

INDIVIDUAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT

In Response to a Request for Technical Assistance

By the

Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency

November 9, 1973

NCJRS

NOV 30 1976

ACQUISITIONS

Prepared by:

Public Administration Service
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637

(Per Contract J-LEAA-015-72)

148

37848

I. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

- A. Consultant Assigned:
Dr. Victor G. Strecher
Michigan State University
- B. Date Assignment Received:
August 17, 1973
- C. Date of Contact with LEAA Regional Coordinator:
August 17, 1973
- D. Dates of On-Site Consultation:
August 27-31, 1973
- E. Individuals Contacted:
See Consultant's Report

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

- A. Problem as per Request for Technical Assistance:
Need for technical assistance in establishing a Criminal Justice Center for the State of Alaska. ✓
- B. Problems Actually Observed:
As Stated.

III. FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

See Consultant's Report.

IV. DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION

See Consultant's Report.

V. RECOMMENDED COURSE OF ACTION

See Consultant's Report.

CONSULTANT'S REPORT

TO: G. M. Morris, LEAA Project Director,
Public Administration Service

FROM: Dr. Victor G. Strecher, Consultant

SUBJECT: Technical assistance in establishing a Criminal Justice Center for the State of
Alaska.

DATE: October 22, 1973

This report consists of the following sections:

- I. Consultant Activities
- II. Observations
- III. Program Concept and Strategy Recommendations
- IV. Research and Planning Committee
- V. Research and Planning Timetable

I. CONSULTANT ACTIVITIES

This consulting assignment was initiated at the request of Mr. Norval Jespersen, Director of the Office of Manpower Development and Educational Assistance, LEAA, Washington. As a result of conversations with Mr. Jespersen, the consultant was placed in contact with Mr. Walt Lawson of the LEAA Region X Office, who made arrangements for the consultant's activities in Alaska for the week of August 27. Following is the schedule of activities for that week.

Sunday, August 26, 1973

Departed Lansing for Seattle (Mr. Lawson had requested consultant's arrival in Fairbanks no later than 2:00 p.m., Monday, August 28).

Monday, August 27, 1973

Consulted with the following officials, individually and in small gatherings, regarding the establishment of a Criminal Justice Center for the State:

- John E. Havelock, Attorney General and Chairman of the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice.
- Victor Carlson, Judge of the Superior Court, and Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Criminal Justice Center for the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice.
- John Huber, State Representative and Vice-Chairman of the Governor's Commission.
- Gordon E. Evans, Attorney and Member of the Governor's Commission.
- Walt Lawson, LEAA Region X Office.
- Lauris S. Parker, Executive Director, Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency.
- Dennis Lund, Chief Program Planner, Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency.
- Jerry P. Hanson, Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency.
- Jim Austin, Planner, Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency.

On the basis of these conversations, the consultant prepared a presentation for the formal meeting of the Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice scheduled for the following day.

Tuesday, August 28, 1973

During the conduct of routine matters by the Commission, the consultant met with Donald R. Theophilus, Jr., Academic Vice President for the University of Alaska. During this meeting Vice President Theophilus committed the University to participation in the projected planning group which would establish the goals, programs, and organizational structure of the proposed Criminal Justice Center. He requested that the consultant relay this commitment to the Governor's Commission, and later had an opportunity to discuss the University's cooperation with Judge Victor Carlson. To further assist in the project, Dr. Theophilus arranged to accompany the consultant to the Anchorage campus to arrange and participate in discussions with the university and community college officials there.

Upon introduction by Judge Carlson, the consultant addressed the Commission with a Criminal Justice Center planning proposal which will be discussed in detail later in this report. The Commission accepted the planning proposal in its skeletal form and requested that the consultant take the following two actions:

1. Prepare a concept paper which will become the body of a grant proposal to be completed by the Criminal Justice Planning Agency.
2. Submit a list of consultants who will be able to participate in the planning project as outlined by the consultant. Those named are to be considered nominees, to be selected by the Commission.

Following the formal commission meeting, conferred with commission members Herbert Soll, Public Defender; Wallis Droz, Fairbanks City Manager; Representative Huber; and Charles Anderson, Deputy Chief of Police, Anchorage. Met further with Mr. Parker and Mr. Lund of the State Planning Agency. Conferred into the evening with Attorney General John Havelock.

Wednesday, August 29, 1973

Traveled to Anchorage with Academic Vice President Donald Theophilus and other university officials. Conferred about the Criminal Justice Center with the following university and community college officials:

- Wendell Wolfe, Acting Provost and Dean of the Senior College, Anchorage.
- Eugene Short, Dean of Anchorage Community College.

- James Z. Irany, Director, Division of Community Services, Anchorage Community College.
- Donald J. Miller, Coordinator, Police Administration and Criminal Justice, Anchorage Community College.

These conferences served to identify participants in the proposed planning project, and to clarify the University's role in helping to develop programs for the proposed Criminal Justice Center.

Thursday, August 30, 1973

Conferred with William R. Nix, Magistrate Supervisor for the Alaska Court System, who indicated a personal interest in participating in Center planning work. Visited informally with command personnel of the Anchorage Police Department who expressed an interest in establishing a baccalaureate degree program at the Anchorage campus of the University.

At the suggestion of Judge Victor Carlson, telephoned Mr. L. S. Gerald Kurtz, newly elected President of the Alaska Bar Association. Mr. Kurtz expressed the interest and support of the Bar Association, asked to be kept informed, and pledged the assistance of the Bar Association in the planning of the Center.

Traveled to Juneau in the company of Dennis W. Lund, Chief Planner for the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency. Upon arrival conferred with Mr. Lund.

Friday, August 31, 1973

Engaged in discussions with the following officials regarding the planning of the Criminal Justice Center:

- Norman Gorsuch, Deputy Attorney General, Supervisor of District Attorneys throughout the State.
- Marshall L. Lind, Commissioner of the Department of Education, State of Alaska.
- James P. Wellington, Deputy Commissioner of Public Safety, State of Alaska.
- Charles G. Adams, Jr., Director, Division of Corrections and the following members of his staff:

Walter B. Jones, Chief Probation-Parole Services
 Carl Nickel, Correctional Facilities Surveyer
 Thomas R. Branton, Administrative Officer
 Edwin Mitchell, Systems Analyst
 Dan Dawson, Statistical Technician

Following these conferences, the consultant met once more with Dennis Lund, and arrived at a final agreement that the consultant's concept paper on the research and planning of the Criminal Justice Center would be fully developed as a grant proposal by Mr. Lund and the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency.

II. OBSERVATIONS

1. Administrative centralization of criminal justice processes in the executive branch of Alaska's government is more conducive to the planning and implementation of a coordinated education and training center than are the governmental structures of most other states.
2. The dimensions of Alaska and resulting travel distances are important constraints to be considered in the systems development for criminal justice education and training. Advanced training technologies (CCTV, video-tape, programmed instruction, etc.) will have to be considered in a cost-benefit context.
3. Present educational and training efforts should not be duplicated or co-opted; however, the opportunity should be provided for existing programs to interact with projected programs to the degree considered mutually beneficial.
4. Regional interests of Alaska's several geographically distinctive areas need to be considered factors in the development of statewide criminal justice education and training.
5. Program development consultants for the police, adjudication, and corrections sectors require a opportunity to work with professional counterparts at several levels of the Alaska criminal justice system hierarchy intermittently throughout the research and planning effort (projected from December 1973 through May 1974). Because travel costs are considerable, telephonic communications should be available to a greater extent than is usual.
6. The research and planning effort needs to be broadly conceived, and representative of the multiple professional, governmental, and state-regional perspectives which are evident in Alaska.
7. Considering that unilateral interests and efforts of the past several years have not eventuated in creation of a Criminal Justice Center, it is hoped that a broadly representative planning group, however unwieldy, will be given sufficient time to perform this complex and sensitive task.

III. PROGRAM CONCEPT AND STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The concept of a Criminal Justice Center, intended for the development of human resources for an articulated criminal justice system, represents a departure from the traditional modes of education and training within and for each of the occupations and professions associated with the administration of criminal justice. To the present, manpower development for each agency of criminal justice has been entirely separate and isolated from the others. The police have relied largely upon pre-service and in-service training at the operational level; prosecutors and judges have relied almost entirely upon the law degree and occasional professional seminars; court administrators, of various title and educational background, have only recently had access to in-service training programs; correctional officials, including probation and parole officers, come from a variety of educational and occupational backgrounds, with some trend toward social work or social science degree requirements. What is more, the historic development of the agencies and occupations of our present complex of criminal justice has led to mutually exclusive perspectives, objectives, strategies, and success criteria for each organization and occupation involved in the total process of criminal justice. The police perspective is organized around the objectives of an orderly community and cleared crimes; for prosecutors, conviction ratio; for courts, adherence to standards of legal procedure; for correctional officials, the practitioner—client relationship, the secure and orderly institution, and recidivism rates. The objectives and priorities of the agencies are not subject to review and influence by an overseeing or coordinating agency, and thus are as likely to be in competition or conflict as cooperative. In short, there is not a single, overriding and constraining set of objectives for the entire criminal justice complex. With this background, there has been no reason to expect that human resources development for the entire complex of agencies would be combined and directed toward consensual objectives, until the very recent coordinating impact of external funding and resulting influence toward a coordinated criminal justice perspective.

The essence of a *criminal justice system* perspective is the setting of goals and priorities for the entire process-chain of criminal justice—interest in the final outcomes of the system after all agencies have contributed their individual efforts. This is in contrast to each agency pursuing its individual goals without particular interest or agreement with the operations of the others.

All of the foregoing is significant in considering the concept, design, and implementation of a human resources development program for the entire criminal justice system in any community or region. A systemic approach to criminal justice manpower development would include the following elements:

1. Inclusion of all the public agencies related to the criminal justice process: police, prosecutors, courts, probation, parole, and correctional institutions within a given jurisdiction or set of jurisdictions.
2. Specific programming for the various hierarchic levels of each organization (operations, supervision, middle management, executive) and for their functional specializations (line operations, staff supports, technical specializations) at each level of the hierarchy.

NOTE: It is essential to observe that several of Alaska's state and municipal criminal justice agencies have for some time conducted pre-entry and specialized training programs for their personnel. It is not intended that the proposed Criminal Justice Center duplicate, supersede, or absorb these existing programs. Rather, it is to be assumed that these programs will continue, but will be provided a continuing opportunity to establish a relationship with the Center to whatever degree appears mutually agreeable.

1. Needs Analysis

Training by Objectives is the concept observed in the following sequence of analytic activities. This concept departs from the most commonly found pattern of piecing together a new program from elements of several existing programs and instead builds upon an analysis of the work to be done or being done by the trainees. Contrary to what might be assumed, there is so little correlation between current criminal justice training curricula and the everyday jobs of practitioners, that the continued emulation of attractively packaged training programs perpetuates this pattern of dissonance between what is learned and what is done on the daily job.

A. Work Analysis

1. Census of training Clientele. A survey of criminal justice agencies in the defined region to determine:
 - a. Agencies which would utilize the regional training center.
 - b. Within each agency, specific positions, assignments, and roles for which training should be provided.
 - c. Classification of positions, assignments, and roles in the following matrix of function and hierarchy (note examples):

	<i>Line</i>	<i>Staff--Administration</i>	<i>Technical</i>
Operations	Patrolman Probation Officer		Computer Programmer Alcohol Test Technician Crime Lab Technician
Supervision	Police Sergeant		Records Supervisor
Middle Management	District Commander	Director of Planning Personnel	Crime Lab Director
Executive	Chief Prosecutor	Court Administrator Data Systems Director	

- d. Numerical census of positions within each classification of the matrix (for later use in allocation of training resources by objectives).
2. Job analysis of each classification in the matrix, using the following analytic categories:
 - a. Role concept of the position. Analysis of the position's major purposes, place in the criminal justice process, relationships with other positions and agencies of criminal justice.
 - b. Cognitive (factual knowledge) requirements of the position. The body of knowledge conventionally associated with a profession or occupation.
 - (1) General perspective knowledge associated with broad functioning as a practitioner in that criminal justice agency.
 - (2) Job-related knowledge associated with specific practices and processes of each position.
 - c. Affective requirements of the position. The emotional and personality capacities associated with the position (capacity for handling stress, maintaining supervisory relationships, decision-making under pressure, being both a manager and subordinate, numerous other capabilities not related to knowledge, per se).
 - d. Motor skills related to job performance. Physical, manual capabilities required (driving, perceptual skills, use of firearms, unarmed personal defense, personal search, others).

- B. Description of all curricular elements required to prepare manpower for the positions, roles, and assignments enumerated in (A) above. Sorting of curricular elements into (1) role concepts, (2) cognitive, (3) affective, and (4) motor skill requirements for each category of positions.

This listing of training curriculum needs would be complete; that is, it would include all requirements, including those already in existence within the region. This point in the analysis *would not involve curriculum design*, but merely enumeration of the *kinds* of training needed for the full potential clientele of the regional training program.

Summary Of Needs Analysis

The products of this needs analysis would consist of the following:

1. Listing of criminal justice agencies requiring training.
2. Listing of categories of positions within those agencies to be trained.
3. Classification of categories by hierarchy and function, a matrix.
4. Numerical count of personnel, by classification, to be trained.
5. Work elements of each position category, in terms of role concepts, cognitive, affective, and motor capacities.
6. Complete listing of training curriculum elements needed to train manpower (training coverage for item 5, just above).

2. Compare Training Needs To Current Resources

There is a need to consider both *education and training* resources in this comparison. The following definitions are employed:

TRAINING: Manpower development which tends to narrow the range of a person's responses to situations which confront him (conditions, problems, human behavior). Training is suitable when habitual action, patterned behavior, and a "best way" of meeting a situation has been evolved and proved out with little expectation of change. Training tends to stabilize the organization and its methods.

EDUCATION: Manpower development which extends the range of personal response to situations which confront him. Developing the person's capacity to deal creatively (use "common sense," or highly developed professional judgment) with varied and complex situations, primarily by his learning of the nature of the world around him (physical and social).

Because education enhances the capacity to comprehend and training enhances the capacity to do something well, it is obvious that both education and training are essential to competent performance in any criminal justice role from operational through executive. Every role has a certain number of elements which are best served by routine and habitual patterns of behavior which serve the needs of organizational stability and predictability of outcomes. This is no less true in the administrative and technical sectors than in the operational, although it has become customary to think of training only for entry-level jobs of most criminal justice agencies. On the other hand the rich complexities of human behavior frequently require a creative approach whether it is concerned with resolving a domestic quarrel, a difficult probationary subject, a supervisory motivation problem, or a policy development and implementation issue. Nearly every development program, whether called education or training, is a combination of education *and* training, whether offered by a university or agency academy.

- A. Survey all criminal justice manpower development programs within the region.
 1. List all educational and training programs relating to any position, roles, and assignments within the agencies enumerated in 1. A. 1. above. Some of these may not be readily apparent (e.g., technical training available to police or court data system personnel in a local university's business administration curriculum).
 2. Analyze in detail the curricula, subjects, and courses of all the educational and training programs.
 - a. List all curricular elements (subjects, parts of courses).
 - b. Classify these curricular elements as follows to relate them to specific positions categories for the various criminal justice agencies.

- (1) Role concepts.
 - (2) Cognitive (factual knowledge) requirements of positions.
 - (a) General perspective knowledge.
 - (b) Specific job-related knowledge.
 - (3) Affective (emotional, personality relationship) capacities.
 - (4) Motor skills.
- B. Compare this enumeration of existing manpower development resources point by point with the description of systemwide curricular needs established in 1. B. above, and item number 6 of the Summary of Needs Analysis. This analysis would identify deficits in the current manpower development resources. This analytic output would lead directly to number 3. following.

3. Current and Projected Training Needs (Manpower and Physical Facilities)

Training needs should be analyzed in two distinctly different ways. The first is in terms of relieving the *resource deficit* identified by the comparison of numbers 1 and 2, above (total resource needs minus existing resources). A second way of perceiving criminal justice training needs is in terms of a coordinated *system* of human resources development. Where the first approach combines available resources (public and private higher education, agency training) with a designed additional program to cover deficits, the second approach is a total manpower development system design.

A. Current Training Needs in Terms of Relieving Resource Deficits.

1. The analytic output of number 2. B. above, consists of curriculum content deficits for across-the-board training for criminal justice agencies and their personnel.
2. For each curriculum element listed as a deficit, analyze the following aspects of providing the additional training:
 - a. Hours of instruction required for that curriculum element.
 - b. Hours required for preparation of training materials.

- c. Equipment and supplies required to provide training.
 - d. Setting for the training (classroom, lab, field, role setting, other).
 - e. Numbers of instructional staff and time commitment required for that curriculum element.
 - f. Numbers and variety of criminal justice personnel to receive that curriculum element.
3. Determine manpower required to provide training enumerated in 3. A. 2. above, in the following categories:
- a. Training materials preparation.
 - b. Instruction, by curriculum categories.
 - c. Program direction and coordination with existing development programs.
4. Determine facilities required to support training enumerated in 3. A. 2. above, in the following categories:
- a. Physical plant.
 - (1) Instructional settings.
 - (a) Conventional classrooms.
 - (b) Training laboratories for technical and specialized functions.
 - (c) Criminal justice facility mockups for on-job-training simulation, role-playing, management scenarios, other techniques.
 - (d) Individual programmed instruction tutorial space.
 - (e) Flexible combinations of the above.

(2) Program direction facilities.

(a) Staff office space.

(b) Materials preparation and technical support space (artwork room, photo lab, equipment maintenance, other).

(3) Living quarters, dining, and food preparation space.

b. Equipment and supplies for training.

B. Projected Training Needs.

Projections of criminal justice training needs are of two kinds, one easily predicted and the second more difficult to plan for.

1. Future training needs based upon criminal justice agency growth. Primarily an exercise in extrapolating past population and agency numerical growth patterns into the next 20 years.
2. Future training needs based upon evolution and change of the criminal justice system: new functions, agencies, roles, technologies, patterns of cooperation (e.g., data systems, air patrols, legal aides, volunteers, cadets, women, particle activation analysis, others).

4. Curriculum Design

The design of curriculum has already been discussed in terms of its derivation from the work analysis proposed in number 1. above. The curriculum would be "organic" in that it would be determined by the nature of the positions in the various agencies, and the work of those positions.

A. Concept of Agency Personnel Mixed in a Regional Academy.

The matrix of hierarchic levels and major functions shown in number 1. A. provides a format for specific curricular elements for each category of operational, supervisory, and managerial roles in the various agencies. This is *not* to suggest that each agency, each function, and each managerial level have its unique and isolated training program. To the contrary, as the needs of these various roles and agencies are determined, it will be found that many roles and agencies share common needs for training (e.g., specific parts of the criminal law, deviant behavior, interviewing, first line supervisory techniques, planning methods, budget preparation and execution, data system utilization, many others). In many cases it will be feasible to combine personnel from several agencies (and sometimes from several levels of command) in single sections of commonly needed courses, and later to separate them for training unique to their individual agency functions (or level of command functions).

B. Return to the Concept of the Academy for Training Format.

Two important needs of criminal justice agencies are met in this concept. The first is the need to train personnel even while they are needed in their on-going work assignments. The second is access to a variety of training programs which are responsive to individual agency requirements. The following possibilities should be analyzed as means of meeting those needs.

1. Extended Training Courses with Intermittent Attendance.

Training programs which meet 40 hours per week for several weeks not only create problems for agencies which need the continuing services of their personnel, but also violate a most important principle of learning: that of pacing the learning experience so that newly learned material may be integrated into thinking and working patterns, creating a readiness for additional new material. Beyond recruit training, short-term saturation

learning severely limits retention and later application. A 4-week training course extended to 20 weeks at the rate of 1 day per week, with take-home assignments related to agency assignment enhances learning retention, the opportunity to relate training to daily work, and long-term improvement of job skills. The great distances between working and possible training locations in Alaska will require a careful analysis of the utility of this concept. Variables such as distance (for trainers or trainees), technological formatting of training, and duration-spread of training will need to be studied in a cost-effectiveness mode to determine the most appropriate programming for various locations and clientele.

2. Unit Courses Available in Flexible Combinations.

A principle of the academy concept, utilized most visibly by colleges and universities, is the organizing of subject matter in discrete units or courses, which may be taken in various combinations to suit the purposes of persons interested in a variety of occupations. Adopting this flexible format of the university does not imply a duplication of the material offered by higher educational institutions. The analyses performed in parts 1 and 2 of this proposal would assure that the regional academy would provide training not presently available. The academic scheduling technique, however, would allow personnel of the several criminal justice agencies to enroll in academy courses in law, management, technology, behavior, budgeting, planning, and other subjects in combinations uniquely suited to their work needs (as determined in the work analyses). Also, individual agencies could be selective about the material they considered appropriate to their personnel in various ranks and assignments.

3. Training Through the Career Cycle.

In most criminal justice agencies, personnel progress through a series of entirely different kinds of work as they are promoted: operational, supervisory, middle-managerial, technically specialized, and eventually, executive or policymaking. The traditional preparation for a career has been a one-time educational or training experience, which presumably prepares the person for this varied work pattern.

It is proposed that the Criminal Justice Center provide training-education for each significantly different level and kind of work performed by criminal justice agency personnel. The matrix of rank and function shown in Number 1 provides the framework for this development.

4. Instructional Methodology Related to Curriculum Elements.

There is increasing realization that the traditional classroom lecture method of instruction is inadequate to the broad range of training objectives in criminal justice practice and management. It is generally conceded that much factual information is more easily and securely learned in programmed formats (with or without machine assistance); certain professional values are best conveyed through personal contact with respected instructors; and personal skills mastered in role-playing practicums.

Each curriculum elements needs to be analyzed to determine its optimum mode of presentations: lecture, programmed instruction, field exercise, role-playing, tutorial, or some other method.

IV. THE RESEARCH AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

The implementation of a generic statewide Criminal Justice Center, a unique undertaking in the evolution of American criminal justice, would seem to call for a uniquely constituted research and development effort, no less broad than the concept of the Center itself. The planning structure should include: (1) the criminal justice professional interests involved; (2) the sponsoring, funding agencies; (3) the proposed institutional base of the Center; and (4) a staff of criminal justice education and training consultants.

Recommended Research and Planning Committee Composition

I. Criminal Justice Agency Members

Police

1. Alaska Department of Public Safety (to be designated by the Commissioner of Public Safety from policy level: e.g., Deputy Commissioner of Public Safety, or Director of the Division of State Troopers).
2. Anchorage Police Department (to be designated by the Chief of Police from policy level: e.g., Deputy Chief of Police).

Prosecution

1. Alaska Department of Law (to be designated by the Attorney General from the policy level: e.g., Deputy Attorney General).
2. District Attorney from Fairbanks or Anchorage.

Courts

1. Alaska Court System (to be designated from policy or administrative level).
2. Magistrate Supervisor.

Corrections

1. Director of the Division of Corrections or his designee.

II. Sponsoring, Funding Agency Members

1. Representative of Criminal Justice Center Committee of Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice.
2. Executive Director of the Alaska Criminal Justice Planning Agency or his designee.
3. Manpower Specialist, LEAA Regional Office, Seattle.

III. Proposed Institutional Base of the Criminal Justice Center

1. Academic Vice President, University of Alaska.
2. University-designated representative from the Anchorage campus.

IV. Staff of Criminal Justice Education and Training Consultants

Following are nominations for consultantships in the professional fields indicated. Their biographic resumes are attached or enroute under separate cover.

Police Program Development

1. Larry Hoover, Assistant Director, Criminal Justice Systems Center, Michigan State University.
2. Herman Goldstein, Professor, School of Law, University of Wisconsin.
3. Sam Chapman, Professor, University of Oklahoma.

Adjudication Program Development

1. James George, Director, Institute for Judicial Administration, Wayne State University.

Corrections Program Development

1. Vernon Fox, Professor, Florida State University.
2. Hans Mattick, Professor, University of Illinois, Chicago Circle.

Criminal Justice Center, Concept Monitor

1. Victor G. Strecher, Professor, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University.
2. Herman Goldstein, Professor, School of Law, University of Wisconsin.

V. RESEARCH AND PLANNING TIMETABLE

<i>Week Beginning</i>	<i>Activity</i>
December 3, 1973	<i>Meeting or Research and Planning Committee.</i> Beginning of data gathering (on-site): Census of education and training clientele.
December 10	Data gathering (on-site): Census of education and training clientele by agency, position classification, assignments.
December 17	Data gathering (on-site): Continued.
December 24	Recessed activity.
December 31	Data analysis: Job analysis of each classification, in terms of role concept, cognitive, affective, and motor skills requirements (consultants' home sites).
January 7, 1974	Data analysis: Continued.
January 14	Data analysis: Continued. <i>Meeting of the Research and Planning Committee</i> to consider completion of needs analysis and planning to follow.
January 21	Thinking.
January 28	Thinking.
February 4	Curriculum development (consultants' home sites).
February 11	Curriculum development: Continued.
February 18	Curriculum development: Comparison of education and training needs to current resources of Alaska.
February 25	Curriculum development: Specification of new programs to fulfill immediate and projected manpower development requirements. <i>Meeting of the Research and Planning Committee</i> to consider initial planning results and next steps toward credential planning within education and training models.
March 4	Thinking.

- March 11 Thinking.
- March 18 Credential planning: Relating job classifications to specific education and training programs.
- March 25 Credential planning continued.
- April 1 Program development: Manpower, facilities, and systems required for new education and training programs.
- April 8 Program development: Implementation plan.
- April 15 — May 6 Final report preparation.
- May 13 Submittal of final report and implementation plan. *Meeting of the Research and Planning Committee.*

ALASKA CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER
 RESEARCH AND PLANNING COST ESTIMATES
 December 1973 – May 1974

<i>Each Consultant</i>	<i>Working Days</i>	<i>Fees</i>	<i>Travel</i>	<i>Living Expenses</i>	<i>Total Costs</i>
Data gathering (on-site)	15	\$ 2,025	\$ 575	\$ 600	
Data analysis (plus meeting)	15	2,025	575	80	
Curriculum development (plus meeting)	20	2,700	575	80	
Credential and program planning (plus meeting)	20	2,700	575	80	
Final report preparation (plus final meeting)	20	2,700	575	80	
Total cost – each consultant	90	\$12,150	\$2,875	\$ 920	\$15,945
Total cost – 3 consultants	\$270	\$36,450	\$8,625	\$2,760	\$47,835
Concept consultant	25	3,375	2,300	840	6,515
Total consultant costs					\$70,295
University of Alaska staff (January–May)			—	—	\$10,000
Research and Planning Committee travel costs (4 meetings)			\$4,400	\$2,880	7,280
Consultant telephone costs (December–May; 4 consultants)					1,750
Clerical costs of consultants					200
Total program development cost estimate					\$89,525

END

7 miles/more