and approximately 40 percent Hispanic. Our department consists of approximately 95 percent Caucasian." Other respondents commented on the growing importance of working with culturally diverse communities. Another sheriff wrote, "I see cross-cultural diversity training essential for this decade. With an ever-changing culture, all public employees need to be informed."

### *Specific Strategies*

A review of comments from police chiefs and sheriffs shows that the most common strategies in this area consisted of (1) recruiting officers from culturally diverse communities, (2) recruiting bilingual officers, (3) training field personnel in effective ways to communicate with people from different cultures, and (4) offering foreign language training to current officers.

With regard to recruitment, respondents reported problems finding candidates and interesting them in becoming police officers. Many respondents said simply that they get very few applications from "culturally diverse candidates." One sheriff noted: "It is difficult recruiting Native Americans. Some of this has to do with culture and more with peer pressure, we suspect."

Training programs on cultural differences were offered by many departments as part of recruiting and inservice training curriculums. One police chief, who depended on the State for training, noted, "The State Law Enforcement Training Academy has provided training in cultural diversity for our department and now trains every new officer as part of the basic course." In some States, cultural diversity training has been mandated, as indicated, for example, by a police chief in a southeastern State: "Per State mandate, all officers must have 16 hours of cultural diversity training (ours have had 24 hours). Cultural diversity and sensitivity training will be included in other programs." As part of an inservice training effort, one police chief developed a committee with citizens to formulate a cultural diversity course for officers with the aim of improving relationships between the police and these communities.

Other approaches mentioned by respondents in the area of cultural diversity were (1) officers riding with their counterparts in surrounding departments in areas where residents have different cultural backgrounds, (2) participation in associations that bring together culturally diverse members of the community, and (3) use of citizen police academies to

introduce residents of diverse communities to police operations. With regard to needs beyond training, the comments from a sheriff in a southeastern State were representative: "We have received some mandated training in the area of cultural diversity; however, no strategy has been developed to work with diverse cultural groups."

The use of bilingual officers is an obvious approach for working with culturally diverse communities. Exhibit 12 (page 61) shows the strong need felt by police chiefs and sheriffs for more bilingual officers. The top portion of the exhibit shows that about 80 percent of the police chiefs wanted more bilingual officers, with about 24 percent indicating a need for major increases. In their comments, a few police chiefs also noted that their departments offered more pay, referred to as bilingual pay, as an incentive for recruitment and to encourage current officers to learn a second language.

The bottom portion of exhibit 12 summarizes survey responses about foreign language training for current officers. A total of 256 police departments (76 percent) and 193 sheriff's departments (75 percent) have had some type of bilingual training effort. However, the exhibit also shows that 85 percent of these departments believed improvements were needed in their training efforts. An additional 16 percent in both groups stated that foreign language training needed to be developed.

**Exhibit 12**  
**Need for Bilingual Officers**

	<u>Increases in Number of Bilingual Officers Needed<sup>10</sup></u>		
	<u>Major Increase Needed</u>	<u>Some Increase Needed</u>	<u>No Increase Needed</u>
Police Chiefs (n=331)	24.5%	55.6 %	13.0 %
Sheriffs (n=260)	23.8%	50.8 %	15.0 %

Currently Have Foreign Language Training

	<u>Number with Training</u>	<u>Needs Little or No Improvement</u>	<u>Needs Moderate Improvement</u>	<u>Needs Major Improvement</u>	<u>Training Needs to be Developed</u>
Police Chiefs	256	14.8 %	55.9 %	29.3 %	54 (16.2%)
Sheriffs	193	14.5 %	61.1 %	24.4 %	42 (16.3%)

---

<sup>10</sup> Seven percent of the police chiefs and 10 percent of the sherriffs indicated "not applicable" to this question. These responses were from communities with small minority populations, so the respondents did not feel that bilingual officers were needed at all: "Cultural diversity and bilingual capabilities are not major issues in our city as we have less than 6 percent minority makeup," wrote one. Another wrote, "We do not cover an area that has a great need for bilingual speakers."

## Crimes Against the Elderly

Prevention of crimes against the elderly, particularly the crime of fraud, was also of concern to police chiefs and sheriffs. Eighty-eight percent of the responding police chiefs and 77 percent of the sheriffs indicated they had activities aimed at preventing fraud against the elderly. With both groups, about three-quarters said they wanted to see improvements made in their activities.

Respondents made several comments about the special problems of responding to the elderly. Comments centered on the need for immediate and personal services when an elderly person calls the police, as indicated by a remark from a police chief in a medium-sized city:

As our population becomes more elderly, the demand for police services by the elderly will increase. Using call diversion techniques has not been well received. Most want a police officer to make a personal response.

Based on respondent comments, education was the most common approach that departments were using to prevent crimes against the elderly. Typical approaches were talks at Neighborhood Watch meetings and senior citizens associations and distribution of written materials with crime prevention tips in communities having high concentrations of senior citizens. Use of the news media to warn against flimflam groups working in an area was another technique. Police chiefs and sheriffs did not seem particularly pleased with the coverage of their activities. As one respondent commented, "Fraud against the elderly is addressed through current Neighborhood Watch programs, which do not necessarily reach a majority of potential victims." Many respondents said they need mechanisms for reaching larger numbers of senior citizens.

## Persons with Mental Illness

A recent NIJ publication, which described a community support program for mentally ill offenders in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, made the following observation about the relationship between the criminal justice system and the needs of mentally ill offenders:<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>McDonald, Douglas C., and Michele Teitelbaum, *Managing Mentally Ill Offenders in the Community*. (National Institute of Justice, March 1994).

Persons suffering chronic mental illnesses are frequently caught up in the criminal justice system, but justice agencies are usually ill-equipped to respond effectively to the problems they pose. Jailing them keeps them off the streets, but this provides only a short-term solution at a high price. Probation may be warranted in some cases, but conventional supervision and services are often insufficient. Many mentally ill persons need the most elementary of necessities as well as medication, and they require more intensive monitoring than most probation departments are able to devote to them.

The NAP surveys asked respondents about problems and needs associated with persons suffering from mental illnesses. Police officers may have to arrest mentally ill persons or remove them from a scene in order to quell a disruptive situation. Mentally ill persons appear in jails in either a pretrial status or serving sentences imposed by the court. As a result, classification systems need to be in place to identify these individuals, and special provisions may have to be made for their treatment. Probation and parole agencies also become involved with the mentally ill because of conditional releases from the court or correctional systems. In either case, the agencies said they felt the need to provide treatment services.

Responses from the NAP surveys showed mixed opinions on handling the mentally ill. On one hand, several respondents commented on what they believed was a shift in responsibility from the mental health community to the criminal justice system. These feelings were particularly reflected in comments from police chiefs and sheriffs and, to an extent, from jail administrators. On the other hand, many jail administrators, wardens, and directors of probation and parole agencies said they felt responsible for providing mental health services to inmates and clients.

Exhibit 13 shows the degree to which selected respondent groups believed that cases involving mentally ill persons contributed to workload problems within their organizations. In comparison to other problems discussed in this report, they indicated a moderate, rather than a major, degree of contribution to problems. Judging by respondent comments, the number of cases was not large, which may have been the reason for comparatively low ratings. The problem is that people with different types of mental illness have different needs, and it is the fulfillment of these special needs that presents difficulties.

**Exhibit 13**  
**Cases Involving Mentally Ill Persons**  
**Percentage Workload Contribution**

<u>Respondent Group</u>	<u>Major Contributor</u>	<u>Moderate Contributor</u>	<u>Not a Contributor</u>
Police Chiefs	11.1 %	56.6 %	32.3 %
Sheriffs	22.3	43.9	33.7
Jail Administrators <sup>12</sup>	14.5	43.4	34.0
Prosecutors	9.0	43.6	44.7
Judges	12.1	35.7	52.2
Trial Court Administrators	12.7	36.6	50.7

The following paragraphs provide additional statistics from the NAP surveys along with selected comments to provide insight into the problems as well as solutions identified by the respondents.

As a starting point, comments from police chiefs and sheriffs reflected resentment about problems created by mentally ill persons. Some comments were on the practical problems of transporting the mentally ill and the amount of time that officers had to spend away from their normal patrol duties on the transports. Respondents would obviously prefer to shift this responsibility to another government agency. Most of the comments, however, complained about the perceived failure of mental health agencies to fulfill their obligations:

<sup>12</sup> The question to jail administrators was whether the lack of community alternatives for the mentally ill contributed to crowding in the jail. All other respondent groups were asked whether cases involving the mentally ill contributed to their workload problems.

Our problem in regard to the mentally ill is that the department is charged with transporting. Sometimes it takes hours off road patrol to pick up, process, and transport to a mental hospital. (sheriff)

Our patrol units are required to transport those deemed to be incompetent; we are constantly overloaded with these transports. We believe these should be handled by the mental health department or additional positions should be allocated to each sheriff's office to handle these. (sheriff)

The response (of society) to the problems of the mentally ill can now be described as a complete failure, and the impact on law enforcement is great. About 30 percent of our jail inmate population would be better served if they were in mental institutions. (sheriff)

The State has reduced its risk with mental patients by allowing the mentally ill to return to their communities. Lack of medical supervision eventually results in a police problem. (police chief)

Shift of responsibility for mentally ill persons from the State health care system to local law enforcement is a major problem. (sheriff)

The State has reduced funding for the mentally ill, and this has increased problems for the police department. (police chief)

The State has closed mental hospitals, placing more people on the street with mental problems. (sheriff)

Jail administrators have taken responsibilities for recognizing inmates with mental health problems and taking the necessary steps for monitoring, treatment, or isolation. Almost 90 percent of the jail administrators indicated that their classification systems included procedures for identifying mentally ill inmates. Virtually all of these jail administrators

could provide medical services for treating inmates with mental illnesses, but 64 percent believed that these services could be improved. Another basic need indicated by comments was in providing separate cells or housing for the mentally ill, when necessary, to remove them from the general jail population. Their specific comments in regard to these problems were as follows:

We are very short in the area of single cells for special-needs inmates, i.e., suicidal, mentally ill, combative, and protective custody.

There is a lack of commitment on the part of county and State officials to treat and offer specialized housing to mentally ill and violent inmates who are obviously in need of special care.

Our primary needs are in dealing with the mentally ill. We have no appropriate areas to house these types of inmates.

We need more intervention by mental health organizations as the State is under court consent decree to deinstitutionalize the number of mentally ill patients currently residing in State mental health hospitals. Many of these displaced mental patients end up in jails.

Several jail administrators commented on successes they have had in either employing mental health professionals on their staff, arranging for services through the county mental health department, or contracting with private mental health professionals. Typical comments were as follows:

For many years, we have contracted the medical and mental health services for jail inmates. This has proved to be highly successful for our agency.

The detention center and the county's mental health department work well together to provide inmate mental health services without a contract.

The community mental health department has provided a part-time counselor to address the mental health needs of the jail inmates.

The needs of probation and parole agencies focused on providing contracted services to the mentally ill. In a list of 21 potential contract services in a wide variety of areas, directors rated mental health services and sex offender treatment as the 2 highest needs.

Regarding mental health services, 245 probation and parole directors (67 percent) indicated they had contracts, and 78 directors (22 percent) expressed a desire to obtain such services under contract. Of the 245 directors with contracts, 38 percent stated that moderate improvements were needed and 44 percent stated that major improvements were needed in the contracted services.

A similar picture emerged with contract services for treatment of sex offenders. A total of 246 directors (67 percent) stated they contracted for treatment and 85 directors (24 percent) did not but would like to have these services under contract. Of the directors with contracts, 37 percent believed moderate improvements were needed in their efforts and 39 percent wanted major improvements. Their comments underscore these concerns, particularly with regard to treatment for sex offenders:

There is a need for more and better access to mental health professionals. Particularly important are the sex offender cases.

Our agency has difficulty finding treatment for sex offenders. The State-supported mental health center issued a written statement indicating they no longer offer treatment for sex offenders because they do not feel treatment is successful. To the best of my knowledge, there are no other sexual treatment programs offered in the area.

Main attention should be concentrated on mental health services (particularly sex offenders) for which treatment services are currently limited.

There needs to be more linkage among correctional institutional programs and community-based programs. For example, if a person has a mental health problem, that individual should be linked to a community agency via the institution.

We need more mental health and sex offender programs as well as substance abuse programs and at a reasonable, achievable cost by parolees and probationers.

Finally, prison wardens expressed concern about increasing the number of mental health professionals for their facilities. Forty-nine percent of the wardens indicated they needed some increase in mental health professionals and 19 percent indicated needs for major staff increases. The following comments underscore their personnel needs:

Our facility is a designated sex-offender treatment facility, housing approximately 70 percent sex offenders. Treatment for these types of offenders is complex and very staff intensive. . . . Because of short staffing in mental health and the complexity of the treatment program, only 10 to 15 percent of classified sex offenders in the facility are in treatment at any one time.

No problems in recruitment, except in medical and mental health areas due to the lack of available qualified applicants.

Recruitment has only been a problem with mental health/counseling positions.

I am grossly understaffed with mental health staff. I have none assigned and there are only six in the State system, none of whom is directly dedicated to my facility.

Treatment facilities available for incarcerated women in this State with mental illnesses or other special needs are inadequate.

Improvements are urgently needed in mental health program development and staffing because of the facility's designation as a sex offender treatment facility.

We have 2 psychologists and 1 social worker for 12 units. This does not even begin to meet the mental health needs of the inmate population.

Increases in prison time actually served by sex offenders may be one reason that wardens expressed strong needs for mental health professionals. The following are comments received from wardens in four different States about changes in the time served by sex offenders:

In this State, it is almost impossible for an inmate to be granted parole if he has any history of sex violations. Most have. At some point in their history, there will be made mention of possible sexual overtones. If this is the case, then parole is all but out of the question. To my knowledge, there is nothing being done along these lines to alleviate these problems.

The state Parole Board has ceased paroling sex offenders and new criminal codes will stiffen sentences for this growing group. Public opinion has impacted the non-release of violent offenders by the parole board.

One of the primary contributors to crowding in our State prisons is minimum mandatory sentencing for sex offenders.

Contributors to prison crowding in our State prisons include a high increase in the sentenced sex offender population, longer sentences for violent crimes, and our own policies concerning mandatory treatment steps for violent and sex offender programs. Failure to complete program requirements results in negative parole recommendations and offenders consequently exceed minimum release dates.

## Information Systems

One section within each survey was completely devoted to the important subject of information systems to support activities within the individual criminal justice agencies. As with other sections in the survey, respondents were provided a list of potential system applications and asked to indicate the extent of need for each system. If a system currently existed within the agency, respondents were asked whether it needed no improvements, moderate improvements, or major improvements.

Overall, respondents rated information system needs higher than virtually any other section in the survey, even higher than program area needs in many instances. They also provided more written comments in this section than in almost all other sections. The comments reflected what the agencies had in the way of information systems, how these systems could be improved, and what they lacked.

One inherent problem in the information system area was that some agencies still had no automation or had limited capabilities, even though the costs of computers and software decreased significantly in the past 10 years. "Our 'system' consists of paper, pen, and people," wrote a prosecutor from a small county. "Our computer is so limited that it is practically useless, so we rely on dockets books, case files, etc." Exhibit 14 (page 73) shows the top three information system needs for selected respondent groups. For example, the three systems of greatest interest to police chiefs and sheriffs were expert systems<sup>13</sup>, systems to support problem solving, and court information (disposition information for cases). A total of 259 agencies (45 percent) said they had expert systems, with 79 percent indicating their current systems needed improvement. A total of 239 agencies (41 percent) wanted to see expert systems developed, and 83 agencies (14 percent) reported that they did not need or want such systems. Interestingly, only one comment was received about expert systems: It indicated that the department had used an expert burglary system for 5 years but was disappointed because "it did not deliver the desired results." The lack of comments may mean that departments were not knowledgeable of these systems' capabilities and how they could be effectively used.

With regard to systems to support problem solving, comments indicated the need for repeat call analysis, tracking progress on problems

---

<sup>13</sup>An expert system is software that attempts to emulate the decision-making process of a human expert. It requires the identification of an expert or group of experts, identifying their key decision-making characteristics, and establishing a system to capture these characteristics.

assigned to officers, and systems to evaluate personnel and projects. The general belief seemed to be that current systems lacked analytical capability. One respondent commented, "Although the department is automated, the programs in use are not sophisticated enough to support problem solving."

Another feature of exhibit 14 is the considerable agreement between respondent groups. For example, jail administrators and wardens rated the same three application areas highest: inmate medical/mental health records, court information, and inmate program needs. The need for systems to alleviate attorney scheduling conflicts was listed as a priority by prosecutors, judges, and trial court administrators. Also of interest in this exhibit is that information from courts was highly ranked by several other criminal justice agencies—police departments, sheriffs, jail administrators, and even wardens.

Exhibit 14 shows further that many agencies with information systems in place were not satisfied with them. For example, 71 percent of the probation and parole agencies had case management systems, but 81 percent of these agencies indicated that the systems needed moderate or major improvement. Indeed, in every application area listed in exhibit 14, a majority of respondents indicated that their systems needed improvement (with the single exception of systems in prosecutors' offices for dates of hearings).

Pinpointing the reasons for dissatisfaction with existing systems was difficult because the deficiencies related to the specific applications of the agencies. Representative comments from respondents gave a range of reasons:

Our computer aided dispatch and records management system is a real disappointment. We do not have our own computer personnel in house. We depend on the city data processing department. (police chief)

The crime analysis system needs to be more user-friendly. It is currently on one computer and should be connected to our records management system, along with the evidence management system. (sheriff)

Current information system contains no statistical/historical reporting capabilities. Data

must be extracted and examined on an ad hoc basis. (jail administrator)

Retrieval is slow and cumbersome. System can be immobilized for hours during a query. (prosecutor)

Essentially we have limited automated information available. The only system we have is at the front desk, which advises what clients are on probation. It is limited in its use. (probation agency)

While our current information system adequately tracks inmate data, there is no parallel information system for tracking institutional operations, budget planning, projected management needs, staffing requirements, etc. Managers at this facility have few automated information tools available to help them oversee the business end of operating the facility. (warden)

The need expressed for court information by other agencies may reflect an overall need for criminal justice agencies to share information about cases and defendants. Based on respondent comments, jurisdictions with systems that shared information from arrest to final disposition appeared to be more satisfied with their information systems. These systems, sometimes called CJIS (Criminal Justice Information Systems), provide agencies with a common data base. A judge from a southern State commented, "The recent systemwide redesign of the criminal justice information system has provided excellent information availability. Improvements to the system are ongoing." A jail administrator from a western State reached the same conclusion: "Our existing jail information system is integrated with all local criminal justice agencies, which is essential for sharing common data and reducing paperwork." In summary, these systems provide other agencies with the court information they desire. The column in exhibit 14 labeled "Needs to be Developed" indicates the degree to which agencies indicated they did not currently have applications but would like to see them in their agencies. As shown in this column, law enforcement agencies wanted expert systems (41 percent) and systems to support problem-solving activities (39 percent); prosecutors and judges wanted systems to handle and avoid attorney schedule conflicts (36

**Exhibit 14**  
**Information System Needs**

<u>Police Chiefs/ Sheriffs</u>	<u>Currently Have System</u>	<u>Current System Need Improvement</u>	<u>Needs to be Developed</u>	<u>Do Not Want/Need</u>
Expert or artificial intelligence system	259 44.6 %	239 78.7 %	83 41.1 %	14.2 %
System to support problem solving	326 55.5 %	84.3 %	227 38.7 %	34 5.8 %
Court information	395 66.9 %	79.5 %	180 30.5 %	15 2.5 %
<u>Jail Administrators</u>				
Inmate medical or mental health records	202 65.8 %	55.9 %	89 29.0 %	16 5.2 %
Court information	236 75.9 %	65.7 %	65 20.9 %	10 3.2 %
Inmate program records	187 60.7 %	57.7 %	92 29.9 %	29 9.4 %
<u>Prosecutors</u>				
Attorney schedule conflicts	154 57.7 %	65.6 %	95 35.6 %	18 6.7 %
Defendant tracking information	210 78.9 %	65.2 %	54 20.3 %	2 0.8 %
Dates of hearings	204 76.7 %	46.1 %	61 22.9 %	1 0.4 %

**Exhibit 14 (continued)  
Information System Needs**

<u>Judges/TCAs</u>	<u>Currently Have System</u>	<u>Current System Need Improvement</u>	<u>Needs to be Developed</u>	<u>Do Not Want/Need</u>
Attorney schedule conflicts	169 56.9 %	70.4 %	99 33.3 %	29 9.8 %
Treatment agency client-space availability	162 56.6 %	74.1 %	86 30.1 %	38 13.3 %
Bail/jail status of defendants	240 79.7 %	57.1 %	55 18.3 %	6 2.0 %
<u>Probation/Parole Directors</u>				
Linkage with other agencies	227 62.7 %	89.5 %	131 36.2 %	4 1.1 %
Case management	257 71.0 %	80.9 %	100 27.6 %	5 1.4 %
Management reports	272 75.2 %	80.9 %	87 24.0 %	3 0.8%
<u>Wardens</u>				
Inmate medical or mental health records	257 74.3 %	57.2 %	78 22.5 %	11 3.2 %
Court information	240 69.2 %	57.9 %	81 23.3 %	26 7.5 %
Inmate program records	289 82.8 %	51.6 %	55 15.8 %	5 1.4 %

percent and 33 percent, respectively); and probation and parole agencies wanted linkages with other agencies (36 percent).

Changes in automation take time, and many agencies have been slow and reluctant to move to automation. Perhaps a judge from a western state summarized this problem best: "We have been deluged with computer technology. While appropriate, it must be recognized that judges are slow to change . . . the quill remaining the tool of preference."

## **5. Research and Evaluation Priorities**

Within the Department of Justice, NIJ is responsible for conducting research and evaluation on key criminal justice topics. Toward this aim, the NAP surveys have been a valuable resource because they have asked practitioners to make suggestions on potential topics. The last question on each survey asked respondents to provide specific areas that they believed should be priorities for research or evaluation. The question was open-ended, allowing respondents to write their thoughts on priorities.

Responses from the open-ended questions are summarized in exhibit 15 (page 79) for local agencies and in exhibit 16 (page 80) for State agencies. These exhibits show the three most frequently mentioned topics for each respondent group. In general, the results reflected the discussions about problems and needs discussed in previous chapters. For example, all local respondent groups (except police chiefs and sheriffs) mentioned alternative sanctions as a priority for research and evaluation. Drug-related topics were on the lists for sheriffs, jail administrators, judges, and probation and parole agency directors. Police chiefs and sheriffs expressed interest in research and evaluation about community policing, which reflects the results given in Chapter 3 on the high number of agencies in the process of implementing this approach. Prosecutors, police chiefs, and sheriffs also mentioned topics on juvenile crimes as priorities.

With State agencies, a different picture emerged. The general topic of recidivism was frequently mentioned by wardens, State commissioners of corrections, and State probation and parole agency directors. Topics related to treatment of sex offenders were on the lists of commissioners of corrections and probation and parole agency directors. Local probation and parole agency directors also listed sex offender topics as a priority. Interestingly, three State respondent groups (wardens, commissioners of corrections, and probation and parole agency directors) agreed with the local agencies on the need for research on alternative sanctions

Two caveats should be given about the topics identified in these exhibits. First, even though the instructions asked for research projects, many respondents listed needs of their agencies, such as "more staff," "automation," and "increased budgets." Although these are certainly important to the agencies, they are not subjects for a national research and evaluation agenda. Second, respondents clearly viewed "research topic" as a broad term encompassing program development, analysis of crime trends, and other empirical approaches. Stated another way, they did not phrase their topics in terms of quasi-experiments with target and control groups.

The topics in the two exhibits are also general because of the types of responses obtained from this question. Some respondents were specific about the type of research desired, such as "effectiveness of boot camps to reduce recidivism," whereas others gave broader statements, such as "effectiveness of alternative sanctions." In order to determine the overall trends of the responses, it was necessary to use the more general terms.

In an attempt to provide more specific topics, a detailed review of all comments from the surveys was conducted. The results are shown in exhibit 17 (page 81) for local agencies and exhibit 18 (page 84) for State agencies. These topics might have been mentioned by one or two respondents but are representative of the type of research that might be conducted under the more general subjects listed in the two prior exhibits. For example, a topic under police chiefs and sheriffs asks "Does community policing reduce crime or serve only to make people feel safe?"

Development of these more specific topics also resulted in identification of agencies that were conducting their own evaluations of changes within their organizations. For example, one police department said it was evaluating a six-officer bicycle patrol in residential neighborhoods as part of its community policing initiative. Another department was evaluating a recently formed investigative unit designed to concentrate on the illegal use of firearms and their origins. Results of the evaluation will help in determining whether the unit is continued in the department. Finally, a department operating under a community policing philosophy changed its procedures to evaluate officers on the basis of how they solve problems in their areas. The new evaluation procedure was under review by the department.

Other comments gave results of evaluations that had been performed on specific projects. For example, a prosecutor mentioned a local "incarceration facility between house arrest and prison which accommodated 340 residents in 1993." The facility included electronic monitoring, a work adjustment center (to develop employment skills), and

probation services (including community service, house arrest, and restitution). Eighty-seven percent of the residents successfully completed the program offered in this facility.

Another prosecutor mentioned a diversion program for persons accused of drug felonies that was developed with the support of the court and public defender. The program has allowed defendants to participate in treatment and, upon successful completion of the year-long program, the felony drug case has been dropped. The prosecutor gave the following results for the program:

Since the program began in August 1991, over 1,400 individuals have participated. Fifty-three percent are classified as active cases continuing in the program, 26 percent have been terminated from the program and face traditional prosecution, and 16 percent have successfully graduated.

With regard to drug and alcohol treatment programs, a warden mentioned a successful program within the institution that had an 11 percent recidivism rate for program clients after release, compared to 34 percent for the general population.

A commissioner from a northwestern State commented on successes in two key program areas. One area was a "relatively successful" community management program for sex offenders through a planned combination of intensive supervision and treatment. Another program has aimed to reduce drug abuse by probationers. It has employed urinalysis tests with penalties for positive outcomes indicating drug use. The first positive test results in an immediate 2 days in jail; the second results in 10 days in jail, and the third in 30 days in jail. The program operates in several counties and has apparently resulted in reductions in offenses by probationers and fewer positive urinalysis results.

As a final note, the results from wardens of female institutions could be overlooked because they have been combined into the results for all institutions. However, wardens of female prisons expressed concerns about research needs for their inmates. As one warden commented:

Not enough research is done, in my opinion, on the needs and on successful programs for female programs. Certain drug treatment programs have claimed higher success rates, as

have other mental health programs. If we know they respond better, we need to program better, and spend our dollars more wisely on surer investments.

Another warden noted the need for a classification system "that meets the needs and programming for female offenders." A warden in the northwest has apparently been conducting research on this problem and summarized the evolving classification procedure for female inmates, as follows:

Upon admission, each inmate is administered a battery of psychological tests. The resulting categories measure the potential for suicide, victimization, violence, substance abuse, and educational achievement. Within the first 30 days of admission and each subsequent 6-month period, the inmate is 'classified.' Elements used for this classification include severity of offense, extent of violence, history of violence, escape history, time remaining, detainers, misconduct history, severity of misconduct, program and work history, gang affiliation, substance abuse, and age. The above evaluations have evolved through numerous years of research and adequately address the institution and inmate needs.

**Exhibit 15**  
**Priorities for Research and Evaluation**  
**Local Criminal Justice Agencies**

<p><u>Police Chiefs</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community Policing</li> <li>2. Juvenile Crimes</li> <li>3. Violent Crimes</li> </ol>	<p><u>Sheriffs</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community Policing</li> <li>2. Drugs</li> <li>3. Juvenile Crimes</li> </ol>
<p><u>Jail Administrators</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative Sanctions</li> <li>2. Classification</li> <li>3. Drug Programs/Mentally ill (tie)</li> </ol>	<p><u>Prosecutors</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative Sanctions</li> <li>2. Juvenile Crimes</li> <li>3. Violent Crimes</li> </ol>
<p><u>Judges</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative Sanctions</li> <li>2. Court Security</li> <li>3. Drug Cases/Case Management (tie)</li> </ol>	<p><u>Trial Court Administrators</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Case Management</li> <li>2. Alternative Sanctions</li> <li>3. Court Security</li> </ol>
<p><u>Public Defenders</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative Sanctions</li> <li>2. Mandatory Sentences</li> <li>3. Death penalty Studies</li> </ol>	<p><u>Probation and Parole Agency Directors</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative Sanctions</li> <li>2. Drug/Alcohol Treatment Programs</li> <li>3. Sex Offenders</li> </ol>

**Exhibit 16**  
**Priorities for Research and Evaluation**  
**State Criminal Justice Agencies**

<p><u>Wardens</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recidivism</li> <li>2. Gangs</li> <li>3. Drug and Alcohol Programs Alternative Sanctions (tie)</li> </ol>	<p><u>State Commissioners of Corrections</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternative Sanctions</li> <li>2. Recidivism</li> <li>3. Sex Offender Treatment</li> </ol>
<p><u>State Attorneys General</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inmate Litigation</li> <li>2. Computer/Telemarketing Fraud</li> <li>3. Environmental Fraud</li> </ol>	<p><u>State Court Administrators</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Case Management</li> <li>2. Automation</li> <li>3. Court Organizational Alternatives</li> </ol>
<p><u>State Probation and Parole Agency Directors</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sex Offenders</li> <li>2. Recidivism</li> <li>3. Alternative Sanctions</li> </ol>	

---

**Exhibit 17**  
**Local Criminal Justice Agency Directors**  
**Suggested Research and Evaluation Topics**

Police and Sheriffs

1. Effectiveness of a department's philosophical change to community-based policing.
2. Does community policing work, i.e., does it reduce crime or serve only to make people feel safer?
3. Effects of mandatory sentencing on violent crime.
4. Effects of mandatory sentencing on drug offenses.
5. Should juveniles who are 15 years or older be handled as adults for felony offenses?
6. Reasons for the increase in violent juvenile crimes during the past 5 years.
7. Programs for preventing juveniles from obtaining guns.
8. Continued followup on long-term impact of D.A.R.E.® on adult drug and alcohol use.
9. What are the results, over time, of (1) vigorous street-level enforcement on drug offenses and (2) concentrating on middle- to upper-level drug dealers?
10. The relationship between drug use, alcohol use, and violent crimes.
11. Integration of detectives into community policing and problem solving activities.
12. Development of performance evaluation for detectives, especially under community policing philosophy.

Jail Administrators

1. Treating mentally ill inmates.
2. Proven alcohol and drug treatment programs in jail settings.
3. Effectiveness of alternatives to incarceration.
4. Substance abuse programs for females.
5. Effectiveness of juvenile boot camps.
6. Effectiveness of jail-based treatment programs in reducing recidivism.
7. Objective classification systems for inmates.

**Exhibit 17 (continued)**  
**Local Criminal Justice Agency Directors**  
**Suggested Research and Evaluation Topics**

Prosecutors

1. Programs to stop violent crime among juveniles.
2. Successful prosecution strategies in domestic violence.
3. Identification and handling of serious habitual juvenile offenders.
4. Effectiveness of various domestic violence arrest and prosecution policies and counseling programs.
5. Effectiveness of boot camp programs for behavior modification.
6. Relationship between gangs and violent crimes.
7. Reasons for the increase in violent crimes committed by subjects 18 years of age and younger.
8. Effectiveness of pretrial diversion programs, particularly for persons accused of domestic violence and child abuse.
9. Effectiveness of boot camp for violent offenders handled in adult court.
10. Effectiveness of diversion programs on recidivism.

Judges and Trial Court Administrators

1. More intensive followup for shock incarceration (boot camp) participants.
2. What to do to prevent violence and drug abuse at the earliest age.
3. Effectiveness of various drug court models.
4. Effective case-flow management strategies.
5. Effect of drug treatment alternatives.
6. Improved court fine and fee collection methods.
7. Specialized domestic violence courts.
8. Court security issues: security procedures, security assessment techniques, and effects of poor facility design on security.

**Exhibit 17 (continued)**  
**Local Criminal Justice Agency Directors**  
**Suggested Research and Evaluation Topics Public Defenders**

Public Defenders

1. Effects of mandatory sentencing on plea bargaining.
2. Effects of recently enacted DWI laws.
3. Would decriminalization of drugs with court program for addicts reduce recidivism?
4. Effects of abolishment of parole.
5. Effects of mandatory sentence structure on crime rates.
6. Comparison of crime rates in determinate and indeterminate sentencing states.

Probation and Parole Agency Directors

1. Does drug treatment have any long-term effects on recidivism?
2. Effective treatment and surveillance of sex offenders.
3. Evaluation of day reporting centers.
4. Special training for officers dealing with sex offenders.
5. Long-term effectiveness of boot camps.
6. Does intensive supervision reduce recidivism?
7. Effectiveness of electronic monitoring.
8. What interventions generate success for high-risk offenders?

**Exhibit 18**  
**State Criminal Justice Agency Directors**  
**Suggested Research and Evaluation Topics**

Wardens

1. Efficiency and effectiveness of privatization of prisons.
2. Effectiveness of pre-release programs on recidivism.
3. Effectiveness of sex offender programs.
4. Effectiveness of gang intervention strategies.
5. Effectiveness of boot camps on recidivism.
6. Development of programs for inmates to provide restitution for their crimes.
7. Effective identification and treatment of mentally ill prisoners.
8. Effectiveness of educational programs compared to inmate work programs.
9. Effectiveness of prison-based therapeutic communities.
10. Effectiveness of community aftercare for inmates who have completed institutional substance abuse programs.

State Commissioners of Corrections

1. Effectiveness of alternative sanctions to prisons.
2. Determination of needs of special populations within the State prison systems (e.g., geriatric inmate, women, parents, etc.).
3. Evaluation research projects to assess the effectiveness of specific institutional programming.
4. Effectiveness of methods for treating sex offenders.
5. Develop better medical, mental health, and gang criteria to improve classification systems.

State Attorneys General

1. Effectiveness of State money laundering statutes.
2. Effectiveness of State prosecution of multistate drug traffickers.
3. Effectiveness of multijurisdictional drug task forces.

State Court Administrators

1. Analysis of court matters that can be removed to administrative proceedings.
2. Analysis of the need for an intermediate appellate court.
3. Effectiveness of guardian ad litem.

4. Evaluation of alternative sanctions.
5. Analysis to determine how to improve operation and organization of indigent defense services.

#### State Probation and Parole Agency Directors

1. Effectiveness of intensive supervision for sex offenders.
2. Effects on recidivism in states that abolish parole supervision.
3. Comparison of violent crime rates in States with indeterminate sentencing and states with determinate sentencing.
4. Determination of a "manageable workload" for probation and parole agencies.

For more information on the National Institute of Justice and to learn how to  
obtain an electronic version of this report, please contact:

**National Criminal Justice Reference Service**

Box 6000

Rockville, MD 20849-6000

Phone: 800-851-3420

Phone: 301-251-5500

E-mail: [askncjrs@ncjrs.aspensys.com](mailto:askncjrs@ncjrs.aspensys.com)

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
Office of Justice Programs  
*National Institute of Justice*

Washington, D.C. 20531

Official Business  
Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE  
POSTAGE & FEES PAID  
DOJ/NIJ  
Permit No. G-91

**National Assessment Program: 1994 Survey Results**