

MF-1



Report by
a Panel
of the
National
Academy
of Public
Administration

d

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION
ABOUT CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES

By David T. Stanley

NCJRS
MAR 2 1982
ACQUISITIONS

Administrative
Information
about:

8294601

CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES

National Academy of Public Administration
Washington, D.C.
September 1977

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 copyrighted material has been granted by
Public Domain/LEAA
National Academy of Public Admn.
to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Foreword	i
Author's Acknowledgements	ii
Summary of Principal Findings	iii
I. Introduction	1
II. Information about Publications	4
A. State and Local Governments in General	4
B. Criminal Justice Agencies Generally	7
C. Police and Sheriffs Departments and Other Enforcement Agencies	14
D. Courts	21
E. Prosecutors	30
F. Corrections	34
III. Analysis and Findings	42
The Miscellany	42
Aggregate vs. Targeted Data	42
Timeliness	43
Minimum Cost	43
Ease of Understanding and Interpretation	44
Ease of Comparability	44
Completeness	44
Ease of Locating Data and Avoidance of Duplication	45
Actions That Might Be Considered	46
Appendix: Excerpt from LEAA Purchase Order	48
Index of Organizations Preparing Reports	49

FOREWORD

Information about the organization, personnel, finances, and administration of criminal justice agencies is found in a wide variety of documents, varying in their origin, degree of detail, coverage, and apparent quality. Discussion of this area of public administration by the Academy staff with Daniel L. Skoler of the American Bar Association and Benjamin Renshaw of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U.S. Department of Justice, led to the conclusion that a brief review should be made of such reports.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provided support for this review, which has now been completed by David T. Stanley, an Academy member and former consultant to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. We hope that his report will prove useful, both as a presentation of the types of data now available and as a possible basis for more detailed studies leading to desirable changes.

The views expressed in this report are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Academy or the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

George H. Esser
Executive Director
National Academy of Public Administration

Criteria for Judgments

A number of criteria can be suggested for reaching judgments about the publications summarized in the following chapter. All relate to the value of the material for several classes of users:

1. First of all, administrative data should be useful to top executives and administrative staff members of state and local criminal justice agencies for preparation of plans, determination of needs for facilities, formulation of grant applications, development of budgets, preparation for collective bargaining (in some jurisdictions), determination of changes in salary levels and benefits, and organizational analysis. Such users will be particularly attentive to workload, staffing, and cost trends, not only in the agencies under consideration, but in comparable agencies elsewhere. They also need directories so they can locate officials elsewhere with whom to coordinate their work.

2. Similarly, legislators and staff planners in federal and state governments will be concerned with the above factors as they consider authorizations, appropriations, and grants.

3. Administrative data should also be useful to researchers, analysts, and writers in research organizations, universities, and the media; to teachers and students of political science, public administration, and criminal justice; and to staff of interest groups and professional associations.

These differing clienteles will have differing requirements and hence differing measures of usefulness, but they will all be primarily concerned with:

1. Timeliness of information,
2. Minimum cost to themselves,
3. Ease of understanding and interpretation,
4. Ease of comparability of data across different time periods and different jurisdictions,
5. Completeness in covering all desired items of information,
6. Ease of locating data and avoidance of duplication, and
7. Relationship of administrative data to operational data, so that financing, staffing, and facility usage can be considered on a per-offender, per-litigant, or per-inmate base or related to

SUMMARY OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

● Administrative reports about criminal justice agencies vary greatly in timeliness, scope, quality, coverage of the field, and cost.

● There is a clear need to relate reports to measures of clientele and of output.

● Some reports publish three- and four-year old data. Many series, however, report more timely data as they become refined and routinized.

● High costs are related to initial design, surveys, follow-up efforts, tabulation design, and correction of anomalies in sampling and processing.

● The main gaps to be filled include a series on prosecutors and public defenders; current data on unionization; pay and benefit data for correctional personnel; and organizational information in areas other than the courts.

● There is substantial duplicative reporting on state court organization, judicial salaries, and pay and benefits for police. There are also overlaps among directories.

● The utility of the Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics is open to question.

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose, Coverage, and Method of Study

/ This is a report of a brief study reviewing and analyzing publications that provide systematic information on the organization, administration, personnel, and costs of state and local criminal justice agencies, called "administrative data" throughout the present report for convenience. / "Administrative data" (e.g., expenditures of a circuit court, staffing of a jail) are distinguished throughout this report from "operational data" (e.g., number of prisoners on work release or number of miles driven per shift in a police car).

The study was authorized and financed by a March 30, 1977 contract of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration with the National Academy of Public Administration Foundation (see Appendix).

/ This review mainly covers statistical reports and organizational directories. / Such publications are issued periodically in most instances, although some one-time reports have been included if they are of a type that might usefully be replicated in the future. Excluded from this review are: (1) reports covering only one government or agency; (2) "how-to-do-it" books or pamphlets; and (3) directories or studies pertaining only to the membership of a particular professional association or interest group.

/ Information was gathered by interviews and library research in the Washington, D.C. area and by telephone calls or correspondence to other areas. / As shown in the next chapter, it was possible to gather and summarize most but not all of the information sought for each publication. Time did not permit getting any significant amount of information about the rigor and accuracy of data collection methods. In the case of every publication summarized in this report the data were collected for use in that publication rather than as part of a broader inquiry. With rare exceptions all of the data collected were reported.

It was agreed orally by representatives of the LEAA Statistical Division and the National Academy of Public Administration that information would not be obtained for this present report on users' opinions of the values and limitations of the publications.

Criteria for Judgments

A number of criteria can be suggested for reaching judgments about the publications summarized in the following chapter. All relate to the value of the material for several classes of users:

1. First of all, administrative data should be useful to top executives and administrative staff members of state and local criminal justice agencies for preparation of plans, determination of needs for facilities, formulation of grant applications, development of budgets, preparation for collective bargaining (in some jurisdictions), determination of changes in salary levels and benefits, and organizational analysis. Such users will be particularly attentive to workload, staffing, and cost trends, not only in the agencies under consideration, but in comparable agencies elsewhere. They also need directories so they can locate officials elsewhere with whom to coordinate their work.

2. Similarly, legislators and staff planners in federal and state governments will be concerned with the above factors as they consider authorizations, appropriations, and grants.

3. Administrative data should also be useful to researchers, analysts, and writers in research organizations, universities, and the media; to teachers and students of political science, public administration, and criminal justice; and to staff of interest groups and professional associations.

These differing clienteles will have differing requirements and hence differing measures of usefulness, but they will all be primarily concerned with:

1. Timeliness of information,
2. Minimum cost to themselves,
3. Ease of understanding and interpretation,
4. Ease of comparability of data across different time periods and different jurisdictions,
5. Completeness in covering all desired items of information,
6. Ease of locating data and avoidance of duplication, and
7. Relationship of administrative data to operational data, so that financing, staffing, and facility usage can be considered on a per-offender, per-litigant, or per-inmate base or related to

operating workload in some other way.

The reader will note in the following section that administrative data are sometimes published with operational data, and sometimes separately. Which is best depends on the user. Chief executives and planners will probably find combined reports more convenient. Specialists in personnel and finance will frequently (but not invariably) prefer to have administrative data separated out.

Another criterion is minimization of the reporting burden on state and local criminal justice agencies. Small organizations are particularly unlikely to have staff members and information systems that enable them to respond fully, promptly, and accurately to long, complex requests for data. A final criterion is cost to the taxpayer, in the case of government publications.

* * *

The next chapter presents detailed information about the publications reviewed, arranged by categories of criminal justice agencies. The final chapter provides a summary analysis related to the criteria above and suggests some areas for future attention.

II. INFORMATION ABOUT PUBLICATIONS

A. Publications about State and Local Governments in General

1. Publications in which Criminal Justice Administrative Data are Presented Only as Part of More General Government Data

These publications will not be discussed in any detail because information about criminal justice agencies is presented largely in gross figures. This readily permits comparison with expenditures or employment in other governmental functions, such as recreation, education, or welfare. The data are of very limited value, however, to officials and researchers who are concentrating on one or more specific criminal justice functions. Furthermore, the data they contain are duplicated in publications about criminal justice agencies.

Examples of such general publications are:

Statistical Abstract of the United States (Bureau of the Census, Annual)

County and City Data Book (Bureau of the Census, Approximately quinquennial)

Publications from the Quinquennial Census of Governments, particularly:

Volume 3. No. 2 Compendium of Public Employment

Volume 4. No. 3. Finances of County Governments, No. 4. Finances of Municipalities and Township Governments, and No. 5. Compendium of Government Finances

County Year Book. National Association of Counties and International City Management Association, Annual)

2. Publications in Which Criminal Justice Administrative Data are Presented Separately in More Detail

a. Book of the States (Council of State Governments, Biennial)

Content: Typical recent volumes include articles on:
(a) the state of the judiciary (a narrative covering significant developments in organization, financing, powers, and administration

of the state courts); (b) state criminal justice systems (another narrative of organizational, administrative, and financial developments); and (c) state police and highway patrols (a narrative plus tables covering staffing, costs, personnel and labor relations, and information systems). Some volumes include other articles, e.g., "State Implementation of the Omnibus Crime Control Act" (1970-71); and "Correctional Programs" (1972-73).

The judiciary article is followed by six tables containing state-by-state data on powers of courts; number, selection methods, terms, and compensation of judges; and data on court administrative offices. Most of this information is reprinted from the Council's publication, State Court Systems.

The criminal justice systems article is followed by four tables containing state-by-state data on numbers of correctional facilities, expenditures on juvenile facilities, numbers of juveniles housed, and criminal justice expenditures by categories. These data are all reprinted from LEAA/Census reports (discussed below).

Collection and Preparation: Articles and tables are prepared by staff of the Council of State Governments or of other interest groups involved, such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Duration of Work and Timeliness: Compilation, writing, seven months; preparation for publication, five months. Data presented are about three years old at time of publication.

Costs: \$85,000 out-of-pocket costs; costs of staff time not available.

Financing: Council of State Governments. The book is sold for \$6.95 a copy.

Quantities: 13,000 printed, of which 10 percent are given away and most of the rest sold.

Principal Users: State governments (both executive and legislative branches), libraries, researchers.

COMMENT: This book presents a selective, condensed overview of events and facts. It would seem to be useful for busy legislators and executives interested in a quick catch-up of recent developments and in comparison of state activities and resources. It is too brief and selective to be useful to scholarly researchers or to program or legislative staff members. The data it presents are superannuated.

b. Municipal Year Book and Urban Data Service (International City Management Association, annual and monthly)

Content: In addition to directory information and data on organization, compensation, and finances for specific cities, the Municipal Year Book has been publishing periodic reports on detailed public practices. Every such report appears first in Urban Data Service, a monthly subscription service of ICMA, and is later reprinted in the Municipal Year Book. The following are the reports published since 1970 in these categories.

(Note: A number of one-time articles are not included.)

<u>Subject</u>	<u>UDS Publication</u>	<u>MYB Publication</u>
Police Personnel Practices (Cities over 10,000)	August 1972	Not reprinted
	November 1973	Not reprinted
	December 1976	1977
Police, Fire and Refuse Manpower, Compensation, and Expenditures (Cities over 10,000)	September 1971	1975
	April 1975	1976
	July 1976	1977

Cities' personnel practices are summarized in detail (down to items of police equipment supplied) by population, region, metropolitan status, and form of government. The manpower, compensation, and expenditure data are similarly grouped, then presented city by city. Annual publication of this last report is expected for the next three to five years.

Note: The following information pertains only to this report on manpower, compensation, and expenditures.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires are mailed by ICMA staff and followed up once; twice if necessary. Response rate is about 65 percent without follow-up, 85 percent with one follow-up. Accuracy is not checked in any detail. Palpably incorrect answers are thrown out by inspection, and some are eliminated by the computer program. Otherwise all data received are published.

Duration and Timeliness: Questionnaires go out in January. Returns are accepted until late April or early May. The data are about six months old when published in the Urban Data Service; a year old when published in the Municipal Year Book.

Costs: Grand total estimated at \$12,000 to \$15,000

including staff time. An outside author, if any, is paid a maximum of \$150. One was not paid but allowed use of the data for his own purposes. Printing costs of a typical UDS report are about \$2,500.

Financing: Entirely by ICMA. Subscription to UDS costs \$125 a year. The Municipal Year Book is currently priced at \$26.

Quantities: UDS: 1,500
MYB: 14,000

COMMENT: These presentations of criminal justice administrative data are timely and well organized. They are selective, but the choices are by staff members of an organization well tuned to its membership's needs. The municipal administrator or staff member can quickly find out what other cities are doing in police administration and, from the directory information elsewhere in the Yearbook, whom to ask for details or explanations.

B. Publications about Criminal Justice Agencies Generally
(All Functions and All Levels of Government)

1. Containing Both Operational and Administrative Data

Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics, (Criminal Justice Research Center, Albany, New York, published by LEAA, annual)

Content: 800 pages of statistical tables on selected major aspects of criminal justice systems in the federal, state, and local governments. All material is from other sources, copied intact in some instances, revised in format in others. Administrative data as defined above (page 1) occupy about 150, or 19 percent of the 800 pages, all of it in "Characteristics of the Criminal Justice System," the first of four major sections of the book. The remainder consists of operational statistics, summaries of practices followed, and tabular comparisons of statutory provisions. Some of the sources are periodic reports; some are one-time studies. Two sources covered in the present study have been heavily excerpted: the Municipal Year Book, and Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System.

Data included, which are selected by the Center staff with the approval of LEAA, "are almost exclusively nationwide in scope" and "focus on state and local data" and are the most recent data available.

The administrative data include categorized counts of

agencies and facilities, masses of employment and expenditure statistics, and detailed tabulations of salaries and other personnel provisions.

Collection and Preparation: Data are gathered in an almost continuous review of published literature by the Center staff. Material is then edited for clarity, restyled as necessary for consistency of presentation, and explained in appropriate notes and appendices. Explanatory monographs, generally on operational rather than administrative topics, are also written.

Duration and Timeliness: Seven months (September through March) for data selection, preparation of draft, and submission to LEAA.

Three months (March-May) to incorporate revisions and prepare for printing.

Seven months (June-January) to prepare, review, and return proofs.

Five months (February-June) printing and release.

Total: 22 months. The 1975 Sourcebook was released in January 1977; the 1976 edition, in June 1977.

Costs and Financing: Staff costs for the Sourcebook cannot be separated from those for the monographs. Both are covered by a two-year LEAA grant of \$514,255. Printing of the 1975 book cost \$64,205. The Government Printing Office (GPO) sells the book for \$9.70.

Quantity: 5,000 printed for LEAA use and distribution. 2,500 more ordered by GPO for sale to public. 75 sold as of May 1977.

5,533 ordered by users from National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), LEAA's distribution contractor. Note: The 533 shortage will be met either by purchasing some of the GPO supply or by rigorous screening of orders and denial of requests from would-be users who seem least closely identified with criminal justice systems.

Principal Users (According to NCJRS orders for the 1975 volume):

Local government police, 1,743; colleges and universities, 1,164; federal law enforcement, 259; state police, 212; state planning agencies, 131; regional state planning agency offices, 224.

COMMENT: This bulky tome is crammed with well-selected data. The headings, format, explanatory notes, and appendices all reflect responsible scholarship. The Sourcebook relieves the researcher, planner, and criminal justice official of having to look in a variety of sources for the comparative information desired. This advantage is offset by the staleness of the data, which are not put into the Sourcebook until they have already been published elsewhere. For example, in the 1975 Sourcebook, released in early 1977, the administrative data are mostly as of 1973, but with some from 1974 and 1972. It would be desirable to know what detailed criteria are followed for inclusion of data, particularly those found in some one-time reports.

2. Containing Administrative Data Only.

a. Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System (LEAA and Census, annual)

Content: Nearly 400 pages of tables cover expenditures -- direct, intergovernmental, and total; number of employees; and amount of payroll. These are tabulated for each level of government and for the nation as a whole. Local government information is shown in total and by counties and municipalities. Specific data are presented for the 17 largest standard metropolitan statistical areas (SMSAs), 334 large counties, and 394 large cities. In addition, all such information is presented for each of the preceding categories by criminal justice function (police protection, judicial, legal services and prosecution, public defense, corrections, and others). Finally, average monthly salaries are shown by level of government and function, but not for the named SMSAs, large counties, or large cities. The data are preceded by 16 pages of analytical text, including tables and charts.

Collection and Preparation: Field representatives of the Bureau of the Census collect data from the states and from part of a representative sample of local governments; the 334 largest counties, the 394 largest cities, and 769 small counties and towns. A mail questionnaire is sent to 7,724 other local governments in the sample. The response rate was 95 percent for the 1975 edition. Data are edited and checked both manually and by computer. Sampling errors are under three percent for state-by-state estimates of total local government expenditures, and under 0.75 percent for estimates of the proportion of such expenditures from local government's own funds.

Duration and Timeliness: For the 1975 report, data collection began in October 1975 and ended six to seven months later. The

report was released in April 1977, 18 months later.

Costs: Latest available figures cover three phases of annual surveys:

1977 planning	\$ 83,000
1976 collection and processing	634,000
1975 publication preparation	42,000
	<u>\$759,000</u>

Financing: All by LEAA

Quantities: 15,000 printed, plus 300 to be sold by Government Printing Office. Nearly 10,000 available for distribution by NCJRS, of which 7,000 have now been ordered.

Principal Users: Orders of more than 150 from NCJRS: local police, 1,918; colleges and universities, 1,516; county police, 559; federal law enforcement, 341; state police, 296; regional state planning offices, 199; private firms, 197; county courts, 176; state courts, 153. (Note: These figures are for an advance report of the 1975 edition because orders had not yet been solicited for the final version.)

COMMENT: A responsible compilation, clearly presented. Practitioners at any level can compare their own total levels of employment and expenditure with those of other governments. The report is designed in part to facilitate compliance with laws and guidelines governing criminal justice grants. LEAA has issued an instructional paper for this purpose: "Using Data from the Survey of Criminal Justice Expenditure and Employment to Meet Guideline Requirements of M 4100.1F," prepared January 1977. As noted in the final chapter (p.42) this publication would be more useful if it included workload or output data. Such a change would require radical revision of data collection procedures.

b. Trends in Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System (LEAA and Census, annual)

Content: This is a compilation of trend data from the annual Expenditure and Employment reports. The recently released edition covers 1971-75. Employment and expenditure data for the years covered are shown both in absolute figures and as percentage of change from one period to another. LEAA staff decide what series shall be included, and the work is done by Census staff.

Costs: Lumped in with those of the annual "E and E" reports, therefore difficult to determine. However, in 1976 the LEAA

staff estimated a cost of approximately \$11,000 for a Trends volume, out of the total of over \$700,000 spent that year for the whole Expenditure and Employment project.

Financing: LEAA

Quantities: 12,000 printed. The Government Printing Office received 504 copies of the 1971-74 edition and has sold 144.

Principal Users: Information not obtained. Presumably similar to users of annual "E and E" reports.

COMMENT: Useful and comprehensive. The question naturally arises as to whether this publication should be combined with the annual "E and E" survey reports. This has not been done because it would make the latter more bulky to ship and use. It would also result in delays because publications with fewer pages are published more promptly by the Government Printing Office.

c. Directories of Criminal Justice Agencies (LEAA and Census, updated from time to time) It has recently been decided to discontinue publication of these directories.

Content: This is the first example in the present study of directories or other publications covering only counts or identities of criminal agencies and lacking information about program, organization, administration, personnel, or financing. There will be others described below.

There is a separate volume for each of ten regions. Each volume has a section for each of its states, beginning with a brief description of the agencies covered and a table showing the number of state and local agencies performing each function (enforcement, courts, corrections, etc.). Most of the pages contain the organizational names and addresses of the individual agencies. Names of officials are not included. A statistical summary report based on the 1970 canvass was published separately by LEAA.

Collection and Preparation: The information was compiled from a 1970 mail canvass of state and local governments by the Bureau of the Census. The response rate after follow-ups was 100 percent for states and counties, 99 percent for cities, except that cities between 1,000 and 25,000 population had a rate of 95 percent. This canvass has been updated in connection with other Census surveys in 1971 and 1973, and through staff research. A new mail canvass had been planned for 1977.

The listings are checked against those in other published

directories and checked with state officials to insure accuracy.

Duration and Timeliness: Information not available for past data collection. The 1977 survey was estimated to require seven to eight months from beginning of data collection until the delivery of final copy to LEAA.

Costs: (For the planned 1977 Survey)

Planning	\$ 55,569
Data Collection and processing	162,838
Publication	22,093

Financing: LEAA

Quantities: 13,500 printed.

Principal Users: Vary by regions, but the largest number of NCJRS orders are from local police agencies, colleges and universities, state police, and state correctional institutions. The Census Bureau staff concerned say, "The primary use of the Directory is as a universe file for the various criminal justice surveys conducted by the Census Bureau and others for LEAA. In addition, special requests for tapes and printouts of the entire Directory, individual states, and individual sectors are received continuously."

COMMENT: A thorough, well-organized official directory. Its usefulness for interagency contacts is impaired by the absence of names of officials in charge. Despite the decision to discontinue publication, Census and LEAA will need to maintain this information for sampling and data collection purposes.

d. National Directory of Law Enforcement Administrators
(National Police and Sheriffs Information Bureau, Milwaukee, annual)

Content: This is a directory of chiefs of police, other law enforcement officials, sheriffs, and heads of correctional agencies at all three levels of government. Federal courts are included, but not those of state and local governments. Sheriffs' terms of office are enumerated by state, but there is no other information about conditions of employment.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires go out about mid-February to all sheriffs, prosecuting attorneys, heads of investigative and correctional agencies, and chiefs of police of municipalities with 5,000 or more population ("plus some smaller ones"). Follow-ups are made by mail and telephone, resulting in a 92 percent response rate.

Duration and Timeliness: Collection, preparation and printing take a total of about four months, so the Directory is usually sent out in June.

Financing: From sales of the book at \$19.85 a copy.

Quantity: Not specified.

COMMENT: The directory is timely and comprehensive. It supplies names, which the LEAA directory does not, but has a lower response rate: 92 percent compared with nearly 100 percent. I infer that this publication is a business venture by the Bureau.

e. Projects Not Yet Completed. Two projects, as yet not completed, will provide important administrative data concerning a wide variety of criminal justice agencies:

(1) Survey of Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics. This is a demographic and personnel management study in which a sample of 50,000 employees of state and local criminal justice agencies were interviewed by Census representatives. The reference date is October 31, 1974, but the data are still being processed and interpreted because of unforeseen sampling problems. When completed, the study will provide data on the compensation, career progression, education, training, and occupational background of the interviewees.

(2) National Manpower Survey of Personnel and Training Needs for the Criminal Justice System. This is a massive, multi-year, \$4 million study, mandated by Congress and financed by LEAA. The grantee managing the study is the National Planning Association, with data collection done by the American Institute of Research and the Bureau of Social Science Research. Unforeseen delays are carrying the project well beyond its intended terminal date of June 1976. An eight-volume report is contemplated by the researchers with a summary volume nearing completion at present.

This survey is obviously very relevant to the present study. It makes projections, both in total and for each major criminal justice function, of manpower needed and of the related education and training requirements. Its planned Volume VI, Criminal Justice Manpower Planning, will discuss current data systems, the data needed for planning, and changes required.

At present, however, there is no assurance that LEAA will publish this particular volume or any other part of the report except the summary volume and one on police manpower.

C. Publications About Police and Sheriffs Departments and Other Enforcement Agencies

1. Containing Both Operational and Administrative Data

a. Uniform Crime Reports (Federal Bureau of Investigation, annual)

Content: About 70 percent of this familiar volume is devoted to statistics on reported crimes and arrests. The remainder contains tables on (1) the number of state and local law enforcement employees, both sworn and civilian, by employing jurisdiction; (2) the timing of shifts and staffing of patrols; and (3) assaults on law enforcement officers. The shift and patrol data are now being eliminated at the request of an advisory committee of police representatives convened by the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Collection and Preparation: The personnel data reported are the number of sworn and civilian employees by sex as of October 31 in each county or municipality. Data are to be received in FBI Headquarters by November 22. Forty-one of the 50 states collect the information from their local governments and transmit it to the FBI. In the remaining nine states the local governments are sent questionnaires directly by the FBI. The overall response rate is approximately 90 percent: roughly 13,500 out of 15,000 jurisdictions. Data are checked for completeness and accuracy by the FBI, then tabulated and analyzed.

The criminal offense information, including that about assaults on officers, is reported monthly by states to the FBI on separate forms or on computer tapes.

Duration and Timeliness: Normally the annual Uniform Crime Reports volume is distributed in August, ten months after the reference date (October 31) of the personnel data.

Costs: Not available

Financing: FBI appropriation.

Quantities: Approximately 65,000 copies printed.

Principal Users: Figures not available because distribution lists are not categorized, but officials say that the bulk of the copies are used by law enforcement professionals, primarily police and sheriffs' departments.

COMMENT: This is a reasonably timely and comprehensive report of the number of law enforcement employees, male or female, in almost every city and county. By contrast the Census reports of Employment and Expenditure data do not report employment in smaller governments and do not divide male from female employees. Uniform Crime Reports alone show the number of law enforcement personnel per 1,000 inhabitants by region, and civilian law enforcement employees, as a percentage of all law enforcement employees, by cities of various population sizes. However, the user who wants data about other criminal justice functions will have to turn elsewhere.

b. General Administrative Survey (Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department/Police Foundation, annual (Planned))

Background and Content: This annual survey of police personnel provisions and selected operational matters in cities over 300,000 population was discontinued in 1974. It is being revived in 1977 and will cover cities over 100,000. The survey covers the number of personnel by rank and ethnic background; qualification requirements; salaries, fringe benefits in detail; weapons, ammunition; use of vehicles, aircraft, computers; and organization, and shift management.

Collection and Preparation: The Kansas City Police Department will send out the questionnaires and tabulate the returns. The Police Foundation will analyze the data and issue the report.

Duration and Timeliness: Unknown at present.

Costs: Unknown. Staff work contributed by the two organizations.

Financing: About 80 percent by Kansas City Police Department, 20 percent by Police Foundation.

Quantity: At least 2,000 copies to be published.

Principal Users: Police departments, particularly of larger cities, and students, teachers, and researchers on police matters.

COMMENT: Both the past surveys and the new one present city-by-city comparisons of pay levels, fringe benefit policies, equipment utilization (both patrol and information processing), staffing by ranks, qualification requirements, and

selection methods. Police officials can quickly relate their own policies to those of comparable cities. The questionnaire is unsophisticated in design as a survey instrument but includes important factors in manpower utilization and personnel management.

c. Comparative Data Report (International Association of Chiefs of Police, about every three or four years)

Content: This is a hardback book of 265 pages of mostly comparative tabular material about the policies and practices of police and highway patrols. The data are voluminous, detailed and presented state by state. There are five chapters in the 1974 edition:

(1) "Related Executive, Judicial, and Legislative Data," such as provisions for gun control, organized crime control, highway speed policies, and key provisions of vehicle codes.

(2) "Administration," including organization structure, budget, number of personnel, salaries, fringe benefits, turnover, and accident experience.

(3) "Operations," including directive systems, inspections, investigations, equipment, laboratories, intelligence units, narcotic units, and youth units.

(4) "Services," including classes of records, data processing facilities, and many statistics.

(5) "Recruitment, Selection, Training, and Promotion," including recruitment responsibilities, selection criteria, training provisions, tenure, and compensation for moving.

Regional meetings are held with state representatives to get advice on subjects for inclusion. For the 1977 edition, for example, policies for dealings with hostage situations are being added.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires are sent to all state police and highway departments, with answers due back in three months. Response is 100 percent. There is later telephoning when necessary to clarify some of the answers. Data are hand tabulated and the report is edited by IACP staff.

Duration and Timeliness: The report is distributed about 11 months after the questionnaires are sent out.

Costs: 1974 edition cost \$33,874, of which \$13,955 was for printing and postage.

Financing: LEAA. Before the Safe Streets Act (1969) this report was financed by the insurance industry and other organizations concerned with highway safety.

Quantities: 2,000 printed, 1,400 or 1,500 distributed.

Principal Users: The state highway patrols and police departments themselves; other state officials, interested U.S. Senators and Congressmen.

COMMENT: This report contains a wealth of comparative detail, issued within a year of the reference date. It seems carefully related to the needs of the state departments and useful for policy consideration.

2. Containing Administrative Data Only

a. Survey of (year) Salaries and Working Conditions of the Police Departments in the United States (Fraternal Order of Police, annual)

Content: Tabular presentation of salaries, fringe benefits, and a few selected conditions of employment (e.g., age, residency requirements, civil service status, compulsory retirement), by rank of officers. The 1,115 participating municipalities are divided into eight population classes, from over 1,000,000 to under 10,000. Most data shown are from municipalities, but there are 33 state police or highway patrol departments, and a "Miscellaneous" category of 53, including federal, county, college, and court organizations. (Figures are for the 1977 survey report.)

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires are sent to 1,800 local governments, plus 1,160 local and state lodges of the Fraternal Order of Police. Without information on the degree of overlap between the governments and the lodges, the response rate cannot be estimated. Returns are checked for obvious inconsistencies and errors by FOP staff.

Duration and Timeliness: About six months from dispatch of the questionnaires to release of the report.

Costs: Estimated total of \$10,000, although it is difficult to estimate costs of staff time.

Financing: FOP

Quantities: 3,500 printed, of which 2,700 are sent to FOP lodges and to chiefs of police on the organization's mailing list. Additional copies are sold to interested persons for \$5.00 each.

Principal Users: Police departments.

COMMENT: The data appear to be the most important facts about pay and fringe benefits, compactly presented for easy government-by-government comparison. However, the coverage is not disciplined or systematic, depending partly on the interest and loyalty of FOP members. The state coverage is incomplete, and miscellaneous organizations are haphazardly presented. Civilian personnel are not covered. Yet the project survives well: the 1977 report is the 26th.

b. Salary-Pension-Fringe Benefits Survey (International Conference of Police Associations, annual)

Content: The survey covers sworn personnel of 82 local governments in 20 states, plus the District of Columbia and three state police departments. Tabulations show staffing by rank, regular and premium pay, many details of fringe benefits, labor relations policies, restrictions on political activity, and other conditions of employment.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires are sent to all members of the ICPA and to other cities that have participated in previous surveys. There is no follow-up of recipients, and the response rate is estimated at 25-30 percent.

Duration and Timeliness: About seven months elapse between the time the questionnaires are sent out and the time the reports are printed and distributed.

Costs:

Preparation and mailing of questionnaires	\$ 342
Compilation of results	1,000
Printing of reports	1,974
Postage for mailing reports	350
	<u>\$3,666</u>

Financing: ICPA. Copies are sold to non-members for \$15 each.

Quantities: 500 reports printed; 250 to 300 mailed to members.

Principal Users: Member associations of ICPA.

COMMENT: Information is clearly presented in tables, and it is easy for members to compare their personnel provisions with those of other departments. The coverage, however, is representative of nothing except ICPA members willing to fill out the questionnaires. For example, Massachusetts is represented only by Boston, Maine only by its state police, and Virginia only by Arlington County.

c. Who's Who in Law Enforcement and American Government (American Law Enforcement Officers Association (formerly called American Federation of Police), triennial)

Content: Summary autobiographies in usual Who's Who format covering a variety of police officers, prosecutors, private detectives, marshals, judges, probation officers, sheriff's deputies, and others to a total of about 2,300. An appended "Who's Who in American Government" covers an additional 32 (sic) persons (e.g., city mayors, auditors, clerks) who could not be identified as law enforcement officers. Coverage was determined by those who wished to complete questionnaires.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires were sent to all members of the Association and to all persons on its mailing list of about 100,000 law enforcement officers, prosecutors, judges, and others. There was no follow-up, and rate of return was between two and three percent. The book was edited by Association staff in its Miami, Florida, office.

Duration and Timeliness: Roughly ten months between the time questionnaires are sent out and time the book is published.

Costs: Approximately \$30,000 for the 1976 edition.

Financing: From sale of copies at \$12 each. Participants are not required to buy the book to be included.

Quantities: 5,000 copies produced, most of which have been sold.

Principal Users: Those named in the book and Association members.

COMMENT: Of very limited value because of its patchy coverage. It includes only a fractional percentage of law

enforcement personnel, and no criterion of distinction seems to have been applied.

d. Other Related Projects. One one-time publication and one proposed publication are mentioned here because of their similarities to those already covered in this section:

(1) Terry Eisenberg, Deborah Ann Kent, and Charles R. Wall, Police Personnel Practices in State and Local Government (International Association of Chiefs of Police and Police Foundation in cooperation with Educational Testing Service, published by Police Foundation, 1973) 136 pp.

This is a very clear analysis of good professional caliber based on a survey of 668 state and local police departments. Response rate was 74 percent. Employment and promotion factors are discussed. Data are analyzed by level of government and by size of department.

The project took 14 months and cost \$40,000. 13,000 copies of the book were produced.

Such a study seems worth repeating every few years.

(2) LEAA (NCJISS) is considering a proposal from the International Association of Chiefs of Police to do a study of local police departments comparable to its Comparative Data Report for state police departments and highway patrols. Cost would be at least \$150,000.

D. Publications About Courts

(NOTE: This section unlike others, is not divided into "both operational and administrative" and "administrative only" subsections because the publications are mostly "administrative" -- that is, containing data on organization, personnel, and conditions of employment, with some caseload information.)

a. National Survey of Court Organization (1973) and its 1975 Supplement to State Judicial Systems (Census and LEAA, two publications so far)

Content: The Survey report contains an introductory explanation, then 31 tables, mostly detailing (a) the numbers of courts by different types of jurisdiction and by state; (b) judgeship positions authorized, vacant, and filled; and (c) numbers of courts having other judicial and support personnel. The tables are followed by a narrative describing the court systems of the federal government and of each of the states, divided into courts of appellate jurisdiction, of general jurisdiction, of limited and special jurisdiction, and judicial councils, conferences, and organizations. The 1975 Supplement updates three tables to reflect major court reorganizations in nine states since the reference date (January 1, 1972) of the Survey and then describes the revised systems in those states.

Collection and Preparation: The Survey data were obtained mainly by a Bureau of Census mail canvass, but field representatives collected information in the largest counties and cities. Follow-up procedures increased the proportion of responses and corrected inconsistencies. The overall response rate was 82 percent, with the rate for courts of general jurisdiction 99 percent, and for courts of limited and special jurisdiction, 75 percent. The Supplement was prepared after review of the reorganization legislation in the nine states. For both the Survey and the Supplement the state descriptions were reviewed by appropriate officials in each state for completeness and accuracy.

Duration and Timeliness: The Survey, reporting as of January 1, 1972, was issued in October 1973. The Supplement, with a reference data of January 31, 1975, was issued in September 1975.

Costs:

	<u>Survey</u>	<u>Supplement</u>
Data collection and preparation of report	\$60,000	\$21,000
	(both)	
Printing & Distribution		1,310

LEAA is providing \$53,000 to the Bureau of the Census for planning and data collection work in 1977 to update the Survey.

Quantities:

	<u>Survey</u>	<u>Supplement</u>
Printed	unknown	9,800
Distributed by NCJRS (5/18/77)	1,815	6,484
Received by GPO for sale	1,256	700
Sold by GPO (5/3/77)	911	160

Principal Users: (NCJRS figures)

	<u>Survey</u>	<u>Supplement</u>
Colleges & Universities	417	1,285
Local Police	214	1,368
State Correctional Agencies	105	471
State Courts	102	307
County Courts	83	233
State Police	105	471

COMMENT: Completeness of response and accuracy are emphasized, as in all the Census/LEAA publications. The organizational material is clearly and concisely presented. The Survey presents tables on courts that use "other judicial personnel" and "support personnel" but did not take the next logical step of collecting and presenting data on the numbers of such personnel.

b. State Court Organization Profiles (National Center for State Courts, continuing)

Content: These are detailed descriptions of the authority, the organization, personnel (judicial, parajudicial, and non-judicial), financing, budgets, and records and statistics systems of each state court system. As of May 1977, 26 state profiles had been drafted, of which about seven were in final form, and four of these had been issued. Data are presented in both narrative and chart form. It is planned that the profiles will be updated annually.

Collection and Preparation: Prepared by NCSC staff from constitutions, statutes, rules, and available library materials. Each profile takes about three weeks for research and drafting, is reviewed by the appropriate regional office of NCSC, then reviewed by a state court official.

Duration and Timeliness: The plan is to keep the profiles current. They are prepared for looseleaf filing.

Costs: Not known. About one person-month is required to prepare each profile.

Financing: Part of an LEAA-funded project to implement the American Bar Association's Standards Relating to Court Organization.

Quantities: 15 duplicated copies to each state for distribution as determined by the chief justice and the state court administrator. Other copies go to appropriate offices of LEAA, the American Bar Association, and the National College of the State Judiciary, and to others on a distribution list. Other organizations with a legitimate need for the information may get it by paying duplication costs.

Principal Users: Presiding judges, state court administrators, judicial planning commissions, bar associations, LEAA staff, law faculty, political science researchers.

COMMENT: The project is comprehensively and competently planned but few of its products are yet in use.

c. State Court Systems Revised, 1974 (Council of State Governments, approximately biennial)

Content: State-by-state tabulations of court nomenclature; number of judges; judicial qualifications, terms, selection methods, removal provisions, salaries and fringe benefits; also data on the numbers, qualifications and pay of administrative officers, commissioners, and clerks and secretaries.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires are sent to the chief justices of the states, and returns are edited by the Council staff. All states, plus the District of Columbia, are covered.

Duration and Timeliness: About 9 months to issue after questionnaires are sent out.

Costs: Preparation costs not known. Printing costs, \$2,000.

Financing: By Council of State Governments. Copies of the report are sold for \$4.00.

Quantities: 2,500

Principal Users: Primarily chief justices, state court administrators, and others in the state judiciaries; also some state legislators and budget officers.

COMMENT: Data are concisely presented and easy to compare. Courts' jurisdiction and authority are not described. This publication contains much more personnel policy information than does the National Survey of Court Organization.

d. Courts of Limited Jurisdiction: A National Survey
(American Judicature Society (AJS/LEAA, one-time))

Content: A 1975 study, conducted by the American Judicature Society with results published by LEAA, into the authority, organization, procedures, financing, and personnel qualifications and processes of courts of limited and special jurisdiction. The sources but not amounts of salaries are stated.

Collection and Preparation: Information was gathered by law students under AJS staff supervision from the statutes and from court administrators in the states.

Duration and Timeliness: A little under three years elapsed from the start of research until publication.

Costs: Research cost over \$50,000; printing, between \$8,000 and \$9,000.

Financing: About half of research cost and all of publication cost paid for by LEAA. The rest was financed by AJS. Copies cost \$4.90 at the Government Printing Office.

Quantities: 1,500.

Principal Users: Court Administrators, judges, attorneys, legislators, court reform organizations, and the interested public.

COMMENT: A comprehensive, well-presented treatment.

e. Intermediate Appellate Courts (American Judicature Society, one-time)

Content: This book presents the jurisdiction, organization, and procedures of intermediate courts of appeal in the 24 states that had them, as of 1975.

Collection and Preparation: The study was conducted essentially by library research over a one-year period.

Duration and Timeliness: At time of publication the information was less than a year and a quarter old.

Costs: Under \$5,000, of which \$1,280 was for printing.

Financing: American Judicature Society.

Quantities: 536 copies printed.

Principal Users: The judiciary, the bar, and the interested public.

COMMENT: Clearly and incisively presented.

f. Judgeship Criteria: Standards for Evaluating the Need for Additional Judgeships (American Judicature Society, one-time)

Content: Results of a 1973 study of criteria used to justify creation of additional judicial positions.

Collection and Preparation: A questionnaire was sent to all 50 states and Puerto Rico. Of the 51 jurisdictions, 34 (67 percent) responded. The report was prepared by AJS research staff.

Duration and Timeliness: The project took about 6 months.

Costs: Under \$5,000; printing cost \$250.

Financing: AJS.

Quantities: 250 copies printed.

Principal Users: Legislators, bar associations, judiciary and the interested public.

COMMENT: The publication is compact and informative. It is unfortunate that information could not be presented from the missing third of the states.

g. Law Clerks in the United States Courts and State Appellate Courts (American Judicature Society, one-time)

Content: A brief 1973 study of "the number, qualifications, method of selection, term of office, and salaries of law clerks employed by judges of federal and state appellate courts." Most of the results are presented state by state in a table.

Collection and Preparation: This was a questionnaire survey, building upon results of a 1965 study for the North

Dakota legislature and a 1967 AJS study of judicial compensation. Results obtained from 50 states and Puerto Rico were set forth by AJS research staff.

Duration and Timeliness: The project took 6 to 8 months.

Costs: Under \$5,000; printing cost \$125.

Financing: AJS.

Quantities: 250 copies.

Principal Users: Court administrators, law students, the judiciary, and the bar.

COMMENT: Another brief, clear, informative presentation.

h. State Court Administrators: Qualifications and Responsibilities (American Judicature Society, one-time)

Content: This 1976 publication shows, for all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, a variety of facts about state court administrators: their qualifications, salaries, responsibilities, sources of funding, budget and staffing totals, and relationships to other officials. After a methodological explanation, the book presents for each jurisdiction the qualifications for and duties of the position of state court administrator. A later section contains tables comparing the jurisdictions on a variety of characteristics.

Collection and Preparation: The book was prepared by AJS staff from statutory research and returns from a 5-page mail questionnaire. There was a follow-up mailing, then telephone interviews. Responses were received from all but two of the jurisdictions (96 percent response).

Duration and Timeliness: The project took about a year and a half.

Costs: "Probably under \$5,000 total," of which printing was \$2,632.

Financing: AJS

Quantities: 1,057 copies printed

Principal Users: Court administrators, court administrative staff, and other research organizations.

COMMENT: This report contains a wealth of information, compactly set forth. It should be valuable to state chief justices and court administrators in appraising the content and level of their activities.

i. Survey of Judicial Salaries in State Court Systems (National Center for State Courts, quarterly)

Content: Tables presenting judges' salaries by state and level of court, plus an appendix on pending legislation and one on "Floating Salary Statutes."

Collection and Preparation: NCSC staff send a data sheet containing the last known figures to the office of court administration in each state, which updates and returns the sheet.

Duration and Timeliness: Obtaining the information from the states takes about one month; preparing it for publication takes four to six weeks.

Costs: \$1,397, of which \$935 is for typesetting and printing.

Financing: LEAA.

Quantities: 3,200 copies.

Principal Users: Judges and other personnel of state court systems.

COMMENT: Data are clearly and incisively presented. Inclusion of fringe benefit information would be desirable but would increase the size, cost, and preparation time of the report.

j. State Judicial Training Profile (National Center for State Courts, 2 editions, 1974 and 1976)

Content: The judicial training programs of all the states are summarized, first in a Basic Data Chart presenting staffing, budget, and evaluation procedures; second, in charts comparing mandatory training programs; and third, in state-by-state program descriptions. Directories of training directors and of national judicial educational organizations, an annotated bibliography of training materials, and appendixes follow.

Collection and Preparation: Staff of the NCSC sent questionnaires and materials to be updated from the previous edition

(1974) to each state judicial training organization. A representative of each state was then interviewed by telephone on the basis of the state's questionnaire. Results were written and edited for publication by NCSC staff. There are no plans for future editions.

Duration and Timeliness: About one year to prepare the current (1976) edition.

Costs: Staff costs not known. Printing costs: \$3,237.

Financing: LEAA.

Quantities: 800 copies printed, of which all but 40 have been given away or sold (at \$6.50).

Principal Users: Judicial colleges, judicial training directors, and some judges.

COMMENT: Clear and apparently complete. The publication should be useful to any judicial official who wants to know how the program of his own state compares with others and whom to communicate with to get detailed information and advice.

k. Directory of State and Local Judges (National College of the State Judiciary, biennial)

Content: A computer-printed list of the names, courts, and addresses of all state appellate, trial, county, and local judges. Names are listed alphabetically within each jurisdictional level.

Collection and Preparation: The first time the Directory was prepared (1975) the College asked state court administrators for the information. Now administrators are given a printout to update in preparing a 1977 edition. It is then hoped to publish the Directory annually.

Duration and Timeliness: About 3 months for the 1977 edition.

Costs: Preparation costs not known because of difficulty in separating out staff time for this project. Publication costs are estimated at between \$800 and \$1,200.

Financing: LEAA for first edition, later ones financed by grants from private sources.

Quantities: 400.

Principal Users: State courts and law schools.

COMMENT: This directory is quick to prepare. It is easy to use if the user already knows the name of the judge whose address is desired. If, however, the user wants to know the name of the justice of the peace in Pascagoula, he must run his finger down the entire list of Mississippi towns until he comes to it.

1. Journal Articles

Valuable administrative data may also be published in the form of Journal articles. Examples: Spring 1977 issue of State Court Journal (National Center for State Courts): state-by-state compilation of provisions concerning compensation of jurors.

October 1976 issue of Judicature (American Judicature Society): entire issue on court administrators -- their characteristics, duties, training, frustrations.

February 1976 Judicature: articles on judicial selection.

May 1976 Judicature: articles on evaluating judges.

February 1975 Judicature: articles on financing of state courts.

November 1974 Judicature: (1) article presenting results of research on reasons for judges' resignations; and (2) 38-page state-by-state presentation of judges' pay, fringe benefits, and expense reimbursements. The latter is partly duplicative of the NCSC salary survey and the CSG compilation on state court systems.

E. Publications About Prosecutors and Related Personnel

1. Containing both Operational and Administrative Data.

a. Selected Statistics on the Office of Attorney General
(National Association of Attorneys General, annual)

Content: 76 pages of narrative and tables concerning organization, financing, staffing, and salaries in offices of attorneys general in 50 states, Guam, Puerto Rico, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. Operational data, which occupy only a small part of the report, cover opinions, publications, and moneys recovered by action of the offices.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires are sent to 54 jurisdictions. Forty-five (83 percent) replied for the 1975 survey. For non-responding jurisdictions data from a prior year are used. Highlights of the report are summarized in the preface.

Duration and Timeliness: 4 months

Costs: not known.

Financing: LEAA.

Quantities: not known.

Principal Users: State attorneys generals' offices.

COMMENT: Apparently useful comparative information.

b. First Annual Report of the National Center for Prosecution Management, 1972. (Note: The Center is no longer in existence, its sustaining grant having expired in 1975.)

Content: 93 pages of narrative and tables devoted mostly to workload and procedures but partly to organization, staffing, terms of office, funding, and salaries. The data are related to such environmental factors as population size and nature, characteristics of the communities, numbers of police agencies dealt with, nature of defense counsel, and court structure.

Collection and Preparation: The report is based partly on visits to seven prosecutors' offices and partly on a subsequent mail questionnaire survey sent to 3,415 addressees, of whom 570 (16.7 percent) responded.

Duration and Timeliness: About 18 months elapsed from the start of research to the issuance of the report.

Costs: Approximately \$256,000.

Financing: LEAA.

Quantities: Never published or disseminated. A few duplicated copies were made available to interested professionals in this field. (No publication money was budgeted.)

Principal Users (intended): Prosecutors.

COMMENT: This was a well-conceived study, with data developed to test hypotheses formulated in advance. The data contain important information on the working constraints and difficulties of prosecutors. The document could be a good basis for planning a useful series on the prosecution function, which is poorly covered with respect to administrative data. It is unfortunate that complete results could not be collected and disseminated.

c. National Prosecutor Survey (National District Attorneys Association (NDAA) one-time)

Note: There is no publication with this title. The NDAA prepared and sent out a comprehensive questionnaire as of June 1974. Because of methodological problems the results were not analyzed and presented in one package. Answers to some of the questions for 30 states were published in The Prosecutor, the NDAA journal. Three issues published in 1976 covering a total of 12 states were available to the author of the present study. Partial data were also published in National Prosecution Standards published by NDAA in 1977.

Content: The Prosecutor reports data on time worked by prosecutors, by function; whether they may engage in private practice; assistant prosecutors' pay, hours, method of selection, and term served; number of investigative staff; and a variety of operational procedures concerning arrest notifications, charges, plea negotiations, and office backlog. The Standards volume reports survey results on term of office, time worked, salaries (both prosecutors and staff) and facilities. One table, covering 22 counties, reports budgets, staffing, prosecutors' salaries, and minimum and maximum staff salaries. This volume includes practically none of the operational data covered by the survey.

Collection and Preparation: The survey procedure was not adequately controlled, no cutoff date was set, and no checks of

statistical reliability made, according to one professional person associated with the survey. For the 12 states covered in three issues of The Prosecutor response rates varied from 40 to 78 percent, with a median of 62 percent.

Duration and Timeliness: About a year and a half elapsed between the start of the survey and the partial publication of the data.

Costs: Roughly \$285,000.

Financing: LEAA.

Quantities: The Prosecutor has a circulation of about 7,000. Approximately 700 copies of National Prosecution Standards were sold and 1,000 copies were given away.

COMMENT: It is unfortunate that this survey did not result in an authoritative report. As far as can be determined from the present study the total number of prosecutors in the United States is not known, to say nothing of many other detailed kinds of information on their work, staffing and expenditures.

d. The Prosecution Function: Local Prosecutors and the Attorney General (National Association of Attorneys General, 1974 updating of three earlier publications issued annually)

Content: 39 pages of narrative and tables covering organization, staffing, selection methods, terms of office, duties, budgets and salaries (summary statistics only), training programs, and information about working relationships between attorneys general and local prosecutors.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires were sent in 1973 to all local prosecutors. There was a 37 percent response. Answers were analyzed by computer and written up by NAAG staff.

Duration and Timeliness: The data were about a year old when published.

Costs: not known.

Financing: LEAA and NAAG.

Quantities: Not known.

Principal Users: Prosecutors.

COMMENT: The publication is largely narrative. The statistics are scanty, because of a low response to the survey, and are presented in severely summarized form. Users probably need more detailed information about budgets, staffing, and compensation.

2. Containing Administrative Data Only

a. Prosecutor Training and Assistance Programs (National Association of Attorneys General, biennial so far)

Content: 90 pages of text, followed by eight appendices of illustrative material from states, describing "state efforts to provide training and other central services to prosecutors." Data cover organization, staffing, funding, and salaries for the training and assistance function.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires were mailed to 53 states and territories, of which 27 responded (51 percent). Nevertheless, information about nonresponding jurisdictions was obtained from grant documents, state publications, correspondence, and telephone calls. The book contains information about 49 states and one territory, Puerto Rico. South Carolina is missing; at the time of the survey it was making a study to determine what activities should be started.

Duration and Timeliness: not known.

Costs: not known.

Financing: LEAA.

Quantities: not known.

Principal Users: not known.

COMMENT: Well presented and informative, but the low response rate raises a question about the effectiveness of the survey method.

b. Budget Comparison Survey, May 1976 (National District Attorneys Association, one-time, but typical of a planned series of limited surveys)

Content: This brief statistical study covers 17 large counties. All are over 500,000 population, and nearly all over 900,000. They are scattered all over the nation geographically. The report consists of a single overall table reporting for each

county its jurisdictional responsibility for various types of cases; its total budget this year and last year; numbers of full-time and part-time assistants, investigators, and other support staff, and the chief prosecutor's salary.

Collection and Preparation: Letter requests for the data were mailed to the participating counties and the results assembled and duplicated by NDAA staff.

Duration and Timeliness: About one month.

Costs: Not known.

Financing: NDAA.

Quantities: Not known.

Principal Users: Prosecutors in the counties named.

COMMENT: A quick and apparently useful compilation of the items of comparative data that the prosecutors say they need most.

F. Publications About Corrections

1. Containing both Operational and Administrative Data

a. Census of State Correctional Facilities, 1974: Advance Report (complete report now nearing publication) (Census/LEAA, first report -- probably to be repeated in a few years)

Content: In addition to operational statistics on population, facilities, and services, this contains data on number of institutions of each type, staffing, payroll, and expenditures. The Advance Report totals 30 pages of narrative and tables.

Collection and Preparation: Mail canvass of the universe of 608 functionally independent state institutions. Telephone follow-ups were made to get missing data or to clarify inconsistencies. Response rate was 97 percent.

Duration and Timeliness: The reference date was January 31, 1974; the advance report was published a year and a half later, and the final report will be out in the second half of 1977.

Costs:

Collection and preparation	\$75,000
Publication of Advance Report	1,265

Financing: LEAA

Quantities:

11,000	printed
7,294	ordered from NCJRS
500	received by GPO for sale
450	sold by GPO

Principal Users: (from NCJRS figures): Local police, 1,437; colleges and universities, 1,357; state correctional agencies, 745; and county police, 423.

COMMENT: Data on staffing, payroll and expenditures show the number of institutions in each interval. Such data are not related to inmate population, and hence are of little value for budgetary or management analysis.

b. The Nation's Jails (Census/LEAA, 1970, 1972 (reviewed here), and 1977)

Content: Population, facilities, programs, and staffing of jails in 48 pages of narrative and tables.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires were sent to local jails with both mail and telephone follow-ups. A few small nonresponding institutions were visited by field interviewers. The response rate was about 92 percent.

Duration and Timeliness: Nearly three years elapsed between the mailing of the questionnaires (June 1972) and the publication of the report (May 1975).

Costs:

Preparation: \$251,679 including both this report and one entitled Survey of Inmates of Local Jails, which contained almost no administrative data.

Printing: \$ 2,294

Financing: LEAA

Quantities:

12,900 printed
 6,743 ordered from NCJRS
 3,000 received by GPO for sale
 2,003 sold by GPO

Principal Users (from NCJRS figures): Local police, 1,297; colleges and universities, 1,261; state correctional institutions, 522; and county police, 430.

COMMENT: The report is useful in determining prevailing facilities and practices of jails. No financial data were collected. Staffing data are administratively helpful, showing types of personnel employed in jails of various sizes, and inmate-employee ratios by state.

c. Children in Custody (Census/LEAA, annual) (The report on the 1971 census and advance reports on the 1972-73 and 1974 censuses are reviewed here.)

Content: Narrative and tables (totaling 69 pages in the 1971 report) covering facilities, population, length of stay, percentage of utilization, and other operational data. The administrative data include staffing and expenditures, both in total and per capita.

Collection and Preparation: Mail questionnaires for the 1971 Census were sent by the Bureau of the Census partly to central state and local agencies that had participated in a previous study by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and partly to individual juvenile detention and correction facilities. There were mail and telegraphic follow-ups and telephone interviews to clarify inadequate answers. The response rate was 100 percent for most items. Data were checked and edited by Census, but the text was prepared by LEAA Statistics Division staff rather than by Census staff, as in other joint publications reviewed here. For succeeding censuses updated versions of the 1971 mailing list were used. Response rates were 99 percent for the 1972-73 census and 100 percent for the 1974 census.

Duration and Timeliness: The first census, as of June 30, 1971, was covered in a final report published in 1974, so it took three years. Times for later censuses are as follows:

<u>Census Conducted</u>	<u>Advance Report Published</u>	<u>Final Report to be Published</u>
November 1973	May 1975	Fall 1977
November 1974	February 1977	Late 1977 or early 1978

Costs (1974 census):

Data collection and processing	\$275,000
Printing (advance report)	11,830 (est.)

Financing: LEAA.

Quantities:

1972-73 Advance Report	13,600 copies printed
	7,646 ordered from NCJRS
1974 Advance Report	14,800 copies printed
	500 received by GPO for sale
	170 sold by GPO

Principal Users (NCJRS figures for 1972-73 Advance Report): local police, 1,575; colleges and universities, 1,295; state correctional agencies, 594; federal law enforcement, 265; county correctional agencies, 259; state police, 233; and state courts, 232.

COMMENT: The administrative data are scanty but well adapted to planning, budgeting, and staffing because figures are related to numbers of offenders in custody.

d. Survey of Corrections Systems in the South (Council of State Governments (CSG) Southern Office, annual, but probably only twice).

(Note: This report was prepared for a "Seminar on the Crisis in Corrections" held in January 1976 by the Task Force Committee on Correctional Problems, appointed by the Southern Governors' Conference. The report was updated by presentations at a follow-up meeting in July 1977.)

Content: 13 pages of tables and narrative on correctional capacity, population, costs per inmate, and costs of buildings needed for additional capacity. Seventeen states (Delaware to Florida; Oklahoma and Texas to the Atlantic) plus the Virgin Islands.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires were sent by CSG staff to corrections commissioners of the participating states. All participants reported. Data were assembled and the report was written by CSG staff.

Duration and Timeliness: Data were collected and the draft report prepared for the seminar in one month. The final report

was issued two months later.

Costs: Not known -- inseparable from other staff costs.

Financing: Council of State Governments.

Quantities: Unknown number given to member states of the Southern Governors' Conference. 721 given away or sold (at \$3) to interested officials and others. 60 still on hand.

Principal Users: Officials of member states of the Southern Governors' Conference; interested officials.

COMMENT: This was a brief, very incisive study with a limited policy objective, competently prepared and clearly set forth.

2. Containing Administrative Data Only

a. Reorganization of State Corrections Agencies: A Decade of Experience (Council of State Governments, one-time)

Content: An 111-page analytical report on state reorganizations of corrections systems, 1965-75. For most states information was drawn by CSG staff from published reports to compare state correctional structures in 1965, 1970, and 1975. To explore the topic more deeply the staff conducted interviews in nine states selected to represent varying organizational patterns.

Duration and Timeliness: The entire project took about one and a half years.

Costs: Not known -- difficult to separate from other staff work.

Financing: LEAA.

Quantities: 3,000 copies printed.

Principal Users: State officials, including governors, legislative correctional officials; members of other interested organizations.

COMMENT: This is a balanced and well-reasoned examination of different ways of organizing state corrections systems. A follow-up study to add 1980 data to those of 1965, 1970, and 1975 would be desirable.

b. Directory, Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies and Paroling Authorities, United States and Canada, 1977 edition (American Correctional Association (ACA), annual).

Content: For each state and province there is a brief description of the organization for corrections. Organizational names, officials' names and titles, addresses, and telephone numbers are then given for each organization. For correctional facilities, the degree of security, bed capacity, sex and age of inmates, and age of facility are stated. Local organizations and facilities are not included.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires are sent to the head of each corrections department (or over-all department if corrections is part of one) and parole board, and returns are used by ACA staff to update the Directory. Response rate is normally 100 percent.

Duration and Timeliness: About four months elapse from the time questionnaires are sent out until the Directory is received from the printer.

Costs: \$1,600 for staff time plus \$7,800 for printing.

Financing: Paid for from fees for several classes of ACA membership and from sales of the Directory itself at \$9.50 per copy.

Quantities: It is estimated that 5,000 to 7,000 copies are distributed to ACA members, and 3,000 to 5,000 copies are sold.

Principal Users: Correctional officials and employees; researchers and students in criminal justice.

COMMENT: A well organized and complete directory. It overlaps in part with the Probation and Parole Directory of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency NCCD (described below), but is much less detailed than the latter. An ACA official says that issuance of a joint directory was proposed to NCCD, but was refused.

c. Probation and Parole Directory, Seventeenth Edition, 1976 (National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD), occasional -- previous edition was for 1970, next edition expected in about three years)

Content: This publication covers all states, the District

of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Canada. Directory information for each state and for Canada is preceded by a brief summary of legal provisions governing juvenile courts and probation, adult probation, and parole and clemency. State, county, and municipal offices are then listed with names of officers in charge and mail addresses. The response was close to 100 percent.

Collection and Preparation: Questionnaires were mailed to organizations covered in the previous directory, and returns were then edited for publication by NCCD staff.

Duration and Timeliness: Issuance of the Directory took 9 to 12 months from the time the questionnaires were mailed, an unexpectedly long time because of NCCD staff turnover.

Costs: not known.

Financing: From sale of the Directory at \$20 a copy.

Principal Users: Mainly field personnel of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies; also law firms, libraries, and publishers.

COMMENT: The Directory seems convenient to use, combining concise legal jurisdictional summaries with county-by-county names and locations of responsible officers.

d. Directory: Association of State Correctional Administrators, National Association of State Juvenile Delinquency Program Administrators, Parole and Probation Compact Administrators Association, and Association of Juvenile Compact Administrators (Council of State Government, biennial)

(Note: First edition issued in looseleaf form in March 1976. Users are asked to report changes to CSG staff so that the Directory can be updated biennially.)

Content: The Directory contains separate state-by-state listings for each association of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of the state representative(s) of each organization. The obvious purpose is to facilitate communication about offenders of interest to more than one state.

Collection and Preparation: Mail questionnaires to the organizations concerned were supplemented by three rounds of telephone surveys to achieve consistency and accuracy.

Duration and Timeliness: Preparation and issuance took about a year.

Costs: Inseparable from other staff costs.

Financing: LEAA grant for a variety of purposes.

Quantity: 3,000.

Principal Users: Correctional, juvenile delinquency, parole, and probation officials.

COMMENT: Convenient and adequate.

III. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Two preliminary reminders are in order. First, the present study is based on only 30 person-days of fact gathering and analysis. Second, no information was obtained about the needs and experiences of the users of these publications. Nevertheless a number of findings readily emerge from this review which may be useful in reassessing reports, designing research in greater depth, and planning revisions.

The Miscellany

It is already apparent that administrative data are found in a great variety of reports started at different times by different organizations for different reasons. They are prepared by government agencies, interest groups, professional societies, and enterprising individuals. Some are costly; some are cheap. Some are high quality; some are terrible. Some are current when issued; some are three or four years old. They are started, revised, or eliminated in accordance with the judgments of the organizations concerned and with the availability, in most cases, of LEAA funds.

Variety is not necessarily bad. However, it is difficult to discern needs and purposes in the mass of information presented. They appear to need titles like, "All Conceivable Totals of Expenditures for Criminal Justice Functions" or "Everything You Might Want to Know about Compensation for Police Officers."

Aggregate vs. Targeted Data

The Census/LEAA series included in the Expenditure and Employment Data reports exemplify this holistic approach. They give detailed information about total amounts spent for, and numbers of personnel employed in, criminal justice agencies. The statistics enable the user to determine the balance of money spent among various criminal justice functions -- for police, for example, as compared to corrections. The data are useful in part for determining LEAA grants under the "pass through" provision.

However, these and other Census/LEAA reports would be more useful if the statistics were related to clientele or output measures. This suggests the need for more series showing police expenditures and employment per citizen, per arrest, per index crime reported, or per some other measure. This approach has been used in the Children in Custody reports and for staffing

data in the jail census reports. Such an approach makes possible more meaningful comparisons between jurisdictions and between time periods. It should increase the usefulness of the data for budget purposes and for pay determinations. Each agency could of course make its own computations of the desired ratios, but much work would be saved if the Bureau of the Census could do it for all. Such a change, however, might mean a change in data collection procedures. Census now gets figures from a central point in each state government or local government. To collect the more specific operational data needed Census might have to communicate with specific criminal justice agencies within state and local governments. This would add to the time and cost of preparing the publications.

Timeliness

In the previous chapter the published data were shown to vary in age from several weeks to several years. The oldest data were those in the Sourcebook, which copies already mature if not venerable information, and some of the newer Census/LEAA series, particularly those which encountered sampling, processing, or analytical problems. The lag time becomes shorter, however, as a series is processed for the second and third time.

Timeliness depends not only on the methodology of the requesting organization but also on the information systems of the state and local governments surveyed. Ideally, criminal justice agencies at those levels should maintain basic data on operations and administration so that reporting, whether to Census/LEAA or to others, is a matter of sending a computer tape or a copy of a print-out rather than making a hand count from card records. It should be perfectly feasible to publish basic recurring data no older than six months.

Minimum Cost

Users for the most part get these publications free or at nominal cost. The cost question is how much should Uncle Sam spend on criminal justice administrative statistics, not only for the Census/LEAA publication but for those produced by nonprofit groups under federal grants. The question does not lend itself to cost-benefit analysis and is likely to be answered somewhat arbitrarily as federal budgets are formulated. The heaviest costs are incurred in new statistical projects: designing surveys, conducting interviews, mailing questionnaires, following-up, clarifying responses, designing tabulations, de-bugging programs, editing data. Costs shrink as reports are cleaned up and made routine.

Some directories and salary studies are priced to be self-supporting or even money-making. Still the prices are trifles to most institutional users. Price reductions would necessitate subsidies by governments or by the organizations producing the reports.

Ease of Understanding and Interpretation

Judgments on this criterion depend on users' reactions, but the author of the present study found most publications to present few puzzles. The Census/LEAA reports were superior in their explanations of what the figures include and how they were obtained. Some of the pay data reported by interest groups and professional associations were lacking in detailed explanations of premium pay and fringe benefit matters.

Ease of Comparability

The typical user wants to compare agencies from one time period to another and from one jurisdiction to another. This argues, as noted earlier, for per client, per capita, per employee, per unit-of-output data. The bulk of the staffing and expenditure data in the publications reviewed need to be redesigned to meet this criterion.

Another comparability problem is the lack of consistency in coverage and methodological rigor among the publications. For example, users who do not find detailed salary and benefit data for police in the Census/LEAA reports can indeed find such data in abundance elsewhere. However, response rates differ from one report to another, as do the care and perseverance with which the data supplied are examined and edited.

Completeness

Meeting the above criterion will fill the most important gap found in the present review. Another major problem is the lack of detailed, comprehensive, recurrent information on the prosecution function. In the Census/LEAA "E & E" publications prosecution is lumped with legal services, which (to compound the problem) include civil as well as criminal functions. It would be desirable to have a prosecution series covering functional organization, staffing, pay, benefits, and expenditures as thoroughly as police and courts are covered.* Another deficiency

*The author did not survey reports concerning public defender or other indigent defense services. He has been informally advised that this function is also scantily covered.

is the lack of pay and benefit data for correctional personnel. It would be desirable also to initiate a series on unionization -- including such information as extent of organization, representation patterns, use of agency shop, scope of collective bargaining, impasse resolution procedures, and extent of job actions and work stoppages. Such areas have been covered infrequently in the Municipal Year Book. Finally, there is a need for clear descriptions of organizational functions and relationships in all areas except courts. Other gaps can readily be identified simply by comparing the coverage of the various functions in the table of contents of Expenditure and Employment.

Ease of Locating Data and Avoidance of Duplication

Some users of criminal justice administrative data might seem to be well served if everything needed were in one publication. The Sourcebook shows the difficulty with this idea. It is bulky to handle, out-of-date in many respects, and contains much data that many users do not need.

Shorter publications dealing with organizational or personnel information, for example, are convenient for the user who wants such data. Here, however, the user may be confronted by duplicative reports. He/she can choose one or two and worry about what is missing in the others, or can get them all and strain both vision and patience making comparisons. Duplicative studies also unduly burden the agencies supplying the information.

The principal areas of duplication identified in the present review are:

COURT ORGANIZATION AND JURISDICTION

Book of the States, Council of State Governments
*National Survey of Court Organization, Census/LEAA
*State Court Profiles, National Center for State Courts
Various publications, American Judicature Society

SALARIES IN THE JUDICIARY

State Court Systems, Council of State Governments
*Survey of Judicial Salaries, National Center for
State Courts
Judicature magazine, American Judicature Society

*Funded by LEAA

SALARIES, BENEFITS AND PERSONNEL PRACTICES IN LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Municipal Year Book, International City Management Association
General Administrative Survey, Kansas City Police Department
Survey of Salaries and Working Conditions . . . , Fraternal Order of Police
Salary - Pension - Fringe Benefits Survey, International Conference of Police Associations

Lesser areas of duplication are:

STATE POLICE STAFFING AND COSTS

Book of the States, Council of State Government
*Comparative Data Report, International Association of Chiefs of Police

STATE POLICE SALARIES AND BENEFITS

*Comparative Data Report, International Association of Chiefs of Police
Survey of Salaries . . . Fraternal Order of Police

DIRECTORY INFORMATION

*Directories of Criminal Justice Agencies, Census/LEAA (publication now discontinued)
National Directory of Law Enforcement Administrators, National Police and Sheriffs Information Bureau
Directory of State and Local Judges, National College of the State Judiciary
Directory, Juvenile and Adult Correctional Departments, Institutions, Agencies and Paroling Authorities . . . , American Correctional Association
Probation and Parole Directory, National Council on Crime and Delinquency

There are also overlaps between the staffing and expenditure information in the Census/LEAA Expenditure and Employment Data . . . reports and several of the other publications.

Actions That Might Be Considered

The present brief review and critique is an insufficient

*Funded by LEAA

basis for decisions by the LEAA, or other interested organizations, on starting, changing, or stopping a report. Nevertheless there are clear indications of the work that needs to be done to achieve optimum packaging of reports at minimum cost, consistent with maximum benefit to users. Further guidance will doubtless emerge from the surveys of users of criminal justice statistics already planned by LEAA's National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service.* The following work should be considered:

1. Revise the LEAA/Census series, both operational and administrative, to add staffing and expenditure data on a per capita, per client, and/or per work unit basis.

2. Continue efforts to reduce the time lags in publication of these series.

3. Restudy the utility of the Sourcebook to administrative decision makers. It may be too diffuse and the data too old for their purposes. On the other hand, it may be enduringly popular.

4. Determine what agencies or interest groups are best able to collect and publish data on the personnel practices, compensation, and fringe benefits of criminal justice agencies. On the basis of the present study, International City Management Association for local police and the National Center for State Courts for the judiciary merit serious consideration.

5. Initiate adequate series in the fields of prosecution, indigent defense, and correction.

6. Determine what can be done to depopulate the overcrowded directory scene. There is clearly a market for specialized annual directories, with names.

7. Examine whether the State Court Profiles of the National Center for State Courts or the State Court Systems, Revised series of the Council of State Governments may be revised to meet needs for court organization information with less duplicative work.

Each of such classes of action, plus others that may be considered, will require consultations among users and producers of administrative data. The changes made will be a compound of economic, statistical, administrative, and personal decisions, none of them beyond doubt or challenge.

*Program Plan for Statistics, 1977-81, U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, NCJISS, pp. 23-25.

APPENDIX

(Excerpt from March 30, 1977 LEAA contract with National Academy of Public Administration Foundation)

This task will examine the main reports and directories issued by either public or private sources that provide systematic information on the organization, administration, personnel, and costs of State and Local Criminal Justice Agencies. The examination will concentrate on reports of conditions in 1970 or later in a number of (preferably all or most) jurisdictions. For each report, an effort will be made to determine or estimate:

- a. the duration and cost of data collection (cost being estimated either in dollars or man-years of effort)
- b. the methods of data collection (mail questionnaire, interview, or secondary sources; and whether the data were collected solely for this purpose or as part of a broader inquiry)
- c. the collecting and financing agencies
- d. the number and kinds of respondents; response rate; and the extent of data editing prior to publication
- e. any evidence of the accuracy and comparability of data
- f. the lag between data collection and publication
- g. the degree to which significant data remain unpublished
- h. the main subjects covered
- i. the kinds of summary tables and special analyses which are undertaken and the kinds which might be prepared
- j. the number of reports printed and distributed, and the general nature of the distribution
- k. the main users and uses of the data
- l. any serious duplication of data in different series

INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS PREPARING REPORTS

American Correctional Association	39
American Judicature Society	24, 25, 26, 29
American Law Enforcement Officers Association	19
Council of State Governments	4, 23, 37, 38, 40
Criminal Justice Research Center	7
Federal Bureau of Investigation	14
Fraternal Order of Police	17
International Association of Chiefs of Police	16, 20
International City Management Association	4, 6
International Conference of Police Associations	18
Kansas City (MO) Police Department	15
National Association of Attorneys General	30, 32, 33
National Center for State Courts	22, 27, 29
National Center for Prosecution Management	30
National College of the State Judiciary	28
National Council on Crime and Delinquency	39
National District Attorneys Association	31, 33
National Planning Association	13
National Police and Sheriffs Information Bureau	12
Police Foundation	15, 20
U.S. Bureau of the Census	4
U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration with Bureau of the Census	9, 10, 11, 13, 21, 34 to 36

END