

METROPOLITAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER

RESEARCH PROJECT

BASELINE DATA OUTLINE

72-ND-99-0005

November 30, 1971



College of William and Mary

WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

34087

READING ROOM

~~72-NI-99-0005~~
METROPOLITAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE CENTER

RESEARCH PROJECT

BASELINE DATA OUTLINE

72-NI-99-0005

November 30, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction	1
II. Structure	3
III. Methodology Used	4
IV. Baseline Data	
A. Part I - Narrative Presentation	7
B. Part II - Statistical Presentation	13

Section I

Introduction

This document reflects the initial action of the Metropolitan Criminal Justice Center which is responsible for conducting a community-based criminal justice pilot program of the Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth and Virginia Beach cities of Virginia under Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's Grant Award NI72-005-G.

The purpose of the compilation of descriptive data and statistics referred to as baseline data is to provide an overview of the cities: criminal justice agencies; supporting or ancillary organizations; and statistical data required for future evaluation actions.

This document is intended to:

- 1) Outline the components of a baseline data system.
- 2) Identify those agencies that comprise the criminal justice system.
- 3) Identify those organizations that can be brought to bear in support of the criminal justice system.

Compilation of baseline data as outlined in this document will:

1) Describe those agencies that comprise the criminal justice system.

2) Describe those organizations that can be brought to bear in support of the criminal justice system.

3) Provide a basis for identifying possible problem areas in the criminal justice system.

4) Provide a basis for further discussion among criminal justice agencies and supporting organizations for the purpose of reducing crime and making the criminal justice system more responsive to the cities' needs.

5) Provide a descriptive flow of offender densities through the criminal justice system.

6) Provide those statistics which reflect an inventory of past and present workloads, manpower, available funding, populations, and community resources, and which will provide a benchmark for measuring future changes against, during post grant application evaluations.

7) Provide LEAA, other Pilot City teams, and other municipalities in the nation with a transferable model for systematic data collection, compilation and presentation.

Section II

Structure

The baseline data are organized in two sections. Section I contains data that lend themselves to narrative presentation while Section II is devoted to those statistics that can be portrayed in tabular or chart form. Where data gathered can be so oriented, trend depictions are included.

Data for each of the four cities are presented independently; however, a composite picture of the entire metropolitan area is presented where feasible.

The criminal justice system operates within, and is designed to serve, the community. Thus, it is influenced by and responsive to numerous elements peculiar to the community within which it operates. The baseline data therefore reflect the community as a total system, one portion of which is the criminal justice system.

Section III

Methodology Used

The goal of gathering statistics over a ten year period as a minimum was set. However, since the cities of Chesapeake and Virginia Beach were both incorporated in 1963 by consolidation actions, it will not be practical to portray meaningful and accurate data prior to this period. Preliminary investigation revealed that records of the governmental structure prior to 1963, where maintained, cannot be correlated with the existing structure. However, where any data elements for other periods are missing, careful extrapolation will be attempted to fill in all gaps thus providing a factual annual representation for comparison and trend analysis purposes.

Preliminary efforts of the research team in investigating the criminal justice operations of the four cities revealed that the police, courts and correctional agencies had been "studied to death" with few, if any, operational changes. In view of this, the research team decided that maximum use would be made of existing data reports or study results and the use of structured questionnaires would be minimized. Although this policy required the research team

to accomplish extensive file identification and sorting at both the local and state level of government it produced numerous side effects that proved beneficial, the most significant of which are:

a. Local governmental agencies, like any other big business which documents, files and retrieves information manually, require an effective indexing system. Several agencies quickly recognized their shortcomings in this area and have already initiated actions to correct the situation.

b. Duplication of effort exists in documentation, filing and retrieval where more than one governmental agency uses the same data. As this situation was experienced both at the local and state level, agreements were made for consolidation of efforts.

c. Much of the data were filed without any significant analysis. Several actions have been self-initiated by local and state governmental agencies to correct this situation.

d. Extensive contact with state level agencies was required to obtain a complete picture of data elements which originated in fragmented form at numerous local agencies. This action produced a successful rapport with state officials earlier than planned.

It was recognized early that verification of data would require personal interviews, especially where two or more reports which originated in the same agency reflected nonconsistency of facts. Application of this technique used on an exception basis was well received by all elements of the four cities with team acceptance and a high degree of cooperation experienced.

During the documentation of the baseline data outline, it is recognized that other elements, presently now known, should be included. As this occurs the outline will be so modified and detailed information included in the baseline document. Further, throughout the grant's term any additional data elements that are discovered and deemed to be pertinent will be incorporated into the baseline data. In such cases, special care will be taken to identify the time frame in which the addition took place. This act is necessary to insure that valid conclusions are drawn during any evaluation actions.

Section IV

Baseline Data

A. Part I - Narrative Presentation

1.0 Community

1.1 Government

- a. Type
- b. Criminal Justice Planning Activities
- c. Community Planning Activities
- d. Organizational Chart

1.2 Services and Agencies

a. Institutional Care

- 1. Group Home
- 2. Maternal and Child Health
- 3. Children and Youth
- 4. Shelter Care for Children in
Emergency

b. Counseling and Related Services

- 1. Adoption
- 2. Foster Family Care
- 3. Social Services for Families,
Children or Individuals
- 4. Under Stress
- 5. Social Services to Unmarried
Parents

6. School Adjustment
7. Counseling Youth - By Volunteers
Under Supervision
8. Vocational Counseling
9. School Health Services
10. Social Services to Unmarried
Parents
11. Emergency Financial and Supple-
mentary Aid
12. Family Planning Service
13. Social Rehabilitation - Group
14. Family Life Education
- c. Services to Atypical Child
 1. Rehabilitation Services
 2. Sheltered Employment
 3. Medical Clinic Services
 4. Special Education and Services
 5. School Adjustment
 6. Institutional Care

1.3 Grants

- a. LEAA funded
 1. Proposal
 2. Status
 3. Evaluation

- b. HEW funded
 - 1. Proposal
 - 2. Status
 - 3. Evaluation
- c. HUD funded
 - 1. Proposal
 - 2. Status
 - 3. Evaluation
- d. Funded by other sources
 - 1. Fund Source
 - 2. Proposal
 - 3. Status
 - 4. Evaluation

2.0 Criminal Justice System

2.1 Juvenile

- a. Community Counseling Service
 - 1. Court Intake
 - 2. Court Probation Counseling Service Unit
 - 3. Aftercare Services
- b. Detention Facilities
 - 1. Training Schools
 - 2. Detention Homes
 - 3. Probation Houses
 - 4. Halfway Houses

2.2 Law Enforcement

- a. Relationship to City Government
- b. Manpower Assignment by Function
- c. Budget Data by Function
- d. Established Minimum Personnel Standards
- e. Manpower Attrition Rate
- f. Education Attainment Profile
- g. Salary Schedule
- h. Estimate of Crime Related Activity vs. Other Public Service and Administration Activity
- i. Inter City Jurisdictional Agreements
- j. Existing Improvements Resulting from Previously Awarded LEAA Grants

2.3 Courts

- a. Organizations
 - 1. Organization Chart
 - 2. Identification, Duties and Responsibilities of Personnel
- b. Budget
 - 1. Amount
 - 2. Source

- 3. Allocation
- 4. Fiscal Period
- 5. Adequacy
- c. Jurisdiction
 - 1. Civil (general)
 - 2. Criminal (detail)
 - A. Level of Court (of record or not of record)
 - B. Concurrent, Exclusive and Appellate
- d. Terms of Court and Hours
 - 1. Days and Hours Court Convenes
 - 2. Office Hours
 - A. Judge Availability
 - B. Office Hours
 - C. Holidays and Court Vacation Periods
- e. Court Officer's and Offices - Descriptive
 - 1. Clerk's Office
 - 2. Prosecution Counsel
 - 3. Defense Counsel
 - 4. Probation Office

f. Criminal Practice and Procedure

1. Pre-Arrest Procedure
2. Pre-Trial Procedure
3. Trial Procedure
4. Pre-Sentencing Procedure
5. Sentencing Procedure
6. Post-Sentencing Procedure
7. Appeal Mechanism

2.4 Corrections

a. Facilities

1. Type
2. Capacity
3. Age

b. Budget

c. Manpower

1. Number by Function
2. Minimum Standards
3. Salary Schedule
4. Attrition

d. Offender Turnover

e. Services

1. Vocational
2. Rehabilitation
3. Recreation
4. Educational
5. Religious

B. Part II - Statistical Presentation

1.0 Social Characteristics

1.1 Population (1960-1970)

- a. Age/Race/Sex
- b. Mobility
- c. Residence (housing unit counts)

1.2 Welfare (1960-1970)

- a. Categories Receiving Support
- b. Portion of Population Receiving Aid
Age/Race/Sex
- c. Funding
 - 1. Federal
 - 2. State
 - 3. Local

2.0 Economic Characteristics

2.1 Income (1960-1970)

- a. Per Capita & Ratio to State Average
- b. Family Median & Ratio to State Average
- c. Source
- d. Minimum Recipients

2.2 Labor Resources (1960-1970)

- a. Work Force
- b. Wage Indices
- c. Work Residence
- d. Unemployment

2.3 Major Employment Sectors

- a. Manufacturing
- b. Retail Trade
- c. Wholesale Trade
- d. Services
- e. Agriculture
- f. Military

2.4 Local Finances (1960-1970)

- a. Real Estate
- b. Tangible Personal Property
- c. Merchants' Capital Tax
- d. Machinery and Tools
- e. Other Taxes

3.0 The Problem of Crime and Delinquency

3.1 Offenses Reported By:

- a. Type
- b. Time

3.2 Offenses Cleared by Arrests By:

- a. Type
- b. Time
- c. Offender

- 1. Age
- 2. Sex
- 3. Race
- 4. Percent Juvenile vs. Adults

3.3 Value of Property Stolen By Type

3.4 Value of Property Recovered By Type

3.5 Estimates of Unreported Crime By:

a. Type

b. Location

c. Victim Profile

d. Target Description or Motive

e. Reason for Not Reporting

4.0 Prosecution/Defense/Courts - Adults

4.1 Criminal Defendant and Caseload Statistics

a. Courts of Record

1. Cases Commenced, Concluded and
Pending Per Year

2. Jury Trial Law Actions

3. Felony Jury Trials

4. Misdemeanor Jury Trials

5. Jury Days Law Actions

6. Jury Days Felony Actions

7. Jury Days Misdemeanors

8. Interlocutory Decree Entered

9. Sentencing Statistics By Offense
and Offender

10. Appellate Statistics By Offense
and Offender Profile

b. Courts Not of Record.

1. Cases Commenced, Concluded and Pending Per Year
2. Jury Trial Law Actions
3. Felony Jury Trials
4. Misdemeanor Jury Trials
5. Jury Days Law Actions
6. Jury Days Felony Actions
7. Jury Days Misdemeanors
8. Interlocutory Decree Entered
9. Sentencing Statistics By Offense and Offender
10. Appellate Statistics By Offense and Offender Profile

c. Overall Disposition Statistics

1. Defendant is Convicted and Sentenced
2. Incompetent to Stand Trial
3. Transfer to Juvenile Court
4. Complainants Withdrew Their Charges
5. Released to Charges in Other Jurisdictions
6. Held for Another State and Released When Charges Dropped

7. Charges Dropped Owing to Plea
or Sentence on Another Charge
8. Charges Dropped Owing to Defendant's
Being in State or Federal Penitentiary
9. Case Dropped Because Companion Case
Acquitted
10. Charges Dropped on District Attorney
Motion (Insufficient Evidence)
11. Cases Still Open or Records Indicate
No Disposition or Closing Entry
12. Bench Warrants Issued for No Show
(Still Outstanding)
13. Death of Defendant
14. Defendant Receiving Psychiatric
Treatment (District Attorney Motion)
15. Acquitted or Vacated at Trial
16. Release to Military Authorities
17. Directed Verdict for Defendant
18. Promised Immunity for Testimony
19. Charges to be Refiled
20. Mistrial
21. Charges Dropped Because Defendant
In or Promises to Enter Narcotics
Treatment Program
22. Defendant Cannot Be Located

d. Court Commitments.

1. Felons Committed to the Virginia State Penal System By Court Committed From According to Race and Sex
2. Felons Confined in the Virginia State Penal System By Location of Court Committed From According to Race and Sex
3. Analysis of Misdemeanants Committed to the State Farm, Bland Farm, Correctional Field Units, Southampton Farm and State Farm for Women, By Location of Court Committed From According to Race
4. Repeaters Committed to the Virginia State Penal System According to Court Committed From and By Race and Sex

5.0 Prosecution/Defense/Courts - Juvenile Courts
Not of Record

5.1 Caseload Statistics

- a. Cases Disposed of By Juvenile Courts According to Type of Case and Race and Sex By Location

- b. Cases Disposed of By the Juvenile Courts for Delinquency and Traffic Violations According to Race and Sex
- c. Cases Disposed of By the Juvenile Courts According to Classification of Case By Location
- d. Disposition of Case
 - 1. Dismissed, Withdrawn or Not Processed
 - 2. Continued Generally
 - 3. Fine and/or Restitution Only
 - 4. Placed on Probation or Supervision
 - 5. Committed to Local Department of Welfare
 - 6. Committed to State Department of Welfare and Institutions
 - 7. Committed to Jail
 - 8. Other
- e. Location of Children Before Disposition
 - 1. Detention in Local Facilities By Sex/Race/Offense/Age
 - 2. Jail or Lock Up
 - 3. Own Home
 - 4. Other (temporary foster care, etc.)

6.0 Juveniles

6.1 Delinquency Rates

6.2 Community Counseling Service Units

a. Court Intake

b. Court Probation Counseling

c. Aftercare Services

d. Community Adjustment Services

6.3 Clinical Services

6.4 Volunteer Services

7.0 Corrections

7.1 Commitments to Local Confinement By:

Sex/Race/Offense

7.2 Commitments to State Confinement By:

Sex/Race/Offense

7.3 Recidivists Committed By:

Sex/Race