


CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE  
PROJECT  
PROGRESS AND FINANCIAL REPORT:  
OCTOBER 30, 1975



**THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY**

Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project  
Institute for Studies in Justice and Social Behavior  
The American University Law School  
Washington, D.C.

31377



**INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN JUSTICE**

Nicholas N. Kittrie, Institute Director  
Joseph A. Trotter, Jr., Associate Director  
David J. Saari, Associate Director  
B. J. Tennery, Associate Director

David E. Aaronson & C. Thomas Dienes, Co-principal Investigators  
**The Impact of Decriminalization on the Intake Process for Public Inebriates**

H. H. A. Cooper, Staff Director  
**National Advisory Committee Task Force on Disorders and Terrorism**

Jerry V. Wilson, Project Director  
**War on Crime in the District of Columbia, 1955-1975**

**Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project**  
Joseph A. Trotter, Jr., Project Director  
Caroline S. Cooper, Deputy Director  
Bert H. Hoff, Assistant Director for Field Services  
Johanna S. Kramer, Coordinator for Evaluation & Followup  
Linda C. Sweeney, Research Assistant  
Mark D. Cherry, Project Coordinator

**Project Advisory Board**

Nicholas N. Kittrie, Institute for Advanced Studies in Justice  
David J. Saari, Center for the Administration of Justice  
College of Public Affairs

**THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY**

George H. Williams, President  
Robert E. Cleary, Provost  
Gordon A. Christenson, Dean, Law School

CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE  
PROJECT  
PROGRESS AND FINANCIAL REPORT  
OCTOBER 30, 1975

Submitted by:

JOSEPH A. TROTTER, JR., DIRECTOR


To:

Courts Division  
Office of Regional Operations  
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration

LEAA Project Monitor:  
GREG BRADY

LEAA Contract Officer:  
JAMES JOHNSTON

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Contract Number: J-LEAA-043-72



THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Washington College of Law  
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN JUSTICE



# THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

Washington College of Law  
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN JUSTICE

## MEMORANDUM

To: LEAA Regional Office Court Specialists  
and State Planning Agency Court Specialists

From: Joseph A. Trotter, Jr., Director *JAT*  
Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project

Subject: Project Progress and Financial Report

Date: November 28, 1975 *Contract*  
*J-LEAA-043-72*

Enclosed please find one copy of this project's Progress and Financial Report, as of October 30, 1975. It has been delayed for several weeks due to our desire to provide you with information as complete and correct as possible. This entailed several double-checks of our new computer data bank, insuring that its raw data was properly coded, and that the new program was functioning correctly. I trust that the completeness of the follow-up and evaluation information will outweigh the tardiness of the report.

Included in the report's contents are:

- o Brief Project Description
- o Statistical Summary of T/A Activity
- o Project Financial Summary
- o Status of Individual Assignments
- o Selected Characteristics of T/A Assignments
- o Follow-up and Client Evaluation Results

An updated List of Reports Completed by Subject Area will be completed shortly and transmitted to you at that time. Together with this report, it should provide you with an idea not only of the current status of the T/A Project, but also of the type of assistance we can provide you and your client agencies. If we can be of any further assistance regarding these or any other Technical Assistance matters, please do not hesitate to contact our staff at the address or telephone number below.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
II. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITY	
A. STATUS OF REQUESTS	2
B. STATUS OF ASSIGNMENT REPORTS	2
C. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUEST ACTIVITY BY MONTH	2
D. STATUS OF EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP	3
III. PROJECT FINANCIAL SUMMARY	4
IV. STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENTS	
A. ACTIVE ASSIGNMENTS AS OF OCTOBER 30, 1975	5
B. CHART OF REQUESTS RECEIVED MARCH-OCTOBER, 1975	11
V. SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ASSIGNMENTS	
A. REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS	21
B. CLIENT AGENCIES	22
C. SUBJECT AREA OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	24
D. SCOPE OF ASSIGNMENT	25
VI. FOLLOW-UP AND CLIENT EVALUATION RESULTS	
A. CLIENT EVALUATION RESPONSES, BY QUESTION AND REGION	26
B. ACTION TAKEN ON CONSULTANTS' RECOMMENDATIONS, BY NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION	31
C. ACTION TAKEN ON CONSULTANT'S RECOMMENDATIONS, BY SUBJECT AREA OF ASSIGNMENT	32
D. ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY TYPE OF CLIENT AGENCY	34
E. REGIONAL COMPARISON OF RECOMMENDATION IMPLEMENTATION	35

## I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project has been in operation since July 1972, and is conducted under a contract between The American University and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The objective of the project is to provide expert advisory services to state and local courts and related agencies, as well as criminal justice planning units on both a state and local level, when these services are not otherwise available. The project functions, thus, as a service arm of the Courts Section of LEAA's Office of Regional Operations, and makes its services available free of charge to the requesting agency.

Housed in the Law School's Institute for Advanced Studies in Justice, the project's activities are undertaken with a view to both serving the immediate needs of the criminal justice system community and developing research and resource tools which can contribute to existing knowledge in the fields studied.

These activities are carried out through several means:

- informal assistance by project staff to potential recipients of technical assistance in clarifying problems, defining needs, and, if appropriate, determining the scope of assistance warranted.
- making available the personal services of appropriate specialists for on-site work in a client jurisdiction.
- documentation of all technical assistance provided in formal, individual reports.
- dissemination of technical assistance reports to jurisdictions where these reports may have potential utility.
- extensive evaluation and follow-up of all technical assistance services to determine both immediate and long-term effectiveness.

To carry out these responsibilities, the project has six full-time staff members, and an open roster of individual and organizational consultants with demonstrated expertise in virtually every aspect of court and court-related operations.

## II. STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITY

As of: October 30, 1975

### A. STATUS OF REQUESTS

Requests Received		222 *
Requests Withdrawn	27	
Site Work Completed	180	
Site Work in Progress	5	
Site Work Scheduled	5	
Pending Scheduling	5	
	<u>222</u>	<u>222</u>

### B. STATUS OF ASSIGNMENT REPORTS

Site Work Completed		180
Reports Sent to R.O.'s & Clients	167	
Reports Being Reviewed by Project Staff	10	
Reports Not Yet Received	3	
	<u>180</u>	<u>180</u>

### C. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUEST ACTIVITY BY MONTH

<u>Month</u>	<u>Requests Received During Month</u>	<u>Active Assignments At End of Month</u>
March 1975	7	10
April	1	7
May	4	9
June	4	9
July	2	10
August	4	14
September	15	25
October	4	28

\*211 of the 222 requests received as of October 30, 1975 will be handled under contract No. J-LEAA-043-72, which terminates on November 15, 1975. The remaining 11 requests will be handled under contract No. J-LEAA-013-76, which began on October 16, 1975. The first progress report under the latter contract will be submitted at the end of November.

D. STATUS OF EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP

Assignments Completed & Reports Transmitted		167
Client Evaluations Returned to Project	143	
Client Evaluations Not Yet Returned	15	
Assignments on which Client Evaluation not Solicited	9	
	<u>167</u>	<u>167</u>

Assignments Completed & Reports Transmitted		167
Assignments with Six-Month Follow-Up Completed	146	
Assignments with Follow-Up In Process	5	
Assignments Not Yet Followed-Up	7	
Assignments not Appropriate for Follow-Up	9	
	<u>167</u>	<u>167</u>



### III. PROJECT FINANCIAL SUMMARY

As of: October 30, 1975

#### COST ESTIMATE (July 1, 1972 - October 30, 1975):

• Funds Expended or Committed in Consulting Fees and Expenses for the 184 T/A Requests Which are Completed or in Progress*	\$478,569	
• LEAA Special Study Team Implementation Study and Conferences	\$ 23,000	
• Estimated Cost of Consultants' Fees and Expenses for the T/A Requests Which are Pending Scheduling	<u>\$ - 0 -</u>	
	<u>SUB TOTAL</u>	\$501,569
• Funds Expended on Project Staff and Support of T/A Activities, Including Evaluation and Follow-Up, Direct Materials, and Other Direct Costs	\$243,774	
• Indirect Costs, Including Rent, Payroll, Accounting, Personnel, and Purchasing Services, etc.	\$95,224	
	<u>SUB TOTAL</u>	<u>\$338,988</u>
	<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>	<u>\$840,557</u>

---

Average Cost per T/A Assignment  
in Consulting Fees and Expenses  
(\$478,569 ÷ 184) \$2601

---

\*Not included in the cost estimate are estimated costs for assignments which will be charged against the new technical assistance contract (contract No. J-LEAA-013-76), which began on October 16, 1975. As of October 30, there were 11 assignments being handled under the new contract. The estimated cost of fees and expenses for these assignments is \$55,050.00.

#### IV. STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENTS

##### A. ACTIVE ASSIGNMENTS AS OF OCTOBER 30, 1975

No. 166 - State of North Carolina: Criminal Justice Information System Planning - Phase III, Selection of Systems Personnel

Approximately 50 applications for the two systems analyst positions recommended by the T/A consultants in July 1974 and just approved were evaluated by two of the consultants. Recommendations were made regarding a phased approach for screening the applicants and for conducting personal interviews. The consultants assisted Mr. Montague, North Carolina AOC Director, in conducting these interviews and developing criteria for final selection. A report documenting this effort and providing guidelines for future staff selection has been developed by Mr. Morrill.

No. 191 - State of Alabama: Development of State Criminal Justice Information System and Relevant Legislation

Larry Polansky provided the initial phase of this assistance: a review of pending legislation in terms of its impact on court automated information system planning and preparation of a draft contract for use by the court in establishing its relationship with the state computer center facility. The second phase of assistance, guidance in developing the courts component of the state master plan for criminal justice information system development, has been provided by Fran Taillifer of the National Center for State Courts during the course of several planning meetings held in September and October. A report of this second effort is expected shortly; it will be incorporated with a report of the first phase and transmitted to the Alabama Department of Court Management through LEAA channels.

No. 192 - State of Kentucky: Planning for Statewide Court Reorganization

Assistance to the Kentucky Judicial Council through the newly established Office of Judicial Planning has been provided during the period of May through October and has focussed on specific planning needs related to the Office's effort in gathering comprehensive statewide court data. A report documenting these several phases will be prepared shortly. In view of the passage of the new judicial article, additional technical assistance will be needed primarily to assist the Office in developing a statewide court personnel system and planning for the expansion of a court administrators program in the state. It is anticipated that a new request for this assistance will be submitted to LEAA.

No. 194 - Leesville, Louisiana: Calendar and Management Study, 30th Judicial District of Louisiana

A prerequisite for this assignment is creation of an atmosphere of coordination and cooperation between the various members of the local criminal justice community. After a problem-definition visit conducted by the T/A

project staff in mid-September, a working group of local officials was formed, which will assist the field-visit team, review the recommendations of the final report, and work towards implementation of those recommendations deemed acceptable. On October 16th and 17th a field team consisting of two court administrators (Gordon W. Allison and Dennis E. Howard) and an architect (Mike Bignell) conducted the requested site work. Their report is expected shortly.

No. 195 - Cuyahoga County Ohio: Court of Common Pleas Security Study

A preliminary site visit was made in July 1975 to respond to the Court's urgent need for a review of its security problems. A proposed study effort was outlined by the consultants and T/A staff, and sent to the Court Administrator for review and approval. This approval was given in September and site work was conducted thereafter; completed late last month. A report is expected shortly.

No. 196 - Ventura County, California: Superior Court Criminal Justice Information System Development

Joe Jordan of the National Center for State Courts has been working with the Regional Criminal Justice Board for Ventura County in assessing the automated information system needs for the Superior Court and determining the potential utility of the Municipal Court's system in the Superior Court as well as providing alternative system recommendations. A report of this effort is expected shortly. Once the County has had a chance to consider its recommendations, limited resources have been reserved for Mr. Jordan to meet with county officials to discuss his recommendations and the most appropriate direction for the court to move. If deemed valuable, site visits to one or two jurisdictions may be planned for a Ventura representative to assess the system or systems considered by the County before a final decision is made.

No. 197 - Cowlitz County, Washington: Facilities and Personnel Review of Superior Court Juvenile Department

This assignment required a projection of present and future personnel and space needs of juvenile probation department and detention facility. It was occasioned by the expected opening of a new courthouse, which will make the basement of the present Youth Services Center available to the Juvenile Department of the court. In mid-August, site work was conducted by architect and space-planner Lawrence Siegel and Rex Smith, a juvenile services specialist. A draft report has been received by the project and transmitted to the client for factual review, with Regional Office approval.

No. 201 - District of Columbia: Evaluation of Superior Court Model Courtroom

The original July - October timetable for work on this evaluation, which is being conducted under a subcontract by the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture, has been extended to November 15, 1975. A draft report is expected in mid-December.

No. 202 - State of Alaska: Recommendations for Improving Criminal Case Processing in State Court System

Site work on this assignment was completed by Consultant Ernest Friesen in late September and a draft report received by mid-October. The client felt that the draft report required more specificity and elaboration, and the consultant is currently in the process of revising his draft. With appropriate LEAA and client agency clearance, the draft was sent to NDAA for orientation of a consultant team scheduled to undertake a management review of statewide prosecutor operations in Alaska (No. 217).

No. 203 - State of Georgia: Planning Assistance to Governor's Commission on Judicial Reorganization

Tom Morrill met with Judge Watson White, Chairman, and his committee in late August to discuss the ramifications of statewide judicial reorganization and the possible areas the Committee might address. At the time of this visit, it was envisioned that a subsequent meeting would be held with Bert Montague attending, since Mr. Montague's experience in North Carolina might have major relevance to Georgia. However, this, in fact, has not proven necessary at this time, since the Governor has not yet reacted to the preliminary recommendations submitted by Judge White's committee and subsequent efforts are not expected to begin before January. A report and recommendations are therefore being prepared by Mr. Morrill and will be submitted to Judge White's committee through LEAA for consideration and for use when the next phase of activity begins.

No. 204 - Owensboro, Kentucky: Assist in Implementation of Pretrial Intervention Program in Circuit Court

On October 1st a voluntary organization will begin operating a pre-trial intervention program in Owensboro, Kentucky, under an LEAA state block grant. Because this has been viewed as a prototype for similar programs in the state, and because legal issues and cost-benefit evaluation criteria remain undefined, technical assistance was requested. Consultants Bruce D. Beaudin and J. Gordon Zaloom visited Owensboro on October 7 - 8, 1975, and have submitted a draft report. The final report will be sent to the client, through LEAA/SPA channels, by mid-November.

No. 205 - Salt Lake City, Utah: Municipal Court Reporting System

Preliminary recommendations have been submitted to the court administrator for review and comment and a final site meeting is scheduled within the next few weeks to present the consultant's recommendations and provide any clarification needed. A formal report of this effort will then be developed.

No. 206 - State of Connecticut: Development of Criteria and Procedures for Using Restitution as a Disposition Alternative

Work has been completed by the National Center for State Courts Northeastern Regional Office. A draft report was submitted to this project and has been edited for final printing, pending comment by the National Center.

No. 207 - State of New Hampshire: Handbook on Judicial Statistics Analysis for Court System Personnel

Work has been completed by the National Center for State Courts Northeastern Regional Office. Comments by the project regarding the draft report have been sent to the National Center and a revised report should be prepared shortly.

No. 208 - State of Massachusetts: Development of Standard Case Reporting Forms for "CHINS" Cases

Work has been completed by the National Center for State Courts Northeastern Regional Office. A draft report was submitted to this project and has been edited for final printing, pending comment by the National Center.

No. 211 - New York County, New York: Space Utilization Study of Manhattan District Attorney Office Operations

Consultant Larry Siegel made a "problem definition" visit in early September and began work on the space analysis later that month after approval of his work plan by this project and the District Attorney's Office. Survey work will be completed in early November, at which time a multi-disciplinary group will be assembled under Mr. Siegel's leadership to complete an analysis of major information flow patterns in the Office and develop recommendations for increasing efficiency of management and space utilization functions.

No. 212 - Baltimore, Maryland: Improvement of Information and Record Keeping Systems in the Baltimore Regional Office of the Juvenile Services Administration and the Baltimore City Juvenile Court

Action on this assignment has been temporarily withdrawn pending a decision from the Office of Juvenile Services Administration as to whether or not the assistance could be of use, in view of some recent changes within that Office.

No. 213 - New York City: Assistance in Implementing New Juror Utilization System in Several Boroughs

This request envisioned two months effort and the services of Byrd Associates, which could be tied in to Byrd's own T/A resources. Since the scope of effort was beyond the resources of this project, and since the participation of Byrd envisioned a commitment by LEAA which had, in fact, not been made, a clarification of this request has been requested to determine whether assistance from this project can be provided within the contract guidelines. If limited assistance can be provided without its being contingent on subsequent LEAA commitments, a study will be launched. If not, the request will be withdrawn.

No. 214 - Wabash, Rice, and Olmstead Counties, Minnesota: Management and Case Processing Study of Three Clerk of Court Offices

Recent changes in the law affecting the status and organization of Clerk of Court offices have resulted in a need to develop a clerk's manual and

training program which may serve as a state-wide prototype. A team of consultants will survey the existing operations in order to identify problems and determine approaches toward their solution, which may lead to development of such a manual and training program. Consultant Charles Starett will make the first of two anticipated site visits on this study the week of November 17 - 21, 1975. A second site visit with other team members is anticipated in December.

No. 215 - State of Tennessee: Orientation to Automated Information Systems for Tennessee Prosecutorial and Judicial Staffs

The SPA requested Tom Morrill to meet within the next several weeks with several small groups of representatives from prosecutorial and judicial agencies to discuss the merits, potential problems, and uses of automated information systems, and how such planning might proceed in Tennessee. Objectives and format for these meetings have been discussed at length with the SPA representative and the consultant. A report will be prepared which will document the recommendations made as well as the problems perceived by the consultant during the course of the discussion sessions.

No. 216 - Suffolk County, New York: Technical Feasibility of Instituting a Decentralized Cable T.V. Arraignment System

E.H. Short and Associates will provide technical assistance in mid-November. The feasibility study will determine whether or not such a system can be implemented, in which case an additional day of technical assistance will be provided to discuss the particulars of the equipment required and the probable cost of such a system.

No. 217 - State of Alaska: Management Analysis of Statewide Prosecutor System

The focus of this assignment is to provide the state Attorney General's Office with an assessment of the prosecutor system's capability and procedures in light of the prospective impact of the recent official abolition of plea-bargaining in the State. A six-member NDAA team is scheduled to conduct site work during the period November 3 - 14, 1975. This assignment follows a judicial management study (No. 202) in Alaska by Ernest Friesen, one of the purposes of which was to assess the impact of plea-bargaining abolition on judicial branch activities in the State. The draft of the report on the earlier assignment was made available to the NDAA team for orientation purposes. The final report on this assignment is expected six weeks after completion of the site work, but the Attorney General's Office will get an in-depth oral debriefing before the team leaves the state.

No. 218 - State of Kentucky: Development of Computer-Adaptable Standardized Case Files and Reporting Forms for Commonwealth Attorneys' Offices Throughout the State

Several factors essential to the efficient application of T/A resources to this request are unresolved. These factors have been identified in discussions between T/A staff and SPA officials, and it has been agreed that the request

will be maintained in a "pending" status while the necessary prerequisites are being developed.

No. 219 - State of New Hampshire: Assessment of Community-Based Resources For Juvenile Status Offenders

The focus of this request is to determine community resource needs in light of new state legislation relating to de-institutionalization of status offenders. The National Center for State Courts' Northeastern Regional Office began work on this assignment in October with an expected completion date of December 15, 1975.

No. 220 - Johnson County, Kansas: Court Administration Survey and Review of Computerization Plans in 10th Judicial District

This assignment comes from a newly-appointed Court Administrator, who wishes a general survey of court administration and review of plans to establish a real-time computer system in support of the District Court Clerk operation. A team of Gordon Allison and James Thomas will conduct site work in the last week of November.

No. 221 - Gwinnett County, Georgia: Management Review of Gwinnett County State Court

Since the request specified a study similar to that conducted last year in Cobb County Georgia, and since the requestor did not seem to fully understand what was involved in requesting technical assistance, the requestor was sent a copy of the Cobb County report to review for help in analyzing his needs. After this review the requestor and project staff will arrange for provision of the necessary assistance.

No. 222 - National Project: Task Force on LEAA Judicial Branch Grant Support and GMIS Reporting of "Courts" Funding

This study was mandated by LEAA in response to requests from the Conference of Chief Justices and from Congressional LEAA oversight committees for a precise accounting of LEAA support of state judicial branch activities from Fiscal Year 1972 - 1975. LEAA also requested that the study develop recommendations for improving its present GMIS system. A planning meeting of Team Members was held on October 16, and an Advisory Board Meeting on October 29. A work plan and methodology for an initial survey of 10 states was presented and approved at a second advisory board meeting on November 11. The timetable calls for completion of the initial 10-state study (New York, Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, Indiana, Illinois, Texas, Arizona, and Iowa) by early December. At that time a preliminary report will be presented to the Advisory Board and plans made for extending the study to 50 states, with a completion date anticipated in early Spring. Consultants on this assignment are: Peter Haynes, Harry Lawson, Ernest Short, Thomas Lehner, and Judge James Richards. The Advisory Board includes SPA, Chief Justice, State Court Administrator, Trial Judge, and LEAA representatives.

B. CHART OF REQUESTS RECEIVED

MARCH - OCTOBER 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
183	3/17/75	State of Mississippi IV	Development of Planning Strategy for SPA: Master Courts Plan and Standards and Goals Study	Tom Baynes Judge Reid Merritt Judge James Chenault Anthony Wilhoit National Center for State Courts Institute for Court Management National Clearinghouse				5/31/75 ●	6/23/75 ●	6/30/75 ●	\$5800. [est.]
184	3/17/75	State of Vermont I	Evaluation of New Criminal Code for SPA Pursuant to Legislature's Request	-----		WITHDRAWN					
185	3/28/75	State of Iowa V	Evaluation of Four Trial Court Administrator Positions Prior to SPA Funding	Charles Starrett S. Allen Friedman Gordon Allison L.M. Jacobs				4/24/75 ●	5/6/75 ●	5/28/75 ●	\$3742.
186	3/28/75	State of Maryland III	Recommendations for More Efficient Preparation of Appellate Briefs	T/A Project Staff				May, '75 ●	5/16/75 ●	5/24/75 ●	NO CHARGE



The American University  
CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
187	3/28/75	Jackson County (Pasca-goula) Mississippi IV	Recommendations for Improving the Administration and Services of the Jackson County Youth Court	Judge Rex Ruff James Dunlap Chris Perrin				5/20/75	6/3/75	6/12/75	\$1174.
188	3/28/75	Ventura County, California IX	Survey of Requirements for Word Processing System for Ventura County; Assistance in Developing RFP and Evaluating Proposals.	Ernest Short				7/2/75	7/7/75	7/11/75	\$2085.
189	3/27/75	Clark County (Springfield) Ohio V	Management Survey of Clark County, Ohio Court of Common Pleas	Clifford Kirsch				5/23/75	6/7/75	6/16/75	\$650.
190	4/5/75	State of West Virginia III	Development of RFP For Implementation Study Pursuant to Statewide Judicial Reorganization	Harry Lawson				5/23/75	6/3/75	6/10/75	\$1091.

The American University

CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
191	5/14/75	State of Alabama IV	Development of State Criminal Justice Information System and Relevant Legislation	Larry Polansky National Center for State Courts Fran Taillefer				10/75 0	8/18/75 (Partial) 0		\$2000. [Est.]
192	5/21/75	State of Kentucky IV	Planning for Statewide Court Reorganization	James Dunlap David Saari Larry Segal Harry Lawson				Oct. '75 0	10/10/75 0		\$4500. [Est.]
193	5/24/75.	State of Georgia IV	Evaluation of Eight Pilot Public Defender Offices in Georgia	NLADA: John Young John Delgado				5/31/75 0	8/4/75 0	10/16/75 0	\$1200. [Est.]
194	5/29/75	Leesville Louisiana VI	Calendaring and Management Study of 30th District Court of Louisiana	Gordon W. Allison Dennis E. Howard				10/16-17 1975 0			\$1850. [Est.]
195	6/9/75	Cuyahoga County, Ohio V	Security Study of Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas	Mike Bignell Kenneth Ricci				10/17/75 0			\$3500. [Est.]

The American University  
CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
196	6/23/75	Ventura County, California IX	Planning of Final Phase of County-wide Criminal Justice Information System Development	<u>National Center for State Courts</u> Joe Jordan				Oct. '75 •			\$3000 [Est.]
197	6/23/75	Cowlitz County, Washington X	County-wide Superior Court: Personnel & Facilities Study of Juvenile Department Operations	Rex Smith, Jr. Larry Siegel				8/14-15 1975 •	9/14/75 •		\$1847. [Est.]
198	6/23/75	State of South Carolina IV	Development of RFP for Statewide Prosecutor Information System Study	Tom Lumbard Robert Harra11				8/7/75 •	9/5/75 •	9/10/75 •	\$1189 [Est.]
166	7/9/74 REACTIVATED	State of North Carolina IV	Criminal Justice Information System Planning, Phase III: Selection of Systems Personnel	Larry Polansky Thomas Morrill				Sept. '75 •	Nov. 5, '75 •		\$1500 [Est.]

The American University  
 CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
199	7/25/75	State of Wyoming VIII	Planning for Development of Court Information System	Geoffrey Corbett				Aug. '75 0	9/10/75 0	9/22/75 0	\$1808. [Est.]
200	8/6/75	State of Utah VIII	Identification & Planning for Regional Court Information System	Geoffrey Corbett				Sept. '75 0	10/17/75 0	10/24/75 (letter report) 0	\$220. [Est.]
201	8/1/75	District of Columbia III	Evaluation of Operation of Model Courtroom/ D.C. Superior Court	National Clearing-house for Criminal Justice Planning & Architecture			Aug.-Nov. 1975 0				\$18,500. [Est.]

The American University  
 CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	CCST
202	9/8/75	State of Alaska X	Improvement of criminal case processing in State Court System	Ernest Friesen				9/24/75 0	10/14/75 0		\$2,847
203	9/19/75	State of Georgia IV	Planning Assist. to Gov. Comm. on Jud. Reorganization	Thomas Morrill				8/29/75 0	11/5/75 0		\$600 [Est.]
204	9/8/75	Owensboro, Kentucky IV	Analysis of Pre-trial Intervention Program	Bruce D. Beaudin J. Gordon Zaloom				10/7-8 1975 0	10/29/75 0		\$1,068
205	8/8/75	Salt Lake City, Utah VIII	Development of Court Reporting System for Municipal Court	Geoffrey Corbett				Aug.-Oct 0			\$3,000 [Est.]
206	9/30/75	State of Connecticut I	Dev. of Criteria & Procedures for Using Restitution As A Disposition Alternative	NCSC R. Hoffman J. Stathakis S. Conti R. Zaredo				10/15/75 0	10/22/75 0		\$2,406

The American University

CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
207	9/30/75	State of New Hampshire I	Handbook on Jud. Statistics Analysis for Court System Personnel	NCSC B. Popp M. Catter S. Conti				10/15/75 0	10/20/75 0		\$2,231
208	9/30/75	State of Massachusetts I	Dev. of Standard Case Reporting Form for "CHINS" Cases	NCSC D. Valluzzi S. Conti D. Maher				10/15/75 0	10/20/75 0		\$1304
209	10/7/75	State of Kentucky IV	Pub. Info. Program for Judicial Article Referendum	Robert Martin				0/10/75 0	10/16/75 0	10/27/75 0 (Letter Report)	\$358
210	8/15/75	District of Columbia III	Improvement of Operations of Citizens Complaint Center, U.S. Attorney's Office	David Austern Paul Rice			Oct-Jan 1975 0				\$8,000 [Est.]
211	8/20/75	New York County, New York II	Space Planning & Evaluation for N.Y. County D.A.'s Office	Larry Siegel			Sept-Dec 1975 0				\$4,000 [Est.]

The American University

CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
212	9/19/75	Baltimore, Maryland III	Improvement of Juvenile Records & Info. System: City Juvenile Services Agency & Juvenile Court		●						\$2,500 [Est.]
213	9/19/75	New York City, New York II	Assist in implementation of New Juror Utilization System		●						\$2,500 [Est.]
214	9/19/75	Wabash, Rice & Olmstead Counties, Minnesota V	Management & Case Processing in three Clerk of Court Offices		●						\$2,400 [Est.]
215	9/29/75	State of Tennessee IV	Orientation to Automated Info. Systems for Prosecutors & Judges	Thomas Morrill		Nov-Dec	●				\$850 [Est.]
216	9/29/75	Suffolk Co New York II	Technical Feasibility Study for Cable T.V. Arraignment System	E.H. Short Assoc. T. Florence W. Olsen		Nov-Dec 1975	●				\$2000 [Est.]

The American University  
 CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED.	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
217	9/30/75	State of Alaska X	Management Analysis of Statewide Prosecution System	NDA P. Trimble P. Healy C. Harward J. Johnson D. Bourland C. Hicks		Nov. 3-14, 1975					\$8,600 [Est.]
218	9/30/75	State of Kentucky IV	Development of Standard Case Files & Reporting Forms for Commonwealth Attorney Offices								\$1000 [Est.]
219	10/3/75	State of New Hampshire I	Assessment of Comm. Resources for Juv. Status Offenders	NCSC J. Leiding		Nov-Dec 1975					\$2,200 [Est.]
220	10/14/75	10th Jud. Dist. of Kansas VII	Survey of court admin. & review of computerization plan	Gordon Allison James Thomas		Nov. 28, 1975					\$1,000 [Est.]



The American University  
 CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Status as of: October 30, 1975

T/A #	DATE RECEIVED BY PROJECT	JURISDICTION	TECHNICAL AREA REQUESTED	CONSULTANTS ASSIGNED	PENDING	SCHEDULED	IN PROGRESS OR ON-SITE	SITE WORK COMPLETED	DRAFT REPORT RECEIVED	FINAL REPORT TO REGIONAL OFFICE	COST
221	10/20/75	Gwinnett, County Georgia IV	Management review of State Court operations		0						\$2,000 [Est.]
222	10/16/75	National	Task Force on LEAA Reporting of State Jud. Branch Grant Support & GMIS reporting of "Courts" funding	Peter Haynes Ernest Short James Richards Thomas Lehner Harry Lawson			10/75-3/76  0				\$30,000 [Est.]

V. SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ASSIGNMENTS (OCTOBER 30, 1975)

A. REGIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

	Pending	Scheduled	On-Site or In Progress	Completed	Terminated or Withdrawn	TOTAL
I	-	1	-	8	2	11
II	1	1	1	12	2	17
III	1	-	2	22	2	27
IV	2	1	-	40	5	48
V	1	-	-	25	2	28
VI	-	-	-	19	4	23
VII	-	1	-	10	2	13
VIII	-	-	1	14	2	17
IX	-	-	-	12	2	14
X	-	1	-	15	4	20
Multi-Region	-	-	1	3	-	4
TOTAL	5	5	5	180	27	222

B. CLIENT AGENCY (RECIPIENT) - NUMBER OF ASSIGNMENTS\* - ALL REGIONS

CLIENT AGENCY (RECIPIENT) OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	TOTAL ASSIGNMENTS ALL REGIONS
Statewide Court System	35
District, County, Tribal Council or Court of Common Pleas	30
State Planning Agency	26
Local Criminal Justice Planning Unit	18
Court of General Jurisdiction	15
Municipal Court	12
State Appellate Court	7
District Attorney or County Prosecutor	8
Statewide Public Defender	7
Legislative Councils	6
County Public Defender	5
Auxiliary Court Agency - Probation, etc.	4
Juvenile, Domestic Relations, Family Court	3
Attorney General	6
Local Judiciary Group - Bar Association, legal, civic volunteer group	4
Regional Criminal Justice Planning Unit	2
Justices of the Peace and Magistrate Courts	1

## CLIENT AGENCY (RECIPIENT) - NUMBER OF ASSIGNMENTS\* - ALL REGIONS

CLIENT AGENCY (RECIPIENT) OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE	TOTAL ASSIGNMENTS ALL REGIONS
Special Prosecutor	1
City Public Defender ---	1
Other	4
TOTAL	195
<p>* Does not include 27 requests which were terminated or withdrawn.</p>	

VI. FOLLOW-UP AND CLIENT EVALUATION RESULTS

C. SUBJECT AREA OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE\* - ALL REGIONS

SUBJECT AREA	NUMBER OF ASSIGNMENTS
Appellate Procedures	7
Architecture: Planning, Renovation, Construction	10
Architecture: Space Utilization	8
Calendaring	6
Code Revision	3
Computer Information System	15
Education/Training	2
Evaluation	19
Juror Utilization	5
Juvenile Court Services	3
Library Resources	2
Management Functions (Court, Prosecutor, Defender)	26
Personnel	6
Pilot Programs Analysis	2
Planning: Implementation	2
Planning: Program Design	9
Planning: Survey of Needs	20
Records: Management/Storage	8
Reorganization	16
Reporting & Transcribing	6
ROR/Pretrial Release	7
Security	4
Sentencing	1
Statistics	3
Training	1
Volunteer Programs	1
Other	3
TOTAL	195

\*Does not include 27 requests which were terminated or withdrawn.

### D. SCOPE OF ASSIGNMENT

SCOPE	NUMBER OF ASSIGNMENTS*
City & Multi-City	18
County	71
Multi-County	11
State	88
Tribal	3
National	2
Other	2
TOTAL	195

\*

Does not include 27 withdrawn or terminated assignments.

A. SUMMARY TABULATION OF CLIENT EVALUATIONS  
OF ACTIVITIES OF THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY  
CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

Responses as of OCTOBER 15, 1975

	<u>(1-2)</u> <u>Unsatisfactory</u>	<u>(3)</u> <u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>(4-5) Very</u> <u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Response</u>
You were kept adequately advised of the status of your request for assistance by the SPA and/or Regional LEAA office prior to contact by the Technical Assistance Project.	(21) 15.3%	(25) 18.3%	(91) 66.4%	137
Arrangements for the delivery of technical assistance were handled adequately by T/A project staff.	(2) 1.5%	(14) 10.2%	(121) 88.3%	137
The consultant appeared competent in his field and brought the necessary background and experience for dealing with the designated problem areas.	(4) 2.8%	(6) 4.3%	(130) 92.9%	140
The consultant dealt fully and adequately with the specific areas of requested assistance.	(5) 3.6%	(15) 10.8%	(119) 85.6%	139
Local staff and officials were aware of and involved in the technical assistance effort.	(5) 3.6%	(15) 10.9%	(118) 85.5%	138
The consultant's report was received within a reasonable period of time, in view of the scope of work involved.	(12) 8.8%	(18) 13.1%	(107) 78.1%	137
The report was clear and comprehensive, and provided a helpful guideline for further action.	(7) 5.2%	(16) 11.8%	(112) 83.0%	135
The consultant's recommendations were timely and practicable, and addressed specific local needs.	(10) 7.4%	(13) 9.5%	(113) 83.1%	136
Can the consultant's report be distributed to interested state and local agencies, universities, or court systems upon request?	YES: (109) 77.9%	NO: (20) 14.3%	N/A: (11) 7.8%	

TOTAL RESPONSES: 140



REGIONAL TABULATION OF CLIENT RESPONSES EVALUATING  
THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

AS OF: OCTOBER 15, 1975

Question 1: You were kept adequately advised of the status of your request for assistance by the SPA and/or Regional LIAA office prior to contact by the Technical Assistance Project.

CLIENT RATING	LEAA REGION										TOTAL RESPONSES
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
1-2 (Unsatis.)	(1) 20%	---	(4) 22.2%	(4) 14.3%	---	(4) 25%	(1) 9.1%	(2) 20%	---	(5) 33.5%	(27) 15.3%
3 (Satis.)	(2) 40%	(4) 40%	(2) 11.1%	(7) 25.0%	(1) 5.6%	(1) 6.3%	(1) 9.1%	(3) 30%	(4) 50%	---	(25) 18.3%
4-5 (Very Satis.)	(2) 40%	(6) 60%	(12) 66.7%	(17) 60.7%	(17) 94.4%	(11) 68.7%	(9) 81.8%	(5) 50%	(4) 50%	(5) 67.5%	(97) 66.4%
TOTALS	5	10	18	28	18	16	11	10	8	13	137

Question 2: Arrangements for the delivery of technical assistance were handled adequately by the Technical Assistance Project Staff

CLIENT RATING	LEAA REGION										TOTAL RESPONSES
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
1-2 (Unsatis.)	---	(1) 10%	---	---	---	(1) 6.3%	---	---	---	---	(2) 1.5%
3 (Satis.)	(2) 40%	(1) 10%	(1) 5.9%	(3) 10.3%	(1) 5.6%	(1) 6.3%	---	(2) 20%	(2) 25%	(3) 7.7%	(14) 10.2%
4-5 (Very Satis.)	(3) 60%	(8) 80%	(16) 94.1%	(26) 89.7%	(17) 94.4%	(14) 87.5%	(11) 100%	(8) 80%	(6) 75%	(2) 92.3%	(121) 88.3%
TOTALS	5	10	17	29	18	16	11	10	8	13	137

Question 3: The consultant appeared competent in his field and brought the necessary background and experience for dealing with the designated problem areas.

CLIENT RATING	LEAA REGION										TOTAL RESPONSES
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
1-2 (Unsatis.)	---	---	---	---	(1) 5.6%	(1) 6.3%	---	(1) 10%	(1) 12.5%	---	(4) 2.8%
3 (Satis.)	---	(1) 10%	(3) 15.8%	---	(1) 5.6%	(1) 6.3%	---	---	---	---	(6) 4.3%
4-5 (Very Satis.)	(5) 100%	(9) 90%	(16) 84.2%	(30) 100%	(16) 88.9%	(14) 87.5%	(11) 100%	(9) 90%	(7) 87.5%	(13) 100%	(33) 32.9%
TOTALS	5	10	19	30	18	16	11	10	8	13	40

Question 4: The consultant dealt fully and adequately with the specific areas of requested assistance.

CLIENT RATINGS	LEAA REGION										TOTAL RESPONSES
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
1-2 (Unsatis.)	---	---	(1) 5.3%	(1) 3.3%	(1) 5.5%	(1) 6.2%	---	---	(1) 12.5%	---	(5) 3.6%
3 (Satis.)	---	(3) 30%	(2) 10.5%	(1) 3.3%	(3) 16.7%	(2) 12.5%	(1) 10%	(1) 10%	---	(2) 16.7%	(15) 13.8%
4-5 (Very Satis.)	(5) 100%	(7) 70%	(16) 84.2%	(28) 93.3%	(14) 77.8%	(13) 81.3%	(10) 90%	(9) 90%	(7) 87.5%	(10) 83.3%	(119) 85.6%
TOTALS	5	10	19	30	18	16	11	10	8	12	139

Question 5: Local Staff and officials were aware of and involved in the technical assistance effort.

CLIENT RATING	LEAA REGION										TOTAL RESPONSES
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
1-2 (Unsatis.)	---	---	(2) 10.5%	---	---	---	(1) 10%	---	(1) 12.5%	(1) 7.7%	(5) 3.6%
3 (Satis.)	---	---	(2) 10.5%	(5) 16.7%	(1) 5.6%	(2) 12.5%	---	(4) 44.4%	---	(1) 7.7%	(15) 10.9%
4-5 (Very Satis.)	(5) 100%	(9) 100%	(15) 78.9%	(25) 83.3%	(17) 94.4%	(14) 87.5%	(10) 90%	(5) 55.6%	(7) 87.5%	(11) 84.6%	(113) 35.5%
TOTALS	5	9	19	30	18	16	11	9	8	13	138

Question 6: The consultant's report was received within a reasonable period of time, in view of the scope of the work involved.

CLIENT RATING	LEAA REGION										TOTAL RESPONSES
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
1-2 (Unsatis.)	---	---	(3) 15.8%	(5) 17.2%	(2) 11.1%	(1) 6.7%	---	(1) 11.1%	---	---	(12) 8.8%
3 (Satis.)	(2) 40%	---	(3) 15.8%	(4) 13.8%	(1) 5.6%	(2) 13.3%	---	(1) 11.1%	(2) 25%	(3) 23.1%	(18) 13.7%
4-5 (Very Satis.)	(3) 60%	(10) 100%	(13) 68.4%	(20) 69.0%	(15) 83.3%	(12) 80%	(11) 100%	(7) 77.8%	(6) 75%	(10) 75.9%	(107) 78.7%
TOTALS	5	10	19	29	18	15	11	9	8	13	137

Question 7: The report was clear and comprehensive and provided a helpful guideline for further action.

CLIENT RATING	LEAA REGION										TOTAL RESPONSES
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
1-2 (Unsatis.)	---	---	(1) 5.3%	(2) 6.9%	(1) 5.5%	(1) 6.7%	---	---	(1) 12.5%	(1) 7.7%	(7) 5.2%
3 (Satis.)	(2) 40%	(1) 10%	(2) 10.5%	(4) 13.8%	(3) 16.7%	(2) 13.3%	---	---	---	(2) 15.4%	(16) 11.8%
4-5 (Very Satis.)	(3) 60%	(9) 90%	(16) 84.2%	(23) 79.3%	(14) 77.8%	(12) 80%	(10) 100%	(8) 100%	(7) 87.5%	(10) 76.9%	(112) 83.0%
TOTALS	5	10	19	29	18	15	10	8	8	13	35

Question 8: The consultant's recommendations were timely and practicable and addressed specific local needs.

CLIENT RATING	LEAA REGION										TOTAL RESPONSES
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	
1-2 (Unsatis.)	---	---	(2) 10.5%	(3) 10%	(2) 11.8%	(1) 6.3%	---	---	(1) 12.5%	(1) 7.7%	(10) 7.4%
3 (Satis.)	(2) 40%	(2) 20%	(2) 10.5%	(3) 10%	(2) 11.8%	(1) 6.3%	---	---	---	(1) 7.7%	(13) 9.5%
4-5 (Very Satis.)	(3) 60%	(8) 80%	(15) 78.9%	(24) 80%	(13) 76.5%	(14) 87.5%	(10) 100%	(8) 100%	(7) 87.5%	(11) 84.6%	(113) 83.1%
TOTALS	5	10	19	30	17	16	10	8	8	13	136

B. ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION \*

ALL LEA REGIONS

NATURE OF RECOMMENDATION	TOTAL NUMBER OF RECOMMEND.	ACTION TAKEN				
		IMPLEMENT.	ACCEPTED & PASSED ON FOR IMPLEMENT.	UNDER CONSIDERATION	REJECTED	UNCOMMON
Administrative Procedure	105 (14.8%)	64 (61%)	2 (1.9%)	23 (21.9%)	13 (12.4%)	3 (2.9%)
Adopt New Program/Policy -- INTERNAL	95 (13.4%)	59 (62.1%)	4 (4.2%)	19 (20%)	8 (8.4%)	5 (5.3%)
Personnel	93 (13.1%)	54 (58.1%)	3 (3.2%)	21 (22.6%)	11 (11.8%)	4 (4.3%)
Additional Study/Development	83 (11.7%)	58 (69.9%)	---	13 (15.7%)	9 (10.8%)	3 (3.6%)
Construction/Expansion/Renovation of Existing Facilities	62 (8.7%)	41 (66.1%)	1 (1.6%)	9 (14.5%)	11 (17.7%)	---
Restructure Current Program/Policy/Office	54 (7.6%)	33 (61.1%)	1 (1.9%)	12 (22.2%)	5 (9.3%)	3 (5.6%)
Training/Education	31 (4.4%)	21 (67.7%)	1 (3.2%)	3 (9.7%)	5 (16.1%)	1 (3.2%)
Legislation	30 (4.2%)	13 (43.3%)	2 (6.7%)	7 (23.3%)	4 (13.3%)	4 (13.3%)
Fiscal/Material	29 (4.1%)	17 (58.6%)	---	9 (31%)	3 (10.3%)	---
Establish Supervisory Body/Commission	19 (2.7%)	11 (57.9%)	3 (15.8%)	1 (5.3%)	3 (15.8%)	1 (5.3%)
Consolidation	16 (2.3%)	9 (56.3%)	1 (6.3%)	2 (12.5%)	3 (18.8%)	1 (6.3%)
Increased Inter-Agency Coordination	15 (2.1%)	10 (66.7%)	---	3 (20%)	2 (13.3%)	---
Other	15 (2.1%)	11 (73.3%)	---	2 (13.3%)	2 (13.3%)	---
New Program-Statewide	14 (2%)	9 (64.3%)	2 (14.3%)	1 (7.1%)	2 (14.3%)	---
Expand Existing Program	13 (1.8%)	4 (30.8%)	2 (15.4%)	3 (23.1%)	4 (30.8%)	---
Continuation of Existing Plans/Programs	11 (1.6%)	9 (81.8%)	---	2 (18.2%)	---	---
Curtailment of Existing Program/Policy	7 (1%)	2 (28.6%)	---	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)	---
Court Rule	6 (.8%)	4 (66.7%)	---	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	---
Increased Coordination-Internal	6 (.8%)	3 (50%)	---	1 (16.7%)	---	2 (33.3%)
Establish Administrative Office/Structure	4 (.6%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	---	1 (25%)	---

\* INCLUDES RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN 146 ASSIGNMENTS WHICH HAVE HAD SIX-MONTH FOLLOW-UPS.

C. ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY SUBJECT AREA OF ASSIGNMENT

ALL IIG ASSIGNMENTS

SUBJECT AREA OF ASSIGNMENT*	ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATION				TOTAL
	IMPL.	ACCEPTED & PASSED ON FOR IMPL.	UNDER CONSIDERATION	REJECTED	
Personnel	(13) 43.3%	1	6	10	(30) 1.7%
Juror Utilization	(18) 94.7%	1	0	0	(19) 2.8%
Management Functions	(63) 69.2%	1	19	8	(91) 13.3%
Reorganization	(47) 68.1%	3	15	4	(67) 10.1%
Calendaring	(17) 85%	1	2	0	(20) 2.9%
Computer Information Systems	(35) 74.5%	0	12	0	(47) 6.9%
Reporting and Transcribing	(8) 32%	0	17	0	(25) 3.7%
Filing System	(3) 100%	0	0	0	(3) .4%
Records	(13) 68.4%	0	4	2	(19) 2.9%
Training	(3) 42.9%	0	4	0	(7) 1%
Education	(2) 18%	0	2	7	(11) 1.6%
Security	(4) 23.5%	0	3	10	(17) 2.5%
Architecture/Space	(19) 95%	1	0	0	(20) 2.9%
Architecture/Planning/Renovation/Construction	(26) 78.8%	0	3	4	(33) 4.8%
Evaluation/Design RFP's	(6) 100%	0	0	0	(6) .9%
Evaluation/Performance/Progress	(37) 62.7%	1	10	11	(59) 8.7%
Planning Program Design	(6) 42.9%	0	4	4	(14) 2%
Planning-Implementation	(8) 100%	0	0	0	(8) 1.2%
Planning/Survey of Needs	(34) 15.3%	5	24	32	(75) 11%
Code Revision	(6) 66.7%	0	1	2	(9) 1.3%
Pilot Program	(4) 57.1%	1	1	1	(7) 1%

\* INCLUDES FOLLOW-UP ON IIG ASSIGNMENTS.

ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS  
BY SUBJECT AREA OF ASSIGNMENT

PAGE 2

SUBJECT AREA OF ASSIGNMENT *	ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS				TOTAL
	IMPLEMENT.	ACCEPTED & PASSED ON FOR IMPLEMENT.	UNDER CONSIDERATION	REJECTED	
ROR/Pre-Trial Release	(21) 67.7%	6	3	1	(31) 4.5%
Library Resource	(4) 57.1%	0	1	2	(7) 1%
Juvenile Court Services	(3) 50%	0	2	1	(6) .9%
Appellate Procedures	(21) 61.8%	2	2	9	(34) 5%
Sentencing	(1) 100%	0	0	0	(1) .1%
Volunteer Programs	(6) 85.7%	0	1	0	(7) 1%
Evaluate Plan	(4) 80%	0	1	0	(5) .7%
Statistics	(2) 100%	0	0	0	(2) .3%
Total	(434) 63.6%	(23) 3.4%	(137) 20%	(88) 12.9%	(682) ** 100%

\* INCLUDES FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION ON 146 ASSIGNMENTS.

\*\* IN ADDITION THERE ARE 27 UNKNOWN ACTIONS TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS.

D. ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY TYPE OF CLIENT AGENCY  
ALL IJG ACTIONS

TYPE OF CLIENT AGENCY *	ACTION TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS				TOTALS
	INITIAL	ACCEPTED & PASSED ON	UNDER CONSIDERATION	REJECTED	
Local Criminal Justice Planning Unit	43 (59.7%)	2	16	11	72 (10.6%)
Regional Criminal Justice Planning Unit	4 (100%)	0	0	0	4 (.6%)
State Planning Agency	45 (60%)	5	11	14	75 (11%)
Statewide Court System	63 (57.8%)	6	34	6	109 (16%)
State Appellate Court	19 (51.4%)	2	7	9	37 (5.4%)
Court of General Jurisdiction	44 (74.6%)	1	11	3	59 (8.7%)
District County Court	59 (53.1%)	3	26	23	111 (16.3%)
Municipal Court	35 (72.9%)	1	4	8	48 (7%)
Juvenile Court	5 (55.5%)	0	4	0	9 (1.3%)
Justice of the Peace	4 (80%)	0	1	0	5 (.7%)
Attorney General Office	4 (57.1%)	0	1	2	7 (1%)
District Attorney Office	25 (83.3%)	0	5	0	30 (4.4%)
Special Prosecutor Office	1 (100%)	0	0	0	1 (.1%)
Statewide Public Defender Office	32 (80%)	1	4	3	40 (5.7%)
County Public Defender Office	18 (69.2%)	0	5	3	26 (3.8%)
City Public Defender Office	3 (50%)	1	1	1	6 (.8%)
Legislative Councils	11 (64.7%)	0	2	4	17 (2.5%)
Local Court-Related Groups	10 (76.9%)	0	3	0	13 (1.9%)
Auxiliary Court Agency	9 (69.2%)	1	2	1	13 (1.9%)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>434 (63.6%)</b>	<b>23 (3.4%)</b>	<b>137 (20%)</b>	<b>88 (12.9%)</b>	<b>682 (100%)</b>

\* INCLUDES FOLLOW-UP ON IJG ASSIGNMENTS.  
\*\* IN ADDITION THERE ARE 27 UNKNOWN ACTIONS TAKEN ON RECOMMENDATIONS.



E. REGIONAL COMPARISON OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED AND OF THOSE ACCEPTED AND PASSED ON FOR IMPLEMENTATION \*

	LEAA REGIONS										TOTALS
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	ALL REGIONS
COMBINATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS IMPLEMENTED & THOSE ACCEPTED & PASSED ON FOR IMPLEMENTATION	22 (84.6%)	31 (70.4%)	67 (62%)	86 (61.4%)	62 (55.9%)	47 (62.7%)	40 (95.2%)	35 (62.5%)	18 (42.9%)	49 (75.4%)	457 (64.5%)
TOTAL NUMBER OF RECOMMENDATIONS	26	44	108	140	111	75	42	56	42	65	709 (100%)

\* INCLUDES FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION ON 146 ASSIGNMENTS.

**END**

7. 26. 1953 / 10. 11. 1953