

**National
Criminal Justice
Association**

HALL OF THE STATES
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.
Suite 305
Washington, D. C. 20001
(202) 347-4900

the
Bellringer

A Periodic Review of Criminal Justice Evaluation

JRB

NCJRS

ARTICLES IN THIS ISSUE

JUN 9 1980

JUNE 1980
Issue #17

OFFENDER DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SYSTEM
--LaRae Shafer

ACQUISITIONS

IMPROVED RECORDS KEEPING SYSTEMS NECESSITATED BY
816 REQUIREMENTS
--Steven Njemanze and Gordon Skelton

[SAFE STREETS 1968-1980: WHAT HAS BEEN DONE WITH ALL THAT
LEAA MONEY IN UTAH? *68177*
--Steve Vojtecky

Also:

ASPA Call for Program Proposals
Positions Available-New York City
Evaluation Axioms

PROJECT WAS SUPPORTED BY GRANT NUMBER 80-MU-AX-0002 and 79-EF-AX-0049,
AND BY THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION, UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS EXPRESSED OR STATED
IN THIS PUBLICATION ARE THOSE OF THE AUTHORS AND DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT THE OFFICIAL POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE.

68177

CALL FOR PROGRAM PROPOSALS

1981 ASPA CONFERENCE IN DETROIT

The American Society for Public Administration has scheduled its next annual National Conference for April, 1981 in Detroit. The Conference Program Committee is soliciting proposals for panels or workshops addressing criminal justice issues. Proposals addressing such areas as victimization, neighborhood crime prevention, the corrections crisis, non-metropolitan area crime, the role of minorities and women in criminal justice, cut-back management in criminal justice, and public officials and corruption in the public service are encouraged. Proposals need not be limited to these topics -- other topics of high interest that address the Conference theme of "developing the professional -- developing the profession" are appropriate.

Innovative means of presentation in the panels or workshops is very desirable and every effort will be made to accommodate presentations that require the use of audio/visual aids if advance notice is given.

The deadline for submission of proposals is June 15, 1980. Proposals in the area of criminal justice should be sent to Program Committee Representative, Juanita Blankenship, Southern Regional District Allocation Committee, 302 East Carson Street, Suite 914, Las Vegas, Nevada 89101. For further information call Ms. Blankenship at (702) 384-2739.

(Editor's Note: Because it will be close to June 15 when you read this article, if you have any ideas for a panel, please call Ms. Blankenship immediately.)

IF YOU HAVE A FAVORITE EVALUATION AXIOM, PLEASE SEND IT TO THE EDITOR. THANKS.

THE BELLRINGER IS PUBLISHED AND DISTRIBUTED BY THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSOCIATION; 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, NW; SUITE 305; WASHINGTON, DC: 20001; 202/347-4900.

ARTICLES REFLECT THE OPINIONS OF THE AUTHORS AND ARE NOT INTENDED TO REPRESENT THE VIEWS OF LEAA OR NCJA.

ANYONE IS INVITED TO SUBMIT ARTICLES FOR PUBLICATION TO THE EDITOR. ARTICLES CAN COVER ANY ASPECT OF EVALUATION. NEXT DATE FOR PUBLICATION IS JULY 18, 1980.

EDITOR: Steve Vojtecky; Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration; 255 South Third East; Salt Lake City, UT 84111; 801/533-4543.

OFFENDER DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SYSTEM

The State of Wyoming, Board of Charities and Reform is the official governing body of the state's five correctional institutions. The Wyoming State Penitentiary, which houses all male felons in the state; Women's Center, which houses all female felons in the state, Honor Farm, which is a work release program for a designated number of "trustee status" offenders from the State Penitentiary; and both our juvenile institutions, Girl's School and the Industrial Institute (Boy's school).

In August of 1979, it was decided by the Board of Charities and Reform that a more efficient and effective record management system was needed to keep track of the individuals who moved within or among the five above mentioned institutions.

Board of Charities and Reform, and the five institutions had previously been using a method that was both time consuming and antiquated, it was hard to keep up with, and constantly needed re-adjustments made to it. The functional reality came about in October of 1979, that a Management Information System for the Board of Charities and Reform was needed. Subsequently Data Services, for the State of Wyoming, was contacted to see about the reality of computerizing a new system.

State Data Services was contacted, from that meeting and subsequent meetings, it was decided that what was really needed was a report writing program. A canned package "Mark IV" (i.e. file management system) was introduced for its ability to compute raw frequencies, percentages of those raw frequencies, and give us printouts in a readable form. They could be used for monthly, quarterly, and yearly reports by the user agencies under the Board of Charities and Reform. Some of the other benefits that will be received by using "Mark IV" is the accessibility of the data entered via CRT, edit capabilities, updating of the Master File on a seven day basis, and the tracking of individuals who are serving time in the state's five institutions.

Another unique advantage which can, on special occasions and/or specific requests, be utilized by the user agencies is a procedure entitled "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences", another canned package from Data Services. SPSS can perform many different types of data analysis in a simple and convenient manner. SPSS allows a great deal of flexibility in the format of data. It provides the user with a comprehensive set of procedures for data transformation and file manipulation, and it offers the user a large number of statistical routines.

During this time period of selecting what type of procedure was to be used, its abilities and limitations, the Board of Charities and Reform were also consulting with another state agency, the Division of Criminal Identification under the Attorney General's Office. The division of

Criminal Identification was currently in the process of starting their new program, OBTS/CCH. A mutual agreement was drawn up between the two agencies, DCI and BCR, that the Division of Criminal Identification would be the agency responsible for the data entry, editing of the forms, updating of the Master file, and generally accountable for the Management Information System for the Board. During the month of March, a representative from Data Services, Board of Charities and Reform, the director and a research assistant from Criminal Identification concluded training seminars at the five institutions around Wyoming. They introduced an "intake form" which had been composed with painstaking effort to eliminate and/or minimize error, a set of detailed instructions, to be used in the process of filling in the "intake form", were included as well.

The month of April is being used as the "trial period" for the new "intake form". Any discrepancies, changes, or readjustments to the "intake form" will hopefully arise at this time. If after the trial month is over, and there is general agreement between the five institutions, Board of Charities and Reform and the Division of Criminal Identification, the system will become operational in the month of July.

LaRae Shafer, Research Assistant
State of Wyoming
Office of Attorney General
Center for Criminal Justice Research
Boyd Building, Suite 4
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002
307/777-7315

(Ms. Shafer had worked for the Center for Criminal Justice Research for six years and is also completing the MPA program at the University of Wyoming.)

EVALUATION AXIOMS

Young's Law: All great discoveries are made by mistake.

Corollary: The greater the funding, the longer it takes to make the mistake.

Truman's Law: If you cannot convince them, confuse them.

Fairfax's Law: Any facts which, when included in the argument, give the desired result, are fair facts for the argument.

(Quoted from MURPHY'S LAW by Arthur Bloch; Price, Stern, Sloan--Publishers, Inc., Los Angeles; October 1977. Submitted by Richard Hamilton, Alabama SPA)

IMPROVED RECORDS KEEPING SYSTEMS NECESSITATED BY 816 REQUIREMENTS

Over the past years, evaluations were, in many cases, conducted with the use of less-than satisfactory data gleaned from quarterly progress reports submitted by subgrantees. These progress reports contained unformatted information and provided very little quantitative data by which the success of a project could be measured. Even when data were available, varying measurements were applied by individual subgrantees, thus making comparative analysis across projects virtually impossible. In most cases, project evaluation was merely a very subjective exercise of limited or no value for criminal justice planning.

With the call for the 816 Report under the JSIA of 1979, a new era began in terms of evaluation/statistical data collection and analysis. Fundamental changes are needed if sufficient data are to be collected on each project. Furthermore, standardization of the data elements across project lines is mandatory if means for comparing success rates of projects are to be developed. Today with budgetary constraints and drawbacks, each subgrantee needs data that will support his/her bid for a share of the limited funds. Therefore, in developing standardized reporting forms for compliance with 816 requirements, the evaluation/statistical analysis unit should be cognizant of the subgrantee's needs as well as its own. For this reason, if for none other, the development of records keeping systems tailored to the subgrantee's needs and uses must take place.

Input from the subgrantee, the program specialist, i.e. juvenile, court, law enforcement, or corrections planner, the evaluation specialist, and statistical analysis center personnel must be acquired. Each of these four divisions has need for data somewhat different from the others. Development of a master list of data needs will certainly reduce duplication. In addition, coordination of the data collection process may greatly relieve the workload placed upon the project director who is ultimately responsible for the submission of the project data.

Modification of reporting dates can improve both the programmatic monitoring process as well as the evaluation process. Monthly reports have advantages that outweigh the increased workload for data collection and report submission. The program monitors can tell more quickly when a project is having difficulty before it becomes too late to salvage the project. In process evaluation of the project relying upon the monthly reports can begin much earlier than if only quarterly reports are utilized. Careful development of the monthly reporting forms should allow the reporting requirements to be held to the barest minimum. Perhaps this is the key to success in utilizing self-reporting forms: keeping the questions short and to the point so as to not overburden the respondent.

In revamping the evaluation unit in Mississippi increased emphasis is being placed upon the development of standardized reporting forms. More specific requests for data are being sculptured into short reporting forms so that all individuals concerned, from the project director to the evaluation specialist, have better insight into the progress of the project and the eventual indepth evaluation.

Automation of the evaluation results are helpful in the development of an effective evaluation system. With the assistance of the SPARKS management information system, the Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center, responsible for the evaluation component, is developing standardized project and program evaluation reporting instruments that will allow quick reference for program specialists and the executive director. Utilizing software to be developed inhouse, along with the user bytes of the SPARKS SUBRECA, it will be now possible to determine whether a given subgrant has been evaluated or audited. Further use of the program EVALUATE allows one to determine which subgrants have been evaluated in each of the programs by funding year. Such a system is quite helpful in planning evaluation activities. In addition, utilizing sampling techniques, the criminal justice programs can be evaluated from data obtained from individual subgrant evaluations.

At present, the use of the minicomputer for management of evaluation data is quite new. However, from preliminary observation the results are quite promising. In general, it is believed that the development of standardized 816 reporting instruments will lend themselves further to automation. Members of the SPARKS Users Steering Committee and the User Group as a whole are fully aware of the potential savings in time and personnel that automation of evaluation data and performance indicators can bring.

If anyone has developed similar software, we would be extremely interested in exchanging ideas. Further information is available by simply writing to the following address:

Steven Njemanze, Evaluation Specialist
Gordon W. Skelton, MSAC Coordinator
EVALUATE
Mississippi Statistical Analysis Center
Criminal Justice Planning Commission
723 North President Street, Suite 400
Jackson, Mississippi 39201
601/354-4111

(Mr. Njemanze recently began work for MSAC as an evaluation specialist; he has an MPA from Jackson State University. Mr. Skelton has worked for MSAC for two years and is currently enrolled in a doctoral program in Political Science and Economics at the University of Southern Mississippi.)

SAFE STREETS 1968-1980

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE WITH ALL THAT LEAA MONEY IN UTAH?

Introduction and Conclusions

Almost twelve years have elapsed since the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) and the Utah Council on Criminal Justice Administration (CCJA) launched an ambitious program to reduce crime and improve the criminal justice system in Utah. By September 1980, over \$37 million will have been used by Utah criminal justice agencies through the LEAA/CCJA program. This amount represents about \$2 million to \$3 million per year or approximately 3 percent of the total \$110 million (1978 amount) used to annually operate all criminal justice agencies in Utah. The \$37 million can be divided into three areas: \$29 million for just over 1,300 direct grants to operating agencies for improvements; \$5.5 million for 100 grants for administration, planning, and evaluation; and \$2.5 million for more than 2,000 loans and grants to criminal justice agency personnel to obtain university educations.

This report examines the changes that have occurred in the state's criminal justice system and assesses the impact of the LEAA/CCJA program.

Topics discussed are:

1. Three Factors are Present in Measuring Changes and Evaluating Impact.
2. Crime Has Not Been Reduced.
3. Criminal Justice Personnel Now Talk to Each Other.
4. Utah Has One Criminal Justice System.
5. Action and Prevention Have Replaced Reaction.
6. Assistance in Making Organizational Change.
7. The Direct Impacts of the LEAA/CCJA Program.
8. Impact on 12 Substantive Areas of Criminal Justice.
9. Non-Financial Technical Assistance.
10. Lessons Learned.
11. Final Analysis.

The eleven sections describe the direct and indirect impacts of the program.

Five impacts can be directly related to this program.

1. Increased communication and coordination among criminal justice segments (law enforcement, prosecution, judicial, corrections, and the public).
2. Development of a single criminal justice system--not five separate systems.
3. Transition of criminal justice agencies from reacting to events to planning and anticipating events--the institutionalization of planning, evaluation, and analysis.

4. Increased availability of assistance to administrators to bring about organizational change.
5. Establishment of information sources on performance of criminal justice agencies.

The initial goal of crime reduction was not achieved. Crime has not been reduced.

The goal of system improvement is being met. Direct and indirect improvements have been made in 12 areas: law enforcement, crime prevention, court reform, prosecution, pre-trial diversion, habitual offenders, victim-witness programs, alternatives to confinement, improved detention and confinement, training, code reform, and statistics and evaluation.

Three Factors Are Present in Measuring Change and Evaluating Impact.

Evaluation systematically measures the amount of change in a series of events and attributes causes to the changes. This process, the evaluation process, has three factors that must be considered. Two relate to measuring change; one relates to determining cause.

In any series of events there are two types of change: 1) change in rate (the change strategy speeds up the events or slows the events down); and 2) change in scope (numbers, volume, etc., increase or decrease). Purists would also suggest there is a third type of change which is no change. But for this report, only two types of change are counted.

Once the amount of change is identified, causes for the change must be examined. Change is relatively easy to determine. Causation is much harder to determine.

Attributing change to the LEAA/CCJA program is especially difficult. The program contributes from three percent to five percent of all criminal justice expenditures. The difficulty comes in assessing changes in criminal justice agency operations and determining how much impact five percent of the total budget produces.

There is a simple process for determining causation. If the change is positive, of course, it was the five percent that brought about the change. If the change is negative, the cause lies in the other 95 percent and more research is needed. No, not really. But these three factors (of change and impact) must be kept in mind when reviewing the LEAA/CCJA program.

Crime Has Not Been Reduced.

One of the initial goals of the program was to reduce crime. A reduction has not occurred nationally or in Utah. In the twelve years, actual decreases in the amount of major crime (Part I offenses: murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, theft, burglary, and auto theft) have occurred twice (1972 was less than 1971; 1977 was less than 1976).

The number of major crimes increased 47 percent from 1972 to 1979 in Utah. When adjusted for population, the crime rate increased 21.3 percent (1972 to 1979).

This statistic, while discouraging in itself, identifies a system improvement attributable to the LEAA/CCJA program. It is an accurate and complete statistic produced by an LEAA funded program. There are other direct impacts attributable to the program.

Criminal Justice Personnel Now Talk to Each Other.

The most often cited direct result of the LEAA program (based on three surveys of criminal justice personnel) has been that the different segments (police, prosecutors, public defense, judges, the public and community agencies, and adult and juvenile corrections) now are aware of each other, communicate, and work together to solve common and individual problems. This communication, cooperation, and coordination occur at state and local levels and have led to the second direct impact--a single criminal justice system.

Utah Has One Criminal Justice System.

We talked about "Existing Systems" for a long time. Somewhere along the way the "s" was dropped. While there may still be some exceptions, criminal justice administrators feel they are part of one system--each part dependent on another and responsible to the others. It is now a criminal justice system comprised of separate branches of government and different levels of government--but one system.

Action and Prevention Have Replaced Reaction.

A third direct effect of the LEAA/CCJA program has been the movement of criminal justice agencies from a generally reactive posture to an active (anticipating, preventing, planning) posture. In 1972, a realistic count of the number of agencies who planned ahead (more than the next year's budget) indicated four agencies were doing more than meeting present demands for services. A slightly relaxed criteria (original criteria was a written document outlining problems and solutions--modified criteria was either written problems or solutions) gave six agencies out of 409 who planned and 10 additional ones who said they tried to plan.

The last count we made, in early 1979, showed 27 agencies who were planning and producing written plans. And most other administrators said they were planning, and analyzing, and evaluating.

The basis for attributing this change to the LEAA/CCJA program is partially discussed in the next section. Other reasons for crediting the program with significantly helping agencies to move from reaction to action are: CCJA provided actual planning assistance; showed a format for planning; required that some planning take place in order to receive a grant; provided financial support for planning, research, and evaluation units; and gave training sessions in planning, evaluation, and analysis.

Assistance in Making Organizational Changes.

The LEAA/CCJA program has assisted administrators in making organizational changes by providing two of the three primary factors needed for making organizational changes.

For organizational change to occur:

1. There must be a need for change such as increased demand, new clients, or new problems.
2. There must be a climate for change. Someone must want the change, or advocate changes, and be willing to change and assist in bringing about the change.
3. The resistance to change must be met. Employees, clients, administrators, and even delivery systems resist change. Dealing with these blocks to change requires money and time.

Public agencies never lack the demand (need) for change. But often the other two criteria for change are not present. In fact, they are not present to a very high degree. Public agencies (and public employees and public officials) don't like to change, and they lack the money and time to initiate and try change.

Each agency administrator is faced with a fairly constant (except for inflation) budget and a fairly constant (rising with population increases) demand for services. All of the regular budget goes to produce all of the regular services in much the same ways as in the past. CCJA funds (even though only a small portion of the agency budget) allowed each administrator to try new ways of doing things, to experiment, to try to meet new demands for services or to try new methods of providing similar services.

For example, a chief whose officers had rapidly increasing workloads could receive one additional officer who dealt with (had to deal with) juvenile problems. The end result: the chief has another officer (increase in resources) who addresses in a planned, new way (the grant application is a small plan) the delivery of services to juvenile offenders.

This fourth impact of the program has been to assist in producing a climate for change. Not only is change advocated, it is required (a notable difference between this block grant program and revenue sharing). Also, funds and time are provided to help meet resistance; and because the funds and time are additions to regular agency functions (not--initially--reorganizations or reallocation of agency functions), the threat of change is lessened.

Two additional aspects of organizational change and the LEAA/CCJA program are non-supplanting and the effect of productivity.

One definition of supplant is "to uproot by force". Only in rare and extreme cases does organizational change occur by force. When forced change does occur, the gains are only short-term; the long-term costs of forced change (human and organizational expenses) usually far outweigh initial gains in productivity. A chief (and fondly thought of) feature of this program has been that non-supplanting is required. Change must be analytical and planned--and therefore, has a greater chance for success.

Planned change, also, initially produces a lower rate of productivity. New skills are learned, new methods tried, new clients are served. But because these change strategies are additional to regular agency functions, a lower productivity rate for the new function does not reduce the productivity of all agency functions.

In sum, this program assists administrators in providing a climate for and the means to implement organizational change in public criminal justice agencies.

The Direct Impacts of the LEAA/CCJA Program.

These four impacts on Utah's criminal justice system--increased communication, development of one system, catalyst for change, and transition from reaction to action--are directly attributable to the LEAA/CCJA program.

Increased communication among criminal justice personnel and the development of a one system concept are attributed to the program based on surveys of criminal justice administrator opinions. The most recent survey (1979) indicated 89 percent of the administrators felt these were significant benefits of the program.

The value of the program in assisting organizational change is implicit in the nature (and requirements) of the program and can be documented in the following section.

The program's impact in moving agencies from reactive to active postures is subjective. The best evidence of this impact is in a review of the actual grant assistance provided to Utah criminal justice agencies.

Impact on 12 Substantive Areas of Criminal Justice

Recent legislation has asked that LEAA report to Congress and CCJA report to the governor and the legislature regarding impact in 18 areas of criminal justice. Applying these Biden (for Senator Joseph R. Biden, Jr., who sponsored the amendment) questions to CCJA, changes and impacts (in rate and/or scope) can be shown in 12 of these 18 substantive areas.

Two problems influence the measurement of impact in these contexts.

First, assigning a specific value to the impact of less than five percent of the system, is not possible. So, change and impact in these 12 areas are indirect impacts of the program. What this means is that criminal justice administrators, assisted by the CCJA program, have substantially improved the system. But, empirically calculating why the system changed can only be done indirectly.

The second difficulty in identifying change and impact from 1968 to 1980 is that information on the system before 1971 is incomplete. Many comparisons then are actually 1971 to 1979, a nine-year period rather than a 12-year period. Some comparisons are less than nine years, because of incomplete earlier statistics. This incompleteness of information highlights one major change in Utah's criminal justice system, statistics on activities and agencies are now readily available for most agencies. Changes in performance can now be measured. More on statistics and reporting is described in the last substantive system impact section.

Even without complete data, some differences from 1968 to 1979 are obvious. Every member of the system could easily prepare a list of changes.

One easy to prepare list is how many of the 479 criminal justice agencies did not benefit (receive a grant-or participate in a grant-funded project) from the program. West Valley City (the brand new city) has never received a grant. There are a few other agencies on the list; but it is extremely difficult to identify more than a handful of agencies who have not benefited from this federal and state funded program.

A brief outline of changes and impacts in each of the various substantive areas of criminal justice is described in the following sections.

1. Improving and Strengthening Law Enforcement

In twelve years, police and sheriff manpower has been significantly expanded and specialized. Police training has changed from less than 200 hours of basic training to a formalized, required basic training period of 320 hours (400 in September 1980) and a 40-hour per year inservice requirement. Increases in manpower and increases in crime have resulted in increased arrests. Clearance rates, the measure (as determined by each police chief and sheriff) of the portion of cases considered solved for the state was 23 percent (for major crimes in 1976). In 1979, the rate was 29 percent. By comparison, the national rate in 1978 was 21 percent.

Prior to 1972, the portion of law enforcement agencies annually reporting crimes, arrests, and clearances was just over 70 percent. In 1979, almost 99 percent were accurately and regularly reporting crime statistics.

This program increased manpower, provided specialization of services, expanded support services, and supported new methods of delivery. Specialized law enforcement units ranging from 20 officers in Salt Lake City to one officer in North Salt Lake have been set up in 44 jurisdictions to focus on investigation and clearance of major crimes.

Support services such as dispatching, polygraph, firing ranges, and intelligence analysis have been created or expanded in 120 police and sheriff jurisdictions. These are not equipment grants (buy a polygraph). They are improvement grants (train and equip a polygrapher to serve six rural police departments). Equipment-only grants ended in 1973. A criminalistics laboratory offering forensic services not previously available in Utah was established at Weber State College. In 1971, nine police and sheriff departments had crime labs. CCJA funds were used to expand seven of these and establish 43 more labs in law enforcement agencies.

Contract law enforcement has been established in five areas. Under this system, one political jurisdiction buys police services from a neighboring jurisdiction. A larger, more efficient and professional department is then available to both jurisdictions. Another special project conducted organizational analysis of 18 police departments.

Youth bureaus have been established in 30 police and sheriff departments. The result has been increases in awareness of juvenile problems, more juveniles arrested for serious crimes, fewer status offense referrals to Juvenile Court, and more school/police involvement and cooperation.

2. Crime Prevention and Community Relations

Few agencies were actively involved in crime prevention prior to 1972. We counted six departments with active crime prevention programs operating in 1971. In 1979, 97 police and sheriffs' offices (most of the departments with three or more officers) had active crime prevention units. Fourteen of these were established with LEAA funds. All received training, brochures, speakers, films, and other services through the Statewide Crime Prevention Program. The statewide program also sponsored media programs against shoplifting, burglary, and vandalism; developed public education curricula on the criminal justice system for use in adult education and regular public school programs; and began an assistance program for battered spouses. The current Utah Hands-Up program continues this work with schools and police. Their most current task is an arson prevention, awareness, and apprehension program.

3. Anti-Fencing Operations and Activities Against Organized Crime

The highly publicized STING (anti-fencing) operations have not been implemented in Utah. Efforts against organized crimes have been participation in multi-state efforts of intelligence collection and sharing. The LEAA/CCJA program has had little impact in these two areas.

4. Arson

Efforts against arson are just beginning. One project is now operating in Salt Lake County, and the Hands-Up program has also just begun an anti-arson program. No impact on arson is yet available.

5. White Collar Crime and Public Corruption

One project was funded in the Attorney General's office to address economic (land and stock frauds) crimes. A model state procurement code (developed with CCJA funds) was adopted by Utah in April 1980; the code can be used by local and state governments to reduce costs and to lessen the possibility of public corruption.

This area is also one in which no real impact can yet be assessed. The economic unit concept continues at the attorney general's office; the code is new.

6. Court Reform

The most dramatic evidence of court reform (in two ways: moving from reaction to planning, and general system improvement) is the GOALS FOR THE UTAH JUDICIARY 1979-1981 AND JUDICIAL PLAN. This excellent document is the work of the Judicial Planning Committee and the Office of Court Administrator (both begun with LEAA funds).

Other improvements (with the LEAA program) are: courtroom facilities were constructed or renovated in five jurisdictions; assistance, training, and additional facilities and equipment were provided to implement the new circuit court system; court management improvements were set in place using automated records systems--improved efficiency in calendar management, case scheduling, and case monitoring have resulted; and nine court administrators (in addition to the state administrator) were added to district and city/circuit court offices to aid judges in carrying out administrative tasks of the court.

7. Prosecution

Senator Biden's seventh category is really diversion from prosecution. But I put that in categories 8 (Pre-Trial Diversion) and 12 (Drugs) and used this category for prosecution improvements.

Now, Utah operates under a single prosecution system using better trained and generally more available prosecutors.

The LEAA program was used to establish the Statewide Association of Prosecutors, to increase the staffs of 15 county attorney offices, to offer training programs to all prosecutors, and to begin automated information system programs for at least two large county attorney offices.

The University of Utah Law School was also assisted in setting up training programs for students interested in prosecution and public defense careers.

8. Pre-Trial Diversion

The most effective pre-trial diversion program is the guilty plea. Most, over 80 percent, sentenced offenders are not convicted, they plead guilty.

LEAA funded two pre-trial diversion programs (in Salt Lake and Ogden) to provide own-recognizance release for minor offenders. Few offenders (less than 4.4 percent wilfully failed to show up for trial; compared with a 7.4 percent failure to appear rate for bonded releases). The unemployment rate of bail bondsmen was also increased.

A diversion program for drug offenders was established. Impact was inconclusive.

Pre-trial diversion programs did aid the two jails in lowering jail populations--but jail populations always quickly adjust to changes and increase to capacity in a short time. The best to be said is that without the programs, jail populations would have been an estimated ten percent higher.

Diversion programs for juveniles--alternatives to Juvenile Court referral--were part of the 30 police youth bureaus (for all offenders). Nine youth service centers for diverting runaway and ungovernable status offenders were set up throughout the state with LEAA funds. Substantial reductions in the number of juveniles placed in detention and referred to court for these two status offenses have occurred.

9. Career Criminals

Two prosecutor programs were set up to identify and convict, without plea bargains, habitual offenders. A career criminal defense effort was also created. The two programs have been effective in producing a coordinated effort to convict multiple offenders. Conviction rates are high and plea bargains are few.

10. Victim and Witness Programs

The criminal justice system will have been substantially improved when the system treats victims and witnesses as fairly as it treats offenders.

While the system treatment of victims and witnesses has improved (two projects for informing victims and witnesses of their responsibilities and for coordinating court appearance times and one project for having juveniles work as restitution were established and worked), the treatment of victims, witnesses, and jurors still needs improvement.

11. Public Defense

Through the LEAA/CCJA program, four public defense offices were created or expanded (three new, one expansion).

12. Drug Offender Programs

With the exception of the discretionary funded Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) project, CCJA has not recently funded drug offender programs.

Earlier grants were made to Project Reality for a methadone maintenance project and to Odyssey House and the Manhattan Project for counseling and board.

13. Alternatives to Confinement

Keeping non-serious juvenile and adult offenders out of prison (or other confinement) has become an important aspect of our criminal justice system. It seems like a good idea, treatment is probably just as good or better, and in most cases it is cheaper.

The LEAA program has provided numerous alternatives to confinement. Nine Juvenile Court neighborhood probation units, and five group homes were established. Nine other group homes were expanded. Seven community alternatives to placement at the Youth Development Center have been created for seriously delinquent youth. In order to place delinquent youth in the appropriate rehabilitation program, a diagnostic and placement team has been established to serve the whole state.

Misdemeanor probation services have been made available to all courts in Utah. Felony probation services were expanded. Two community correction centers for men (Salt Lake and Ogden), a women's correction center (Ogden), the prison diagnostic unit, three alcohol detoxification programs (Salt Lake, Vernal, Cedar City), a minority probation service (through SOCIO), a high school completion program for jail inmates (Weber County), and two pre-trial release programs (Ogden and Salt Lake) were established.

14. Reduction of Inmate Violence

Programs, specifically to lessen violence among inmates have not been funded in Utah.

15. Improved Conditions in Detention and Other Confinement

Standards and licensing requirements for detention centers were developed by an LEAA project. Development and adoption of jail standards were assisted and coordinated by CCJA staff. Using LEAA funds, 21 of Utah's 50 local jails were built or significantly expanded and five (of the state's seven) detention centers were upgraded.

16. Training and Education

Police receive 320 hours of basic training and at least 40 hours of annual inservice training. Judges receive 40 hours of basic training and are offered two statewide inservice training sessions each year. Prosecutors are annually provided two statewide training programs. Correctional officers and probation and parole personnel receive annual training in excess of 25 hours of training.

The LEAA/CCJA program sponsored much of this expanded training. In the past 10 years, if you attended a criminal justice training session, it was probably an LEAA funded program. If you went out of state, your travel was probably paid with LEAA funds.

The Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) assisted over 2,000 criminal justice personnel in working toward college degrees. During only 1976 and 1977 through this program, policemen, prosecutors, defenders, jailers, correctional officers, judges and other criminal justice personnel received 120 associate degrees, 65 bachelor degrees, and 19 master's degrees.

17. Statutes, Rules, Regulations

Using LEAA support, the substantive and procedural sections of the state penal code were completely revised; a model municipal ordinance package was developed for cities; the Ute Indian Tribal Code was rewritten; and a model procurement code was prepared.

18. Statistical and Evaluative Systems

The major factor in moving agencies from reaction to planning has been the growing availability of useful information on system performance.

Through the LEAA/CCJA program, 71 feasibility studies and research projects covering communications, police consolidation, jail construction, extradition, court administration, and other similar topics have been conducted.

Examinations have been made of the corrections system (prison, jails, probation, parole, juvenile detention, intake services); of the judicial systems (justices of the peace, city courts, Juvenile Court, district court, supreme court, city attorneys, county attorneys, attorney general, public and private defense); of auxiliary agencies (family services, mental health, medical examiner, etc.); and of crimes on city, county, regional, and state levels. UCCJA has been the only agency to analyze crimes, offenders, and victims on a statewide basis. Twelve annual plans for improvement have been prepared. As a result of the standards and goals effort, approximately 200 standards were referred to the governor for implementation through administrative and legislative changes. Thirty-eight separate standards and goals pamphlets have been published and distributed to criminal justice agencies.

Better crime reporting and management information systems have been implemented. An officer who has pulled a car over for a minor traffic violation can quickly look into state and national files for pertinent information before he walks up to the car. A small agency records system was implemented in over 100 police agencies with the capability of providing uniform crime reporting statistical information. The Bureau of Criminal Identification now collects crime and arrest statistics throughout the state.

A Juvenile Court judge or staff member can immediately determine the status of any juvenile case in the state; summary information for management purposes is available monthly. The state prison and adult probation and parole staffs have access to similar case by case and summary information for adults. Adult court and prosecutor information systems are available in some jurisdictions, but will soon be available to all jurisdictions.

Also, planning capabilities were begun for group homes (Social Services), the Salt Lake County Sheriff, the Juvenile Court, for county attorneys (SWAP), for the Office of Court Administrator, and for the seven association of governments (criminal justice planning). Evaluation capabilities were created for the Department of Social Services.

In summary, the LEAA/CCJA program can be credited for part of the improvements (in time and scope) in 12 major substantive areas of Utah's criminal justice system.

Non-Financial Assistance

Although the CCJA program is often thought of as only a grant program, a large portion of CCJA activities address non-grant functions.

Recent examples of this assistance include:

- administration of the surplus property program to distribute excess equipment to criminal justice agencies;
- training of CETA funded records clerks for job placement;
- obtaining free food for 12 jails through the USDA commodities program for institutions;
- assistance to the Sheriff's Association in developing and adopting jail standards;

- conducted needs assessments of police training and appellate courts;
- developing and editing of a nationally distributed evaluation newsletter, THE BELLRINGER;
- establishment of manual record systems in smaller police departments; and
- sponsoring district-wide, day-long sessions for criminal justice personnel to discuss and solve common problems.

Lessons Learned

This section could be titled "ideas that didn't work" or "things we won't try again". But this title is appropriate. We have learned at least nine lessons.

1. Contract law enforcement usually doesn't work. A community has become dissatisfied with its police services; usually because the services (of its own department) are not available enough. For the community to feel the new agency is providing more services an explicit contract is needed. And periodic (probably monthly) meetings between community officials and the contracted agency head are needed to make sure the contract is being followed. Explicit contracts (even though we've provided a model) and monthly meetings are rare. So contract law enforcement programs usually don't work.
2. I can't prove it, but I've always felt we could have a better use for our funds than sending police officers from small departments to lie detector schools. Even with a cooperative multi-agency effort, the officer will never give more than 100 tests a year. A lie detector operator needs to give 200 tests a year to stay proficient.
3. Crime prevention programs too often assume the public will naturally come to the programs. The concept is establish a program, advertise its existence, and the public flocks to the program for advice. Crime prevention programs, in order to increase citizens' use of crime prevention techniques, must actively seek out and meet with citizen groups and create a demand for services.
4. Training of prosecutors (or training of anyone) should not be done by collecting brochures on what training is available and then asking who would like to attend. The best way (and only useful way) is to assess staff skills and job requirements, and seek out or develop training to meet identified gaps in skill levels.
5. Public defense has few lessons learned, because activities in public defense have been few. The primary lesson is that an effective public defender system for Utah will not be developed on the county or city level (except in large jurisdictions). An effective and cost conscious system for less urban areas will probably have to be generated from a state agency.

6. Two rules apply to adult corrections programs. First, the first law of penology--"if there is an empty bed, (cell, room), someone will be found to fill it". The importance of this law is that any facility (a prison, a jail, a community center) will be quickly filled. So careful and exacting planning is needed to identify specific clients and selection criteria. The second law is the "50 percent rule"--no matter what is done, only half the people will be happy with it. The usefulness of this law comes from the fact that all too often corrections people try to get complete support from everyone. Since only half of the people will be happy, 100 percent support is not possible. In fact, if 60 percent support is raised, the program should be considered a success.
7. Youth corrections is much like adult corrections. Except instead of one client being found for every empty bed, two youth clients are found for every empty youth corrections spot. Again, just as in adult corrections, careful analysis and planning are essential.
8. Most criminal justice information systems that have been developed in the last ten years have been funded in significant part by the LEAA/CCJA program. The main lesson is that a useful system takes five years to conceive, implement, develop, and be completely operational. Occasionally, one can be created in four years--but never less than four years.
9. The final lesson is that fighting concerns does little good. But addressing identified problems can result in improvements. Our best efforts have been those that first sought out the problem, analyzed the problem, and then worked toward solving the problem.

Final Analysis

Two last statistics summarize the LEAA/CCJA program impact.

About 70 percent of the projects that were funded were successful in achieving their objectives. This number indicates about two-thirds of the experiments (innovations--changes) worked; and about a third didn't work. One purpose of the program is to try new ideas. Some failures are to be expected. The one-third non-success rate shows administrators are willing to try new techniques. It's easy to maintain a perfect record of success--never try anything new.

Of all the 1300 grants and ideas and change strategies that were implemented, just over half have been continued in concept by operating agencies. The staff of the project, or the project identity, may not have been continued but the new concept has. So, half of the organizational changes that were attempted have succeeded. And that is a good record for a public policy program.

--Steve Vojtecky

POSITIONS AVAILABLE/NEW YORK CITY

CRIMINAL JUSTICE COORDINATING COUNCIL

1. Associate Evaluation Analyst - To design, conduct and write evaluations of district attorney and court-related programs. Knowledge of caseflow through the criminal justice system required.
- 2) Associate Evaluation Analyst - To design, conduct and write evaluations of juvenile and adult community-based criminal justice programs.
- 3) Associate Evaluation Analyst - To analyze the cost effectiveness of criminal justice programs. Requires relevant training and working knowledge of costs analysis techniques.

All three positions require a graduate degree in a related area. Statistical skills and knowledge of research methodology necessary. Practical program evaluation experience desirable. Familiarity with New York City metropolitan area helpful. Salary \$16,000-\$18,000. Send resumes to Mark Sadacca, Assistant Director for Research and Evaluation, Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, 111 John Street, 21st Floor, New York, NY 10038.

THE BELLRINGER IS PUBLISHED AND DISTRIBUTED BY THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSOCIATION: 444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.W.; SUITE 305; WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001; 202/347-4900.

END