


The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System

Volume One Summary Report

43739
c1



National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U. S. Department of Justice



The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System

Volume One Summary Report

August 1978

National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U. S. Department of Justice



National Institute of Law Enforcement and
Criminal Justice
Blair G. Ewing, Acting Director

Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
James M.H. Gregg, Acting Administrator

This project was supported by Contract Number J-LEAA-035-74 awarded to the National Planning Association, Washington, D. C., by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended. 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 U. S. Department of Justice.

FOREWORD

The criminal justice system is a labor-intensive enterprise, vital to the nation and beset with manpower problems. One of the most recent attempts to help alleviate some of the problems was the National Manpower Survey. The Congressional mandate for this survey was written in 1973, the survey was begun in 1974 and completed last year.

This summary report deals with manpower requirements now and in the future. It reports on issues such as recruitment and turnover, especially as they relate to minorities and women. And it explores the various aspects of training and education.

The survey results do not provide final answers to all of the manpower issues. In particular, the assumptions built into the model for projecting manpower requirements may have to be modified in light of additional experience. Nevertheless, the Institute believes the study represents a significant advance in the tools available to deal with manpower problems. We hope it will be of value to the many hundreds of state and local officials who must plan for manpower needs.

Blair G. Ewing
Acting Director
National Institute of Law Enforcement
and Criminal Justice

PREFACE

This volume presents the major findings and recommendations of the National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System. The study was performed for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration by the National Planning Association, as prime contractor, in association with The American Institutes for Research and the Bureau of Social Science Research—all of Washington, D.C. It was conducted in response to a Congressional requirement, under the 1973 Crime Control Act, for a survey of personnel, training and education needs in the fields of law enforcement and criminal justice and of the adequacy of federal, state and local programs to meet these needs.

The study, initiated in July 1974, is based, in large part, on a comprehensive series of surveys of executives, agencies and of employees of state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, including both mail questionnaires and field visits, conducted between November 1975 and June 1976. An Interim Report, based on an initial analysis of the survey results, was submitted on June 30, 1976. In addition to the present Summary Report (Volume I), the detailed results of the study have been presented in the following reports:

Volume II, *Law Enforcement*, October 1976

Volume III, *Corrections*, November 1976

Volume IV, *Courts*, February 1977

Volume V, *Criminal Justice Education and Training* (2 Parts), November 1976

Volume VI, *Criminal Justice Manpower Planning*, December 1976

A special report, *Criminal Case Loads and Estimating Processing Time in General Trial Courts, Fiscal Year 1975*, was also completed in May 1977, as a supplement to the original study plan.

These reports are the joint product of a team of over 40 professional staff members and consultants, and of supporting research and administrative staff, of the three research organizations responsible for this study. These individuals came from diverse professional disciplines, including education, manpower and personnel research, economics, statistics, sociology, psychology and law, as well as from operational roles in law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. The NMS study group benefited from the advice and guidance of a ten-member Advisory Board, chaired by Dr. Donald Riddle, formerly President of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice of the City University of New York, and which included eminent leaders and academic experts in the fields of law enforcement and criminal justice and related disciplines. (A list of the NMS staff and Advisory Board members appears in Appendix A).

In addition, the National Manpower Survey consulted extensively with a wide range of criminal justice practitioners, technical experts and educators to obtain more specialized advice on various aspects of the study. A total of over 30 panel sessions or conferences were held for this purpose, ranging in scope from a broad review of major criminal justice issues and assessments of major training and education programs, to detailed technical reviews of the NMS manpower projection model and of the occupational analyses of key occupations.

This study would not have been possible without the active cooperation of some ten thousand executives and other officials of state and local law enforcement, correctional and court-related agencies throughout the country who took time from their busy schedules to respond to our detailed questionnaires or to meet with representatives of our

field analysis staff. The readiness of these officials to devote the necessary time to respond to this survey provides perhaps the best evidence of the importance of the many critical personnel, training and educational issues addressed.

Finally, we are especially appreciative of the advice, assistance and guidance provided to us by Sidney Epstein and Nick Pappas of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration who served as project monitors for the study. Their help was particularly valuable in arranging liaison with LEAA and state planning agency staffs, in facilitating clearance of our numerous survey instruments, and in providing access to a wide range of relevant research and data sources within the Federal Government.

* * *

In preparation of this Summary Report, I would like to express my appreciation particularly to Harry Greenspan, Frank McKernan and James Stinchcomb—all formerly associated with the NMS staff—for their review and comments on portions of this report; to Elizabeth Naden, who ably supervised the editing and production of the manuscript, and to Jacqueline Rupel and Lorraine Staliper, of our administrative and secretarial staff, who saw this document through to final copy. The undersigned must, however, be held solely accountable for any sins of omission or commission.

HAROLD WOOL
Director
National Manpower Survey

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
FOREWARD	iii
PREFACE	v
<i>Chapter</i>	
I. REPORT HIGHLIGHTS	1
A. The NMS Study Program	1
B. Current Personnel Needs and Resources	1
C. The Employment Outlook	3
D. Personnel Recruitment and Retention	4
E. Higher Education for Criminal Justice Personnel— The LEEP Program	5
F. Training for Law Enforcement and Correctional Occupations	6
G. Management Training and Education	7
H. Professional Education and Training for Judicial Process Occupations	8
I. Major Priority Recommendations	9
II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE NATIONAL MANPOWER SURVEY	11
A. Background	11
B. The Study Mandate	12
C. Scope of Surveys	12
D. Major Limitations	15
1. Limitations in scope	15
2. Evaluative data on criminal justice training and educational experiences	16
3. Data reliability	16
III. CURRENT PERSONNEL RESOURCES AND NEEDS	17
A. Employment Profile of the Criminal Justice System	17
1. Employment by sector	17
2. Summary employment trends	17
3. Police protection agencies	17
4. Judicial process agencies	22
5. Corrections	25
B. Criteria for Assessing Personnel Needs	28
C. Agency Manpower Needs: The Executive's Perspective	31
1. Major agency manpower problems	31
2. Estimated additional manpower needs	32
D. Analyses of Manpower Needs By Sector	34
1. Police agencies	34
2. Judicial process agencies	36
3. Corrections manpower	40
E. Conclusions On Manpower Needs	41
IV. THE EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK: MANPOWER PROJECTIONS TO 1985	44
A. Manpower Projections	44

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. The criminal justice manpower model	44
2. The NMS projection scenario	46
3. Criminal justice workloads and employment projections	47
4. Employment trends by sector	49
B. Manpower Implications	52
1. Decriminalization	53
2. Pre-trial diversion	54
3. Sentencing policy trends	55
4. Police agency organization trends	56
5. Court unification	58
6. Increased use of community-based correctional facilities	59
C. Conclusions On Manpower Outlook	61
V. PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION	64
A. Recent Recruitment and Retention Experience	64
1. Sworn police officers	65
2. Deputy sheriffs	66
3. Assistant prosecutors and defenders	66
4. Corrections personnel	68
B. Projected Recruitment Needs	70
C. Utilization of Minority Personnel and Women	71
D. Conclusions	77
VI. HIGHER EDUCATION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE PERSONNEL: THE LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION PROGRAM	79
A. The Issue of Educational Standards	79
1. Major commission recommendations	79
2. Occupational analysis findings	81
3. Empirical research findings	81
4. Police chief appraisals	82
5. Agency standards and practices	84
B. The LEEP Program	86
1. Program objectives and guidelines	86
2. Current LEEP issues	87
3. Impact of LEEP on educational attainment of crim- inal justice personnel	88
4. Qualitative assessment of criminal justice education programs	90
C. Implications of Future Manpower Trends	93
1. Employment trends	93
2. Trends in job functions and roles	93
3. Trends in educational attainment	93
D. Findings and Recommendations	94
1. Major findings	94
2. Recommendations	95
E. Conclusions On Educational Standards	96
VII. TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CORRECTIONAL OCCUPATIONS	97
A. Training for Law Enforcement Officers	97
1. Entry-level training	97
2. In-service training	100
3. Supervisory training	101
B. Line Personnel in Adult Corrections	101

<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Entry-level training	101
2. In-service training	103
C. Child Care Workers in Juvenile Institutions	104
1. Current status of training	104
2. Entry-level training	104
3. In-service training	105
D. Training for Probation and Parole Officers	106
1. Education and training needs	106
2. Current status of training	107
3. Entry-level training	107
4. In-service training	108
5. Major problem areas	108
E. Training of Correctional Supervisors	108
F. Overall Assessment: Major Findings and Recommendations	109
1. Findings	109
2. Recommendations	110
VIII. MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND EDUCATION	112
A. Management Roles and Responsibilities	112
B. Educational and Training Status of Executives	116
C. Current Management Training Programs	119
D. Summary and Recommendations	122
IX. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR JUDICIAL PROCESS OCCUPATIONS	124
A. The Role of Law Schools in Preparation for Criminal Justice Careers	124
B. Assistant Prosecutor and Defender Training	125
1. Background	125
2. Occupational analysis findings	126
3. Entry-level training programs	126
4. In-service training	127
5. Adequacy of staff training programs	128
C. Training for Chief Prosecutors and Defenders	129
D. Judicial Training	131
1. Judicial functions and training needs	131
2. Recent developments	131
3. Entry-level training	132
4. In-service judicial education	132
5. Training for lay judges	135
6. Current status of judicial education and training	135
E. Court Administration Training	136
1. The court administrator's role	136
2. Profile of court administrators	138
3. Professional education and training for court administrators ..	139
4. Findings on court administrator training	141
X. PRIORITIES FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AND FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANPOWER PLANNING	143
A. Priority Concepts	143
B. Priority Recommendations	144
1. Educational assistance programs	144
2. Training assistance programs	144
C. The Role of Criminal Justice Manpower Planning	145
APPENDIX A. NATIONAL MANPOWER SURVEY ORGANIZATION ..	149

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
II-1 NMS Survey Results	15
III-1 Employment in State and Local Criminal Justice Agencies, By Function, October 1974	19
III-2 Criminal Justice System Employment Growth, by Sector, Compared to Total Employment Growth in State and Local Governments, 1971-1974	19
III-3 Occupational Distribution of Sworn and Nonsworn Employees of State and Local Police Protection Agencies, October 1974	20
III-4 Occupational Distribution of Employees of Police Protection Agencies by Level of Government, October 1974	21
III-5 Comparison of Employment in State and Local Police Protection Agencies with Crime Rates, 1960-1974	22
III-6 State and Local Judicial Process Agencies: Number of Agencies and Employment, by Type of Agency, and Local Governments, 1974 ..	23
III-7 Occupational Distribution of Employees in State and Local Courts of General Jurisdiction by Size of Court, 1974-75	25
III-8 Occupational Distribution of Employees in Prosecution Agencies by Size of Agency, 1974	25
III-9 State and Local Correctional Employees, by Type of Agency, 1974 ..	26
III-10 Estimated Distribution of Full-Time Equivalent Employment in State and Local Correctional Activities, By Major Occupational Group, 1974	27
III-11 Indicators of Correctional Workloads for Adult and Juvenile Offenders, 1965-1974	27
III-12 Employment in State and Local Correctional Activities, 1965, 1974 ..	28
III-13 Executive Responses on "Most Serious Manpower Problem" and on "Major Factor Contributing to Most Serious Manpower Problem," by Type of Agency	32
III-14 Executives' Estimates of Increases in Agency Employment Needed to Effectively Fulfill All Agency Duties and Responsibilities	33
III-15 Full-Time Law Enforcement Employees Per 1,000 Population and Crime Rates, by Size of Group, 1974	34
III-16 Selected Court Caseload Statistics	36
III-17 Distribution of General Trial Courts by Months Needed to Process Felony Cases Pending at the End of FY 1975 and by the Felony Equivalent Caseload Per Judge-Year Devoted to Criminal Cases ...	37
III-18 Felony Cases and Felony Equivalent Cases per Prosecutor and Full-Time Equivalent Prosecutor, by Size of Agency, State and County Prosecution Agencies, 1975	38

<i>Table</i>		<i>Page</i>
III-19	Months to Process Felony Cases Pending at the End of Fiscal Year 1975 by Felony Equivalent Caseload Per Prosecutor	39
IV-1	The NMS Projection Model: Projections of Key Economic, Fiscal, and Demographic Variables, 1974-85	47
IV-2	The NMS Projection Model: Projections of Selected Criminal Justice Workload Indicators, Expenditures and Employment by Sector, 1974-85	48
IV-3	Projected Employment Growth in Selected State and Local Criminal Justice Occupations, 1974-85	49
IV-4	Current and Projected Corrections Employment by Level of Government and Function	51
IV-5	Changes in Arrest Policies for Specified Offenses and Effects on Number of Arrests, 1970-74, as Reported by Police Executives	53
IV-6	Percentage Change in Full-Time Equivalent Judicial Employment by Degree of Lower-Court Unification and Level of Government, 1971-74 .	59
IV-7	Responses by Correctional Executives on Current and Expected Use of Community-Based Facilities of Halfway Houses, 1975	60
V-1	Percent of Agency Executives Reporting Recruitment and Turnover Problems in Key Occupations During 1971-74	65
V-2	Hiring Rates and Voluntary Resignation Rates in Selected Occupations, Fiscal Year 1974	65
V-3	Years of Service with Agency of Assistant Prosecutors and Defenders, 1974	67
V-4	Executive Responses on Most Important Factor Contributing to Voluntary Resignations of Prosecutor and Defender Attorneys	68
V-5	Minimum Salaries for Assistant Prosecutors and Defenders, by Size of Agency, 1975	68
V-6	Percent of Correctional Administrators Reporting Recruitment and Retention Problems in Key Occupations, in Joint Commission Survey for 1967 and in National Manpower Survey for 1971-74	69
V-7	Estimated Annual Recruitment Needs in Selected Criminal Justice Occupations: Actual, Fiscal Year 1974; Projected, 1975-80, 1980-85 .	71
V-8	Employment of Blacks and Spanish-Americans, as Percent of all State and Local Law Enforcement Officers: Selected Years, 1960-1974	72
V-9	Percent of Minorities Employed in Line Custodial Positions in State and Local Correctional Institutions, Selected Years: 1960-74	72
V-10	Percent of Black Policemen and Detectives in City Police Agencies, 1974 Compared to Percent of Blacks in Total Urban Population, by LEAA Region and State	73
V-11	Blacks as Percent of Custodial Officers and of Inmate Populations in State Prisons for Selected States, by LEAA Region, 1973-74 ...	75
V-12	Percent of Women Employed as Law Enforcement Officers in State and Local Agencies, Selected Years: 1960-1970	77
V-13	Employment of Women in State and Local Police Agencies, by NMS Occupational Group: 1974	77
VI-1	Percentage of Sworn Law Enforcement Personnel with One or More Years of College, by Occupation and Years of Service in Present Agency, 1974	82
VI-2	Police Chief Appraisals of Performance of College-Educated and Non-College Educated Officers, 1975	83
VI-3	Percentages of Police Chiefs Rating College-Educated Officers as Superior to Non-College Officers, by Size of Agency	83

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
VI-4 Executives' Opinions on Overall Performance of College Educated and Non-College Educated Police Officers, by Age and Educational Attainment of Respondent, 1975	83
VI-5 Current Minimum Educational Standard for Entry into Line Police Officer and Custodial Officer Positions, by Type of Agency, 1975 ..	85
VI-6 Percent of Law Enforcement and Correctional Executives Reporting Use of Selected Policies to Encourage Continuing Education of Line Personnel, 1975	86
VI-7 Percent of Employees of State and Local Criminal Justice Agencies Who Had Received LEEP Assistance, by Sector, October 1974 ...	88
VI-8 Distribution by Sector of Criminal Justice System Personnel Who Have Received LEEP Support, October 1974	89
VI-9 Educational Attainment of Sworn Police Personnel, 1960-74	90
VI-10 College Degrees Earned by Two Entry Cohorts of Sworn Law Enforcement Officers During Comparable Periods Following Their Entry	90
VI-11 Total Criminal Justice-Related Courses and "Training-Type" Courses Offered by LEEP-Supported Institutions, by Field Emphasis of the Courses, Academic Year 1975-76	91
VI-12 Criminal Justice Faculty Members With at Least a Master's Degree at LEEP-Supported Institutions Compared with All Faculty Members at all Institutions, by Type of Institutions	92
VI-13 LEEP-Supported Institutions with Criminal Justice Programs That Have at Least One Full-Time Faculty Member, by Type of Institution, Academic Year 1975-76	92
VII-1 Sworn Law Enforcement Personnel Who Had Attended Police Academies by Size of Agency, 1975	98
VII-2 Police and Sheriffs' Agencies Providing Formal Entry-Level Training, by Type and Size of Agency, 1975	99
VII-3 Distribution of Hours of Formal Entry-Level Training Provided by Police and Sheriffs' Agencies to New Recruits, by Size and Type of Agency, 1975	100
VII-4 Estimated Percentage Distributions of Sworn Law Enforcement Officers, by the Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided, 1974-75	100
VII-5 Distribution of the Duration of Entry-Level Training for Adult Corrections Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975	102
VII-6 Percent Distribution of Juvenile Corrections Agencies by Extent of Provision of Entry-Level and In-Service Training and by Type of Agency, 1975	104
VII-7 Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided to Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers, by Size of Agency, 1975	105
VII-8 Training Provided to Probation and Parole Officers, by Type of Agency, 1975	107
VII-9 Overall Satisfaction of Executives of Law Enforcement and Correctional Agencies with Their Agency's Training Program, by Type of Agency	110
VIII-1 Most Frequent Problem Areas for Law Enforcement Executives ...	113
VIII-2 Most Frequent Problem Areas for Correctional Executives	113
VIII-3 Selected Characteristics of Law Enforcement and Correctional Executives, 1975	117
VIII-4 Percent of Police Chiefs Who Recommended Courses, and Percent Who Have Taken Courses, in Selected Law Enforcement and	

<i>Table</i>	<i>Page</i>
Management Subjects, 1975	118
VIII-5 Percent of Adult Corrections Executives Who Recommended Courses and Percent Who Had Taken Courses, in Selected Corrections and Management Subjects, 1975	118
VIII-6 "Most Needed" Additional Training Courses for Law Enforcement and Correctional Executives, Based on Differences Between Percentages Recommending and Percentages Who Have Taken Courses	119
VIII-7 Areas of Management Interest in the Collective Bargaining Process	121
IX-1 Assessment of Adequacy of Preparation of Law School Graduates by Heads of Prosecution/Defense Offices	125
IX-2 Percent of Prosecution Agencies Providing Formal Entry-Level Training for Assistant Prosecutors and Length of Training, by Agency Size, 1975	127
IX-3 Percent of Public Defender Agencies Providing Formal Entry-Level Training for Assistant Defenders and Length of Training, 1975	128
IX-4 Sources of Training Assistance for Prosecution and Defender Offices	128
IX-5 Overall Satisfaction of Chief Prosecutors and Defenders with Agency Training Program	129
IX-6 Recommended Specialized Courses and Actual Courses Taken by Chief Prosecutors, 1975	130
IX-7 Recommended Specialized Courses and Actual Courses Taken by Chief Defenders, 1975	131
IX-8 Number of States Providing Entry Training for New Judges, by Type of Court, 1975	132
IX-9 Number of States Providing In-Service Judicial Education by Type of Judge, and by Source of Training, 1976	133
IX-10 Responsibilities of Court Administrators, by Level and Type of Court Served and by Presence of Professional Staff	137
IX-11 Educational Attainment of Court Administrators by Level and Type of Court Served and by Presence of Professional Staff	138
IX-12 Recommendations of Court Administrators on Training Courses Especially Useful for Court Administrators	140
IX-13 Percent of Court Administrators Attending Training Programs, by Source	140

LIST OF CHARTS

<i>Chart</i>	<i>Page</i>
II-1 NMS Objectives	13
II-2 NMS Occupations	14
III-1 Total Employment in Protective Service and Criminal Justice Activities	18
III-2 "Most Important" Goals of Law Enforcement and Correctional Executives	30
IV-1 Key Factors Affecting Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Employment	45
VIII Training Courses Recommended by Criminal Justice Executives ...	114
VIII Training Courses Recommended by Probation and Parole Executives	115

CHAPTER 1. REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

A. The NMS Study Program

The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System was conducted in response to a requirement included in the 1973 Amendments to the Safe Streets Act which provided for a survey of "existing and future personnel needs of the Nation in the field of law enforcement and criminal justice and the adequacy of federal, state and local programs to meet such needs." Major study objectives were:

- To assess the adequacy of current personnel resources of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies and to project future manpower needs;
- To assess training and educational needs in law enforcement and criminal justice occupations, and the adequacy of existing training and educational programs in relation to these needs;
- To recommend priorities for allocation of LEAA funds for training and academic assistance;
- To design procedures for use in criminal justice manpower planning, including manpower projection models and data collection methods; and
- To identify any other needed changes in personnel policies and procedures to improve system performance.

The study incorporates findings based on an extensive data collection program, including:

- Comprehensive questionnaire surveys of about 8,000 executives of state and local agencies—police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors, public defenders, court administrators, wardens, juvenile corrections administrators and heads of probation and parole offices;
- A mail survey of over 1,600 state trial and appellate courts;
- A mail survey of over 250 law enforcement academies;
- An analysis of the results of a 1975 Census survey of nearly 50,000 employees of state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies;
- Field visits to more than 250 agencies and training or educational institutions.

In addition, the NMS study staff received valuable advice and assistance from its 10-member Advisory Board, from over 100 criminal justice officials and experts who participated in various panel groups, from

LEAA national office and regional staffs and from staff of state criminal justice planning agencies.

B. Current Personnel Needs and Resources

Nearly 1.0 million personnel were employed in state and local criminal justice agencies in 1974, the base year of the NMS assessment.

- Over 580,000 were employed in police protection agencies, of whom about 80 percent were sworn officers.
- Over 190,000 were in courts, prosecution and legal services, and indigent defense agencies, including about 28,000 judges and other judicial officers, about 21,000 prosecutors, assistant prosecutors and other attorneys in prosecution and legal services offices, and 4,000 defenders or assistant defenders.
- Nearly 220,000 were in corrections agencies, including about 70,000 correctional officers in adult facilities, 18,000 child care workers, 23,000 probation and parole officers, and 23,000 treatment and education specialists of all types.

Several approaches were used in assessing the adequacy of current agency staffing levels, including:

- Responses by agency executives to survey questions concerning the manpower needs of these agencies;
- Comparison of actual staffing ratios with those recommended by various study commissions or professional organizations; and
- Analysis of the relationship between agency staffing and measures of performance on work backlogs.

Based on responses of agency executives, an increase of 220,000 or 26 percent, in number of employees in state and local criminal justice agencies, other than courts, was needed to enable them to fulfill all agency responsibilities effectively in 1975.

- Among the major agency categories, the largest relative personnel shortages were reported by probation and parole administrators and by sheriffs; the smallest, by administrators of juvenile corrections agencies.
- Smaller agencies generally reported higher relative requirements for additional personnel than did larger agencies. However, heads of large police depart-

ments, with 1,000 or more employees, also reported a need for large percentage increases in staff.

Wide inter-city differences in the ratio of police employees to population served were found to be explainable only in part by differences in crime-related workloads.

- Police employment ratios in larger cities (100,000 to 1 million population) were found to be partially correlated with differences in robbery rates among these cities. In smaller cities, per capita tax levels were found to be more important in explaining inter-city differences in police staffing than were crime-related factors.
- Higher levels of police staffing have, moreover, not been consistently associated with improved performance, in terms of crime reduction or clearance rates. A number of studies, based on data for states or larger cities, have indicated positive results; other research has been inconclusive in this respect.
- Although increases in police staffing are probably fully justifiable in many growing or less affluent communities, the limited correlations among police staffing, crime rates, and police performance suggest that, in other communities, improvements in deployment and utilization of existing resources, combined with more active citizen involvement and support, may be as important in improving overall police performance as additional increments of police manpower.

In state trial courts surveyed by the NMS, criminal case delay problems were found to be associated both with inadequate judicial staffing and with court management and procedural policies.

- For courts with 100 or more felony filings in 1975, felony backlogs at end 1975 corresponded to a 4.4 month case delay period in courts where judges handled 200-399 felony equivalent cases per year, as compared to 7.1 months, where the caseload per judge-year was 1,000 or more.
- The proportion of cases disposed of by plea bargaining was found to be significantly higher in courts with high criminal caseloads per judge.
- However, factors such as observance of strict continuance policies, greater degree of court unification and effective speedy trial laws were also found to be associated with shorter case delay.

In prosecution agencies, criminal caseloads per full-time prosecutor were found to be nearly twice as great in the larger agencies, with 10 or more employees, as in offices with less than 5 employees.

- High criminal caseloads per prosecutor (300 or more per full-time equivalent prosecutor) were found to be associated with a significantly longer average

court case delay than in jurisdictions where prosecutor caseloads were substantially lower, based on a matched survey of prosecutor and courts data for 188 jurisdictions.

Estimates of additional manpower needs of public defender agencies were found to differ widely, depending upon the criteria used.

- These ranged from an increase of only 18 percent, based on public defender estimates of the number of additional staff attorneys needed to "fully comply" with recent Supreme Court decisions, to as much as a six-fold increase, based on full provision of defender services to all individuals charged with felonies, misdemeanors or juvenile offenses, whether through defender agencies or assigned counsel systems.

In corrections agencies, comparisons of actual staffing ratios in key occupations with those proposed by various national commissions or professional associations indicate major deficits of probation and parole officers and of treatment and educational staffs in prisons and local jails.

- Only about one-half of state prison systems met the American Correctional Association staffing standard for social workers; about one-fourth, for psychiatrists, and only about 10 percent, for psychologists, in 1974; whereas 60 percent met or exceeded a ratio of one custodial officer per six inmates, originally proposed by the President's Crime Commission in 1967. Prison wardens responding to the NMS survey in 1975 also reported a much higher relative shortage of treatment staff than of custodial officers.
- Among probation and parole officers surveyed, only 28 percent met the ACA standard of 50 case units per officer. Caseloads ranged from a median of 42 per month for adult parole agencies and 62 for juvenile agencies to 161 for adult probation agencies.
- Staffing ratios in most state juvenile institutions in 1975, on the other hand, generally met or exceeded professionally recommended standards, in part because of the substantial recent declines in inmate populations. Juvenile corrections administrators also reported substantially lower needs for additional manpower than any other category of agency executive.

Conclusions

1. The composite survey evidence tends to support a need for selective increases of personnel in most categories of criminal justice agencies, other than juvenile corrections institutions, in order to enable them to fulfill all their assigned responsibilities and

workloads—particularly for additional judges, prosecutors and defenders, and for additional treatment and caseworker personnel in correctional activities.

2. However, provision of additional resources alone—in the absence of other needed policy or organizational improvements—will not necessarily contribute materially or efficiently to the ultimate national objectives of crime reduction and improvement in the quality of justice.

C. The Employment Outlook

Overall employment growth in state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies is expected to be considerably slower between 1974 and 1985 than during the early 1970's, as the combined result of a projected slowdown in crime rates and of tighter state and local government budgets.

- The crime rate, as measured by the FBI index for Part I offenses, is expected to experience a relatively slow net growth between 1974 and 1980 and to decline significantly between 1980 and 1985 as a result of: (1) a projected reduction in the youth population; (2) increased population decentralization; and (3) a projected reduction in unemployment rates.
- Criminal justice expenditures and employment growth will also be checked by the more limited increase in state and local government expenditures projected for 1974-1980, as a result of the recent economic recession.
- Although "full-time equivalent" employment in criminal justice activities is projected to grow by nearly 400,000 or 43 percent between 1974 and 1985, the projected annual growth rate, of about 3 percent, will thus be substantially below the average annual increase of about .5 percent, experienced between 1971 and 1974.

Employment growth rates between 1974 and 1985 are projected to be substantially greater in the courts and correctional sectors than in law enforcement.

- Police protection agencies are expected to increase their staffs by about 180,000, or 33 percent, between 1974 and 1985, in full-time equivalents, but their share of total criminal justice employment will decline from about 59 percent to 55 percent over this period. More rapid employment growth is projected for state and county agencies, than for city police departments.
- Prosecution and public indigent defense agencies are expected to experience the most rapid growth rates—of 71 percent and 91 percent, respectively.
- Total employment in state and local courts will in-

crease by 54 percent, with much more rapid growth for general jurisdiction courts than for courts of limited or special jurisdiction.

- Overall employment in corrections activities is projected to increase by 62 percent, but with very divergent growth trends for different agency categories. The most rapid employment growth is projected for probation and parole agencies and in locally based juvenile institutions in contrast to a projected employment decline in state juvenile institutions. Employment in adult correctional institutions is expected to increase by 58 percent as a result of a projected trend towards increased imprisonment of some categories of offenders.

Employment growth will be more rapid in the professional, technical and administrative occupations than in the "line" law enforcement occupations.

- In police agencies, the number of non-sworn personnel is expected to increase by 53 percent, as compared to a projected increase of 28 percent in sworn officer employment, as a result of the continued trend towards increased use of civilians in administrative and technical positions.
- Employment of non-judicial personnel in general jurisdiction and appellate courts is expected to grow more than twice as rapidly as judges, reflecting increased requirements for administrative and technical support personnel.
- Staff attorneys in prosecution and indigent defense agencies, and probation and parole officers, will also experience relatively rapid employment growth.
- Child care workers in juvenile institutions are expected to experience very limited employment growth, as a result of the projected continued trends towards deinstitutionalization and the use of community-based programs.

Analysis of a number of major recent trends or developments in the criminal justice system indicates that they will have mixed impacts upon agency manpower requirements.

- The trend towards decriminalization of certain victimless offenses, such as public drunkenness, has apparently had limited impact upon police and prosecution manpower needs, based on executive responses.
- Formal pre-trial diversion programs were reported by about one-third of probation and parole agencies and about two-fifths of the prosecutors. Workload impacts were also reported to be limited. These programs may have contributed, however, to the declining trend in juvenile institutional populations.
- The impacts of the trend towards determinate, and to

mandatory minimum sentences, upon manpower needs cannot yet be determined, but these trends are likely to entail more manpower for both correctional and courts agencies, with a probable reduction in parole agency workloads.

- An increase in court unification is likely to result in economies in judicial manpower by reducing or eliminating various limited or special jurisdiction courts, but may require increases in support personnel in higher level courts and court administrative agencies.
- Increased reliance upon community-based programs, primarily for juvenile offenders, is a significant factor contributing to a projected reduction in employment in state training institutions, and has also tended to shift some of the correctional employment from the public to the private sector.

The above manpower assessments and projections are necessarily subject to considerable margins of uncertainty because of the limited historical data base available and the need to make numerous assumptions concerning both future criminal justice system trends and broader economic or social trends.

- A detailed methodology for use in periodic updating of the NMS projections has been prepared, which will allow incorporation of revised policy assumptions and new data, as they develop.

D. Personnel Recruitment and Retention

Relatively high personnel turnover rates, as well as difficulties in recruiting qualified applicants, had been experienced by many criminal justice agencies during the early 1970's—prior to the recent economic recession.

- Personnel turnover (quit) rates were particularly high for assistant prosecutors and defenders, child care workers, correctional officers, and law enforcement officers in small departments; they were relatively low for police officers in large and medium-sized departments and for probation and parole officers.
- Recruitment difficulties in the early 1970's were reported by nearly one-half of the chiefs of small police and sheriff's agencies, by over 40 percent of the wardens (with respect to correctional officers) and by one-fourth of the prosecutor agencies.

Personnel turnover and recruitment problems were, however, greatly reduced by 1975, as a result of the economic recession.

- NMS survey results and field interviews in late 1975 indicated that quit rates had dropped sharply and that sufficient applicants were available for most categories of positions.

Annual recruitment requirements for most line criminal justice occupations are projected to be substantially lower during 1975–80, than in 1974, due to continued low turnover and reduced employment growth.

- Relatively sharp reductions are projected for sworn law enforcement officers, correctional officers and child care workers; smaller reductions for assistant prosecutors and defenders.
- If general labor market conditions improve in the early 1980's, as anticipated, turnover and recruitment rates will increase significantly, but could still remain below 1974 levels in most occupations, other than assistant prosecutors and defenders.

Employment of minority personnel in police officer and correctional officer positions increased in the early 1970's, but still remains below the ratios of minorities in the populations served by these two occupations.

- For law enforcement officers, the lowest proportions of blacks were in state or county agencies. The greatest disparities, in relation to overall population ratios, were in LEAA Regions IV and VI, which include most of the Southern states.
- Among 17 state prison systems with large proportions of black inmates, only 5 states reported proportions of black correctional officers which were one-half or more of the corresponding black inmate ratios.
- At the executive level, representation of blacks or other minorities was found to be negligible among police chiefs and sheriffs (1 percent or less), but substantially higher among heads of correctional agencies.
- Continuation of recent minority recruitment ratios for blacks and Spanish-Americans would increase the minority share of total law enforcement officer positions from 9.3 percent in 1974 to 13 percent in 1985—still substantially below their projected overall population ratio of 17.6 percent in 1985.

Utilization of women in police officer positions has grown only slightly—from about 2 percent in 1960 to 3 percent in 1974.

- Women police officers continue to be disproportionately concentrated in support-type positions rather than in line activities.

Conclusions

1. The outlook is for lower levels of recruitment in most criminal justice occupations in the next five years than in the early 1970's, hence resulting in a reduced volume but increased quality of entry level personnel.
2. However, if labor market conditions substantially improve, personnel turnover will again increase, with

attendant costs and problems for criminal justice agencies. Concerted efforts to upgrade status of criminal justice jobs, for example—through job enlargement and career development programs—should be encouraged.

3. Criminal justice agencies—particularly state and county police and sheriffs departments—have seriously lagged in minority recruitment and have made limited progress in utilization of women in line positions.

E. Higher Education for Criminal Justice Personnel—The LEEP Program

Over \$40 million per year has been expended by LEAA in recent years for academic assistance for criminal justice personnel, mainly through the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP).

- A basic premise of the program is that higher education for law enforcement and other line personnel is a necessary condition for upgrading their performance and for improving the responsiveness of the system.
- A number of guidelines, issued by LEAA, establish a sequence of priorities for LEEP eligibility, as well as certain criteria for institutional qualification, in terms of program content, faculty qualifications and faculty-student ratios.

NMS assessments have not confirmed the need for mass higher education for all line law enforcement or correctional officers, but do support the need for a more selective program of support for continuing education, to meet career development needs at the supervisory and managerial levels and to strengthen the system's resources for research, development, evaluation and training.

- Occupational analysis studies, based on ratings of skill and knowledge needs for specific police officer tasks, failed to identify any major task of the basic patrol officer which necessitated a college-level educational background, as contrasted to a significant number of line supervisory or managerial tasks, requiring such training.
- A review of available research findings designed to relate education—and other attributes—to police performance, or police attitudes, similarly provided limited evidence of superior performance by college-educated officers.
- Police chief responses to NMS queries concerning relative performance of college-educated officers were quite mixed, and appeared to be highly conditioned by the respondent's own educational background. Of seven performance criteria, college educated officers were rated as superior by a plurality of respondents in "handling of paperwork,"

"dealing with juveniles" and "achieving promotions."

- Only about 5 percent of police agencies responding required completion of one or more years of college as an entry standard for police recruits.
- Nevertheless, police chiefs and sheriffs—as well as heads of correctional agencies—strongly endorsed continuing education for in-service personnel—and reported a variety of inducements, ranging from adjustment of work schedules to provision of increased pay based on college credits or degrees.

The LEEP program appears to have significantly contributed to a sharp recent growth in college-educated police officers.

- Over 80 percent of LEEP assistance has been given to law enforcement employees, although they account for less than half of total criminal justice personnel. About one-fourth of all law enforcement and probation and parole officers received some LEEP assistance, as compared to 14 percent of correctional personnel.
- This has in turn contributed to a particularly rapid recent growth in the proportion of police officers with one or more years of college education—from 20 percent in 1960 and 32 percent in 1970 to 46 percent in 1974.
- Since this trend was influenced by a number of other factors, including the GI Bill and general labor market trends, the net effect of LEEP cannot be clearly isolated.

The quality of much of the LEEP-funded education appears to be seriously deficient, however, even when related to LEAA's own modest standards.

- At least 15 percent of all LEEP-funded courses were narrowly training-oriented, e.g., procedures, traffic control, polygraph or report writing. This was particularly true of the two year college programs.
- Only 77 percent of LEEP faculty, and 60 percent of those in the two year colleges, had any advanced degrees, as compared to 93 percent of all college and university faculty.
- Only 73 percent of all LEEP-funded programs had even one full-time faculty member in the 1975-76 academic year.
- Less than one-half apparently satisfied the LEAA guideline of one full-time equivalent faculty member per 60 full-time equivalent students.
- Other qualitative problems, not equally amenable to statistical documentation, have included lack of adequate academic performance standards and lack of adequate integration between two-year and four-year college programs.

Projected criminal justice manpower trends will re-

duce the need for academic assistance for basic line personnel, but are expected to increase educational demands for managerial positions and in the corrections and courts sector.

- Employment will grow much more rapidly in the latter sectors, as well as for non-sworn police positions, indicating a need to achieve better balance in LEEP recipients and in curriculum offerings.
- A continued sharp increase in the proportion of police officers with at least one year of college is projected—from 46 percent in 1974 to 75 percent by 1985—due in large part to rapid growth in the proportion of new recruits with some college work. This will further reduce the need for academic assistance programs at the freshman/sophomore levels.
- There will, however, continue to be a considerable “educational generation gap” in many police forces, as illustrated by the fact that in 1974, only 28 percent of officers in managerial-level positions had completed two years of college, as compared to over 40 percent of all patrol officers and sergeants.
- Demands upon executives and other managerial-level personnel are also becoming more sophisticated as a result of growing pressures for fiscal performance and accountability, recent court decisions and the growth of public sector unionism.

Major LEEP Recommendations:

1. Upgrade and enforce qualitative standards of LEEP programs, working with appropriate accrediting organizations.
2. Assign priority for LEEP funding to advanced undergraduate and graduate-level programs; phase out aid for first two years.
3. Place greater emphasis on assistance to correctional and court-agency personnel by requiring better balance in course offerings.
4. Initiate programs of grants to assist both highly qualified in-service personnel and pre-service personnel enrolled in full-time graduate programs in crime-related or management fields.

F. Training for Law Enforcement and Correctional Occupations

Although formal entry training was provided by nearly all police or sheriffs' agencies with 25 or more employees in 1975, and by nearly all state adult correctional agencies, substantial proportions of the small police and sheriffs' agencies, and larger proportions of juvenile corrections and probation or parole offices, still provided no formal entry training to their line staff.

- Among law enforcement agencies with less than 25 employees, 31 percent of the police departments and

22 percent of the sheriffs' agencies provided no formal entry-level training to new recruits. State or regional academies were used by a majority of the smaller agencies which did provide training.

- Nearly one-half of all juvenile agencies, and over 40 percent of probation and parole agencies, provided no formal entry training to their line staffs.

A large proportion of entry-training programs in these occupations were shorter in length than the minimum standards recommended by the National Advisory Commission.

- Recruit training courses for police and sheriffs were less than the recommended minimum of 400 hours in agencies accounting for about two-fifths of law enforcement employment. Only one-fourth of programs for agencies in the smallest size group met this standard.
- Over one-half of the programs for adult corrections were less than 100 academic hours.
- Entry-training courses for child care workers averaged about 30 hours; less than one-fourth were in excess of 40 hours.
- About 55 percent of probation and parole agencies reported entry-training programs of 40 hours or less; only about 20 percent exceeded 100 hours.

Although most agencies provided some formal in-service training for experienced personnel, the proportion of employees receiving such training in 1975 was very small in the case of most police and adult corrections agencies; much larger, for juvenile corrections and probation and parole staffs.

- Over 90 percent of the police and sheriffs' agencies reported that less than one-fourth of their officers had attended an in-service course in 1975. Only 36 percent of all sworn officers reported that they had ever taken a specialized course, other than recruit training, based on the 1975 Census personnel survey.
- Less than 10 percent of state correctional officers had attended an in-service course in 1975.
- In contrast, juvenile corrections and probation/parole agencies reported that, where in-service training was provided, a large proportion of their staffs had participated in 1975.

Training courses of both law enforcement officers and of correctional officers place primary emphasis on procedures and on technical skills; relatively little emphasis on human relations aspects.

- Only about 7 percent of course time in law enforcement academy recruit training courses was allocated to “human values and problems,” (e.g., community relations, juvenile delinquency, minority relations, crisis intervention), as compared to the 22

percent recommended by the National Advisory Commission for these subjects.

- Subjects such as inmate-staff relations, inmate rights and race relations similarly received much less emphasis than custodial and security procedures, in courses for adult corrections officers.

Law enforcement academy training methods and faculty resources were found to be in need of substantial upgrading.

- The formal lecture method continues to be the primary mode of instruction for nearly all classroom subjects, with very limited use of individualized training or other more innovative methods.
- Field training was included in the recruit training curriculum in only 36 percent of the academies responding to the NASDLET survey, despite strong emphasis on the need for such training by police training experts.
- Nearly 80 percent of academy faculties consisted of part-time instructors, many of whom are inadequately prepared for non-procedural subjects.
- About one-half of the surveyed academies reported recruit class sizes in excess of the maximum of 25, recommended by the National Advisory Commission.

Supervisory training—although strongly endorsed by most executives—was required by only a small proportion of law enforcement and correctional agencies.

- Mandatory supervisory training was recommended by the National Advisory Commission; its importance was also confirmed by NMS analyses of supervisory tasks and knowledge requirements.
- However, only 37 percent of the police agencies, 29 percent of the sheriffs' agencies and about one-tenth of the correctional agencies surveyed by the NMS required that newly appointed supervisors take such courses, either before or shortly after assuming their duties.

Conclusions

1. Major gaps in provision of training to line law enforcement and correctional personnel include—

- Continued absence of any provision for formal entry level training in large proportions of juvenile corrections, probation and parole, and small police or sheriffs' agencies.
- Inadequate participation of line law enforcement and correctional officers in in-service training.
- Limited requirements for supervisory training, particularly for correctional officers.

2. Qualitative inadequacies in existing training programs include—

- Insufficient course lengths, as compared to the minimum standards recommended by the National Advisory Commission.
- Inadequate coverage of "human relations" aspects of the law enforcement and correctional officer roles.
- Excessive reliance on traditional lecture methods and on part-time faculty in academy programs.

G. Management Training and Education

Increased emphasis on scientific management methods and on accountability for use of resources, as well as the growth of unionism among both police and correctional employees, have highlighted the importance of systematic management training programs for criminal justice executives.

- Courses in administration, personnel management, budget and community relations were among the subjects most frequently recommended by incumbent executives as important for newly appointed heads of police and correctional agencies.

Although nearly all executives of law enforcement and corrections agencies reported having taken some specialized training in their respective fields, substantial proportions had not been specifically trained for their management duties, either in formal degree programs or in special management training courses.

- Only about one-fourth of police chiefs in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population, and one-fifth of sheriffs in agencies with 10 or more employees, were college graduates in 1975. Among correctional executives, the percentages of college graduates ranged from 63 percent in adult institutions to 91 percent in juvenile agencies.
- Based on comparisons of executives' training recommendations with their own training background, courses in budgeting, planning and evaluation were consistently identified as the "most needed" training for all categories of executives. Other key areas of management training deficiencies, based on this criterion, included training in personnel management and community relations for law enforcement executives; in facility management and community resource development for correctional institution executives; and in community relations and use of community resources, for probation and parole office heads.

Although a considerable variety of separate management training and education courses are available, many of these programs are too fragmented, too short and too specialized or—when university sponsored—are too theoretical in approach.

- Few courses are addressed to such basic management responsibilities as problem identification and establishment of management priorities, or are designed to strengthen leadership skills.
- The effort to adapt courses to the limited time availability of most executives has resulted in a proliferation of short orientation courses on special subjects, which lack integration or continuity.

Major recommendations for LEAA assistance in management training, include: (1) planning and development of comprehensive management training and education programs for criminal justice executives; and (2) establishment of regional centers for provision of management training programs to all categories of criminal justice executives.

H. Professional Education and Training for Judicial Process Occupations

Undergraduate law school courses provide an inadequate preparation for legal practice in the criminal justice system—whether in prosecution or defender agencies or in judicial roles.

- Despite some increase in course offerings, criminal justice courses accounted for only 6.8 percent of total law school offerings in 1975. Only about one-third of the law schools offered advanced courses or seminars.
- Course emphasis is on broad principles and on development of analytical skills, with very limited coverage of procedural and institutional aspects of criminal law practice.
- About seven out of ten chief prosecutors and defenders considered law school graduates inadequately prepared in procedural and trial advocacy skills.
- Clinical law programs are designed to partially compensate for these limitations, but only about one-fifth of recent graduates have completed such programs.

Nearly one-half of all prosecution and public defender agencies surveyed by NMS offered no formal entry training, other than brief orientations, to newly hired staff attorneys.

- Despite considerable recent growth in national and state-level training programs, 47 percent of both prosecutor and defender offices reported no formal entry training other than basic orientations of one day or less for newly appointed assistants.
- Availability of formal entry training varied with agency size: less than one-half of the small prosecution offices with fewer than 5 assistant prosecutors provided such training as compared to 80

percent of the large offices, with 25 or more assistant prosecutors. Smaller offices are more likely, however, to recruit attorneys with prior trial experience, often on a part-time basis.

- Entry courses were relatively short, typically less than two weeks.

In-service training for experienced staff is mainly provided through external programs, except in the largest agencies, with participation usually on a voluntary basis.

- Only 28 percent of the defender agencies and 15 percent of the prosecution offices—mainly those with 25 or more employees—provide formal in-house training for their personnel.
- Major sources of external continuing legal education were the national colleges for district attorneys and for defenders, programs sponsored by national prosecutor and defender associations, and those sponsored or conducted by state prosecutor and defender offices.
- Although a large proportion of agencies provided some assistance for external continuing education, only about one-third had policies requiring staff participation.
- Training contents of in-service programs tended to parallel those of entry level courses, but with lesser emphasis on procedural subjects.

Specialized training of many chief prosecutors and defenders is significantly deficient, based on comparisons between recommended courses and courses actually taken by incumbents.

- In addition to a need for further specialized training in legal subjects, such as law of evidence and trial advocacy, significant proportions of incumbents expressed an interest in management courses and in training in community and human relations whereas very few had actually attended such courses.

Progress in judicial training programs has been uneven, with significant deficiencies in availability of entry-level training and in the quality of in-service training programs and training services.

- NMS field interviews confirmed that newly appointed judges were inadequately prepared by prior experience or training for most specialized judicial tasks.
- Entry-level training was only provided, however, by about one-half of the states for judges in trial courts of general jurisdiction, and by about two-fifths of the states, for judges in courts of special or limited jurisdiction.
- Although virtually all states provided some form of in-service judicial education through state-level and/or national programs, most state programs were

limited to short week-end sessions on special topics, as contrasted to the more comprehensive programs provided by the national colleges and by a few of the larger states.

- Nearly one-third of all states utilizing lay judges had no requirement for formal entry training for these officials, despite the obvious need for such training.
- Supporting services for new judges, such as bench books, manuals and evidence guides were still inadequate in most states.

Court administrators were found to vary widely in the scope of their managerial responsibilities and in their own professional preparation.

- State court administrators generally have broad responsibilities for fiscal management, planning and evaluation and statistical management. Over 80 percent have a legal professional background.
- However, a substantial proportion of trial court administrators have predominantly administrative duties, limited to such functions as calendar management and statistics. Many of the latter have no professional staffs, while those with professional assistants more frequently reported fiscal and personnel management responsibilities among their key functions. Over three-fourths of the latter were college graduates, as compared to less than one-half of the administrators without staffs.
- Over 70 percent of court administrators had less than 5 years of service in their current positions. However, about one-half had held prior court administrative positions.

Training and educational needs of court administrators vary with their functional responsibilities.

- Academic field preferences, for all surveyed court administrators, were management, law and public administration, in that order. Whereas state court administrators strongly prefer a legal background; trial court administrators give first priority to management training.
- Training courses in court information systems and in planning and evaluation were most frequently recommended by state court administrators, whereas trial court administrators assigned first priority to case flow management.

Although most court administrators had received some specialized training, only about one-fourth had completed a special program in judicial administration before entering their current position.

- Major sources of court administrator training included the Institute for Court Management, state agencies, the National Association of Trial Court Administrators and university-related centers for continuing education.

Recommendations for upgrading court administrator capabilities include provision of support for graduate level pre-service programs, increased emphasis on development of broader managerial skills in both pre-service and in-service courses, and orientation of judges on the court administrator function.

I. Major Priority Recommendations

Educational assistance priorities under the LEEP program should be shifted from a general objective of upgrading of academic education of all line law enforcement or correctional personnel to a more selective, quality-oriented program, designed to improve competencies of managerial-level personnel, and of professional staffs in planning, research, evaluation and education.

- LEEP institutional qualification standards should be upgraded and effectively enforced.
- Priority should be given to qualified students in advanced undergraduate and in graduate level programs, with a phase-out of support for students in first two years of college.
- Priority should be given to programs which offer more balanced curriculum offerings, including adequate coverage of corrections and court-related subjects.
- Special programs of direct grants for full-time graduate study in crime-related or management subjects should be established or strengthened for both managerial-level in-service personnel and for highly qualified pre-service students.
- Assistance should be provided for development of improved law school curricula educational materials and methods in the field of criminal law practice.

Training assistance programs should concentrate on correcting existing major quantitative and/or qualitative deficiencies, including emphasis on management training, on assistance for smaller agencies, and on enrichment of existing training for line law enforcement and correctional officers.

- Priority should be given to development of integrated management training programs for criminal justice supervisors and managers, to be conducted at regional management training centers.
- Formal entry level training should be made mandatory for personnel in all line criminal justice occupations, including police officers and deputy sheriffs in small agencies; judges, assistant prosecutors and defenders; correctional officers, child care workers and probation and parole officers.
- State and regional academies for training of personnel from smaller agencies should be expanded and

improved in quality to assist in achieving this objective.

- Training assistance for line law enforcement and correctional officers, in entry and in-service programs, should emphasize qualitative improvements in training methods, in training faculty and in scope of training, including improved coverage of "human relations" subjects.
- Support should be provided for development of model curricula and improved training methods, for law enforcement and correctional academies, including provision for systematic evaluation of training effectiveness.

A positive organizational commitment to criminal justice manpower planning is a necessary condition for improving the long-range effectiveness of assistance programs for manpower development, at both the national and state level.

- A Manpower Analysis and Planning Office or unit should be established in LEAA for maintaining a continuing assessment of manpower development needs and resources.

- A specialized unit on criminal justice manpower statistics, as well as a national clearinghouse function on planned or ongoing criminal justice manpower surveys, should be established in the appropriate LEAA or Department of Justice statistical office.
- Priority in development of the needed criminal justice manpower data should be placed on linkages with existing federal statistical programs, and on development of a cooperative federal-state program, for meeting supplemental data needs.
- State planning agencies should be encouraged to develop parallel criminal justice manpower planning and data analysis functions, including provision of training assistance to planning staffs.
- LEAA annual plan guidelines should be revised to require periodical submission of comprehensive manpower assessments, in place of the current requirement for routine manpower statistics in the annual plans.

CHAPTER II. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE NATIONAL MANPOWER SURVEY

A. Background

All major assessments of the criminal justice system during the past decade have assigned a high priority to upgrading the personnel of the Nation's law enforcement, judicial and correctional agencies. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, in 1967, identified as one of its seven major objectives, the need for attracting "more and better people—police, prosecutors, judges, defense attorneys, probation and parole officers, and corrections officials with more knowledge, expertise, initiative and integrity."¹ Similarly, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, in its 1973 Report, included numerous specific recommendations for improvement of selection, training and education of personnel in virtually all major law enforcement and criminal justice occupations.

Recommendations for qualitative improvements in personnel have often been paralleled by findings on the need for quantitative increases in staffing. A decade ago, the President's Crime Commission reported the need for substantial increases in personnel for a wide range of criminal justice occupations, such as police officers, judges, public defenders, probation and parole officers and correctional specialists. Despite considerable employment growth, reports of personnel shortages—in the face of mounting agency workloads—have persisted throughout the past decade. Thus, in his Annual Report for 1976, Chief Justice Burger cited a requirement for additional judges, as one of the pressing needs of the Nation's judiciary, in coping with large case backlogs.²

This emphasis upon improvement of personnel resources stems in part from the fact that law enforcement and criminal justice services are highly labor-intensive activities. Over 80 percent of all direct governmental expenditures for these activities go to defray the salaries and benefits of agency employees. The performance of these agencies depends, in large measure, upon the skills, capabilities and dedication of their personnel—and on the quality of their leadership. The personnel variable is particularly critical because of the wide degree of administrative discretion entailed in every stage of the criminal justice process, from initial decisions to

investigate, apprehend and charge suspected offenders through the process of adjudication and correctional supervision of those found guilty. In relation to these responsibilities, the national commissions had found serious inadequacies in the educational preparation of many incumbents of law enforcement and criminal justice positions and in the specialized training available to them.

In recognition of these needs, financial assistance for training and education of personnel in state and local criminal justice agencies has been provided in various forms by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration since its establishment in 1968. The largest and most visible of these programs has been the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP), which has provided financial assistance, since its inception, to about 250,000 college students who were—or who were planning to become—employees of law enforcement or criminal justice agencies. Appropriations for this program, for Fiscal Years 1968–1976 amounted to a total of \$234 million and were maintained at an annual level of \$40 million for the period Fiscal Years 1973–1976. Other direct financial assistance has been provided through discretionary grants to training and educational programs, through the Educational Development Programs and LEAA internship programs. In addition, a significant percentage of state expenditures, funded by LEAA block grants, goes to training and related activities. Total LEAA direct and indirect expenditures for training and education are estimated at about \$80 million in Fiscal Year 1975, corresponding to about 9 percent of total LEAA outlays.³

As these programs have grown and become institutionalized, the need for systematic assessments of their adequacy and effectiveness has become apparent. Such assessments are needed both to determine the aggregate levels of funding for these programs and to assure that the available funds are allocated efficiently. The establishment of priorities for assistance requires an adequate body of data on relative manpower and training needs, by function and occupation. Such information is needed, not only at the national level, but—in considerably more detail—at the state and local levels.

Moreover, investments in specialized training and education necessarily entail some judgments as to future,

as well as current, personnel and training needs. To the extent that these trends can be reasonably anticipated for a period of years ahead, they can—and should—influence decisions concerning training and educational assistance.

The initiation of the National Manpower Survey thus rested on the recognition of both the importance of providing financial assistance for personnel upgrading programs and of the need for a systematic manpower planning approach, to assure that such funds would be allocated as effectively as possible.

B. The Study Mandate

Although the need for more adequate data to assist in criminal justice manpower planning had apparently been recognized for some time, the specific impetus for initiation of the present study came from a provision in the 1973 Amendments to the Safe Streets Act which directed the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of LEAA to:

“survey existing and future personnel needs of the Nation in the field of law enforcement and criminal justice and the adequacy of federal state and local programs to meet such needs.”⁴

Included in this statutory provision were specific requirements to determine the “effectiveness and sufficiency” of the training and academic assistance programs provided by the Federal Government for such personnel, and for issuance of guidelines by LEAA governing its project grants for training and academic assistance “based on the needs and priorities established by the survey.”⁵

The scope of the study was more specifically defined in the “Request for Proposal” issued by the LEAA, inviting proposals for conduct of the study, and in the contract awarded to the National Planning Association (NPA) in June 1974. The latter provided for a comprehensive study of: (1) present and projected personnel resources; (2) present and projected personnel requirements; and (3) present and projected training and education resources for state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. Both quantitative and qualitative aspects of personnel needs and resources were to be studied, with particular emphasis on selected key occupations in each agency category. Priorities for upgrading training and education practices and programs were to be specified where inadequacies in existing programs were found. Although the assessments of training and education programs and needs were to be the prime focus of the study, it was anticipated that considerable useful data would be derived on related personnel practices and

issues, including personnel recruitment and utilization policies affecting minority personnel. Finally, the contractor was required to provide a method for periodic updating of the manpower, training and education data and projections to be developed for the study. Chart II-1 provides a schematic summary of these major study tasks and outputs.

In addition to the formulation of the study tasks and objectives, the LEAA contract prescribed other major guidelines for the conduct of the study. The National Manpower Survey was to provide comprehensive coverage of all major categories of state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, including police departments, sheriffs’ agencies, correctional institutions, probation and parole officers, prosecutors and public defenders’ offices and the courts. Priority in analysis of occupational tasks was to be given to a number of “key” occupations, selected on the basis of such considerations as size and importance and the extent of specialized training and education required. The list of these key occupations appears in Chart II-2.

C. Scope of Surveys

The assessments required by the study entailed development of comprehensive data on jobs, personnel and training and education programs, for law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. An initial phase of the study included an identification of the following major categories of information needed for the assessments.

- Employment and turnover statistics
- Agency workload and expenditure data
- Job characteristics data
- Personnel characteristics data
- Training and education program data

In almost all instances, such data were needed for each of the major sectors, or types of agencies, within the criminal justice system and were required separately for the major occupations in these agencies. Moreover, although the focus of the National Manpower Survey was on a broad national-level assessment, some further disaggregation of this information by region, size of community or agency size was also considered essential.

In addition to quantitative data, the study design required information of a qualitative nature, for use particularly in assessing the training and education needs of agency personnel and the adequacy of existing programs in meeting these needs. Of equal importance, too, was the need to obtain the judgments of agency executives and other experts, concerning the adequacy of agency personnel resources and training, and on expected trends affecting future personnel needs.

Chart II-1
NMS Objectives




Chart II-2
NMS Occupations

LAW ENFORCEMENT

- Police Chief Executive
- Police Mid-Level Manager
- Patrol Officer
- Detective/Criminal Investigator
- Patrol Line Supervisor
- Police Planner
- Evidence Technician/Crime Scene Analyst
- Police Legal Advisor

JUDICIAL PROCESS

- Judge—Court of General Jurisdiction
- Judge—Court of Limited Jurisdiction
- Court Administrator
- Prosecutor
- Defender

CORRECTIONS

- Correctional Institution Administrator (Adult and Juvenile)
- Correctional Officer
- Probation Officer
- Parole Officer
- Counselor/Case Worker

Review of the available literature and of ongoing research indicated that much of the information needed was not available on a comprehensive, national basis. To illustrate, although statistics on aggregate employment and expenditures of state and local criminal justice agencies had been compiled for LEAA by the Bureau of the Census since 1969, and were considered comprehensive and comparable for the years 1971-1974 inclusive, very limited information was available on the occupational distribution of personnel in these agencies, on their training and education, on personnel turnover and on other personnel characteristics. An on-going LEAA-financed Census survey of characteristics of criminal justice employees was expected to fill some of these data gaps, but this survey excluded the courts and was subject to a number of other serious limitations. Generally, agency-level data were somewhat more adequate for police agencies, and progressively less adequate for corrections, probation and parole and courts-related agencies.

To meet these data needs, a comprehensive survey plan was designed, providing for: (1) a series of mailed questionnaire surveys of executives of state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies; (2) a mailed survey of general jurisdiction and appellate court agencies; (3) field visits to 200 selected state and local agencies in 10 states to obtain more detailed data about their jobs, personnel policies, training programs and future plans; and (4) field visits to selected educational institutions, academies and other specialized LE/CJ training

activities. Approval for this comprehensive survey program, including over 40 separate major survey instruments, was obtained from the Office of Management and Budget in September 1975. Questionnaire mailings and field visits were conducted in the period November 1975-March 1976, with the exception of surveys of courts' agencies and court administrators, which were not completed until June 1976.

The largest single NMS data collection effort consisted of the questionnaire surveys addressed to executives of state and local law enforcement and correction agencies by the Bureau of Social Science Research (BSSR). These detailed questionnaires requested three broad categories of information: (1) opinions concerning agency manpower needs, personnel policies and future trends; (2) data on agency functions, employment, training programs, personnel turnover and workloads; and (3) information on the executive's own background education and work history. An additional questionnaire survey was addressed to all state general jurisdiction and appellate courts, requesting detailed agency data on court personnel, caseloads, and training activities.

In all of these surveys, with the exception of the smaller police and sheriffs' agencies, the NMS attempted to reach all state and local agency executives who could be identified in available directory sources or by other special means. These were supplemented by large samples of the "small" police and sheriff agencies. The mailings were preceded by a letter from LEAA Administrator Richard Velde urging cooperation with the study. Two follow-up mailings were made to non-respondents. As a result of these efforts, about 9,700 of the questionnaires were completed. As shown in Table II-1, response rates ranged from 79 percent for police chiefs in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population, and 77 percent for wardens, to slightly under 50 percent for prosecutors, defenders and for the court agency survey. The latter types of agencies include a large proportion of small offices, or units, often staffed by part-time personnel. Response rates averaged 60 percent or higher for executives in all agency categories with ten or more employees, and were reasonably well distributed by geographical region. Generally these response rates compare favorably with analogous surveys conducted in this field, with the sole exception of those conducted by the Bureau of the Census, using its extensive field organization. Nevertheless, the survey results must be interpreted with considerable caution, particularly for agency categories where response rates fell below 60 percent.

In addition to these major new surveys, the NMS established cooperative arrangements with the Bureau of the Census to process data based on its 1975 survey of nearly 50,000 employees of state and local law enforce-

ment and criminal justice agencies, other than courts, which provided information on their occupations, work experience, education, training and other personnel characteristics. These data were intensively analyzed, based on a specially designed occupational classification system, and served as the primary source of current data on the education and specialized training of these personnel.

Information on state and local law enforcement academies was also obtained by NMS from a nationwide survey conducted jointly with the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training (NASDLET), based on responses from 250 academies.

TABLE II-1
NMS Survey Results

Survey	Responses	Response Rate*
Executive Surveys:		
Police chiefs, jurisdictions with 17,000 population or more -----	1,207	79
Police chiefs, less than 17,000 population -----	1,515	60
Sheriffs, 10 or more employees ---	309	61
Sheriffs, less than 10 employees --	279	55
Wardens, state adult corrections institutions -----	220	77
Juvenile corrections administrators _	585	73
Probation and parole administrators	2,011	67
Prosecutors -----	1,344	46
Public defenders -----	252	48
Court administrators -----	334	73
Courts Agency Survey:		
General jurisdiction/Appellate courts -----	1,644	47
Total, all surveys -----	9,697	58

* Usable questionnaires as a percent of questionnaires mailed, exclusive of questionnaires removed from sample as "out-of-scope" or not locatable.

The NMS also conducted a program of field visits to agencies and to educational and training institutions throughout the country. In the course of the study, staff of the American Institutes for Research visited about 200 state and local agencies in 10 states, to obtain first-hand information on occupational tasks, training needs and many related aspects of personnel management and organization. Similarly, about 60 visits were conducted by representatives of the National Planning Association to higher education institutions offering criminal justice programs, to law enforcement and other correctional academies and to other specialized training and educational activities. Since comprehensive statistical data on these agencies and types of activities were being developed from other sources, the emphasis in all of these

visits was upon qualitative assessments and insights, and on obtaining the first-hand judgments of administrators and personnel concerning major current problems and expected future trends.

In addition to these field data sources, valuable guidance on the personnel needs, and on the training and education needs of criminal justice agencies was provided by the NMS Advisory Board, chaired by Dr. Donald Riddle, and consisting of eminent leaders in the fields of law enforcement, criminal justice, education and related disciplines. The NMS staff also consulted extensively with a wide range of practitioners and educators in relevant fields to obtain more specialized advice on technical aspects of the study and on major issues. A total of over 30 panel sessions or conferences were held for this purpose, ranging in scope from broad reviews of criminal justice issues to be addressed, and assessments of major training and education practices, to detailed technical reviews of the tasks and the skill and knowledge requirements in key occupations.

D. Major Limitations

Although this study is based on the most comprehensive body of information assembled, to date, on the personnel of the Nation's law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, and on their training and education, it is subject to a number of limitations which must be borne in mind by those reviewing its findings and recommendations.

1. *Limitations in scope.* Under the guidelines established by the LEAA for this study, the NMS surveys and related assessments have been limited to the personnel of state and local agencies with law enforcement and criminal justice functions. Excluded from the contractual scope of the study were the 95,000 personnel, employed in 1974, in federal law enforcement, corrections and judicial process agencies, as well as an estimated one-half million employees engaged in protective service activities in the private sector or as private criminal defense attorneys or who performed indigent defense services or rehabilitation services under contract with state and local agencies. Also excluded from the mail survey programs were certain categories of state and local agencies, within the scope of the study, but which could not be covered because of technical or cost constraints. The most significant of these exclusions were: (1) courts of limited and special jurisdiction; (2) local government adult correctional agencies or facilities, other than those operated by sheriffs' offices; and (3) legal units, such as city corporation counsel offices, which serve cities or townships, and which may have some criminal prosecution functions. Information on the

personnel and training needs of certain of these agency categories was, however, developed from data obtained from field visits and from existing literature and data sources.

2. *Evaluative data on criminal justice training and educational experiences.* The original study design for the NMS contemplated the execution of a systematic questionnaire survey of a sample of employees in key occupations of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies to obtain detailed information from them on the extent of their specialized training and education (including LEEP-financed courses), their assessments of the usefulness of this training in their current positions and related information on their career plans and job attitudes. Inclusion of this survey in the overall NMS study plan did not prove feasible, however, because of the concurrent funding by the LEAA of the large-scale Census Bureau Survey of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel. Although the latter survey provided data on such employee characteristics as educational background and occupation, it did not include any questions designed specifically to assess the quality and usefulness of the training received, or other questions of an attitudinal nature. Alternatives for developing such data, either through a supplement to the Census survey or through a separate survey of former LEEP students in one LEAA region, were proposed at various times by the NMS staff, but were not approved by the LEAA. Some limited information of this type was developed in the course of field visits to selected law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, and from collateral data sources, but—in our judgment—was far less satisfactory than the more comprehensive employee survey originally planned for this purpose.

3. *Data reliability.* One of the inherent limitations of any survey program of the type conducted by the NMS is that the reliability of the resulting data depends upon the extent of cooperation of the officials and agencies surveyed and on the accuracy of the data provided by them. Survey response rates of 85 percent or higher are considered desirable by survey researchers to minimize the problems of "response bias." Such response rates have

rarely, if ever, been achieved in any comprehensive surveys of state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, other than those conducted by official government agencies such as the Census Bureau. The lowest response rates, in the NMS surveys, were experienced in the judicial process sector, particularly for those prosecutor and public defender offices with fewer than 10 employees, and in the survey of general jurisdiction courts. These may be attributable to the weak level of administrative support in many of these agencies, to the wide diversity in organizational structures and to the absence of adequate records or standard reporting procedures, which—in the past—have posed almost insurmountable problems to survey researchers in this field. Despite these limitations, validations of the resulting survey data through available comparisons with other national level data, from Census, FBI or other sources, have suggested a reasonable degree of consistency in results. In addition, in the presentation of certain of the quantitative responses, such as estimates of manpower needs and personnel turnover rates, weighting procedures by size of agency were used, based on the estimated distribution of all agencies by number of employees, thus reducing any bias resulting from differential response rates by agencies in different size groups.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (1967).
2. Warren E. Burger, *Annual Year-End Report on the Judiciary*. Supreme Court of the United States (1976).
3. Based on NMS estimates, described in Volume VI, Chapter II (Criminal Justice Manpower Planning). These expenditures, moreover, are only a portion of the total Federal Government outlay in support of criminal justice education and training. Estimates by the National Manpower Survey indicate a total outlay of about \$225 million in Fiscal Year 1975, including the payments of veterans readjustment benefits to students enrolled in criminal justice programs, the cost of FBI training of state and local law enforcement officers and of other federal agency programs providing training for personnel of state and local agencies.
4. Public Law 93-83, 93d. Cong., 1st Sess., August 6, 1973, 87 Stat 197 (Crime Control Act of 1973).
5. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER III. CURRENT PERSONNEL RESOURCES AND NEEDS

An initial task of the present study was to assess the adequacy of existing personnel resources of the state and local agencies in the criminal justice system. These resources, in 1974, consisted of the approximately one million men and women, employed in over 40,000 separate agencies, who were responsible for law enforcement and the administration of justice, in the 50 states and in thousands of separate communities throughout the nation.

The first section of this chapter provides an employment profile of the system including summary statistics on employment, on functions performed and on the occupations of personnel in each major agency category.

The second section describes the criteria and research approaches used in the assessment of manpower needs.

The subsequent sections present findings on the quantitative adequacy of existing personnel resources in each major category of agency.

A. Employment Profile of the Criminal Justice System

1. *Employment by sector.* The provision of police protection and of related security services, and the administration of justice, together constitute one of the nation's major "industries," in terms of number of persons employed. In 1974, a total of nearly 1.1 million persons were employed in public law enforcement and criminal justice agencies at all levels of government. More than 500,000 additional workers were employed as private police, investigators, guards and watchmen, or were engaged in private criminal law practice on a part-time or full-time basis. Thus, as shown in Chart III-1, a total of about 1.6 million persons, or nearly 2 percent of the total employed labor force of the United States, were employed to provide public or private security services and other criminal justice-related services.

Within the public sector, police protection and related judicial and correctional activities are primarily the responsibility of state and local government agencies. Nearly one million, or more than 90 percent, of all employees of public criminal justice system agencies, were employed by agencies of the 50 states, or of local governments. Of this total, 584,000, or 58.5 percent,

were in police protection agencies, including state and local police departments and sheriffs' agencies with law enforcement responsibilities. About 192,000—nearly one-fifth of the total—were employed in the "judicial process sector," including employees of state and local courts, prosecution and other legal service activities, and public defender offices. An additional 217,000 employees—more than one-fifth of the total—were in the correctional sector, including state or local correctional institutions for adults and juveniles, probation and parole functions and central administrative agencies for state or local corrections functions. Finally, about 5,000 personnel were employed in state criminal justice planning agencies or in other administrative or planning agencies with functions of a broad multi-sector nature (Table III-1).


2. *Summary employment trends.* Comprehensive statistics on total criminal justice employment, by sector, have only been compiled by the Federal government on a comparable basis since 1971.¹ The trends for the period 1971-74 are summarized in Table III-2, based on the Census statistics on "full-time equivalent employment" in these agencies. During this period the number of full-time equivalent employees in all state and local criminal justice agencies increased by 133,200, or 17.0 percent. This increase compared closely to the increase of 17.9 percent, in total state and local government employment over the same period. The rate of employment growth varied by sector from an increase of 14.3 percent in police protection, and 17.6 percent, in correctional agencies, to much sharper percentage increases in prosecution and legal services, in indigent defense agencies and in the small category of "other" agencies, which includes state criminal justice planning agencies and other local or state coordinating units.

3. *Police protection agencies*

a. *Major functions.* Responsibility for law enforcement is primarily that of local governments—cities, counties and townships—with both state and federal agencies playing a more limited and specialized role. The local police protection function was performed in 1974 by 487,000 employees in some 19,000 separate city and county police departments or sheriffs' offices. About two-thirds of these agencies are located in small

Chart III-1

Total Employment in Protective Service and Criminal Justice Activities—Public and Private, 1974



¹ Estimated lawyers with criminal practice, as one of three specialties.

Sources: Data on public employment from U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System 1974*, p. 21. Data on private sector employment in protective service activities from U.S. Bureau of the Census sources. Estimated number of private legal defenders adapted from results of 1972 survey by the Institute of Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin.

TABLE III-1

*Employment in State and Local Criminal Justice
Agencies, by Function, October 1974*

Function	Number (000)	Percent
Total -----	998	100.0
Police protection -----	584	58.5
Judicial process agencies, total ---	192	19.4
Judicial (courts) -----	134	13.5
Prosecution and legal services _	51	5.2
Indigent defense -----	7	.7
Corrections -----	217	21.7
Other -----	5	.5

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Expenditures and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1974*.

TABLE III-2

*Criminal Justice System Employment Growth,
by Sector, Compared to Total Employment
Growth in State and Local Governments,
1971-1974*

	Full-Time Equivalent Employees (000)		Increase 1971-74	
	1974	1971	Number (000)	Percent
All state and local employees --	6458.6	5476.6	982.0	17.9%
Criminal justice system employees, total ---	917.5	784.3	133.2	17.0
Police protection --	539.4	472.1	67.3	14.3
Judicial ---	118.4	99.7	18.7	18.8
Prosecution and legal services _	45.4	34.1	11.3	33.1
Indigent defense ---	6.0	3.5	2.5	71.4
Corrections	203.2	172.8	30.4	17.6
Other ----	5.1	2.1	3.0	142.9

Source: U.S. Department of Justice *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1971, 1974*, Table 9. Data are as of October in each year.

cities or rural jurisdictions and typically employ fewer than 10 personnel. At the other extreme are the metropolitan police departments of our large cities. The 34 largest of these departments employed a total of 144,000 personnel in 1974, or more than one-third of all employees of city police departments.

Virtually all local police protection agencies perform, to some extent, the basic functions of patrol, criminal investigation, traffic control, and emergency communications. Large departments are much more likely to have specialized units for these functions and for related community service responsibilities, as well as specialized administrative and training staffs. Large sheriffs'

agencies have a particularly broad range of responsibilities including operation of the county jail and provision of services to the local courts as well as general police protection functions. Most small police or sheriffs' agencies, on the other hand, are likely to have much simpler "line" organizations and to rely on state police departments or on larger adjacent departments for many specialized services, such as crime laboratory, training and communications and dispatching.

State police departments, in turn, have had primary responsibilities for highway patrol and traffic law enforcement, but also provide statewide criminal investigative and laboratory services, operate state or regional training academies, and perform various auxiliary services, such as motor vehicle registrations and conduct of drivers' license examinations. A total of 97,200 persons were employed in state police departments in 1974, exclusive of those in agencies responsible for vehicle inspection and licensing, fish and game wardens, and certain other specialized regulatory agencies.

b. *Occupational distribution.* Employees of police and other law enforcement agencies have been broadly classified as "sworn officers," (i.e., police officers or deputy sheriffs with general arrest powers), or as "non-sworn" employees. The latter include both auxiliary uniformed personnel, such as school crossing guards and meter attendants, as well as civilian personnel engaged in various technical, support or administrative-type functions. Although summary statistics on total police employees and on sworn officers have been published for a period of decades, very little information has been available on the distribution of these personnel by function or by types of duties performed. Such data are clearly relevant to any systematic analysis of agency manpower and training needs.

Comprehensive statistics on the occupations of employees of law enforcement agencies have been developed for the first time based on a special NMS analysis of the results of the 1975 Census criminal justice employee characteristics survey. The NMS classification groups all police agency employees under three broad functional categories—primary operating personnel, direct support and indirect support—based on the relationship of their duties to their agency's primary law enforcement missions, and further classifies these personnel in terms of their more specific tasks or duty positions. The distribution of sworn and non-sworn employees, based on this grouping, is summarized in Table III-3.

- *Primary operating personnel* include those personnel who are directly engaged in—or supervising—patrolling, traffic control, criminal investigation and other line or supervisory functions, as well as those responsible for overall agency management and di-

rection. A total of 462,000 personnel, or 77 percent of all employees of state and local police protection agencies, were in these primary operating positions in 1974. With the exception of some 32,500 auxiliary uniformed personnel, such as school crossing guards and meter attendants, these positions were almost entirely occupied by sworn officers. About one-half of all agency employees and over three-fifths of all sworn officers were in the line patrol officer position—the largest single police occupation and the most visible to the general public.

- *Direct support personnel* perform a variety of professional, technical, and administrative tasks closely linked with the performance of line law enforcement functions. A total of 55,400 or 9.2 percent of agency employees were engaged in these activities in 1974, of whom 22,700 were sworn officers, and 32,700 were non-sworn or civilian employees. About 27,500, or one-half, of all direct support personnel were employed as dispatchers or in allied communications positions. An additional 20,000 were in such positions as desk and booking sergeants or served as custodial officers in police or sheriffs' lock-ups or jails. Also included in the "direct support" group

were over 3,000 medical examiners, coroners, and forensic scientists, as well as 4,800 technical specialists, such as fingerprint technicians, evidence technicians, polygraph operators, and crime scene analysts.

- *Indirect support personnel*, about three-fourths of whom are civilians, perform a wide range of professional, technical, administrative, clerical, and service-type duties, other than those in the "direct support" category. This group accounted for 62,000 or about 10 percent of total police agency employment in 1974. The largest single occupational group in this category consists of 52,000 clerical employees. An additional 20,000 were either professional-technical personnel, or administrative employees, engaged in such staff functions as budgeting, personnel administration, research, and data processing. About 10,000 were "blue collar" workers in crafts and service occupations.

Occupational distributions were found to differ significantly among agencies, based on functions performed and agency size. State and county agencies (including sheriffs' departments) employed a smaller proportion of their total personnel in primary law enforcement operat-

TABLE III-3¹

Occupational Distribution of Sworn and Nonsworn Employees of State and Local Police Protection Agencies, October 1974

	Total Employees		Sworn		Nonsworn		Nonsworn as Percent of Total Employees
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	
Total employees ¹	599,300	100.0	476,500	100.0	122,800	100.0	20.5
Primary operating personnel, total	462,600	77.2	432,800	90.8	29,600	24.1	6.4
Management	45,400	7.6	44,800	9.4	600	0.5	1.3
Line officers, total	378,800	62.3	378,800	79.5	—	—	—
Supervisors	26,800	4.5	26,800	5.6	—	—	—
Basic line officers, total	352,000	58.7	352,000	73.9	—	—	—
Patrol	299,000	49.9	299,000	62.8	—	—	—
Investigation	53,000	8.8	53,000	11.1	—	—	—
Trainees, including recruits, cadets, probationers	9,400	1.6	9,400	2.0	—	—	—
School crossing guards, meter checkers, police aides	29,000	4.8	—	—	29,000	23.6	100.0
Support personnel total	136,700	22.8	43,500	9.1	93,200	75.9	68.2
Direct support personnel	55,400	9.2	22,700	4.7	32,700	26.6	59.0
Dispatchers and communications technicians	27,500	4.6	5,900	1.2	21,600	17.6	78.5
Medical-forensic professionals	3,200	0.5	—	—	3,200	2.6	100.0
Investigative technicians	4,800	0.8	16,800	3.5	7,900	6.4	32.3
Other direct support	19,900	3.3					
Indirect support, total	81,300	13.6	20,800	4.4	60,500	49.2	74.4
Professional and technical	14,200	2.4	13,200	2.8	6,400	5.2	32.7
Managerial and administrative	5,400	0.9					
Clerical	52,000	8.7	7,600	1.6	54,000	43.9	87.5
Crafts and service workers	9,700	1.6					

Source: Adapted from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Employee Characteristics Survey*, 1975.

¹ Total police protection employment in this table (599,300) differs from the total of 584,000 for 1974, based on the annual Census LEAA Survey of criminal justice agencies, due mainly to differences in agency classification and reporting procedures between the two surveys.

ing positions than did city police departments as a group, reflecting the more diversified responsibilities of many of the former agencies (Table III-4). Among city police agencies, larger departments—those with 400 or more employees—employed a larger proportion of their staffs in “indirect support” type of activities and in investigative positions, whereas smaller agencies reported higher proportions in line management and line patrol duties. These differences result, in part, from the much greater degree of specialization of tasks in larger police departments and from the fact that most smaller agencies rely on other organizations for many technical services. In the latter agencies, higher ranking officers are also more likely to perform line patrol or investigative duties, in addition to their managerial responsibilities.

TABLE III-4

Occupational Distribution of Employees of Police Protection Agencies by Level of Government, October 1974

Occupational Group	City ^a	County ^b	State
Total employment -----	386,700	99,000	80,000
Percent Distribution:			
Primary operating personnel,			
total -----	78.0	69.8	66.4
Management -----	7.9	7.2	4.7
Line, total -----	62.5	58.9	58.7
Supervision -----	4.4	3.2	6.3
Basic line, total -----	58.1	55.7	52.4
Patrol -----	49.1	45.9	45.6
Investigation -----	9.0	9.8	6.8
School crossing guards, meter			
checkers, police aides,			
trainees -----	7.6	3.7	3.0
Support positions, total -----	21.9	29.9	33.5
Direct support personnel, total	8.4	14.0	11.7
Dispatchers and communi-			
cations -----	5.0	1.0	5.3
Other direct support -----	2.4	13.0	6.4
Indirect support personnel,			
total -----	13.5	15.9	21.8
Professional, technical and			
administrative -----	3.1	2.8	3.5
Clerical, crafts and service			
workers -----	10.4	13.1	18.3
Total -----	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Excludes townships.

^b Includes county police agencies and sheriffs departments with a police protection function.

Source: Adapted from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

The occupational distribution of sworn police and sheriff officers is of particular interest in any assessment of law enforcement manpower, since a number of studies have been critical of the assignment of police officers to “civilian-type” duties which do not effectively utilize their specialized police training. Sworn officers totalled

476,000, or 79.5 percent of all police protection employees, in 1974. Based on their responses to the Census survey, a total of 433,000, or 90.8 percent of these officers were classified as in “primary operating” occupations, including line managers and supervisors, line patrol and investigative officers and those in related trainee or probationary positions. These positions are those traditionally associated with the police officer’s role. Certain line functions—such as traffic control—have, however, been assigned in some agencies to auxiliary non-sworn personnel. Of the 43,500 sworn officers classified in support-type positions, over one-half (22,700) were assigned as dispatchers, investigative technicians, booking sergeants, custodial officers or in similar “direct support” activities. The remainder, nearly 21,000, were engaged in a variety of indirect support functions or activities, mainly in staff administrative or technical duties.

Civilians, or non-sworn personnel, totalled 123,000 or 20.5 percent of all police agency employment. Nearly one-half of all non-sworn employees were engaged in indirect-support functions, mainly in clerical jobs. About 24 percent were employed in auxiliary uniformed positions, such as part-time school crossing guards. About 18 percent were dispatchers or communications technicians. The remainder were employed in a variety of professional, technical, and administrative activities.

c. *Police employment trends.* Police employment has experienced a sustained growth over a period of decades, both in absolute numbers and in relation to the total United States population. Based on decennial Census data, the number of policemen and detectives (public and private), increased from 74 per 100,000 population in 1910—the earliest census year for which comparable statistics are available—to 182 per 100,000 in 1970. Data from the monthly sample labor force surveys indicate a further increase in this ratio to 217 per 100,000 in 1975. The increased concentration of population in urban areas and accompanying increases in crime rates, the rapid growth in motor vehicle traffic and—more generally—the growing affluence of our society, have all resulted in increased demands for police protection services.

More detailed annual statistics indicate a steady recent year-to-year growth in *total* employment in state and local police protection agencies (sworn and non-sworn), from 341,000 in 1960 to 597,000 in 1974. The average annual rate of growth over this period was about 4 percent, with particularly rapid growth—averaging 5.1 percent annually—between 1965 and 1970 (Table III-5).

The recent growth in police employment appears, in large part, to have been a response to rapidly rising crime in our cities and to related symptoms of urban unrest,

including the rash of large scale civil disorders during the 1960's. The increase in serious (Part I) crime rates was particularly sharp in the years following 1965, due in part to the rapid growth in the number and proportion of teenage youth and younger adults in our population—the age groups with the highest propensity for crime. As

shown in Table III-5, the most rapid increases in police department employment also were recorded after 1965. Nevertheless, over the entire 15-year period (1960–1974), the increase in the crime rate, of 157 percent, was more than three times as great as that in per capita police employment.

TABLE III-5
*Comparison of Employment in State and Local Police Protection
Agencies With Crime Rates, 1960–1974*

Year	State and Local Police Departments			Part I Crimes per 100,000 Population	
	Total Employment (000)	Employees per 100,000 Population		Number	Index (1960=100.0)
		Number	Index (1960=100.0)		
1960	341	189	100.0	1,876	100.0
1961	345	188	99.5	1,894	101.0
1962	358	192	101.6	2,008	107.0
1963	368	195	103.2	2,167	115.5
1964	378	197	104.2	2,374	126.5
1965	397	204	107.9	2,434	129.7
1966	413	210	111.1	2,655	141.5
1967	433	218	115.3	2,972	158.4
1968	463	231	122.2	3,350	178.6
1969	487	240	127.0	3,658	195.0
1970	508	248	131.2	3,960	211.1
1971	524	253	133.9	4,140	220.7
1972	550	263	139.2	3,939	209.9
1973	581	276	146.0	4,130	220.1
1974	597	282	149.2	4,821	257.0

Source: Police employment from U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Government*, 1972, Vol. VIII, p. 265, and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Public Employment in 1974*, p. 7. Crime rates from FBI *Uniform Crime Reports*, 1975, p. 55.

4. Judicial process agencies

a. *Major functions.* The judicial process sector of the criminal justice system consists of those public agencies directly responsible for the administration of justice—the courts, prosecution and legal service offices, and publicly funded indigent defense activities. In nearly all states, the function of adjudication of both criminal and civil cases—other than those which involve federal laws—is, in first instance, very largely a responsibility of local government agencies, at the county or city levels. The high degree of decentralization of this system is illustrated by the fact that nearly 26,000 separate state and local judicial process agencies were identified in Census directories as of 1974, including 15,000 courts (at all levels), over 10,000 prosecution and legal services offices and over 500 public indigent defense agencies. The major types of judicial process agencies are described below.

- *Courts.* In all but a few states, the courts are organized hierarchically into three tiers: appellate

level courts, trial courts of general jurisdiction and limited, or special, jurisdiction courts. The *appellate-level* courts include the state supreme courts, as well as intermediate appellate courts. The former may also exercise administrative authority over the entire state court system. The *trial courts of general jurisdiction* are normally the courts of initial jurisdiction for trying felony cases; however, most of these courts also exercise jurisdiction over civil cases and over certain types of misdemeanor cases. These courts are consolidated under a statewide system in a few states, such as New Jersey, but are based on judicial districts or county jurisdictions in most states. *Courts of limited jurisdiction* have the dual responsibility of trying misdemeanor and municipal ordinance violations and of holding pre-trial hearings and setting bail in felony cases. Juvenile cases, domestic relations issues and probate of wills are also often handled by these courts. In many states, non-law trained judges or para-judicial

personnel are authorized to preside over trials or hearings, and to make judicial decisions, particularly in minor offenses and in juvenile cases.

• *Prosecution and legal services.* The prosecution function within states may be shared by three or more offices: the state attorney general, the district attorney and the county or city attorney. At the local level, the district attorney, or prosecutor, is normally responsible for prosecution of felony cases, with jurisdictions which normally tend to parallel that of the court structure. District attorneys also handle misdemeanors and other less serious offenses in some jurisdictions; however, the latter are often assigned to municipal legal officers (corporation or city counsels) to the extent that they are not directly handled by the police. These officers also often have responsibilities for civil law actions, and for provision of related legal services to local officials, particularly in smaller communities.

• *Indigent defense.* The constitutional requirement to provide counsel to indigent defendants is accomplished either through an "assigned counsel" system, where courts assign local attorneys as defenders on a case-by-case basis, or through a public defender system. The latter may consist of salaried attorneys, directly employed by a state or local public defender office, or of attorneys retained by contractual arrangements with legal aid organizations or

private law firms. The use of public defender agencies is more typical of the larger urban jurisdictions, whereas rural jurisdictions continue to rely mainly on assigned counsel.

b. *Employment by agency category.* Of a total of 192,000 employees of state and local judicial process agencies in 1974, 134,000—or about 70 percent—were employed in the courts, and 51,500—or 24 percent—in a wide variety of prosecution and legal service offices. Public indigent defense offices, the newest and smallest component, employed 6,500 personnel (Table III-6).

As a result of the high degree of decentralization of these functions, the typical court or court-related agency is very small, averaging 7.5 full-time or part-time employees per agency, or 6.6 per agency on a full-time equivalent basis. State level agencies or units tend to be larger in size, as do public indigent defense agencies, which are mainly located in the larger jurisdictions. In contrast, the staff of a typical municipal legal office is likely to consist of one attorney and a secretary—often on a part-time basis. Part-time employment is also frequent among county-level prosecution offices. Thus, over one-third of all chief prosecutors and assistant chief prosecutors responding to the NMS survey were employed on a part-time basis, as were 14 percent of all assistant prosecutors.

c. *Occupational distributions.* Four judicial process occupations were selected for detailed analysis of

TABLE III-6

State and Local Judicial Process Agencies: Number of Agencies and Employment, by Type of Agency, and Local Governments, 1974

Agency Type and Level of Government	Number of Agencies	Employees		Average Employees Per Agency	
		Total	Full-Time Equivalents	Total	Full-Time Equivalents
Total, judicial process -----	25,720	192,300	169,800	7.5	6.6
State -----	2,380	39,700	38,300	16.7	16.1
County -----	9,410	104,900	93,000	11.1	9.1
Municipal -----	13,930	47,700	38,400	3.4	2.8
Courts -----	14,990	134,300	118,400	9.0	7.9
State -----	1,550	24,600	23,900	15.9	15.4
County -----	6,330	78,300	68,700	12.4	10.9
Municipal -----	7,110	31,400	25,700	4.4	3.6
Prosecution and legal services -----	10,300	51,500	45,400	5.0	4.4
State -----	600	12,400	11,800	20.7	19.7
County -----	2,800	23,000	21,100	8.2	7.5
Municipal -----	6,800	16,100	12,500	2.4	1.8
Indigent defense -----	530	6,500	6,000	12.3	11.3
*State -----	230	2,700	2,600	11.7	11.3
County -----	280	3,600	3,200	12.9	11.4
Municipal -----	20	200	200	10.0	10.0

Sources: Number of agencies from Census Bureau Directory files, as revised by NMS. Employment data from LEAA/Census, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1974*. Number of employees in county and municipal agencies partially estimated, based on data for large counties and cities. Municipal data include data for cities, townships and consolidated city/county agencies. All data rounded.

personnel needs and of specialized training and education requirements for the National Manpower Survey. These include judges, chief and assistant prosecutors, chief and assistant defenders, and professional court administrators. These occupations account—in combination—for about 30 percent of total judicial process employment. Descriptions of these occupations are presented below.

- *Judges* play the central role in the adjudicative process. In addition to presiding at trials, conducting hearings and similar proceedings, setting bail, imposing sentences or fines, their duties may include administrative responsibility for operation of the courts, holding of conferences with prosecution and defense counsel, preparation of opinions and related tasks. A recent survey by the American Judicature Society identified a total of 21,600 judges, or persons exercising judicial authority, in courts of limited jurisdiction.³ Included in this total are officials, such as justices of the peace or magistrates, who are not necessarily lawyers, and who perform certain limited judicial functions often on a part-time basis. A total of 5,400 judges were employed in general jurisdiction courts, which also employed about 4,400 parajudicial personnel, such as magistrates and referees. Less than 800 judges were employed in state appellate courts.
- *Prosecutors and assistant prosecutors* review evidence to determine whether a criminal charge is warranted, develop case information through interviews and the collection of physical evidence, prepare cases, negotiate with defense counsel and prosecute cases in court. An estimated total of about 21,000 attorneys were employed in all state and local prosecution and legal service offices in 1974, including those performing exclusively or mainly civil law functions. It is estimated that about three-fifths of this total were employed in state or county offices with responsibilities for prosecution of serious criminal offenses.
- *Defenders and assistant defenders* in state and local defense agencies perform the responsibilities of defense counsel to represent clients found to be indigent, and, in addition, may provide collateral services, such as referral to appropriate community service agencies or related counseling. About 3,600 attorneys were employed as chief defenders or staff attorneys in public indigent defense offices in 1974, or about 3,200 on a full-time equivalent basis.
- *Court administrators.* The need for more effective management of courts and court systems has resulted in the emergence of the professional court administrator as a recognized occupation during the

past decade. These are defined as non-elected professional administrators concerned with caseflow throughout the court system, personnel management, budget and financial management, planning and research, and all other administrative and managerial business of the court system. Based on a special NMS survey of state court administrators, a total of 455 state or local professional court administrators were identified in 1975.

More detailed statistics on the occupational distribution of personnel attached to trial courts of general jurisdiction are presented in Table III-7 based on the NMS Survey of Courts. Of an estimated total of 53,800 full-time equivalent court personnel (including probation officers), about 18 percent were either judges or other judicial officials, such as magistrates and referees. Among non-judicial occupations, the largest group, 22 percent of the total, were Clerks of the Court and their deputies. The Clerk of the Court is normally an elected official whose responsibilities may range from strictly clerical functions to full responsibility for court administration. A total of about 8,200 probation officers were reported as attached to these courts, although not necessarily on the court payroll. (Since many probation and parole offices function as independent agencies or are attached to correctional organizations, this key function has been treated in this report as part of the corrections sector, in accordance with current LEAA-Census statistical reporting procedures.) Other major categories of courts personnel include bailiffs, court reporters and clerical and secretarial personnel. Larger courts also employ personnel in a number of other specialized occupations, including law clerks, staff attorneys, court administrators, computer specialists and in other professional, technical or administrative occupations.

The overall proportions of non-judicial personnel tends to increase with the size of the court, from 77 percent, for courts with fewer than 10 employees, to 88 percent in those with 150 or more employees. Whereas the typical court in a small rural jurisdiction may consist of a single judge, a clerk of the court, and a bailiff often functioning on a part-year basis—the large metropolitan trial courts include a much more diversified range of specialized personnel.

NMS survey data on prosecution and public defender offices indicate a relatively simple occupational structure for these agencies. In both categories, the attorneys serving as prosecutors or defenders and those in assistant prosecutor or defender positions, together constitute about 55 percent of total agency personnel. The second largest group consists of secretaries, typists and other clerical personnel, who account for over 30 percent of the total staff. Other specialized personnel, found

TABLE III-7
*Occupational Distribution of Employees in State and Local Courts of General Jurisdiction
by Size of Court, 1974-1975^a*

Occupational Group	All Size Groups		Size of Court—Number of Employees				
	Number ^b	Percent	150 or more	75-149	25-74	10-24	1-9
<i>Percent of Total Employment</i>							
Total	53,800	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Judicial occupations	9,800	18.2	11.7	17.7	24.6	25.9	22.9
Judges	5,400	10.0	5.2	8.0	13.8	16.1	19.1
Other officials exercising judicial authority	4,400	8.2	6.5	9.8	10.8	9.8	3.8
Other occupations	44,000	81.8	88.3	82.3	75.4	74.1	77.1
Clerks & deputy clerks of court	11,800	21.9	17.1	21.9	22.4	26.0	34.0
Probation officers	8,200	15.2	18.8	14.5	11.9	12.7	11.4
Bailiffs	5,800	10.8	10.6	12.4	10.6	11.5	9.8
Court reporters	4,700	8.7	6.6	7.6	9.5	10.6	13.9
Law clerks	1,100	2.0	2.8	2.5	2.3	1.0	.4
Staff attorneys	700	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.5
Other professional & technical	1,600	3.0	4.2	3.9	2.3	1.2	.4
Clerical/secretarial	7,300	13.6	20.6	13.2	9.6	6.8	4.2
Other	2,800	5.2	6.7	5.4	5.2	3.0	1.5

^a Total employment as of October 1974, adapted from LEAA/Census, *Expenditures and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1974*. Includes estimate of 10,700 probation officers and associated clerical employees, attached to courts, but excluded from the LEAA/Census statistics. The latter estimate and data on other occupations are from the NMS Courts Survey (1976) and refers to June 1975.

^b Full-time equivalent employees.

TABLE III-8
*Occupational Distribution of Employees in Prosecution Agencies by Size of Agency, 1974
(Percent distribution)*

Occupational Group	Size of Agency					
	All Agencies	75 or More Employees	25-74 Employees	10-24 Employees	5-9 Employees	1-4 Employees
Total employment	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Chief and assistant chief prosecutors	12.1	3.2	7.0	14.0	20.3	37.2
Assistant Prosecutors	33.0	39.3	35.9	33.6	29.3	12.4
Investigators	10.4	14.0	10.9	8.9	7.5	3.0
Paralegals	2.6	3.1	4.1	3.4	.4	.3
Secretaries, stenographers and typists	34.2	29.4	33.8	33.6	39.0	44.6
Other	7.7	10.9	8.3	6.4	3.5	2.4

Source: NMS Survey, 1975.

primarily in the larger agencies, include investigators and paralegal staff (see Table III-8).

A substantial proportion of attorneys serving as prosecutors and assistant prosecutors in smaller agencies perform these functions on a part-time basis, while maintaining their private law practices. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals and other studies have recommended that each prosecutor's office should employ at least one full-time prosecutor, through restructuring of jurisdictions, where necessary.⁴

5. Corrections

a. *Major functions.* The correctional function encompasses a particularly diversified range of activities which begin at the stage of initial detention of persons charged with crimes and include pre-sentence investigations of adjudicated offenders, confinement and treatment in correctional institutions or facilities, determinations of parole eligibility, and correction supervision of those under probation or parole. Agencies are differentiated as either residential facilities such as prisons, jails, reformatories and work camps, or as non-

residential programs including probation and parole activities. They are further differentiated by type of offender/group served (men, women, juveniles), and—in the case of institutions—by length of detention, degree of security and the type of work, training or rehabilitation activities pursued.

The major categories of state and local agencies are described below:

- Correctional institutions designed primarily for adult offenders account for 106,000 or 52 percent of total state and local correctional employment, based on full-time equivalents (Table III-9). These include about 66,000 state employees in state prisons, road camps, prison farms and related activities, as well as 40,000 employees of county and municipal jail facilities. Most of the latter are operated by county sheriffs' offices.
- Juvenile institutions employed 43,000 full-time equivalent employees in 1974. State juvenile institutions, such as training schools, ranches, and camps, accounted for 29,000 or two-thirds, of this total. Locally operated facilities, such as detention centers, or group homes, employed an additional 14,000. The latter total excludes publicly funded community-based juvenile residential facilities if the latter are operated by a non-governmental agency.
- State and local probation and parole activities accounted for 46,000 full-time equivalent employees in 1974. These activities are performed in a large variety of organizational contexts, including independent state-level agencies or boards, agencies affiliated with correctional departments, and units affiliated with court systems. About 27,000, or three-fifths of probation and parole staff, were employed by local governments.
- An additional 8,000 correctional employees were in administrative or miscellaneous activities, mainly at the central administrative level of state correctional "headquarters" agencies.

b. *Occupational distribution.* Large correctional institutions, such as state prisons and juvenile training centers, are—in many respects—self-contained communities. In addition to their primary responsibilities for assuring secure custody of inmates and for their rehabilitation, their work forces must provide for feeding of inmates, for maintenance of facilities and grounds, and for specialized inmate services, including medical and dental care, recreational activities and religious services, in addition to the usual administrative staff services.

Summary statistics on the distribution of correctional employees by occupational group have been developed, based on separate censuses or surveys conducted in the past few years of each of the major categories of correctional activity. As shown in Table III-10, the line correctional occupations accounted—in combination—for 61 percent of total correctional employment in 1974. Correctional officers and supervisors in adult institutions, the largest single occupational group, accounted for more than one-half of this total and for 34 percent of total correctional employment. Line probation and parole officers were the second largest group, with an estimated employment of 22,500, exclusive of about 3,000 supervisory personnel. About 17,800 additional employees were classified as child care workers in juvenile institutions or other residential facilities.

The managerial group (including probation and parole supervisors) is estimated at 14,300 or 7 percent of the total. This category includes individuals with widely differing scopes of managerial responsibilities, from administrators of state correctional systems and of large correctional institutions to those supervising local jails, group homes, or probation and parole offices with very small numbers of employees. Many of the latter also perform line correctional duties, in addition to their administrative or supervisory responsibilities.

An additional 22,600 employees, or 11 percent of the total, were classified as treatment and educational specialists in adult and juvenile facilities. This group is

TABLE III-9
State and Local Correctional Employees, by Type of Agency: 1974
(Full-time equivalents, numbers in thousands)

Type of Agency	Total		State		Local*	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	203	100	121	100	82	100
Adult correctional facilities	106	52	66	55	40	49
Juvenile institutions	43	21	29	24	14	17
Probation/Parole	46	22	18	15	27	33
Administrative and miscellaneous	8	4	7	6	1	1

* Estimates of distribution of local employment by type of agency based on data for 384 cities and 312 counties, which accounted for 84 percent of total local corrections employment. Source: LEAA/Census, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1974*, Tables 9, 45, 46, 47.

TABLE III-10

*Estimated Distribution of Full-time Equivalent
Employment in State and Local Correctional
Activities by Major Occupational Group: 1974*
(Full-time equivalents)

Occupational Group	Number	Percent
Total -----	203,200	100
Management ^a -----	14,300	7
Custodial officers, adult facilities -----	69,500	34
Child care workers -----	17,800	9
Probation and parole officers ^a -----	22,500	11
Treatment and educational specialists in adult/ juvenile facilities -----	22,600	11
Clerical, craft and other support personnel --	56,500	28

^a Management group also includes approximately 3,000 probation and parole supervisors. Sources: NMS estimates by occupational group adapted from occupational distributions of various categories of correctional agencies, primarily from following sources:

LEAA-Census, *Census Survey of State Correctional Facilities, 1974*.

LEAA-Census, *Census of Juvenile Detention and Correctional Facilities, 1973* (unpublished data).

LEAA, *The Nation's Jails, 1975* (based on 1972 jail census).

NMS Executive Survey of Probation and Parole Executives, 1975.

primarily limited to those in specialized professional occupations, and who perform functions such as counseling, rehabilitation, education, medical, and related welfare services. It excludes correctional officers and auxiliary personnel, such as clerical workers and paraprofessionals, who may be assigned to these functions in a

supporting role. The latter are included, with all other support and administrative personnel, among employees in the "clerical, crafts, and other support personnel" group, which accounted for 56,500 or 28 percent of total correctional employment in 1974.

c. Correctional workload and employment trends.

The rapid escalation of crime rates during the past two decades has been accompanied by sharp increases in the total number of offenders either arrested and convicted of serious crimes if adults, or who have been adjudicated as juvenile delinquents, and who have thus—in either case—normally become subject to some form of correctional control or supervision. Although comprehensive historical data on the flow of offenders through the criminal justice system are not available, Table III-11 provides indicators of: (1) "inputs" into correctional control, as measured by estimates of the number of convictions of persons charged with felonies, and of delinquency cases disposed of by juvenile courts; and (2) of the number of offenders actually in custody in state adult or juvenile penal institutions.

The comparisons provide a sharp contrast between the trend of correctional inputs and that of the numbers actually confined in state institutions. In the case of adult offenders, the number convicted increased by about 46 percent between 1969 and 1974. On the other hand, the number of inmates of state institutions showed little net change between 1969 and 1972, then increased in the

TABLE III-11

Indicators of Correctional Workloads for Adult and Juvenile Offenders, 1965-1974
(Numbers in thousands)

	Adults				Juveniles			
	Estimated Felony Convictions ^a		Prisoners in State Institutions ^b		Delinquency Cases Disposed of by Juvenile Courts ^c		Offenders in State Institutions ^d	
	Number	Index *	Number	Index *	Number	Index *	Number	Index *
1965 -----	—	—	189.8	107.6	697.0	70.5	42.4	97.7
1966 -----	—	—	180.4	102.3	745.0	75.4	—	—
1967 -----	—	—	175.3	100.6	811.0	82.0	—	—
1968 -----	387.5	95.6	173.1	98.1	900.0	91.0	—	—
1969 -----	405.2	100.0	176.4	100.0	988.5	100.0	43.4	100.0
1970 -----	450.8	111.3	176.4	100.0	1052.0	106.4	42.2	97.2
1971 -----	486.6	120.1	177.1	100.4	1125.0	113.8	36.8	84.8
1972 -----	492.0	121.4	174.4	98.9	1112.5	112.5	—	—
1973 -----	537.3	132.6	181.4	102.8	1143.7	115.7	28.5	65.7
1974 -----	591.1	145.9	195.8	111.0	—	—	27.4	63.1

^a *Estimated felony convictions*: Adapted from data in FBI, *Uniform Crime Reports*. Calculated by applying disposition statistics from sample cities to total number of offenses known. Includes both persons found guilty of offenses charged and those found guilty of lesser offenses.

^b *Prisoners in state institutions*: U.S. Bureau of Prisons, *National Prisoner Statistics*, NPS Bulletins No. 43, August 1968 and No. 47, April 1972, and LEAA, *Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions*, December 31, 1971, 1972, and 1973, May 1975. Data for 1960-70 include all sentenced inmates; for 1971-74, include prisoners sentenced to at least a year and a day.

^c *Delinquent cases disposed of by juvenile courts*: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Offices of Human Development and Youth Development, *Juvenile Court Statistics, 1973*, March 1975.

^d *Offenders in state institutions*: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Correction in the United States, 1966*, Table 25 and *Children in Custody*, for the years indicated (1971 data are revised, data for 1974 are preliminary.)

* 1969=100.

following 2 years. Moreover, it continued to grow sharply to a record high of 217,000 in 1975, according to preliminary reports. However, in 1974, the prison inmate population was still only 11 percent above the 1969 level.⁵ In the case of juvenile offenders, the number of delinquency cases disposed of by juvenile courts—including “status” offenses, but excluding ordinary traffic cases—rose by 64 percent between 1965 and 1973. Yet over the same period, the number confined in state juvenile institutions remained stable between 1965 and 1970, then dropped sharply in the following three years. In 1974, it was 35 percent lower than in 1965.

One obvious explanation for these contrasting trends has been the increased diversion of both juvenile and adult offenders from institutionalization to probation or other forms of community-based, nonresidential programs. In 1969, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training estimated that a total of 836,000 offenders were under the control of probation/parole agencies, as compared to about 279,000 in adult institutions, jails, or juvenile detention facilities.⁶ Although definitive statistics are lacking, there is considerable evidence—developed later in this chapter—that probation/parole caseloads have grown rapidly since then. Several factors contributed to this trend, in our judgment. These include: (1) the high cost of institutionalization, which was estimated to be about 10 times as great, per offender man-year as community-based nonresidential programs, by the President’s Commission in its 1967 report;⁷ (2) mounting evidence publicized by such studies as that of the Crime Commission that imprisonment was no more—and perhaps even less—effective in rehabilitation of offenders than the much less costly community programs; (3) the increase in prison riots in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, which served to dramatize the deplorable and inhumane condi-

tions in many institutions; as well as related problems concerned with overcrowding and racial tensions in these institutions; and (4) an apparent increased reluctance on the part of many judges to sentence offenders to prison terms, or to assign them to juvenile institutions, in view of these conditions.

Although the above interpretations are not readily capable of empirical verification, it is clear that imprisonment has increasingly been reserved for the more serious and dangerous offenders. Thus, J.Q. Wilson has noted that the proportion of state prison inmates who had been convicted of homicide, robbery, or assault rose from about one-third of the prison population in 1960 to nearly one-half in 1974, while those convicted of non-violent crimes, such as burglary, larceny, and auto theft, had actually decreased—despite the fact that the reported rate of these crimes had increased more than four times.⁸

Additional confirming evidence is provided by the data on employment trends in various correctional activities during the past decade (Table III-12). Between 1965 and 1974 total correctional employment nearly doubled, rising from about 116,000 in 1965 to nearly 208,000 in 1974. Probation and parole agencies experienced the most rapid growth over this period, increasing their staffs from about 19,000 in 1965, to nearly 50,000 in 1974. Relatively rapid growth was also indicated for local jails and other locally based facilities. The slowest employment growth, about 41 percent, was experienced by the state correctional institutions for adults and juveniles.

B. Criteria for Assessing Personnel Needs

The data presented in the preceding sections of this chapter have indicated that both employment in criminal

TABLE III-12
*Employment in State and Local Correctional Activities:
1965, 1974 **

	Number		Percent Distribution		Percent Change 1965-74
	1965	1974	1965	1974	
Total	115.9	207.6	100.0	100.0	87
State adult institutions	46.7	66.0	40.3	31.8	41
Local jails and other adult facilities	19.2	44.4	16.6	21.4	131
State juvenile institutions	21.2	30.0	18.3	14.5	41
Local juvenile institutions	9.9	17.6	8.5	8.5	78
Probation and parole	18.9	49.6	16.3	23.8	162

Sources: 1965—Based on survey by National Council on Crime and Delinquency, published in *Corrections in the United States, 1966*, Table 25. Probation and parole employment, including court-affiliated agencies, estimated in part based on interpolation of data on probation and parole officers for 1962 and 1967, from the *Probation and Parole Directory, 1976*, NCCD. 1974—LEAA-Census, *Employment and Expenditure Data for Criminal Justice Agencies, 1974*. The distribution of local government by type of activity is partially estimated. Data in both years refer to total employees, and exclude employees in administrative agencies.

* Includes full-time and part-time workers. Part-time workers not adjusted to full-time equivalents.

justice agencies and crime-related workloads have increased substantially in recent years. They provide no direct basis, however, for assessing total agency personnel needs and the adequacy of current staffing levels to meet these needs. Any assessment of personnel or other resource needs in the public sector poses some unique problems. In the private economy, resource allocations among competing goods and services are governed by the rules of the market place. In the public sector, such allocations are accomplished through a complex process of decision-making involving legislative and executive officials at all levels of government.

A point of departure in this decision-making process is the setting of social goals and priorities. Government officials in a democratic society tend to set their priorities based on their perception of what their constituents are willing to "spend" for these services.

Measures to control crime have ranked high on this list of priorities. Almost all recent public opinion surveys have revealed widespread fear of crime, as a major concern. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the statutory authority for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, reflects this concern. The preamble to this law states its purpose to be: "to reduce and prevent crime and juvenile delinquency, and to insure the greater safety of the people. . ."⁹

The premise underlying this legislation, as well as similar governmental responses to the crime problem at the state and local levels, is that crime can be reduced through a strengthening of those agencies directly responsible for coping with crime, i.e., the police, the prosecutors, the courts, the correctional agencies and other elements of the "criminal justice system." Although nearly all assessments recognize that crime is a social problem, with deep-rooted causes in the fabric of our society, most have also accepted the assumption that crime can be reduced, to some extent, by making crime more "costly" to the criminal, i.e., by increasing the likelihood that he will be apprehended and prosecuted, that he will receive a speedy trial and be punished if found guilty.

Although this premise appears inherently reasonable, direct empirical evidence of the linkage between increased personnel for various categories of law enforcement and criminal justice programs and crime reduction is still quite limited. This is due, in part, to the fact that the incidence of crime in our society is influenced by a large number of economic, social and psychological factors outside of the control of agencies within the criminal justice system. Most informed observers, including many officials of these agencies themselves, recognize that the efforts of their agencies can have only a marginal effect upon the overall crime problem. Thus, when

queried as to how much improvement in crime control and the administration of justice could be achieved through changes in staffing, organization and policies of law enforcement agencies generally, only 41 percent of the 1,185 police chiefs responding to this question expected a "great deal of improvement"; 51 percent anticipated "some improvement" and 8 percent, "little or no improvement."¹⁰


Another difficulty in any attempt to assess "optimal" manpower needs for law enforcement and criminal justice agencies results from the fact that most of these agencies have multiple functions or goals, some of which have no direct relationship to crime reduction or prevention. Thus, the typical local police department performs a wide range of community functions not related to crime control, including—among others—such activities as traffic regulation, crowd control, resolving conflicts among family members or neighbors and providing emergency assistance for the sick, the disabled and the inebriated. Prosecutors in many jurisdictions perform a variety of legal services of a civil nature, such as tax collection, as well as handling criminal cases in their jurisdiction. Most state courts similarly combine civil and criminal functions. Finally, correctional agencies, such as prisons, jails and juvenile institutions, are responsible both for the secure custody and maintenance of their inmates, and for various inmate counseling, training, work and recreational programs.

The emphasis given to these various agency functions or goals can vary widely among jurisdictions, depending upon such factors as agency structure, resource availability, community attitudes and the priorities of agency officials themselves. Some indication of the extent of variation in these goals is provided by responses to questions addressed to police protection and correctional executives concerning "the most important goals" of their agencies.

- *Police chiefs and sheriffs.* Police chiefs and sheriffs were asked to rank in order of importance five possible goals. Over half ranked one of these goals, "community satisfaction," as the most important criterion of their agency's performance (Chart III-2). About one-fifth identified "a low rate for major street crimes" as their primary goal, while relatively small percentages cited such other performance measures as a quick response to service calls, a low reported (overall) crime rate or a high clearance rate, as their first choice. Clearly, a more generalized formulation, such as "community satisfaction," more accurately reflected the multiple functions of most police or sheriff departments. In turn, the lower ranking assigned to crime rates, as a measure of police performance, reflects the growing appreci-

Chart III-2

"Most Important" Goals of Law Enforcement and Correctional Executives



* Low response time; high clearance rates.

Sources: National Manpower Survey, Executive Survey.

ation by law enforcement executives that these are influenced by many factors outside of their control.

- *Corrections administrators.* Administrators of state correctional institutions for adults ranked "inmate maintenance" most frequently as their most important goal (56 percent), as compared to "rehabilitation of offenders" (30 percent), with relatively few identifying other functions, such as inmate counseling, vocational training or job placement of offenders, as "most important." In contrast, a majority of administrators of state juvenile correctional institutions assigned highest priority to their rehabilitation functions, including such activities as counseling, education and training. Only about four out of ten of these executives considered maintenance of juvenile residents (provision of adequate housing, food and medical care) or enforcement of discipline, as their principle goals. In even more emphatic fashion, heads of probation and parole agencies agreed that rehabilitation of ex-offenders was the primary objective of their agencies, while only about 10 percent of responses related their agency's most important goal to such monitoring functions as "adherence to probation-parole agreements" or a "low probation-parole violation rate."

In the face of these diverse functions and goals of criminal justice agencies, and of the inherent difficulties of any attempt to measure the direct relationship between manpower resources for these agencies and crime reduction, the research approach to this aspect of the National Manpower Survey was designed to provide information on two closely related issues: (1) whether existing staff levels appeared generally adequate, or inadequate for performance of the responsibilities and functions of these agencies; and (2) whether some categories of criminal justice agencies or functions appeared to be relatively more in need of additional personnel than others.

Several approaches were used in assessing the quantitative adequacy of current personnel resources, depending in part upon the data available in each sector.

- First, executives in all categories of agencies were queried in the NMS surveys concerning the major personnel problems and manpower needs of their agencies to enable them to effectively fulfill their responsibilities.
- Second, actual staffing ratios, for certain categories of agencies and personnel, were compared to those recommended for these agencies, by professional organizations in the field or by various study commissions. Such comparisons were primarily limited to the corrections sector, for which detailed staffing norms have been developed.

- Finally, available evidence was examined on the relationship between agency staffing levels and measures of performance or of case backlogs. Analyses of this type were attempted for police agencies and for trial courts.

The results of these analyses are presented in the following sections of this chapter.

C. Agency Manpower Needs: The Executive's Perspective

1. *Major agency manpower problems.* In any assessment of an agency's resource needs, a reasonable point of departure is to request the agency's executive's own appraisal of these needs. The executive of any public agency is accountable for its performance. His requests for funds and personnel are the normal starting point in the budgetary process, although these are often constrained by fiscal guidelines and by his own judgment of fiscal realities. One would, *a priori*, anticipate some upward bias in any executive's response to queries concerning his agency's total manpower needs, as compared to those which might be derived from an independent management assessment. On the other hand, our field interviews with several hundred executives and management staff of such agencies throughout the country suggest that—as would be expected—these individuals as a group have a firm grasp of the attainable. Although their assessments will be conditioned by their own perceptions of their agency's goals and responsibilities, they are not likely to indulge in "blue sky" estimates.

Each executive surveyed was first requested to identify in rank order the "most serious" manpower problem in his agency. The problems listed were:

- Inadequate number of authorized positions
- Inability to achieve or maintain authorized strength
- High (excessive) turnover
- Inadequate training of personnel
- Inadequate representation of minorities or women on staff

As shown in Table III-13, an "inadequate number of authorized personnel" was the problem most frequently identified as "most serious" in each agency category. "Inability to achieve or maintain authorized strengths" was the next most frequent response in the case of police, sheriffs and administrators of adult correctional institutions. This item was designed to identify manpower problems resulting from recruitment difficulties. However, as a result of the fiscal problems experienced by many state and local jurisdictions during the period of this survey, it is probable that many agencies did not have sufficient funds to hire personnel who may have

TABLE III-13

Executive Responses on "Most Serious Manpower Problem" and on "Major Factor Contributing to Most Serious Problem," by Type of Agency ¹
(Percent distribution)

	Police	Sheriffs ²	Prosecutors	Defender	Adult Corrections	Juvenile Corrections	Probation and Parole
Most Serious Manpower Problem:							
Inadequate number of authorized positions -----	53.3	68.0	68.1	74.9	52.2	35.8	53.9
Inability to achieve or maintain authorized strength -----	19.9	13.3	5.9	6.3	13.8	10.1	10.0
High (excessive) turnover -----	3.7	4.4	7.0	2.9	9.5	12.6	6.5
Inadequate training of personnel -----	11.0	7.3	10.7	8.8	13.4	31.9	19.0
Inadequate representation of minorities or women -----	9.3	2.8	1.7	3.8	6.0	4.7	4.6
Other -----	2.9	4.1	6.6	3.3	5.2	4.9	6.0
Total -----	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Major Contributing Factor:							
General budgetary problems -----	66.2	71.8	60.9	74.5	63.6	42.6	59.1
General lack of qualified applicants -----	6.7	2.9	2.2	1.3	8.1	7.3	2.4
Lack of minority or female applicants -----	7.0	1.8	0.9	0.4	2.5	2.8	1.2
Inadequate levels of compensation -----	5.7	11.7	24.0	7.8	8.1	12.6	10.7
Insufficient funds for training -----	5.4	3.3	4.4	5.2	8.6	18.5	11.0
Limited opportunities for advancement -----	1.8	1.8	1.6	0.4	4.0	5.7	3.8
Other -----	7.1	6.6	6.1	10.4	5.1	10.5	11.8
Total -----	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

¹ In cities with populations of 17,000 and over.

² Sheriffs agencies with 10 or more employees.

Sources: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

been originally "authorized" in their budgets for that year. Other categories of agency executives, including juvenile correctional administrators, heads of probation and parole offices, prosecutors and defenders, identified "inadequate training of personnel" as their second most frequent response. Thus, numerical shortages—and, to a considerably lesser extent—recruitment difficulties or qualitative deficiencies were identified as the manpower problems of greatest concern to virtually all categories of law enforcement and criminal justice executives.

As would be expected, when executives were next asked to indicate the major factor contributing to their "most serious" manpower problems, "general budgetary problems" were most frequently reported by all categories of agency executives. Inadequate pay or inadequate training funds were also noted by 10 percent or more of the respondents in the case of juvenile corrections administrators, prosecutors, sheriffs and heads of probation and parole offices.

Although all categories of agency executives identified the manpower/budget squeeze as their most pressing personnel problem, the proportion of executives who

ranked these first on their list did vary significantly by agency category. Thus, about 75 percent of the public defenders and over two-thirds of the prosecutors and sheriffs (in agencies with 10 or more employees) ranked this as their most serious problem, as contrasted to only 36 percent of juvenile correctional administrators. Similarly, only about two-fifths of the latter reported "general budgetary problems" as the most important factor contributing to their manpower problems, as contrasted to much higher proportions of executives in other types of agencies.

2. *Estimated additional manpower needs.* In order to obtain a more quantitative assessment of the extent of perceived manpower needs, in each agency category, executives were also requested to estimate the total number of employees needed to "fulfill effectively all the duties and responsibilities" with which their agency was charged. Their responses, when related to their agency's employment in June 1975, indicated an average requirement for all major agency categories of an increase of 26 percent in number of employees (see Table III-14). This corresponds to a requirement for an addi-

tional 220,000 employees based on our estimate of total employment in these agency categories in 1974. These totals, moreover, exclude courts agencies and municipal legal service agencies, which were not covered in the NMS executive surveys.

Among the agency categories surveyed, sheriffs and heads of probation and parole offices reported the greatest proportionate requirements for additional personnel—34 percent and 35 percent, respectively. Heads of correctional institutions reported a lower-than-average need for additional staff—20 percent for adult institutions, and 15 percent for juvenile institutions. Requirements of other agencies, including police, prosecutors and public defenders more closely approximated the overall average.

TABLE III-14

Executives' Estimates of Increases in Agency Employment Needed to Effectively Fulfill All Agency Duties and Responsibilities

Agency Category	Actual Employment 1974 ²	Percent Increase Needed ^{3*}	Estimated Additional Employees Needed ⁴
Total ¹ ---	834,000	26	220,000
Law enforcement, except sheriffs' agencies ---	515,000	27	139,000
Sheriffs' agencies ---	85,000	34	29,000
Prosecution and legal service including municipal agencies ---	35,000	22	8,000
Indigent defense ---	7,000	23*	2,000
Adult corrections, except sheriffs' jails ---	102,000	20	20,000
Juvenile corrections ---	45,000	15	6,000
Probation and parole ---	45,000	35	16,000

¹ Includes all categories of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies except courts, municipal prosecution and legal service agencies and general administrative agencies.

² Source: U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System*, 1974, and special tabulation of Census Employee Characteristics Survey, 1974, for estimated employment in sheriffs' agencies.

³ Based on responses to NMS executive surveys, 1975, weighted by agency size.

⁴ Derived by applying percentage increases needed to actual 1974 employment. Since agency employment probably increased between 1974 and the time of surveys in late 1975, these estimates slightly understate the total number of additional personnel needed at the latter date.

* The question addressed to public defenders related to staffing needs "to fully comply" with Supreme Court requirements. The percentage increase shown refers to those agencies (76 percent of the total) which reported they were not in full compliance.

A more detailed examination of these responses indicates significant differences in needs, by agency size, and for particular categories of personnel. Among police agencies, heads of large departments—with 1,000 or more employees—reported a greater relative need for

additional staff than all but the smallest agencies, as shown in the following table:

Agency Size	Median Percent Increase in Police Employees Needed
All police departments -----	26.8
1,000 or more employees -----	28.6
400-999 -----	17.5
150-399 -----	16.8
75-149 -----	20.1
25-49 -----	23.9
1-24 -----	32.9

With few exceptions, the estimated percentage increases in personnel needed, for agencies other than police, varied inversely with agency size. Thus, sheriffs in agencies with less than 10 employees reported a need for 60 percent additional staff, as compared with 25 percent by sheriffs in agencies with 150 or more employees. Prosecutors in offices with 1-4 employees reported a need for 37 percent more personnel, as compared to 19 percent by prosecutors in offices with 75 employees or more. Heads of probation and parole offices with less than 10 employees reported a need for a 70 percent increase in staff, as compared with 46 percent in agencies with 10-24 employees and 30 percent in those with 25 or more employees. Similar patterns were evident in the reports of correctional institution executives.

In the case of correctional agencies, administrators of both adult and juvenile correctional institutions also reported a greater relative need for treatment specialists than for line custodial personnel. Heads of adult correctional institutions reported a need for an increase of 42 percent in treatment personnel, as compared with 15 percent for custodial officers. Juvenile correctional administrators indicated a need for 23 percent additional treatment employees, as compared with 12 percent for child care workers.

In probation and parole agencies, the reported requirement for additional probation and parole officers, of 29 percent, was lower than the overall estimated requirement for additional personnel, of 35 percent, reflecting relatively high needs for secretaries, para-professionals and other support personnel in these agencies.

In summary, therefore, the surveys of agency executives (other than courts) revealed a widespread consensus that lack of sufficient numbers of personnel was their agency's most serious current manpower problem and that this was primarily attributable to inadequate agency budgets, rather than to difficulties in recruiting the needed personnel. Additional staffing needs were proportionately greater in some agency categories, such as probation and parole, sheriffs and prosecutor agencies;

they were significantly lower-than-average for juvenile corrections agencies. The largest proportionate staffing need in correctional institutions was for additional treatment personnel, rather than custodial workers. Smaller agencies consistently reported a higher percentage requirement for additional staff than did larger agencies. However, among police departments, the largest departments—those with 1,000 or more employees—also reported relatively high manpower needs.

D. Analyses of Manpower Needs by Sector

In addition to the above survey results, a series of more specialized analyses, relevant to current manpower needs, were conducted for specific categories of agencies. The results are summarized below.

1. Police agencies

a. *Inter-city variations in police employment.* The number of employees of municipal police agencies, expressed as a ratio to number of inhabitants, varies widely from city to city. In 1974, this ratio ranged from an average of 3.5 full-time law enforcement employees, per 1,000 inhabitants, in cities with more than 250,000 population, to 1.9 per 1,000 in cities with 10,000 to 100,000 population. It was only slightly higher, 2.1 per 1,000, in cities with less than 10,000 inhabitants (Table III-15). The wide variation in per capita police employment, even among cities of a given size group, is illustrated by the interquartile range of these ratios. Thus, in cities with less than 10,000 population, these ratios fell below 1.4 per 1,000 population or exceeded 2.7 per 1,000, in one-half of the cities surveyed.

One partial explanation for these differences is that crime rates also vary widely from city to city. An examination of Table III-15 suggests that the actual differences in police employment ratios among cities are explainable, in part, by variations in crime rates. Thus, cities with 250,000 or more population, which reported the highest per capita police employment as a group, also experienced the highest rates of reported serious crime—almost twice as great as among cities with less than 10,000 population. In an effort to explain these differences more fully, 1973 data were compiled on police employment, population, reported crime rates and on a number of other relevant social and economic characteristics for cities whose populations ranged from 25,000 to 1,000,000.

The factors found to contribute most to differences in per capita police employment among all the cities studied were: (1) the incidence of street crime, as measured by the robbery rate; (2) the amount of taxes per capita; and (3) the proportion of low income families in each jurisdiction. About 30 percent of the variation in per capita

TABLE III-15

Full-Time Law Enforcement Employees per 1,000 Population and Crime Rates, by Size of Group, 1974

City Size Group Population	Employees per 1,000 Population		Index Crime Rate (per 100,000 Population)
	Average	Inter-Quartile Range	
Total Cities -----	2.5	1.4-2.5	5966
Over 250,000 -----	3.5	2.2-3.5	7499
100,000-250,000 -----	2.3	1.8-2.5	7111
50,000-100,000 -----	1.9	1.5-2.2	5747
25,000-50,000 -----	1.9	1.5-2.1	5152
10,000-25,000 -----	1.9	1.5-2.2	4418
Less than 10,000 -----	2.1	1.4-2.7	3818

Source: FBI, *Crime in the United States, 1974: Uniform Crime Reports*, Tables 14, 56.

police employment was found to be associated with differences in the robbery rate. Cities with higher robbery rates tended to have higher police employment ratios. Differences in per capita tax rates accounted for an additional 15 percent of the variation. Those cities with higher tax rates also tended to have higher police employment ratios, as did cities with a greater incidence of poverty. In all, these three factors—robbery rates, taxes per capita and the proportion of low income families—were estimated to account for about one-half of the variation in per capita police employment among cities. Significantly, such factors as city size, *per se*, and population density (i.e., population per square mile), had little or no independent influence upon the observed variations in police-population ratios.

Among larger cities, those with populations of 100,000 to one million, police employment levels were found to be most sensitive to the robbery rate. This factor alone explained 46 percent of the variation in police employment ratios. The amount of taxes per capita and the proportion of black males, aged 15-24, in the population (which has been found to have a positive correlation with crime rates) were next in order of importance, but had much less influence.

In contrast, the tax level was found to be the most important single variable associated with differences in police employment ratios in the medium-sized and smaller population cities analyzed, with populations of 50,000-100,000 and 25,000-50,000 respectively. For these agencies, differences in per capita taxes explained 19 percent and 25 percent of the variation, respectively, in per capita police employment, with the robbery rate ranking next in order of importance.

From this analysis, it is evident that differences in crime rates and in crime-related workloads provide only a partial explanation for variations in police employment levels. This is not surprising in view of the fact that only

a limited proportion of total police effort is directly related to crime control activities, such as responding to calls concerning commission of crimes, investigation of crimes and apprehension of criminals. A major portion of the duty time of line officers—typically as much as 80 percent—is devoted to such activities as routine patrolling, traffic control, responding to various types of non-crime-related calls for service, and to a variety of non-police related activities.¹¹ Among communities with similar levels of crime rates, the more affluent communities—as measured in this analysis by the level of per capita taxes—tend to demand more police services and to employ more police than do those with lower revenue levels.

b. *Police manpower and police performance.* Although the above analysis has provided insights as to factors accounting for variations in police employment, it does not provide a basis for determining whether additional investments in police manpower will produce sufficient community benefits—in terms of reduced crime or other desired results—to be cost effective, in comparison with alternative uses of these funds. Such judgments must be made at the community level, based on much more detailed information on agency workloads and staffing and on community needs than was available for the present study.

A number of research studies have attempted, however, to estimate the extent to which additional police manpower, or expenditures, have been “productive,” as measured by such yardsticks as their effects upon crime rates and clearance rates. These experimental projects, designed to test the efficacy of particular police strategies, as well as a number of quantitative, multi-variate analyses, have attempted to determine whether differences in levels of police staffing or expenditures among departments have been associated with lower crime and/or higher arrest rates. These studies have yielded mixed and—at times—controversial results, as illustrated below:

- Experimental projects, such as those entailing substantial police manpower increases in high crime precincts in New York City and in New York City subways, have resulted in reductions in crimes in these jurisdictions. Their net effect upon overall crime levels is less clear, however, because of the possibility that criminals may simply have shifted their activities to other locations. Moreover, substantial increases in random preventative patrol, as in the Kansas City experiment, do not seem to have been effective in reducing crime rates.
- Results of multi-variate analyses, typically based on “cross-sectional” comparisons of police employment and police expenditures among cities, states or

metropolitan areas, have also produced apparently conflicting results. About one-half of these studies found that higher levels of police resources were associated with lower crime or higher arrest rates than would otherwise be expected, and attribute these findings to the deterrent effects of increased police activity. The remaining studies, however, reported either negative or statistically insignificant results. Generally, studies in which the units of analysis were states or large cities were more likely to result in positive findings than those including large numbers of small cities.

- A detailed Rand Corporation study of the criminal investigative process, employing both multi-variate analysis and intensive survey methods, concluded that differences in investigative staffing levels or procedures had no appreciable effect on crime, arrest or clearance rates, and that the single most important determinant of success was the amount of information provided by the victim to the immediately responding patrol officer.

The above findings, when related to the results of the NMS surveys and analyses reported previously in this chapter, clearly suggest the need to avoid broad generalizations concerning additional needs for law enforcement manpower on a nationwide basis. During periods of fiscal stringency, such as those experienced by many state and local governments during the past few years, the practical issue facing many officials is whether moderate increments or decrements in law enforcement manpower will have any appreciable effect upon crime control or upon the adequacy of the other community services performed by law enforcement agencies. The lack of adequate data on these non-crime related workloads, as well as the inherent limitations of the available statistics on reported crimes and clearance rates, are among the obvious limitations of all of the above studies. Equally essential, for informed decision-making, are systematic and detailed management analyses of alternative approaches to utilization of existing police manpower resources, including consolidation or increased cross-servicing arrangements among police departments, more efficient patrol deployments, increased use of civilians in duties not requiring the skills of sworn police officers, and other measures to reduce the amount of officer time devoted to non-essential activities.

The available research does suggest, however, that in many communities improvements in deployment and management of existing resources, combined with more active citizen involvement or support, may contribute as much, or more, to the overall effectiveness of law enforcement agencies, as additional increments of police manpower or funds.

2. *Judicial process agencies.* Almost all recent assessments of the problems of the Nation's courts, and of related prosecution and defense agencies, have noted as major shortcomings the problems of case backlog and case delay; the pervasive reliance upon—and abuse of—plea bargaining procedures; inadequate screening of cases; insufficient provision of defense counsel; sentencing disparities among courts and judges; and insufficient time—generally—for judges, prosecutors and defenders for pre-trial preparation and an even-handed administration of justice. These shortcomings have been attributed to a variety of causes, including—among others—the need for additional manpower; for more judges, prosecutors, defenders and specialized management or support personnel. Such needs have, however, rarely been quantified at the national level, in part because essential data on judicial process agency workloads in relation to personnel have not been available.

Summary information on these agencies' caseloads was collected for the first time in the course of the NMS surveys. In addition, court administrators were requested to provide their assessments of the case delay problem in their courts and of the major factors contributing to case delay. The results are reviewed below:

a. *Courts.* The NMS survey of trial courts of general jurisdiction, conducted in early 1976, requested data on the number of cases pending and disposed of by these courts during Fiscal Year 1975, as well as related data on court personnel. Despite recent efforts to improve the efficiency of the courts in many states, including enactment of "speedy trial" legislation and provision of additional personnel, the results suggest a worsening, rather than improvement, in the ability of these courts to cope with their caseloads. As shown in Table III-16 felony case backlogs increased by 10 percent in fiscal year 1975, and civil case backlogs by 13 percent among these reporting courts. There were relatively small changes in case backlogs for juvenile cases or misdemeanor cases in those general trial courts with jurisdiction over the latter categories of cases.

Estimates of the mean number of additional months required to process pending cases were also computed for each type of case, by relating the size of these backlogs at the end of Fiscal Year 1975 to actual dispositions during the year. These ranged from about three months for misdemeanors and juvenile cases to nearly six months for felony cases and ten months for civil cases.

These data must be interpreted with some caution, since the reports cover only about one-fourth of all trial courts of general jurisdiction in the case of felony cases, and because of wide differences in record keeping and statistical practices among the courts. Nevertheless, the

severity of the existing problems of case delay is illustrated by the contrast between the estimated average additional time required to process existing felony case backlogs in these courts, and the total elapsed time between arrest and trial of two months recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.¹²

The survey data also indicated wide variations in the average length of time required to dispose of existing felony case backlogs, among those courts responding to the survey. Thus, for courts with 100 or more felony filings, in fiscal year 1975, an equivalent of 5.2 months was required by the average (median) court for processing felony case backlogs. However, 27 percent of these courts reported backlogs which could be processed in three months or less while at the other extreme, 13 percent had backlogs which corresponded to a delay of more than one year between filing and disposition.

TABLE III-16
Selected Court Caseload Statistics
Changes in Pending Caseloads, General Jurisdiction
Trial Courts, Fiscal Year 1975

Type of Case	Number of Courts Reporting	Average Pending Caseloads		
		Beginning of Year	End of Year	Percent Change
Felony -----	830	154	169	+10
Misdemeanor -----	432	162	158	- 2
Juvenile -----	501	69	70	+ 1
Civil -----	948	943	1064	+13

Estimated Mean Months to Process Pending Cases Based
on Number Disposed of in Fiscal Year 1975

Type of Case	Beginning of Year	End of Year
Felony -----	5.3	5.8
Misdemeanor -----	3.0	2.9
Juvenile -----	3.0	3.0
Civil -----	8.8	10.0

Source: NMS Survey of State and Local Trial Courts of General Jurisdiction, 1976.

The analysis further indicated a consistent relationship between case delay and the level of judicial staffing for criminal cases, as measured by the number of judges attached to each court and by the estimated percentage of their time devoted to criminal cases, i.e., "judge years on criminal cases". The average number of additional months needed to process pending criminal cases was found to be twice as great in courts where the "felony equivalent" caseload per judge year on criminal cases was 1,000 or more, than in courts where the caseload per judge year was less than 200 (Table III-17). Of equal

TABLE III-17

Distribution of General Trial Courts by Months Needed to Process Felony Cases Pending at the End of Fiscal Year 1975 and by the Felony Equivalent Caseload per Judge-Year Devoted to Criminal Cases

Months Needed To Process Pending Felony Cases	Courts by Felony Equivalent Caseload ^b Per Judge-Year					
	All Replies	0-199	200-399	400-699	700-999	1000 or More
All Courts:						
Median months to process pending cases -----	5.1	2.9	5.0	5.4	6.8	6.6
Percent of Total						
All replies -----	100	100	100	100	100	100
0-3 months -----	31	52	31	22	16	22
3.1-6 months -----	27	19	28	35	27	24
6.1-9 months -----	15	10	15	11	24	24
9.1-12 months -----	9	5	10	10	14	7
12.1-24 months -----	13	10	9	15	16	20
24.1 months or more -----	5	3	6	7	3	4
Number of reports -----	(345)	(86)	(78)	(89)	(37)	(55)
Courts With 100 or More Felony Filings:						
Median months to process pending cases -----	5.3	^a	4.4	4.8	6.6	7.1
Percent of Total						
All replies -----	100		100	100	100	100
0-3 months -----	26		37	28	14	18
3.1-6 months -----	31		28	37	31	23
6.1-9 months -----	19		19	13	24	25
9.1-12 months -----	8		9	6	14	9
12.1-24 months -----	13		5	15	14	23
24.1 months or more -----	2		2	2	3	2
Number of reports -----	(178)	(6)	(43)	(54)	(29)	(44)

^a Median not computed because there were fewer than 25 replies.

^b Caseload as used for this table includes cases pending at the beginning of the year plus those filed during the year. Felony equivalent cases are a weighted combination of felony and misdemeanor cases under which 5.5 misdemeanor cases are estimated to be the workload equivalent of one felony case.

importance, however, was the evidence of wide variations in estimated processing time among courts with similar felony caseloads per judge. Thus among the 106 courts reporting a workload of 1,000 or more felony cases per judge year, 17 percent reported that their case backlogs at the end of Fiscal Year 1975 corresponded to a period of 3 months or less, whereas 23 percent would require more than 12 months, based on Fiscal Year 1975 experience. Although these disparities may be due, in part, to differences in reporting and record keeping practices, they suggest that factors other than availability of judicial personnel have contributed to the case delay problem in many courts.

Further insights as to factors contributing to case delay were obtained from the NMS survey of court administrators. Of 208 administrators of trial courts responding to this question of case delay, 47 percent indicated that they considered case delay a serious problem in their courts. An additional 39 percent considered it a problem, but "not serious," while 15 percent did not consider it a problem at all in their courts. A higher proportion of

appellate court administrators (24 percent) reported that they had no problem of case delay in the courts in which they served.

The court administrators who identified case delay as a problem were then asked to indicate, in their own words, what they considered to be the single most serious cause of case delay in their courts. The responses identified a wide range of contributing factors, including limitations of court resources, continuance problems and other personnel interaction problems. These varied explanations were not unexpected since recent studies have highlighted that the interactions of judges, prosecutors and defenders and their diverse motives and problems, as well as the pressures of heavy workloads, all contribute to continuances and case delays.¹³

Insufficient personnel—primarily a shortage of judge time—was, however, cited as the most important factor by 28 percent of the 230 administrators responding to this question. Other responses, such as inadequate preparation of attorneys, or general references to overcrowded dockets, may also have reflected personnel shortages.

Court administrators were also asked to identify the types of additional personnel, or staff time, that would "contribute most to reducing unnecessary delay and achieving the goal of speedy trials" in the courts they administer. In response to the question on types of personnel most needed, 39 percent identified increased judge time, and an additional 25 percent selected increased prosecution time as most important. Relatively few considered that an increase in staff time by the defense counsel or by other court staff would contribute most to reducing case delay.

When court administrators were further asked to identify, from a list of procedural policies, the one whose adoption would contribute most to reducing unnecessary delay in the courts they administer, stricter control of continuances was chosen most frequently, by 37 percent of those who replied. Significantly, average felony case delay was found to be more than one month less in courts following strict continuance policies than in other courts surveyed. The adoption or strict enforcement of statutory or regulatory time limits for processing cases was rated next most frequently as likely to reduce delay. This response also was confirmed by the NMS analyses of case delays, which found that states with weak speedy trial laws had much longer average case delays—among courts with 100 or more felony filings—than did other states.

Finally, the NMS court caseload analysis indicated that trial courts with relatively long case backlogs disposed of a smaller percentage of their criminal cases through trial, probably reflecting a greater pressure to resolve cases through plea bargaining in such courts.

b. *Prosecution agencies.* About one-half of the prosecution agencies responding to the NMS survey on their manpower needs also provided data on their criminal caseloads in Fiscal Year 1975. Based on these

reports, three ratios of caseloads per prosecutor were computed. The first was the ratio of felony cases per prosecutor employed. As shown in Table III-18, the median felony caseload per prosecutor, for all 595 agencies reporting these data, was 93 in fiscal year 1975. Larger agencies, with 10 or more employees, reported significantly higher felony caseload ratios than did those with fewer than 10 employees.

This initial set of ratios did not make any allowance for other types of criminal caseloads, or for differences among agencies in the proportion of full-time and part-time personnel. To provide a weighted caseload measure for all major categories of criminal cases handled by prosecution offices, a workload measure referred to as "felony equivalent cases" was constructed by assigning the weighting factors to non-felony cases adapted from those recommended for defender agencies by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. The results of this procedure, as shown in the second column of Table III-20, was to widen the relative disparity in caseload ratios among agencies in the various size groups. Based on this measure, the median felony equivalent caseload per prosecutor was 340 for agencies with 10 or more employees, or more than twice as great as the caseload of 154 per prosecutor for agencies with less than 5 employees.

The third set of ratios makes a further adjustment for the lower average hours worked per week by part-time prosecutors or staff attorneys. This measure of full-time equivalent cases per full-time equivalent prosecutor tends to narrow somewhat the caseload differential between large and small offices. Nevertheless, the larger agencies, those with 10 or more employees, had criminal caseloads per employee nearly twice as great as those computed for the smallest agencies, i.e., those with fewer than 5 employees.

TABLE III-18

Felony Cases and Felony Equivalent Cases per Prosecutor and Full-Time Equivalent Prosecutor, by Size of Agency, State and County Prosecution Agencies, 1975

Size of Agency (Number of Employees)	Felony Cases Per Prosecutor		Felony Equivalent Cases Per Prosecutor ^a		Felony Equivalent Cases Per Full-Time Equivalent Prosecutor ^b	
	Median	Number of Reports ^c	Median	Number of Reports ^c	Median	Number of Reports ^c
Total -----	93	595	178	499	286	281
10 or more -----	122	94	340	68	390	60
5-9 -----	107	76	225	61	330	57
1-4 -----	79	425	154	370	206	164

^a Weighted average of felony, misdemeanor, juvenile and appeals cases. Felony cases, misdemeanors, juvenile cases, and appeals given weights of 1, .375 and 6 respectively.

^b Weighted average of full-time and part-time prosecutors.

^c The number of reports is reduced because of item non-response as each additional item of information is added to the calculations. Thus the drop-off in the number of reports in the final columns is due to the omission by many respondents of the number of hours worked per week by part-time prosecutors.

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

In the absence of any established caseload standards for prosecutors, the above data cannot be used to estimate *total* manpower needs of these agencies. The implication of the above comparisons is, however, that the larger prosecution offices, typically those in large cities, have a larger *relative* need for additional staff attorneys to handle their criminal caseloads than do the smaller offices.

Inadequate levels of prosecutor staffing have been cited as one of the factors contributing to case delay, as well as to excessive reliance upon plea bargaining. Thus, in response to a question on the types of additional personnel that would most contribute to reducing unnecessary delay, 25 percent of the court administrators surveyed by NMS cited increased availability of prosecution staff as the most important. Some corroborating evidence for this assessment was provided by an analysis of the relationship between prosecutor felony caseloads and the estimated number of months to process pending felony cases, in 188 jurisdictions which provided all the relevant data in the NMS surveys of prosecutors and of state courts of general jurisdiction. As shown in the following table, the median number of months to process pending felony cases was 6.9 months in jurisdictions where the "felony equivalent caseload per full-time equivalent prosecutor" was 301 or more cases per year, as compared to 5.0 months, where the caseload was 100 or fewer cases per year. This relationship was, however, not completely consistent, as indicated by the much lower average delay time indicated in the 37 jurisdictions where prosecutor caseloads were between 201 and 300 per year.

TABLE III-19

Months to Process Felony Cases Pending at the End of Fiscal Year 1975 by Felony Equivalent Caseload per Prosecutor

	Felony Equivalent Caseload Per Full-Time Equivalent Prosecutor				
	All Reports	1-100	101-200	201-300	301 or More
Months to process pending felony cases —Median court ----	5.4	5.0	5.6	3.6	6.9
Number of reports ----	(188)	(55)	(44)	(37)	(52)

Sources: NMS Surveys of Prosecutors and of State Trial Courts of General Jurisdiction, 1975-76.

c. *Public defender agencies.* Public indigent defense agencies, although the smallest agency category within the criminal justice system in terms of employment, have

also experienced the most rapid growth in the past several years. The number of full-time equivalent employees of state and local defender agencies nearly doubled, from 3,000 in 1970 to 6,000 in 1974. This growth has resulted in large part from recent Supreme Court decisions which have broadened the obligations of courts to provide counsel to indigent defendants who are subject to confinement.

Despite this growth, recent studies have estimated a large additional requirement for public defenders. Based on a 1973 survey of indigent defense activities, the National Legal Aid and Defense Association (NLADA) estimated a need for about 17,300 staff attorneys in defender agencies (public and contract), to meet standards recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Standards and Goals.¹⁴ This estimate is more than doubled, moreover, to about 37,000 if further allowance is made for the added requirements of jurisdictions relying on assigned counsel (rather than defender agencies) and for certain additional types of workloads, not provided for in the original estimates. The latter figure is about six times as great as the estimated number of full-time equivalent defenders currently provided either by publicly operated agencies or on a contract basis in 1974.

Much more conservative estimates were derived based on NMS survey results. Heads of public defender offices, excluding contract agencies, were first asked to assess how well their office was complying with recent Supreme Court decisions. Less than one-fourth (23 percent) reported that their agency was in "full compliance." All other defenders were then requested to estimate the number of assistant defenders needed to achieve full compliance. On the average, the latter reported a need for 23 percent more defenders. If this figure is adjusted for the agencies which already reported that they were in full compliance, this percentage increase is reduced to 18 percent.

A somewhat higher estimate of needs was derived by analysis of caseload data and staffing data submitted by some of the public defender offices. These resulted in an estimate of 192 "felony equivalent" cases per year per full-time equivalent defender, about 28 percent higher than the standard proposed by the National Advisory Commission. The latter estimate is based on a small sample of only 48 agencies which provided the detailed data needed for this computation, and which—for that reason—are likely to be better staffed than other agencies.

The above approaches have clearly yielded widely divergent estimates of defender manpower needs. Responses by defenders in public indigent defense agencies to the NMS survey indicated that an increase of only 18

percent in staff attorneys was needed by these agencies to fully comply with recent Supreme Court decisions. The analysis of caseloads per attorney for a small sample of these agencies, in relation to standards recommended by the NAC, yielded a somewhat higher estimate, in excess of 28 percent. In contrast, the NLADA estimates of the total "universe of need" for defender services indicated a requirement for a six fold increase in defenders, on a full-time equivalent basis.

Several factors probably contribute to this gross disparity. The major one appears to be that the NLADA analysis of requirements is based on the proposed standard providing that all indigents charged with a felony, misdemeanor or as a juvenile delinquent are to be represented from the time of arrest. This standard is more inclusive than that required by recent Supreme Court decisions, with respect to the less serious offenses. Many arrested indigents do not receive representation at time of arrest and subsequently receive representation only if it appears that a jail or prison sentence may result from a conviction.¹⁵ Additionally, indigents may waive their right to counsel without a full understanding of the significance of the action. There is a significant fall off in the number of persons charged with a crime, especially those charged with misdemeanors, in these early stages.

The chief defenders, on their part, appeared to have adopted a considerably narrower interpretation of their roles. In its 1973 study, the NLADA found that 36 percent of defender agencies provided counsel for all indigent misdemeanor defendants; 39 percent provided counsel only if the offense was punishable by jail; 18 percent only if the judge believed he would impose a jail sentence if the defendant was found to be guilty and 6 percent provided counsel only if the prosecutor would seek a jail sentence.¹⁶ To the extent that the current local practice tends to keep marginal cases of indigency, or marginal cases of required representation, from becoming a workload for the defender or assigned counsel, the need for additional staff as perceived by chief defenders may reflect a more limited view of the extent to which services are to be provided, than the criteria used by NLADA in its calculations of the universe of need for defender services.

3. *Corrections manpower.* In the corrections sector—unlike other components of the criminal justice system—a number of staffing standards or norms have been developed by professional organizations in the field for use in assessing correctional manpower needs. These professional judgment standards are defined in all cases as broad statistical guidelines or "yardsticks," since staffing decisions in individual agencies must take into account a large number of more specific variables, such as characteristics and needs of the client population, the

types of programs provided, the physical layout of the facility, etc. Nevertheless, the existing standards may provide a useful guide in assessing the *relative* manpower needs of different categories of corrections agencies. These comparisons are reviewed below for the major categories of corrections agencies.

a. *Adult prisons.* Available data indicate a significant overall improvement in staff inmate ratios of state prisons between the early 1960's and 1974. The average number of inmates per custodial officer declined from 8.2 at the end of 1960 to 5.0 in January 1974. Between 1962 and 1974, the number of educational and treatment specialists in state prisons also doubled, whereas the number of inmates was at about the same level in both years.

Comparisons of actual staffing ratios in 1974 with those previously proposed for these occupational groups, in various studies, indicate a continued severe deficiency in many categories of treatment personnel, but a much more favorable staffing level for custodial officers. Thus, only one-half of all state prison systems met the American Correctional Association's staffing standard for social workers; about one-fourth, for psychiatrists and only about 10 percent, for psychologists. On the other hand, about 60 percent of all state facilities met or exceeded the ratio of one custodial officer per six inmates, originally proposed by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.

Staffing levels for both correctional officers and treatment personnel were found to be least adequate in the South. Prisons which were overcrowded in 1974, based on designed capacity, consistently reported higher numbers of inmates per correctional officer than did other prisons.

The more severe deficiency of treatment staffs, than of custodial officers, indicated by these comparisons is consistent with the assessments of prison wardens of their agencies' manpower needs, based on the NMS survey. Their responses indicated a need for an increase of 42 percent in treatment specialists, as compared to 14 percent for custodial officers.

b. *Local jails.* The most severe staffing deficiency in local jails was the absence of any significant training or treatment functions in most jails, based on the 1972 Census of Jails.¹⁷ In 1972, the total number of professional treatment specialists corresponded to the equivalent of one full-time counselor for every 363 inmates, in contrast to a ratio of one case work counselor for every 30 jail inmates which had been proposed by the President's Crime Commission in 1967. Custodial officer staffing in jails, corresponding to a ratio of one per 7.2 inmates in 1972, was also significantly lower than the standard of one per six inmates, previously suggested by this Commission.

c. *Juvenile institutions.* In contrast to the situation in adult institutions, staffing ratios in state juvenile institutions in 1975 compared much more favorably with those proposed in earlier studies. Thus, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, in a 1966 study, had adopted a composite standard of one treatment specialist per 21.4 juveniles as a statistical guideline, as compared to an actual ratio of one specialist per 33.1 juveniles, in 1965. By 1975, this ratio had been increased to one treatment specialist per 21.9 juveniles, in part due to the substantial reduction in the number of juvenile inmates. Similar increases in staffing levels per inmate also were reported for child care workers and for educational personnel.¹⁸

These findings are consistent with the pattern of survey responses of juvenile correction administrators, concerning their manpower needs. As previously noted, these administrators—as a group—reported much lower needs for additional manpower in the NMS survey than did any other category of criminal justice executive.

d. *Probation and parole.* The American Correctional Association has recommended a statistical standard of 50 case units per probation or parole officer, per month, under which a presentence investigation equals five units and a probationer or parolee under supervision equals one case unit. An analysis of actual caseloads per officer, based on responses from 939 agencies to the NMS survey, indicates that 72 percent of all agencies did not meet this standard. Caseloads per officer varied widely by type of agency, from a median of 42 per month for adult parole agencies and 62, for juvenile agencies, to 161 for adult probation agencies. The high workload of the latter agencies suggests that most adult probation offices are in a position to provide only nominal supervision to persons under their control and are equally limited in their capabilities with respect to other workloads, such as presentence investigations.

The above findings are consistent with the relatively high needs for additional personnel reported by probation and parole executives responding to the NMS survey, as well as with reports based on field visits, indicating particularly severe shortages among many of the adult agencies visited.

E. Conclusions on Manpower Needs

This chapter has presented a variety of data related to the current personnel needs of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. The current personnel resources of these agencies, as well as recent employment and crime-related workload trends, were reviewed in the first section of this chapter. The point of departure for assessing

current personnel needs was the perceived needs of the agency executives themselves. These agency executives reported substantial needs for additional personnel. There were, however, significant variations in extent of reported shortage by size and type of agency and for different categories of personnel. These shortages were generally attributed to budgetary constraints rather than to difficulties in recruitment of personnel.

These initial survey findings were supplemented by more specific analyses of agency staffing and workload levels, for each major sector, including comparisons of actual staffing ratios with professionally recommended standards, where the latter were available. These analyses did not, in most instances, provide categorical estimates of the total magnitude of additional personnel needs for these functions and could not be expected to do so, in view of the wide variations in functions, goals, and organizational structures among agencies, and because of the many limitations of the available data base. Yet, the composite evidence available supports a finding that—in the face of mounting crime-related workloads—many of these agencies, as currently organized, have been inadequately staffed to provide the level, and quality, of services which they consider necessary to fulfill their assigned responsibilities. Some of the supporting evidence is summarized below:

- *Law enforcement.* Despite the substantial growth in employment in police protection agencies since the early 1960's the much sharper growth in the crime rate—as well as the addition of new specialized functions—has imposed heavy workload pressures upon many police department staffs, as reflected in the relatively large estimates of additional manpower needs reported by police chiefs and sheriffs. Analysis of inter-city variations in per capita police employment indicates that the existing deployment of police personnel resources is, however, often more dependent upon the ability, or willingness, of different communities to pay for these services, than on any objective measure of crime-related workloads. The high reported needs for additional manpower of smaller police agencies, and of sheriffs agencies, may thus be attributable to the less adequate tax bases of many of the communities in which these agencies are located, and the limited capability of these agencies to provide a full range of police services, as well as to the growing decentralization of population—and of related crime problems—which has increased the need for police services in many of these communities. At the same time, many of the largest police departments—those with 1,000 or more personnel—appear to have been particularly impacted by recent budgetary pressures,

in the face of continued high urban crime rates.

- *Judicial process agencies.* Data on case backlogs, and on caseloads of judges, prosecutors and defenders, compiled by the National Manpower Survey, indicated that—by any reasonable standard—a large proportion of these agencies are inadequately staffed to meet their responsibilities for the speedy, efficient and even-handed administration of justice, which has forced extensive reliance upon plea bargaining procedures and other administrative expedients. In a large sample of trial courts reporting to the NMS, felony case backlogs rose by 10 percent in fiscal year 1975, and civil case backlogs by 13 percent. The estimated average time required to process felony cases pending at the end of fiscal year 1975 exceeded six months in 41 percent of the courts, in contrast to a standard of two months proposed by the National Advisory Commission on Standards and Goals, for total elapsed time between arrest and trial for such cases. The consistent relationship between the size of caseload per judge and case delay in these courts—as well as the assessments by court administrators surveyed by the NMS—both confirm that shortages of judicial and other manpower are key factors contributing to case delay in many of these courts.

Analysis of caseload statistics for prosecution and for public indigent defense agencies has resulted in similar findings. Thus the average “felony equivalent” caseloads of 280 cases per year, per prosecutor, and of 192 per defender, estimated for samples of agencies reporting to the NMS, can be contrasted with a recommended standard of 150 per year, proposed for defenders, by the National Advisory Commission.

Although the above data support the need for additional judges, prosecutors and defenders in many agencies, collateral survey findings indicate that additional manpower, alone, is only a partial solution to the problem of case delay in most courts. Court administrators responding to the NMS survey gave at least equal emphasis to the need for procedural reforms, including the adoption of strict continuance policies, as essential for reducing case delays. In addition, the very wide variation in felony caseloads per judge or prosecutor, revealed by the NMS surveys, suggests that considerable improvement can be accomplished through more efficient allocation of personnel resources, within states, through such measures as court reorganization or consolidation of small prosecution offices.

- *Corrections.* Analyses of responses by correctional administrators, and of correctional staffing and

workload data, have provided an essentially consistent pattern of findings concerning the relative manpower needs of various categories of correctional agencies. Despite substantial employment growth, staffing levels of most probation and parole agencies—and particularly those responsible for adult probation—were found to be much higher than considered acceptable to provide other than nominal supervision to their clients or to perform related workloads, such as pre-sentence investigations. Probation and parole office administrators responding to the NMS survey also reported a greater relative need for additional manpower than did executives of any other category of correctional agency.

In the case of residential correctional facilities, such as prisons, jails and reformatories, the declining or stable trend of inmate populations until the early 1970's, combined with gradual employment growth, had resulted in general increases in staff-inmate ratios over the past decade. The improvement was most pronounced for juvenile institutions, which had experienced a substantial reduction in inmate population. As a result, staffing levels in these agencies, as a group, appeared to be more adequate than any other major category of correctional agency. Adult correctional institutions were, however, still seriously deficient in specialized treatment staffs, with the most severe shortages reported in the southern states, and in local jails generally. Staffing levels for custodial officers in state prisons appeared to have been more adequate than for treatment staffs, based on responses by wardens concerning their manpower needs as well as on comparisons with existing staffing standards. It is probable, however, that custodial staff-inmate ratios in state prisons declined between 1975 and 1977, as a result of the continued rapid growth in inmate populations.

Although the preceding analyses have arrayed a considerable body of evidence which support the need for additional manpower resources in many categories of criminal justice agencies to enable them to perform their assigned tasks, these findings cannot support a broader conclusion that provision of such resources *alone*—in the absence of other needed policy or organizational improvements—will materially or efficiently, contribute to the ultimate national objectives of crime reduction and of improvement in the quality of justice. As noted by Norval Morris and Gordon Hawkins, the problem of violent crime in America “*is not a problem that can be solved merely by the allocation of increased resources. The inadequacy of this approach has been amply demon-*

strated. Between 1969 and 1974 spending for federal, state and local criminal justice systems more than doubled, rising from \$7.3 billion to more than \$15 billion. The number of personnel employed in those systems increased by one third, from 725,000 to over one million. Over the same period, recorded violent crime increased by 47 percent, recorded crimes against property by 37 percent."¹⁹

Some of the limitations of a strategy geared solely, or primarily, to provision of additional resources to law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, as presently constituted, have been noted in our preceding analyses:

- In the law enforcement sector, the relationship between additional police resources and police "performance," as measured by such indexes as crime or arrest rates, has been found to be tenuous and uncertain.
- In the judicial process sector, differences in court policies and practices, for example with respect to continuances, were considered to be as important as inadequate resources, in contributing to case delays.
- In the corrections sector, few issues have been more controversial in recent years than the efficacy of rehabilitation efforts as practiced in most correctional institutions, with at least one observer contending that "with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism."²⁰
- In all sectors, the proliferation of large numbers of very small agencies—whether of very small police departments in fragmented jurisdictions, or of courts, prosecution offices or jails, often staffed by part-time personnel—has contributed to system inefficiencies and manpower wastage.

Finally, there has been growing recognition, by both scholars and practitioners, that the potential impact of the criminal justice system upon crime trends—no matter how efficiently it is organized—is probably overshadowed by that of more fundamental social, economic and cultural influences in our society.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. An annual series of reports on public expenditures and employment on criminal justice activities was initiated by the U.S. Bureau

of the Census and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in Fiscal Year 1967. However, the survey was greatly expanded in Fiscal Year 1971, and data for years prior to Fiscal Year 1971 are not considered fully comparable. (*Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System*, 1974, p. 1).

2. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation, *Uniform Crime Reports*, 1960, 1974. The percentages of non-sworn employees in these reports for 1974 is lower than that estimated by NMS on the basis of the Census 1975 survey of employee characteristics, due to differences in coverage and in classification procedures.
3. American Judicature Society, *Survey of Courts of Limited Jurisdiction* (1973).
4. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (Hereinafter referred to as National Advisory Commission), *Courts* (1973).
5. The latter data are based on a somewhat more restrictive definition of the prisoner population, i.e., those sentenced to at least one year and a day. The difference between the latter definition and total sentenced prisoners is believed to be 6 percent or less.
6. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *A Time to Act* (1969), p. 55.
7. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (1967), p. 161.
8. James Q. Wilson, "Who is in Prison?" *Commentary* (November 1976): 57.
9. Public Law 93083, 93rd Cong., 1st sess., August 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 197 (Crime Control Act of 1973).
10. NMS Executive Survey, 1975. Based on responses by police chiefs in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population.
11. National Commission on Productivity, *Opportunities for Improving Productivity in Police Services* (1973), pp. 13-36.
12. National Advisory Commission, *Courts*, p. xx.
13. Martin A. Levin, "Delay in Five Criminal Courts," *The Journal of Legal Studies* 4 (January 1975); Lewis R. Katz, Lawrence B. Litwin and Richard H. Bamberger, *Justice is the Crime, Pre-Trial Delay in Felony Cases* (Case Western Reserve University, 1972).
14. National Legal Aid and Defender Association, p. 24, and pp. 34-40.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
16. *Ibid.*
17. U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, *1972 Census of Jails*.
18. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Corrections in the United States* (1966), p. 142.
19. Norval Morris, and Gordon Hawkins, *Letter to the President on Crime Control*, University of Chicago Press, 1977, p. 6 (editorial note: The actual increase in total employment in all public law enforcement and criminal justice agencies between 1969 and 1974 was more than 50 percent, rather than "one-third," based on the LEAA-Census Statistics for these years).
20. Robert Martinson, "What Works—Questions and Answers about Prison Reform," *The Public Interest* (Spring 1974): 25.

CHAPTER IV. THE EMPLOYMENT OUTLOOK: MANPOWER PROJECTIONS TO 1985

One of the major tasks of the National Manpower Survey was to project future employment in state and local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, for the 10 year period 1975-85. These projections and related estimates of recruitment and training needs are designed to assist in determining the priorities for academic and training assistance among various sectors and occupations in the criminal justice system.

The first part of this chapter describes the basic projections developed for this purpose: the projection model, the assumptions used and the resulting estimates by sector and occupation. These are designed to portray the probable future trends in employment in these agencies, rather than future "needs" or optimal requirements.

The second part of this chapter reviews a number of recent trends, policy issues and innovations in the criminal justice field which may have a significant influence upon future manpower needs. It presents information on the current status of these developments, on the likelihood of their further expansion, and their possible effects upon quantitative or qualitative requirements for personnel.

A. Manpower Projections

1. *The criminal justice manpower model.* The employment projections presented in this chapter were based on a model which defines a set of relationships among key variables affecting both aggregate employment in all categories of criminal justice agencies and the distribution of employment among major categories or activities.

The basic premise underlying this model is that the future demand for law enforcement and other criminal justice services will be largely determined by two major factors, in addition to population growth. These are: (1) the future trend in crime rates; and (2) trends in the growth of total state and local government expenditures. Both crime rates and the levels of government spending are, in turn, assumed to be influenced by a number of other social, economic and institutional factors, as described in Chart IV-1.

- *Crime rate.* Recent analyses of criminal behavior have attempted to interpret most forms of crime within a rational decision-making framework: indi-

viduals are more likely to pursue criminal careers, rather than legal activity, if the economic returns from crime are perceived to be better than the alternatives available to them, after allowing for the risks entailed in criminal activity. Thus, those who are poor, unemployed and economically disadvantaged are more prone to engage in crimes such as robbery because they have less to risk and because their alternative means of earning a livelihood are restricted. Large urban centers, which include both concentrations of poor, minority populations as well as concentrations of wealth—i.e., "crime opportunities"—are more likely to have higher crime rates than are smaller, more homogenous, middle-class communities. Youth, and particularly disadvantaged youth, are much more crime prone—both because they have the highest unemployment rates and the most limited earnings potential in legal pursuits—and because they are more likely to take risks than more mature individuals. To the extent that law enforcement and criminal justice agencies increase the risks of apprehension and punishment, they increase the "costs" of criminal activity and serve to deter crime.


The above analysis thus suggests some of the key variables that may affect future crime trends. Among them are future trends in the level of general economic opportunity, as measured by such factors as the unemployment rate and per capita income; trends in the proportion of youth in the population, and trends in the concentration of population in urban areas. In addition, community investments in law enforcement, judicial process, and correctional agencies can affect these trends to the extent that they increase the probabilities of arrest and imprisonment. These and similar variables have all been found to contribute significantly to variations in reported crime rates.

- *Criminal justice expenditures.* The level of criminal justice expenditures by state and local governments will be determined both by the demand for these services, as measured by trends in the crime rate, and by various economic and fiscal factors, which will affect the total size of government budgets. The

Chart IV-1

Key Factors Affecting Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Employment

THE NMS ANALYTICAL MODEL



latter, in turn, are strongly influenced by economic growth rates, which have a direct impact on governmental tax revenues. In addition, they are affected by the extent of financial assistance obtained from the Federal Government, through LEAA grants or other sources.

- *Criminal justice employment.* The level of employment in criminal justice agencies will be determined both by criminal justice expenditures and by trends in wage or salary rates for employees of these agencies. The latter are likely to be influenced by general labor market trends as well as by more specific factors, such as the changes in job and skill requirements and in the extent of unionization of their employees.
- *Arrest and imprisonment rates.* The model also postulates that there is a systematic relationship between levels of employment in criminal justice agencies and the probability that those committing crimes will be arrested and imprisoned. In turn, these probabilities are assumed to "feed back" upon the crime rate, to the extent that changes in the likelihood of apprehension and punishment have a deterrent effect upon criminal activity. (Clearly many institutional and policy factors, in addition to employment levels in criminal justice agencies, will affect these relationships. Some of these are separately discussed in the second part of this chapter but could not be directly incorporated into this model.)

The relationships described above, expressed in a series of linked equations, were empirically tested based on data for the 50 states for the years 1971-74, inclusive. All of the resulting equations yielded statistically significant results which appeared generally consistent with the theoretical premises underlying the model. Crime rates were found to be particularly sensitive to differences in the relative size of the youth population (aged 14-24 years) and—to a lesser extent—to differences in urbanization, per capita income and unemployment rates. Differences in arrest and imprisonment rates were also found to have the expected negative effects upon crime rates. Thus, an increase in arrest rates of 10 percent was associated with a 3 percent reduction in crime rates.

Criminal justice expenditures, however, were found to be more influenced by the aggregate levels of state and local government budgets, or expenditures, in the various states, than by crime rates or specific crime-related variables. Thus, a 10 percent increase in total government expenditures was associated with a short-term increase of the same magnitude in budgets for criminal justice. However, a 10 percent increase in crime rates was found to result in only a 4 percent increase in

criminal justice expenditures, holding other factors constant.

A more detailed technical description of this model, and of the estimating coefficients, appears in Volume VI of this report, *Criminal Justice Manpower Planning*.

2. *The NMS projection scenario.* In order to project future employment trends, based on these relationships, independent forecasts or projections were first required for each of the key "external" variables which had been found to influence crime rates and criminal justice expenditure levels. These projections for 1980 and 1985 are shown in Table IV-1.

Among these factors, one of the most important—and predictable—is the proportion of youth in our population. The sharp escalation of crime rates in the mid-1960's coincided with the "coming of age" of the post-World II baby-boom generation. During the 1960's, juveniles and younger adults accounted for a large and growing share of those apprehended for many categories of serious crimes. The outlook now is for a reversal of this trend. In the past decade and a half, rapid growth in the number of youths and young adults, aged 15-24 years, had increased that group from 13.4 percent of the population in 1960 to 18.7 percent in 1974. This proportion will stabilize in the period 1974-80, and will drop significantly, to 16.4 percent, by 1985.

Another demographic factor which has been associated with rising crime rates—the high proportion of our population concentrated in large metropolitan areas—is also expected to decline. Over a period of decades, the proportion of our population concentrated in large metropolitan areas has steadily grown—and these areas, as has been noted, have included the highest concentrations of crime. This pattern now appears to have been reversed. Recent population growth has been more rapid in the non-metropolitan areas. The proportion of the population living in SMSA's declined gradually in each year between 1970 and 1974. A continuation of the recent decline is assumed in our scenario. The population residing in metropolitan areas is projected at 71.2 percent in 1985, as compared with 72.8 percent in 1974.

Other factors affecting the future demand for law enforcement services can be projected with much less confidence than the demographic trends described above. The most critical of these is the future state of the nation's economy. The overall level of economic activity, as measured by such statistics as the gross national product (GNP), has a direct impact on governmental tax revenues and hence on the ability of state and local governments to expand public employment. It also has a significant effect upon crime rates, in view of the observed direct relationship between unemployment and crime.

TABLE IV-1
*The NMS Projection Model: Projections of Key Economic, Fiscal, and
 Demographic Variables, 1974-85*

	Actual		Projected		Average Annual Growth Rates	
	1974 ^a	1980	1985	Percent Change 1974-85	1974-80	1980-85
Economic and Social Variables ^a:						
GNP (\$ billion) -----	953	1,082	1,336	40	2.1	4.2
Total state and local expenditures (\$ billion) -----	167	204	258	54	3.3	4.8
Federal grants for criminal justice activities (\$ billion) -----	.94	1.1	1.2	28	2.0	2.5
Per capita income (\$) -----	4,584	5,145	5,643	23	1.9	1.9
Unemployment rate (percent of civilian labor force)	5.6	7.0	5.0	-11	3.8	-6.3
Demographic Variables						
Total population ^b : (millions) -----	211.9	223.0	234.3	11	0.9	1.0
Youth, ages 15-24, as a percent of total populations ^b	18.7	18.6	16.4	-12	-0.1	-3.7
Urbanization—SMSA population as a percent of total	72.8	71.9	71.2	-2.2	-.21	-.21

^a Source: H. Townsend, T. Sivia, and M. Kendall, *Investment in the Eighties*, NPA, National Economic Projections Series, 1976. All dollar values are in constant 1967 dollars.

^b Source: Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 601, "Projections of the Population of the United States: 1975 to 2050."

The economic scenario followed in the NMS manpower projections is based on the National Economic Projections Series of the National Planning Association. These projections provide short-term forecasts of probable economic trends to 1980 and are designed to portray an attainable growth path for the economy beyond 1980, resulting in relatively full employment by 1985. The short-term economic outlook provides for a relatively low average GNP growth rate of 2.7 percent annually (in constant dollars) during the period 1974-80, reflecting only partial recovery from the 1973-75 economic recession. This would be followed by a substantially higher GNP growth rate of 4.2 percent annually during the period 1980-85, concurrent with a projected reduction in the unemployment rate from 8.5 percent in 1974 to about 7 percent in 1980 and 5 percent in 1985. In turn, the projected level of growth of expenditures by state and local governments is expected to increase from a rate of about 2.0 percent annually (in constant dollars) in 1974-80, to 2.5 percent between 1980 and 1985.

3. *Criminal justice workloads and employment projections.* The major outputs of the NMS projections model, shown in Table IV-2, include national projections of key workload indicators (crimes, arrests, imprisonments), of criminal justice expenditures, and of employment by sector. These trends are summarized below:

- *The crime rate*, as measured by the FBI index for Part I offenses, is expected to continue to grow between 1974 and 1980, but to decline significantly

between 1980 and 1985. The projected increase, from 4.8 offenses per thousand population in 1974 to 5.4 in 1980, is due in part to the continued high unemployment levels projected for this period. Its anticipated growth rate, averaging 1.8 percent annually, is much lower than for recent periods as a result of the stabilization of the proportion of youth in the population and the gradual decline in the proportion of population residing in metropolitan areas. The projected reduction after 1980 to 4.6 per thousand population in 1985—at a rate of 3.9 percent annually—reflects mainly the combined effects of the reduction in the proportion of youth, the assumed reduction in unemployment, and a continuance of the reduction in the proportion of the population living in metropolitan areas. It is also influenced by the projected increases in criminal justice expenditures and employment discussed below.

- *The number of arrests for Part I offenses* is projected to increase from 2.16 million in 1974 to 2.6 million in 1980, as the combined result of increases in Part I crimes and of a projected increase in the arrest rate per reported offense associated mainly with increased expenditures and employment in law enforcement activities. A reduction in arrests to 2.42 million in 1985 is projected, reflecting the net effect of the projected reduction in crime volume and of increased arrest rates.
- *Prisoners in state institutions for adults* are projected to increase from 190,000 in 1974 to 243,000

TABLE IV-2

The NMS Projection Model: Projections of Selected Criminal Justice Workload Indicators, Expenditures and Employment by Sector: 1974-85

	Actual 1974	Projected		Percentage Change 1974-85	Average Annual Growth	
		1980	1985		74-80	80-85
Part I—Crimes	10,192	11,989	10,174	-.2	2.7	3.2
(Rate per thousand population)	4,821	5,377	4,400	-9.0	1.8	-3.9
Part I—Arrests (in thousands)	2,164	2,604	2,421	12	3.1	-1.4
Arrests per Part I Crime21	.22	.24	14	0.7	1.8
Prisoners in state institutions	190	243	252	33	4.2	0.7
Prisoners per arrest	0.9	0.9	.10	11	—	2.1
Criminal justice expenditures (\$ billion constant 1972 dollars)	10.9	14.0	16.6	52.0	4.3	3.5
Criminal justice employment (full-time equivalent) ...	916	1,174	1,307	43	4.2	2.2
Police protection	539	657	718	33	3.3	1.8
Judicial	118	155	182	52	4.6	2.7
Prosecution and legal services	45	66	80	71	6.5	4.0
Indigent defense ^a	11	17	21	91	7.5	4.3
Corrections	203	279	325	62	5.4	3.1

^a Includes estimate of publicly-funded contract employment, as well as employees in public defender offices.

Source: NMS Projection Model

in 1980, as a result of the projected increase in volume of arrests (to 1980) and of a projected stabilization in the ratio of prisoners per arrest during this period—in contrast to the sharp decline in this ratio during the 1960's. The continued small net increase to 252,000 in 1985, despite a reduction in arrest volume, implies a policy of increased reliance upon imprisonment, particularly for serious repeat offenders, and allows for the effect of a projected continued growth in criminal justice expenditures during this period, particularly for corrections and prosecutor personnel. ¹

- *Criminal justice expenditures* by state and local governments are projected to grow by 52 percent between 1974 and 1985, in constant dollars. The growth rates are influenced by the projected trends in total state and local expenditures and in crime rates. Between 1974 and 1980, the annual rate of increase in criminal justice expenditures is projected at 4.3 percent, as compared with 3.3 percent for total state and local expenditures. However, the projected growth of criminal justice expenditures is expected to decline to an annual rate of 3.5 percent in 1980-85, as contrasted to a more rapid growth in total state and local expenditures of 4.8 percent, due to the projected decline in crime rates in the latter period.
- *Employment in state and local criminal justice activities*, in turn, is projected to increase from 916,000 in 1974 in full-time equivalents, to 1,307,000 in 1985, or by 43 percent—with much

more rapid growth between 1974 and 1980 than between 1980 and 1985. Employment growth rates are lower than projected expenditure trends in each period since the projections allow for the effects of wage increases in each sector. Employment growth in police protection agencies is projected to be at a substantially lower rate than other sectors, reflecting recent experience. The number of full-time equivalent police protection employees will increase by 33 percent, from 539,000 in 1974 to 718,000 in 1985, under this projection. In contrast, the projections indicate increases of 62 percent in correctional employment, of 52 percent in judicial employees, 71 percent in employment in prosecution and legal services agencies, and of 91 percent in indigent defense activities over the same period.

Estimates have also been made of projected employment growth in a number of key criminal justice occupations or functional groups (Table IV-3). In addition to allowing for projected overall growth trends in each major agency category, these estimates were based on available evidence on recent shifts in the occupational distribution of personnel within these agencies and on forecasts of future (short-term) employment growth by occupation, by executives responding to the NMS survey. The wide variation in prospective growth rates is illustrated by the contrast between the projected growth of more than 90 percent, for prosecutors and other staff attorneys in prosecution and legal service agencies, and the anticipated net employment gain of only 7 percent, for child care workers in state and local juvenile institu-

TABLE IV-3

Projected Employment Growth in Selected State and Local Criminal Justice Occupations, 1974-85

Occupation Group	Full-Time Equivalent Employees			
	1974	1985	Increase, 1974-85	Percent Increase *
Prosecutors and other staff attorneys (prosecution and legal services agencies) ----	19,000	37,000	+ 18,000	+92%
Court employees, excluding judges and probation officers (appellate courts and trial courts of general jurisdiction) -----	42,000	78,000	+ 36,000	+87
Defenders and assistant defenders (public indigent defense agencies) -----	3,200	5,500	+ 2,300	+72
Probation and parole officers (including supervisors) -----	29,000	47,000	+ 18,000	+65
Custodial officers (state adult institutions) -----	42,000	64,000	21,000	+53
Non-sworn employees (police protection agencies) -----	117,000	179,000	+ 62,000	+53
Treatment and education specialists (adult and juvenile institutions excluding jails) -----	20,000	29,000	+ 9,000	+47
Judges (appellate courts and trial courts of general jurisdiction) -----	5,200	8,400	+ 2,200	+35
Sworn officers (police protection agencies) -----	423,000	539,000	+116,000	+28
Child care workers (juvenile institutions) -----	17,800	19,100	+ 1,300	+ 7

* Percent increases based on unrounded estimates.

tions. The most rapid gains—of 65 percent or more—are projected, generally, for personnel in judicial process occupations (other than judges) and for probation and parole officers. More moderate growth, averaging about 50 percent over this period, is projected for key correctional occupations (other than child care workers) as well as for non-sworn personnel in police agencies. Considerably lower rates of employment growth are projected for judges and sworn officers of police protection agencies, as well as for child care workers. Nevertheless, sworn police officers and deputy sheriffs—the largest single major occupation group—will continue to account for the largest number of new positions in the coming ten-year period.

Some of the factors contributing to these differential growth trends are reviewed in the following section.

4. *Employment trends by sector*

a. *Police protection agencies.* Although police protection accounts for a major share of total criminal justice expenditures and employment, the recent rate of growth in police employment has been less rapid than for judicial process agencies or for the correctional sector. Between 1971 and 1974, the police agency share of total state and local criminal justice employment declined from 60.2 percent to 58.8 percent. A continuation of this trend is projected, reducing this share to about 55 percent in 1985.

Among police protection agencies, recent employment growth has been more rapid for state and county agencies than for city police departments as a group. Between 1971 and 1974, for example, the share of total police employment in state and county agencies increased from 29 to 32 percent. This trend is due to a number of factors, including the more rapid increase in crime rates in small-

er communities, many of which are served by county and state agencies. Thus, between 1971 and 1974 the crime rate rose more than 30 percent in counties with populations of 10,000 or more outside of SMSA's, as contrasted with increases of 4.3 percent in cities of 250,000 or more population, and 10.6 percent in cities with 100,000 to 250,000 inhabitants. A continuation of this trend to 1985 would increase the share of state and county agencies to 37 percent of total police protection employment.

Among city police agencies, employment growth during the past decade has been more rapid among medium-sized agencies than for either the very large or the very small agencies. This differential growth pattern is probably due to several factors: the sharp increase in crime rates in smaller communities, the declining proportion of the population located in our large central cities, and the increasingly severe fiscal problems of many of these cities. A continuation of this pattern is assumed in our projections. The medium-size agencies—those with 150 to 399 employees in 1974—are projected to increase their employment at an annual rate of 4 percent between 1974 and 1985, as compared with less than 1 percent for agencies with more than 1,000 employees, and less than 2 percent for those with fewer than 75 employees.

The percentage of civilian or nonsworn employees of police agencies has been gradually increasing during the past two decades. FBI statistics indicate an increase in the proportion of civilians among employees of city police departments from 10.0 percent in 1960 to 15.3 percent in 1974. Data for county and state agencies, available for the period 1970-74, indicate a similar trend. This trend is attributable, in part, to the growth in the "support-type" functions and activities of police

agencies, associated with introduction of more sophisticated technology for police communications, crime detection and data processing, and with related expansion of administrative staffs. The outlook—as discussed later in this chapter—is for a continuing gradual trend towards increased “civilianization.”

As a result, sworn officer employment is projected to grow at a rate of only 2.2 percent annually, as compared with an estimated rate of 4.0 percent for nonsworn employees. Total employment of nonsworn or civilian employees is projected to increase by 33 percent from 117,000 in 1974 to 179,000 in 1985.

Supporting positions—including both direct and indirect support—will also account for an increasing share of total police employment. Employment in these functions and activities is expected to grow by about 52 percent between 1974 and 1985, as contrasted to a projected increase of 27 percent for personnel in line patrol and investigation activities. Occupations such as dispatchers, data processors, and investigative technicians will experience relatively rapid growth, and an increasing proportion of these positions is expected to be filled by civilian personnel.

b. Judicial process agencies

(1) *Courts.* Employment in all state and local courts is projected to increase by 54 percent, from 118,000 full-time equivalent employees in 1974 to 183,000, in 1985. The most rapid employment growth is expected for appellate level and general jurisdiction courts, with much lower rates of employment increase anticipated for courts of limited or special jurisdiction.

The relatively slow employment growth anticipated for limited jurisdiction courts is associated with two trends, discussed in more detail later in this chapter. The first is the relatively slow recent growth in caseloads associated with Part II offenses, and in juvenile delinquency cases, which—in combination—have accounted for a major portion of lower court workloads. In part, these result from revisions in arrest policies and practices, reflecting *de jure* or *de facto* decriminalization of certain categories of offenses, such as public drunkenness, in many jurisdictions. In part, they reflect increased reliance upon pre-trial diversion programs, particularly for juveniles and other first offenders.

The second trend has been the continued movement towards consolidation or unification of lower-level courts. During the 1971–73 period, four states abolished their lower courts by integration of their functions into the general jurisdiction courts; two states moved toward creation of a single tier of lower courts and four states reduced the number of lower courts. One of the objectives of these reorganizations has been to achieve increased efficiencies in utilization of court manpower.

Available evidence, reviewed later in this chapter, suggests that this has in fact resulted. Thus, the employment projection for these courts assumes a continuation of this trend.

The overall growth in courts employment is likely to be accompanied by a significant increase in the ratio of support personnel to judges, if recent trends persist. Between 1971 and 1974, the number of judges in general jurisdiction courts grew at about half the rate of total employment in these courts. Similarly, the number of judges in appellate courts grew at about one-fourth the rate of total employment. A number of factors probably contributed to the slower growth of judges than of support personnel. Judicial positions usually are established by state legislatures and require passage of new legislation which is frequently a slow process. Consequently, with the growth in workloads and pressure for speedy trials, adjustments were more easily made by increasing the number of parajudicial or of administrative and other support personnel, to facilitate improved calendar management and to accomplish better utilization of available judicial manpower. The much more rapid increase for court employees other than judges, assumes a continuation of this trend.

(2) *Prosecution and legal services.* Total full-time equivalent employment in state and local prosecution and legal service agencies is expected to increase from 45,400 in 1974 to 78,800 in 1985. The projected growth rate between 1974–85, of 5.1 percent annually, is expected to be about half as great as that experienced between 1971–74, mainly because of the anticipated slow down in the growth of the crime rate. State-level prosecution and legal service agencies are projected to grow at a more rapid rate than county or city agencies. By 1985, state government agencies are expected to account for about 31 percent of all personnel in this function, as compared to 26 percent in 1974.

The more rapid growth of state-level agencies appears to be due to a combination of factors. Although local government agencies still bear the primary responsibility for criminal prosecution in all but a few states, there has been a trend towards strengthening of the role of the state's attorney general, in coordination or supervision of certain local prosecution activities and in provision of technical assistance or training. A major portion of the recent increase appears due, however, to rapid expansion of employment in state legal service offices concerned with civil functions, including such activities as consumer protection, environmental protection and anti-trust units. A continuation of these trends is assumed in the projections to 1985.

A more rapid employment growth is projected for prosecutors and staff attorneys in these offices than for

supporting personnel, based on analyses of 1971-74 trends and on responses by prosecutors to the NMS survey.

(3) *Indigent defense.* Between 1971 and 1974, employment of defenders in public agencies increased by 68 percent, while estimated contract or government-funded employment increased by 127 percent, with most of this growth at the state level. Thus, it appears that, while employment in publicly administered defender offices was increasing at a rapid rate, there was greater growth in the use of assigned counsel and other contractual arrangements.

Total indigent defense employment is projected to almost double by 1985. This is a substantially slower rate than was evidenced during the period 1971 through 1974, a period in which many defender agencies were established, partly as a result of the *Argesinger* decision. We can expect a slower growth rate in the future as the rate of increase in criminal justice expenditures decreases and as the number of defender agencies stabilizes.

Although we are projecting slower future employment growth for the indigent defense function than in 1971-74, it is expected that the recent patterns of growth—including increased use of contract organizations and more rapid growth at the state level—will hold in the future. It is expected that in 1985, there will be 10,000 full-time equivalent employees on public payrolls and an additional 11,000 full-time equivalent individuals who will provide defense services on a contractual basis with government funding.

c. *Corrections.* Employment projections for the

four major categories of correctional agencies in state and local governments are shown in Table IV-4. These estimates, based primarily on experience during the 1971-74 period, indicate a wide divergence in employment growth rates, ranging from a projected increase of 150 percent for state probation and parole agencies between 1974 and 1985 to a reduction of 17 percent, for state juvenile institutions, such as reformatories.

One of the critical variables in these estimates is the future size of the inmate population of state adult correctional institutions, which employ about one-third of all personnel in the corrections sector. These projections assume that the increase in state prison population which began in 1973 will continue in the coming 10 year period, but at a slower rate than in the period 1972-75. In the latter period, the number of state prison inmates sentenced to at least one year and a day had increased from 174,000 to 217,000 according to preliminary estimates. The increase had been widespread, affecting most states and regions. Part of the increase was due to the relatively rapid growth in the population aged 25-34 years, which normally accounts for a large proportion of all prison inmates. A major portion of this recent growth appears to be due, however, to a general hardening of public attitudes towards serious offenders, which—in turn—has influenced the actions of legislators, prosecutors, courts and correctional agencies.

The projections of prison population for the period 1974-80 assume a growth of the prisoner population to 243,000 in 1980, corresponding to an average increase of 4.2 percent per year. The reduction in crime rates is

TABLE IV-4
Current and Projected Corrections Employment by Level of Government and Function

Occupation	Number of Full-Time Equivalent Employees (000)			Percent Distribution			Percent Change 1974-85
	1974 ^a	1980	1985	1974	1980	1985	
Total	203	278	324	100	100	100	60
Adult institutions	106	145	167	52	52	52	58
Juvenile institutions	43	47	48	21	17	15	12
Probation/Parole	46	75	96	23	27	30	109
Administrative and other	8	11	12	4	4	4	50
State ^a	113	149	173	56	54	53	53
Adult institutions	66	90	104	33	32	32	58
Juvenile institutions	29	26	24	14	9	7	-17
Probation/Parole	18	33	45	9	12	14	150
Local ^b	81	118	138	40	42	43	70
Adult institutions	40	55	63	20	20	19	58
Juvenile institutions	14	21	24	7	8	7	71
Probation/Parole	27	42	51	13	15	16	89

^a Source: The 1974 distribution of correction employment is from LEAA/Census, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System*, 1974, Tables 9, 45, 46, and 47. These estimates exclude employment in "miscellaneous" correctional agencies, 1980-85: NPA Projections (see text and Volume VI).

^b Estimates of total local employment by function were based on distributions of employment in 384 cities and 312 counties which represented 80 percent of total local corrections employment.

expected to slow down the growth of prisoner population during the period 1980-85, resulting in an estimated total of 252,000 in the latter year. The latter estimate is higher than an alternative projection of 233,000, which assumes that the prison population in 1985 will maintain the same proportion of the population in each age group as it did in 1974. It is much less than the total of 435,000, in 1985, which would result if the rate of increase for the 1972-75 period were maintained over the next 10 years. The latter projection is considered improbable because inmate populations in a large proportion of prisons are already at or above designed capacity, and further large increases would require major increases in public expenditures for both new prison construction and operation.

Based on our assumption of a more moderate long-term growth rate in prison population, full-time equivalent employment in state adult institutions has been projected to increase by 58 percent, from 66,000 in 1974 to 104,000 in 1985. The latter estimate allows for some continued reduction in staff-inmate ratios, with a further differential increase in the proportion of treatment and education specialists. A more rapid growth in inmate populations than projected would not necessarily be accompanied by a corresponding increase in prison staffing, since the more overcrowded prisons have tended to have significantly lower ratios of staff to inmates, than have those where inmate populations are below designed capacity.

Overall employment in state and local juvenile corrections institutions is projected to increase by only 12 percent, reflecting an assumed continuation of the trend towards deinstitutionalization of certain categories of juvenile offenders, as well as the projected decline in the teen-aged population. The projection also assumes a continued movement of the youthful inmate population from state-operated reformatories or similar facilities to community-based residential and non-residential programs. As a result, employment in local public juvenile facilities is expected to increase by 71 percent, as compared to the projected reduction of 17 percent, in state institutions. These projections do not reflect the probable continued growth of employment in those local juvenile residential programs, such as halfway houses, which are publicly funded but operated by private agencies on a contract basis.

Employment in local adult institutions—mainly jails operated by sheriffs' departments—is assumed to increase from 40,000 to 63,000 over this period, or at about the same rate as state prisons. Since a number of states have resorted to the practice of retaining, or assigning, state prisoners to local jails, due to severe prison overcrowding, continuation of the recent rapid growth

trend in imprisonment would probably also require a more substantial increase in local jail staffs, than projected.

Total probation and parole employment is projected to more than double, from 46,000 in 1974 to 96,000 in 1985, based on an assumed continuation of the rapid growth trend of the preceding decade. Growth is expected to be more rapid in state-level agencies than in local agencies. Employment of probation and parole officers including supervisors, is expected to increase less rapidly than total employment in these agencies, because of increased utilization of aides and other supporting personnel in these functions, as reflected in NMS survey results. The trend towards fixed, or determinate sentencing, discussed later in this chapter, would—if maintained—have the effect of slowing down this projected growth, by reducing the requirement for parole officers.

B. Manpower Implications of Key Criminal Justice Trends

Although the above projections have been presented in a relatively precise form, they are subject to considerable margins of uncertainty. These stem, in part, from the limitations of available data on current and past employment in the various categories of criminal justice agencies and occupations. In part, they stem from our very imperfect knowledge of the complex of forces influencing crime rates, and from our limited capabilities to project longer-range economic trends, which influence both crime rates and the levels of expenditures of criminal justice agencies.

More important, however, is the fact that the criminal justice system—and particularly the correctional sector—has been highly controversial, in terms of its basic objectives, strategies and organizational structures. The explosive growth in serious crime during the past two decades has resulted in a wide range of national and local initiatives designed to modify past policies or practices of criminal justice agencies. These have ranged from broad-gauged recommendations to limit the scope of the criminal justice process itself, through such measures as "decriminalization" of certain offense categories or by diversion of some offenders to treatment outside of the conventional correctional framework, to other measures which would have the opposite effect, by imposing mandatory prison sentences on certain offender categories. They have also included many recommendations to increase the effectiveness of these agencies through a variety of organizational reforms.

Based on advice from a panel of leaders in the criminal justice profession, a number of these trends or innova-

tions were selected for closer examination through the NMS survey questionnaires, through field visit interviews and literature review. These included:

- Decriminalization
- Pre-trial diversion programs
- Sentencing policy changes
- Increase use of civilians in police agencies
- Team policing
- Consolidation of small police departments
- Court reorganization
- Community-based corrections programs.

The following sections summarize findings on the manpower implications of these trends.

1. *Decriminalization.* A large number of behaviors subject to criminal prosecution under existing laws deal with such offenses as public drunkenness, possession of narcotics, gambling, prostitution, and sexual deviance. Offenses of this type impose a very substantial workload upon the police, the lower courts, prosecutor offices, and the jails. They all fall under the category of "victimless" crimes. Although these activities contravene existing moral codes and standards of behavior, in most instances the sole victim is the offender himself. As recently as 1969, arrests for offenses of this type constituted about one-half of all arrests of police agencies.

Advocates of law reform have therefore proposed that certain of these offenses be "decriminalized" and handled, where appropriate, by agencies outside of the criminal justice system. Such recommendations have frequently been made with respect to drunkenness, gambling, possession of small amounts of marijuana, and certain types of sexual deviancy.²

Of these offenses, formal "decriminalization" actions through appropriate changes in legal codes have been mainly confined to public intoxication. Following a long line of Supreme Court decisions, offenses related to excess use of alcohol with no harm to others have been altered or eliminated in a number of jurisdictions. In addition—on a more extensive basis—arrest policies have been modified by police and prosecutors to reduce arrests for certain types of offenses in order to concentrate their resources on more serious crime or, in some cases, because crowded jails and court calendars have dictated such action.

For this reason, the NMS queried police chiefs and prosecutors concerning the extent to which arrest policies had been changed in their jurisdictions for specified offenses in the previous 5 years (either through legislative, judicial, or administrative actions), and about the effect of these changes upon the number of arrests. The results indicated that, where changes had occurred, the effect of the changes was predominantly to reduce arrests, particularly for such offenses as public intoxication,

marijuana possession, pornography, and homosexual behaviour (see Table IV-5).

These responses by executives can be compared with actual trends in arrest rates for certain offenses since 1970 as reported to the FBI. These data indicate a net reduction in the number of arrests for 10 "victimless" crimes from 3,963,000 in 1970 to 3,664,000 in 1974. A more detailed analysis indicates sharp reductions in both gambling and drunkenness arrests but increases in prostitution and marijuana arrests over this period. Arrests for all such crimes, exclusive of narcotics offenses, declined from 43.7 percent of total arrests in 1970 to 33.1 percent in 1974.

Despite these trends, when police chiefs and prosecutors who reported reduced arrests for these causes were queried as to the effect of this reduction upon their agencies' manpower requirements, about 90 percent of the police chiefs and more than 80 percent of the prosecutors reported that these changes had not affected their agencies' manpower requirements. The proportions of executives reporting reduced manpower requirements as a result of decreased arrests for these causes ranged from 5 percent to 8 percent for police chiefs (depending upon the arrest category), and from 12 percent to 16 percent, for prosecutors.

TABLE IV-5

Changes in Arrest Policies for Specified Offenses and Effects on Number of Arrests, 1970-74, as Reported by Police Executives
(Percent distribution)

Offense	Total	Arrest Policies Changed			Arrest Policies Unchanged
		Arrests Decreased	Arrests Increased	Arrests Not Changed	
Public intoxication ---	100.0	48.1	7.6	8.3	36.0
Possession of small amounts of marijuana -	100.0	34.9	18.4	12.9	33.8
Prostitution -	100.0	12.6	6.5	20.9	60.1
Homosexual acts between consenting adults ---	100.0	24.1	1.2	22.0	52.6
Selling pornographic material ----	100.0	29.3	8.6	18.5	43.6
Gambling ---	100.0	16.3	8.4	19.9	55.4

Source: NMS Executive Survey, Police Departments in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population. (N=1,150)

These results may appear surprising. Enforcement of laws concerning "victimless" crimes clearly entails

some measurable cost in terms of police effort in apprehension and booking of the violator, filing of reports, and time spent in courts. Thus sample analyses of police and detective man-hours by activity in two jurisdictions resulted in estimates of between 1 and 2 hours of time per drunkenness arrest, and 15-25 hours, per gambling arrest.³

One explanation for this response is that the time spent on the most frequent of these offenses, that of public drunkenness, is in fact quite small per arrest since the police objective is to simply get the offender "off the street" rather than to prosecute. Moreover, as a practical matter, police officers are frequently called upon to take some action to assist intoxicated individuals, even though they are not formally arrested.

More generally, the responses of both police executives and prosecutors may have been conditioned by the fact that, in the face of continued increases in the rate of serious crimes, overall agency workloads had increased over the previous 5 years; hence, any personal savings resulting from reduced arrests or prosecutions of these cases had not resulted in any net reduction in personnel needs.

It should be noted, too, that in many jurisdictions, county and state prosecution offices play a limited role in prosecution of many of these offenses, which are often summarily disposed of by local police and magistrates or by juvenile courts, without any direct involvement of either prosecution or defense attorneys.

A continuation of the trend towards reduced arrests for certain categories of victimless crimes, would thus on balance, appear to have a limited overall impact upon the demand for criminal justice personnel resources by police executives and prosecutors, but—at a minimum—offers the potential for more effective utilization of their resources for more essential activities.

It is probable, moreover, that one of the major beneficiaries of the reductions in arrests of this type have been the lower courts, in which these cases are mainly handled. Employment in municipal courts increased by only 10 percent between 1971 and 1974, as contrasted to increases of 19 percent and 24 percent in state and county courts, respectively—possibly due, in part, to the slowdown in caseload growth for these causes.

2. *Pre-trial diversion.* Diversion, as it has been defined by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, is the halting or suspending of formal criminal or juvenile justice proceedings against an individual who has violated a criminal law, in favor of processing through a noncriminal disposition. Forms of diversion are practiced, often quite informally, by all components of the criminal justice system. As examples, police may exercise discretion in determining whether

formal charges should or should not be brought against an individual. Intake workers in juvenile court may divert children who in their judgment could be better served by social and rehabilitative measures rather than formal and usually punitive court processing. Prosecutors may screen out cases which they judge to be minor or nonharmful behavior. Even following adjudication, judges and corrections officials have options for the use of treatment rather than punitive alternatives. The National Advisory Commission endorsed diversion, in "appropriate cases," both as a means of compensation for the tendency of criminal codes to result in "overcriminalization" in certain offense categories and because diversion broadens access to community resources for rehabilitation of offenders.⁴

The major forms of diversion being practiced today are pre-trial diversion, alcohol and drug diversion, juvenile diversion, mental health treatment alternatives, and first offender programs. In general these programs provide that the accused enter into supervised activities such as job training, regular employment or rehabilitative services in the hope that this will encourage constructive, noncriminal behaviour. The offender is subjected to specified controls, but is not prosecuted in the courts or incarcerated.

The extent of formal pre-trial diversion programs and their manpower effects were probed in the NMS surveys of probation and parole chiefs, prosecutors, and defenders.

- About 34 percent of chief probation-parole officers reported the availability of adult pre-trial diversion programs other than deferred prosecution in their jurisdictions. There appears to be a definite expectation of greater participation and utilization by probation agencies of pre-trial diversion programs. About 30 percent of the agency executives expect an increase in the assignment of probation/parole officers to diversion programs in the next 2 years while only about 2 percent expect a decrease.
- About 40 percent of the prosecutors reported that pre-trial diversion programs operated in their jurisdiction and 13 percent or more said that such programs were administered by their offices. The presence of formal pre-trial diversion programs in a jurisdiction tends to increase with the size of the agency. Thus, three-fourths of prosecution agencies with 25 or more employees operated such programs while about half of the remaining agencies reported plans for initiating programs in the near future.

When queried about the effects of pre-trial diversion programs upon agency workloads, a large majority of both prosecutors and defenders who reported that such

programs were in effect, indicated that these programs had not affected their workloads. However, where changes in workloads were attributed to these programs, a very large proportion of all defenders, and about two-thirds of all prosecutors in agencies with 10 or more employees, reported that the effect was a reduction in workloads.

Although diversion may occur at any stage of a criminal proceeding, the greatest effects in reducing workloads should be on correctional facilities. In the absence of a comprehensive analysis of offender flows—and of the effect of existing diversion programs upon these flows—no quantitative assessment of the effects of these programs on the latter agencies is available. It is likely however, that increased reliance upon both formal and informal diversion practices contributed significantly to the decline in juvenile institutional populations, and—to a lesser extent—to the declining trend in adult inmates prior to 1972.

3. *Sentencing policy trends.* While revised arrest policies and pre-trial diversion programs have some effect in reducing flows of certain categories of offenders through the system, recent trends in sentencing legislation may have the opposite effect. This includes the trend towards determinate or "fixed" sentences, and towards mandatory minimum sentences for certain categories of offenders.

a. *Determinate sentences.* Under typical existing sentencing practices, the prosecutors and courts exercise wide discretion in determining whether convicted offenders will be incarcerated and in setting the length of their sentence. Parole boards, similarly, exercise wide discretion in determining the length of imprisonment. This discretion is exercised through the widespread practice of plea bargaining and through the equally widespread practice of "indeterminate sentencing," which—in effect—relegates to parole boards much of the decision-making authority on actual length of incarceration. A completely indeterminate sentence does not have any fixed date by which the offender must be released. For example, until recently the California indeterminate sentencing laws permitted felons to be incarcerated from one year to life, release being entirely a matter of parole board decision. A more typical indeterminate sentence (also called an indefinite sentence) provides for a broad range, e.g., 1 to 5 years, within which the parole board has discretion to release an inmate. Under this practice, the sentenced individual may be released at any time after the first year of incarceration, but must be released after 5 years.

The indeterminate sentence has come under attack on the ground of inequity and because it does not serve as an effective deterrent to crime. In proposing substitution of

a fixed sentencing policy, the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Criminal Sentencing recommended that "for each subcategory of crime. . . the legislature, or a body it designates, adopt a presumptive sentence that should generally be imposed on typical first offenders who have committed the crime in the typical fashion." ⁵

At the time of preparation of this report only three states, Maine, California and Indiana had enacted fixed sentencing laws, effective at various dates between March 1976 and July 1977. About 10 additional states were actively considering such legislation.⁶

The long-term impact of these proposals upon prison populations and related staffing needs cannot be determined from available information. This will clearly depend upon the relationship in each state between the actual average length of imprisonment under previous practices as compared with those specified under fixed sentencing rules. Thus, the recently enacted California law establishes a series of fixed sentences ranging from 2 to 6 years for most crimes, in place of the previous open-ended indeterminate sentences often ranging from 1 year, or 5 years, to life. In assessing the probable impact of this law upon future inmate population trends, an official of the California Department of Corrections estimated that the short-term effect might be an initial reduction in prison population, as prisoners serving longer sentences were released under the new law, but projected a subsequent steady rise in prison population. However, these estimates were considered "highly speculative," prior to accumulation of several years of experience under the new law.⁷

One predictable impact of adoption of these policies would be, however, to reduce parole workloads or—at the extreme—to even eliminate the need for the parole function.

b. *Mandatory minimum sentences.* A closely related sentencing reform, which has been actively supported by the Federal Government, would require the imposition of mandatory minimum sentences for certain categories of offenses or offenders. This was one of the major recommendations in President Ford's Crime Message to the Congress in 1975. Noting that a large proportion of individuals convicted of felonies, including repeat offenders, are not actually imprisoned, President Ford recommended that, in the case of federal offenses, incarceration be made mandatory for: "(1) offenders who commit violent offenses under Federal jurisdiction using a dangerous weapon; (2) persons committing such extraordinarily serious crimes as aircraft hijacking, kidnapping, and trafficking in hard drugs; and (3) repeat offenders who commit federal crimes—with or without a weapon—that cause or have a potential to cause personal injury." ⁸ The President also called upon the states to

establish similar mandatory sentencing policies.

Among the apparent consequences of adoption of such policies would be: (1) an increase in the number of individuals assigned to prisons rather than probation; and (2) a corresponding reduction in probation workloads. Any precise estimate of impacts would, however, require specific analysis, for each affected offender category, of the difference in imprisonment rates before and after imposition of these policies, of the average length of imprisonment in each case, and of the possible interaction between mandatory sentencing requirements and the number of individuals convicted for such offenses, either through trial or plea bargaining procedures.

The many uncertainties related to an assessment of these impacts are illustrated by experience under the mandatory prison requirement for certain offenders, enacted in New York State in 1973. This legislation imposed plea bargaining restrictions and mandatory prison sentences on offenders convicted of certain drug felonies and on all second felony offenders. A preliminary report by the Drug Law Evaluation Project of the New York City Bar Association, based on 2 years of experience under this law, found that one effect of the law was to significantly raise the demand for trials in drug-felony and "second offender" cases with resulting increases in case backlogs. The result was a sharp reduction in drug cases processed and in drug convictions in the 2 years following passage of the law. The likelihood of a prison sentence following arrest increased, for drug felonies, in only two of the seven jurisdictions studied (including New York City), but did not increase in any of the jurisdictions for other felonies. Although the new drug laws may have facilitated enforcement by providing greater incentives to offenders to provide information to the police, there was no evidence during this initial period of any significant reduction in either drug crimes or drug usage attributable to the new law.⁹

The generally negative results of this policy, to date, may—of course—be attributable to the limited period of time that the New York law has been in operation. This experience does, however, confirm earlier observations that a "tougher" policy on imprisonment of offenders can only be implemented if additional resources are provided to both correctional institutions and to other agencies, e.g., courts and prosecutors, which have the responsibility of implementing these policies. If these policies do prove to have the desired deterrent effect there may be some offsetting savings resulting from reduced crime rates. However, the latter could only be expected to materialize over some longer-term period, if at all.

4. *Police agency organization trends.* Among various recent proposals for improving the effectiveness of

police agencies, three issues were selected for examination. These were increased use of civilians, team policing and consolidation of small departments.

a. *Civilianization.* Police departments and sheriffs' offices, traditionally, have been predominantly staffed at all levels by sworn officers. Civilian or nonsworn personnel, where utilized, were typically assigned to routine clerical or administrative duties or to certain lower-level support functions.

A number of recent studies, including that of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, have recommended increased utilization of civilians for a number of reasons, including:

- The lower costs associated with the use of civilian personnel, as illustrated by a recent Urban Institute study which indicated that salaries of civilians average 23 percent lower in selected cities than those of sworn officers in similar duties.¹⁰
- The growing need for specialized administrative, technical, and professional skills not normally possessed by the sworn officer; and
- The need to increase utilization of sworn officers in critical operational tasks requiring their specialized law enforcement training and experience.

Available data, based on FBI reports, indicate a gradual trend toward increased utilization of civilians in police departments. Between 1960 and 1974, the overall percentages of civilians in city police departments rose from 10 percent to more than 15 percent. Departments in larger cities with a broader range of administrative and technical functions tend to employ a larger percentage of civilians.

The NMS queried both police chiefs and sheriffs on their plans for changing the proportion of civilians in their agencies during the next 2 years. About two-thirds expected civilians to constitute a growing proportion of their total personnel, whereas only a negligible proportion expected a reduction in the relative use of civilians. The NMS survey also indicated that large proportions of these chiefs expected to increase the civilian share of personnel in specific functions, such as dispatching, data processing, administrative services and crime laboratory.

Based on this evidence, the NMS manpower projections assume that the proportion of non-sworn personnel in all police departments will increase from about 21.7 percent in 1974 (in full-time equivalents) to 24.9 percent in 1985, an increase consistent with past trends. An even larger overall increase would probably be desirable, from the standpoint of effective personnel utilization. However, the projected slower rate of growth in total police employment—and probable opposition from unions to any shift which would significantly curtail police officer

career opportunities—can be expected to serve as a constraint on more rapid growth in police civilianization.

b. *Team policing.* The conventional policing strategy involves central command of the patrol and investigative operations. Patrol officers and their supervisors operate out of precinct stations on a shift-by shift basis and are frequently rotated throughout the agency's total geographical jurisdiction. Patrol personnel usually are not responsible for investigating the crimes to which they respond. The reports are turned over to the investigative bureau and assigned to detectives. The detectives operate out of this bureau on a shift-by-shift basis and work on their cases primarily independently of the patrol officers who initiate the reports.

Team policing, as an alternative to this traditional organization, was recommended by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967.

Police departments should commence experimentation with a team policing concept that envisions those with patrol and investigative duties combining under unified command with flexible assignments to deal with the crime problems in a defined sector.¹¹

Since the 1960's a number of police departments have introduced some form of the team policing concept. The actual organizational structure and mode of operation for team policing varies from agency to agency, but usually includes the following features: geographic stability of patrol, maximum interaction among team members, and maximum communication between team members and the community.¹²

The extent of current and anticipated use of team policing was covered in the NMS survey of police chiefs in cities with 17,000 or more population. Of the 1,159 executives responding, 66 reported that they had adopted team policing throughout their jurisdictions, and 65 reported adoption of this innovation on a pilot basis. Another 195 agencies reported planning to adopt team policing throughout their jurisdictions or as a pilot project. Thus, more than one-fourth of the police departments surveyed had initiated, or were planning to initiate, team policing on either a full or experimental basis. Larger agencies included a greater proportion which had adopted or were planning to adopt this approach. Over 80 percent of chiefs whose departments had adopted team policing reported either a "moderate" or "substantial" increase in effectiveness, as a result of this change.

The most frequently cited benefits of team policing are: (1) improved police-community relations, (2) more efficient deployment of manpower, and (3) better coverage of patrol areas.

If a police agency completely reorganizes into a team

policing mode of operation, what is the overall net effect of this change upon the agency's manpower requirements? In their study of team policing, Bloch and Specht concluded that it does not require more personnel than conventional methods.¹³ NMS field analysis findings tend to corroborate this conclusion. In none of the three agencies visited by NMS staff that have adopted team policing did the changeover to team policing itself necessitate the hiring of more patrol officers. One of the reasons given for adopting team policing is that it is believed to increase the level of services without increasing the staffing level.

The team policing concept may, however, have a somewhat greater impact on qualitative personnel requirements, since it entails a combination of patrol and investigative functions, thus breaking down the traditional specializations of patrol officers and detectives. The limited NMS field observations of agencies with team policing suggest that—if this strategy is more extensively adopted—it may produce a demand for increased training of patrol officers in investigative skills, such as evidence collection, and in community relations, as part of the development of a more broadly-trained "generalist" officer occupation.

c. *Consolidation of small police agencies.* Most major policy-level studies of the organization of police services in the United States have been highly critical of the fragmentation of local law enforcement efforts among large numbers of small agencies. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals noted, particularly, that very small local agencies are incapable of a full-range of police services and suffer from inadequate staffing. It recommended a variety of arrangements designed to share or pool certain specialized services, such as laboratory services, information systems and intelligence and communications systems, on a statewide or areawide basis, and that: "at a minimum, police agencies that employ fewer than 10 sworn employees should consolidate for improved efficiency and effectiveness."¹⁴

Although the NMS surveys did not attempt an independent assessment of the relationship between agency size and agency performance, its extensive survey coverage of a sample of over 1,515 executives of "small" police and 276 "small" sheriffs' agencies has permitted identification of a number of special personnel problems of these agencies.

- As reported in Chapter V, personnel turnover rates have been exceptionally high for these agencies. In 1973-74, voluntary resignation rates of sworn officers averaged 22 percent for police agencies with fewer than 25 employees, and 39 percent for sheriffs' agencies with fewer than 25 employees. The rela-

tively low salaries of sworn officers in these small agencies, the limited opportunities for advancement, and their greater reliance on part-time personnel were among the contributing factors.

- High personnel turnover, in turn, results in a lower experience level of the officer force, and increases the importance of adequate training of personnel in these agencies. Yet over 30 percent of police and sheriffs' agencies with fewer than 25 employees reported that they provide no formal training to their new recruits, whereas all but a small percentage of larger agencies provided such training. Moreover, among the small police agencies providing recruit training, only 8 percent met the recommended standard of 400 hours.
- Hiring standards also tend to be significantly lower among small agencies. Thus, 21 percent of surveyed police agencies in jurisdictions with populations under 17,000 reported that they had no minimum educational standard for recruits, or that the standard was less than high school graduation, as contrasted with 4 percent for all larger agencies surveyed.
- In assessing their agencies' manpower problems, relatively high proportions of the chiefs of these small police agencies identified "inadequate training of personnel" and "high personnel turnover" as their "most serious problem"—27 percent of respondents in the case of training, and 16 percent in the case of personnel turnover. It is also significant that, among various types of services typically provided to small agencies by other law enforcement agencies, training ranked highest as the category of service these chiefs expected to expand in the next two years.

Thus, from the standpoint of personnel quality, the above data tend to support the need for consolidation of very small police agencies where this is geographically feasible. Nevertheless, any realistic assessment of the outlook for such consolidation efforts must take into account local community sentiments, which tend to prefer maintenance of local control over police agencies.

The manpower projections described earlier in this chapter do imply some continued trend in this direction, since they indicate that the proportion of total employees of local police agencies accounted for by agencies with fewer than 25 employees in 1974 will decline from 22.2 percent in 1974 to 21.0 percent in 1985. In view of the obstacles to a large-scale consolidation "movement," this may be a realistic assessment of the outlook for the coming 10-year period.

5. Court unification. All major assessments of the court system have highlighted the need for unification and consolidation of the multi-tiered, decentralized or-

ganizational structure of the courts, still prevailing in most states. Emphasis has been placed, particularly, on the need to reform and upgrade the lower court structure, as a necessary step towards increased efficiency and equity in the adjudicative process. The National Advisory Commission thus recommended that state courts should be organized into a unified system financed by the state, that all trial courts should be unified into a single trial court of general jurisdiction and that criminal jurisdiction now in courts of limited jurisdiction should be placed in these unified courts, with the exception of certain traffic violations.¹⁵

Even though over 20 states have reconstructed their courts in the past 10 years, problems of overlapping and concurrent jurisdictions still exist.

In many areas of the country today, a potential litigant discovers that he can choose between the original jurisdiction of either a state court, a county court, or one of several municipal based courts.¹⁶

At a minimum, unification of courts has meant a consolidation of functions in a structure that is more organized and more manageable as a unit than were the separate component pieces. But it is important to stress that court consolidation has taken a variety of forms, which Gazell classifies as five patterns.¹⁷ These range from consolidation of all courts in selected counties or cities, to establishment of a single statewide trial court of general jurisdiction and abolition of all lower courts. As measured by the number of tiers, between the years 1936 and 1970, 17 states partially unified their lower courts while retaining two or more tiers with fewer tribunals; three states consolidated lower courts into a single level, and one state abolished its lower courts.¹⁸ Since 1970, four states have altered lower courts without unifying them, four more states have reduced lower courts to two tiers, two states have moved toward one tier systems, and three states have at least temporarily abolished lower courts in their jurisdictions.

Clearly, lower court-unification is a change that is taking place by degrees. The degree of court unification in various states has been measured by Gazell, using a scale consisting of seven variables. These are based on the extent to which various forms of managerial control are exercised, on the presence of intermediate appellate courts, the kinds of general trial courts and the kinds of lower courts. "Unification scores", based on this scale range from a low of 2 (Mississippi) to a high of 25 (North Carolina).

An obvious question is the effect of lower-court unification upon employment trends. We would expect that those states that extensively modified their courts system experienced less growth in judicial employment than

those that did not. This is not an unreasonable expectation since lower court unification frequently involves elimination of the positions of some judicial personnel. Indeed, one of the major stumbling blocks to any trial court unification effort has been the difficulty of consolidating the work of limited jurisdiction courts. The reasons for this are political: unification almost always results in the elimination of many quasi-judicial positions—usually justices of the peace—and causes local jurisdictions to lose not only some control, but also revenue from agencies that were formerly considered “their” courts.

There does appear to be a relationship between the degree of unification and the change in employment between 1971 and 1974 (Table IV-6). States coded by Gazell as having high degree of unification report a much slower growth in judicial employment in the 1971-74 period than states that have not made much progress towards unification. The disparity in employment growth is most evident at the state level where there is a four-fold difference between states included in the “high” category and those in the “low” category.

Caution must be exercised in interpreting these data because, obviously, alternative explanations are possible for these relationships. It must be kept in mind that the changes included in this classification scheme have occurred over a considerable period of years. Unification as a process began in 1936, and continues up to the present time. Also, a simple classification scheme cannot take into account the varying rates of growth of criminal and civil caseloads among the states, or of other factors which might contribute to the differential growth in court employment.

The NMS manpower projections for state and local courts are consistent with a continued trend towards court unification and related management reforms. The slowest rate of employment growth in the judicial process sector has been projected for the lower courts. Moreover, the projections also provide for a significant increase in the proportion of non-judicial personnel in state trial and appellate-level courts. This is expected to result, in part, from the need for additional specialized professional, technical and administrative personnel to manage a more centralized court system.

6. *Increased use of community-based correctional facilities.* In the face of the apparent failure of conventional prisons or juvenile training institutions to accomplish rehabilitation of offenders—and of the high cost of inmate maintenance in these institutions—correctional reformers have placed increased emphasis upon the role of small community-based facilities. These, according to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice “offer a

middle ground between the often nominal supervision in the community provided by probation services and confinement in an institution.”¹² The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals similarly recommended transfer of most adult inmates from the large existing state institutions to community-based programs, as well as an eventual phasing out of the use of the state institutions for juveniles and youths.²⁰

TABLE IV-6

Percentage Change in Full-Time Equivalent Judicial Employment by Degree of Lower-Court Unification and Level of Government: 1971-1974^b

Degree of Unification ^a	Level of Government ^c		
	Total	State	Local
Low: 0-10 (7 states) -----	26	40	24
11-14 (14 states) -----	22	36	19
15-18 (16 states) -----	20	26	18
High: 19-28 (13 states) -----	15	10	17

^a Source: James A. Gazell, “Lower-Court Unification in the United States,” p. 660.

^b Source: U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of Commerce, *Expenditure and Employment Data for the Criminal Justice System, 1971 and 1974.*

^c Percentage changes are weighted averages.

Community correctional centers—although varying widely in specific characteristics—can be classified into two major categories: pre-release centers for adult offenders, and halfway houses, which may be utilized for either adult or juvenile offenders. Pre-release centers are usually small facilities (100 residents or less) in which inmates stay for the final parts of their sentence as briefly as two weeks or as long as a year or more and participate in a wide range of community release programs. Halfway houses are often similar to the pre-release or community correctional centers, when utilized for adult offenders, except that residents have already been paroled and are living at the facility as a condition of that parole.

In the case of juvenile offenders, halfway houses—or group homes—have been defined in the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections as:

... facilities generally handling between 5 and 30 adjudicated offenders and situated in urban locales. They are distinguished from institutions not only by their smaller size and community location but also by their encouragement of offenders' attendance at local schools or involvement in local employment. ... This definition excludes nonresidential or ‘day treatment’ programs although in some states a few offenders are allowed to live outside the residential program.²¹

Halfway houses are usually (but not always) operated by private organizations under contract with a State Department of Corrections.

Only partial statistics on community correctional center inmates and staffs are available at present. The 1974 Census of State Correctional Facilities, covering all states other than Massachusetts, reported that of a total of 188,000 inmates, about 9,000 or 4.8 percent were confined in some 158 "community centers," nearly 3,000 of the inmates being reported by North Carolina alone. These included both publicly operated and contract facilities. Almost all were classified as "minimum security" facilities. Of these 158 centers, 137 had fewer than 20 full-time staff positions.

The National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections reported a total average daily population of 5,663 juveniles in more than 50 separate state-related community-based residential facilities during 1974. These accounted for 17.7 percent of the total number of juveniles in state residential corrections programs. The total covered both privately operated and state operated programs, and contrasted with a much lower LEAA/Census estimate of 1,218 youths assigned to state-operated community centers alone in 1973.²²

Although the above data sources are not completely comparable, they indicate a much greater relative utilization of community centers for juvenile programs (17.7 percent) than for adult inmates (4.8 percent).

Some additional insight on current and anticipated use of community-based programs is provided by responses of correctional executives to an NMS question concerning the functions performed by their agencies (Table IV-7). Nearly one-half (46 percent) of the executives of both adult and juvenile institutions reported that they were currently administering community-based facilities or halfway houses. However, a somewhat greater proportion of heads of juvenile agencies, 39 percent, reported that they expected increased staffing needs for either existing or planned community programs in the next two years, as compared with 31 percent of the heads of adult correctional institutions.

The rather extensive use of some form of community-based facility—although on a small scale—was also confirmed by the field visits of NMS staff to correctional activities in 10 states. Eight of these 10 states reported operation or use of small, community-based correctional facilities for adults. Among these the largest number of community-based facilities for adult corrections was 23 and the smallest number was 3. Ratios of inmates in institutions to inmates in community-based facilities varied, but—in each state visited—the residents of adult community facilities

TABLE IV-7

Responses by Correctional Executives on Current and Expected Use of Community-Based Facilities or Halfway Houses, 1975

	Adult Institutions	Juvenile Institutions
Number responding -----	208	560
Percent Distribution:		
Activity currently performed, total	46	46
Manpower needs will increase		
in next two years -----	24	27
Manpower needs will stay about		
the same -----	20	18
Manpower needs will decline ---	2	1
Activity not currently performed,		
total -----	54	55
Will not be added in next two		
years -----	47	43
Will be added -----	7	12
Total -----	100	100

Note: Percentage detail may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

represented only a small proportion of the total number incarcerated.

Specific findings, based on these field interviews, are summarized below:

- Most of these correctional departments used community-based facilities for adult inmates nearing the end of their prison sentence or for those approaching parole eligibility. None of the departments sampled indicated that such facilities were used for housing newly committed offenders or those persons with long amounts of time remaining until potential release.
- None of the departments or agencies visited had established a classification process for making rapid initial assignments of new offenders to small community-based facilities. To institute such a classification policy for new offenders would produce significant changes in manpower needs—increasing numbers of inmates would be housed in smaller facilities, requiring a change in both programs and personnel. None of the departments visited indicated plans for such a change in the organization of facilities and in program priorities.
- While there is a strong commitment to community corrections, caution and selectivity are being exercised in placing offenders in community-based facilities. While increases in inmate populations result in pressure upon administrators to keep community facilities filled to maximum levels, administrators are also pressured to select inmates who have demonstrated "readiness" for such an experience in

order to avoid adverse community reactions.

- NMS staff expected that there would be significant differences in the manpower, education, and training needs of community-based facilities, as compared with large institutions. For the most part, however, they found very limited staff specialization or specialized staff training to meet the very specific treatment needs and priorities of such facilities.

In contrast to the relatively limited and supplementary role of community-based institutions for adults, these programs have been advanced as a major alternative to institutionalization in the case of juveniles, on the grounds that they are more humane, more effective, and less costly. The sharp decline in the number of juvenile inmates in state training centers—from nearly 41,000 in 1969 to 25,000 in 1974—combined with indicators of growth in the community-based programs, suggest that this trend has, in fact, occurred. Moreover, as noted above, nearly two-fifths of the 500 juvenile corrections executives responding to the NMS survey in 1975 anticipated an increased use of community-based programs in the next 2 years.

Only one state—Massachusetts—has actually implemented a program of complete deinstitutionalization of its juvenile offenders. In 1972, all of the state's juvenile training centers were closed. As of August 1975, of 1,864 youths sentenced to the state's Department of Youth Services, 1,378 had been assigned to a variety of nonresidential programs or were living at home under minimal supervision, 167 were in foster care homes, 214 were in group care facilities, and 105 in secure programs.²³ Although no other state had gone as far as Massachusetts, 3 other states—South Dakota, Minnesota, and Utah—had assigned between 50 and 60 percent of their juveniles in residential programs to community centers by 1974, and an additional 8 states had deinstitutionalized between 25 and 50 percent of their juvenile residential inmates.²⁴

The limited available evidence on results of deinstitutionalization of juveniles is still not conclusive. Preliminary and partial results of a follow-up study of the Massachusetts experience, by Lloyd E. Ohlin and associates, have indicated few significant differences in juvenile recidivism rates since deinstitutionalization, compared with those of a control sample for 1968, prior to initiation of the program.²⁵ From a cost standpoint, it appears that the per capita costs of custody in community-based, mainly privately operated, facilities have been much lower than in state training centers. However, these savings have been partly offset, to date, by the continued maintenance of the state training centers and staffs in states other than Massachusetts, and by their

higher per capita costs under conditions of declining inmate populations.²⁶

From a longer-range manpower standpoint, a continued trend towards deinstitutionalization clearly implies a reduction in staffs of state operated training centers after some period of adjustment, but an increase in personnel needs for largely private community residential centers, as well as for juvenile probation activities.

C. Conclusions on Manpower Outlook

This chapter has presented a series of manpower projections designed to describe the probable growth trend in the major categories of state and local agencies and occupations which comprise the criminal justice system. One basic premise underlying these projections was that the future demand for criminal justice manpower will be strongly influenced by broader trends in the nation's economy, as well as by more specific trends affecting the incidence of crime. A second key assumption was one of continuity between trends in relative employment growth rates of the recent past and trends in the coming ten-year period.

The longer-term outlook, portrayed by these projections, is essentially optimistic from the standpoint of the capability of criminal justice agencies to cope with their crime-related workloads. A more rapidly growing economy in the 1980's would make possible a higher level of expenditure for criminal justice activities. At the same time, such predictable demographic trends as the decline in the proportion of youth in our population, in combination with a more favorable job climate, could result in a significant reduction in crime rates. This trend would be reinforced, moreover, to the extent that better-staffed, and more efficient, law enforcement and criminal justice agencies create a more effective deterrent to criminal activity. A combination of increased resources and lower crime rates, in turn, would tend to ameliorate some of the problems of agency understaffing, reported in our surveys of criminal justice executives.

Employment growth rates are expected to vary significantly by sector. The most rapid growth is projected in the judicial and correctional sectors; the least rapid in police protection agencies. Within each sector, wide variations in growth rates are anticipated for particular categories of agencies and occupations. Among city police agencies, more rapid growth is projected for the medium-sized agencies, than for the large municipal police departments, as a result of a continuing trend towards decentralization of population. Employment growth in state-level agencies is expected to be more rapid than in local agencies in the police and judicial

process sectors, as well as in probation and parole activities, partly because of a trend towards consolidation or coordination of certain of these functions at the state level. An opposing trend towards decentralization is, however, projected for correctional institutions, as evidenced particularly by the shift to increased use of community based facilities for juveniles.

The projections of employment trends in the major criminal justice occupations reflect an even more consistent pattern. In nearly all major agency categories, more rapid growth rates are projected for the more specialized professional, technical and administrative occupations, than in the traditional "line" occupations. In police agencies, the rate of growth of the non-sworn component is projected to be twice as great as that of sworn officers. In the courts, employment of non-judicial personnel is expected to increase much more rapidly than that of judges. In correctional facilities, similarly, employment of professional treatment and training specialists is expected to grow more rapidly than that of line custodial officers. Although the available statistical data base did not permit a meaningful projection of trends for each specialized occupation, collateral data suggest that, in each sector, growth is likely to be more rapid in functions associated with information processing and with the more advanced management technologies.

Any attempt to project future personnel needs in the wide range of agencies and functions which comprise the criminal justice system is, of course, subject to large margins of potential error. The results must be viewed as "conditional" projections of what may happen under a set of specified assumptions, rather than as forecasts of actual future employment levels. These projections have entailed numerous assumptions concerning future trends in the nation's economy and in criminal justice policies or organizational developments. Among the former assumptions, one of the more critical was the projection that economic growth rates during the period 1974-80, as a whole, would not be sufficiently great to reduce unemployment below a rate of about 7 percent in 1980, but that more rapid growth between 1980 and 1985 would contribute to a reduction of the unemployment rate to about 5 percent by the latter year. President Carter has, however, announced as a policy objective the reduction of the unemployment rate to 5 percent by 1981. A more rapid short-term expansion of the economy will be required to achieve this goal, which could affect our projections in several ways. On the one hand, a more favorable job climate would contribute to reduction in crime rates and related criminal justice workloads, thus tending to reduce personnel needs for criminal justice agencies. On the other hand, increased tax revenues and state and local government budgets would make possible

increased expenditures for these agencies. The extent of "sensitivity" of our resulting projections to these and other possible changes in basic economic or demographic assumptions has been illustrated in Volume VI of this report.

Of equal importance are the possible effects of changes in existing laws, policies or practices, impinging directly on personnel needs for various categories of criminal justice agencies. Several of these recent trends, or issues, were reviewed in the second half of this chapter. Some of these developments have a potentially important impact upon offender flows and workloads. A continued trend towards *de jure* or *de facto* decriminalization of certain categories of offenses, or to increased use of pre-trial diversion programs, will tend to reduce or check the growth of these workloads. Conversely, recent changes in sentencing policies, including adoption of mandatory or determinate sentencing, may have the opposite effect, and appear to be contributing to the recent sharp increase of imprisonment rates. It is quite possible that these trends will operate concurrently—each applying to different categories of offenses and offenders or to different jurisdictions. In any event, pending development of more experience and of more adequate data on offender flows, their net effect is difficult to predict at the present time.

Assessments of the impact of trends in system organization or in agency personnel practices are equally difficult. Assumptions concerning some trends, such as the increased use of civilians in police departments or the increased reliance upon community-based correctional facilities, have been explicitly made in the employment projections for the agencies affected. Other developments, such as the trend towards court unification have been reflected in these projections only indirectly, to the extent that they had affected judicial employment trends during the 1971-74 base period.

For these reasons, any systematic use of manpower projections in planning of training and education assistance programs, or for related purposes, must provide for periodic review and modification of these projections, to reflect emerging policy and program developments as well as more current employment and workload trends. A procedure for updating and revising these projections at the national level, and for development of similar state-level projections, has been described in Volume VI of this report.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. These projections are designed to be comparable with the annual statistics on prison population published by LEAA in the National Prisoner Statistics series between 1971 and 1974. The latter are limited to inmates who had been sentenced to terms of at least one

- year and a day. Also excluded are federal prisoners and those in institutions of the District of Columbia. As a result, these data are not directly comparable with the more comprehensive totals reported by *Corrections Magazine* based on its recent annual surveys.
2. Board of Directors, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, "The Non-Dangerous Offender Should Not be Imprisoned," *Crime and Delinquency* 21 (1975): 315-330; Eugene Doleschal, "Victimless Crimes," *Crime and Delinquency Literature* 3 (June 1971): 254-269; William L. Hickey and Sol Rubin, "Suspended Sentences and Fines," *Crime and Delinquency Literature* 3 (September 1971): 413-427; and Sanford H. Kadish, "The Crisis of Overcriminalization," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 374 (November 1967): 157-170.
 3. Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, A Criminal Justice Planning Model for Prince George's County, Maryland (1975); Jacob Belkin, Alfred Blumstein, and William Glass, *JUS-SIM, An Interactive Computer Program for Analysis of Criminal Justice Systems* (Urban Systems Institute, 1974).
 4. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Courts* (1973). (Hereinafter referred to as NAC, *Courts*).
 5. The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Criminal Sentencing, *Fair and Certain Punishment* (1976), p. 20.
 6. *The New York Times*, October 12, 1976, p. 17.
 7. *Corrections Magazine*, December 1976, pp. 55-56.
 8. President Gerald Ford Message to Congress on Crime, June 1975.
 9. The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, *The Effects of the 1973 Drug Laws on the New York State Courts* (Drug Abuse Council, Inc., 1976).
 10. Alfred I. Schwartz, et al. *Employing Civilians for Police Work* (The Urban Institute, 1975).
 11. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (1967), p. 118.
 12. Lawrence W. Sherman, Catherine Milton, and Thomas Kelly, *Team Policing: Seven Case Studies* (Police Foundation, 1973).
 13. Peter B. Bloch and David Specht, *Neighborhood Team Policing* (U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1973).
 14. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Police* (1973), p. 106.
 15. NAC, *Courts*.
 16. Alan Ashman and Jeffery Parness, "The Concept of a Unified Court System," *DePaul Law Review* 24 (Fall 1974): 25.
 17. James A. Gazell, "Lower Court Unification in the American States," *Arizona State Law Journal* 1 (1974): 654-655.
 18. *Ibid.*
 19. The President's Commission, pp. 170 and 171.
 20. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Corrections* (1973), pp. 349-352.
 21. Robert D. Vintner, George Downs, and John Hall, *Juvenile Corrections in the States: Residential Programs and Deinstitutionalization: A Preliminary Report* (University of Michigan, National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections, November 1975), p. 31.
 22. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
 23. Serrill, Michael S., "Juvenile Corrections in Massachusetts," *Corrections Magazine* 2 (November/December 1975): 3.
 24. Vintner et al., p. 50.
 25. Lloyd E. Ohlin, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* (January 1976).
 26. Serrill, Michael S. "Harvard Recidivism Study." *Corrections Magazine* 2 (November/December 1975): 21-23.

CHAPTER V. PERSONNEL RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

The adequacy of an agency's personnel resources depends both on its overall level of staffing and on its ability to attract and retain qualified personnel. Officials of criminal justice agencies have, in the past, often expressed concern about turnover among their personnel, in view of the substantial costs of recruitment and training involved and because of its effects upon the overall experience level of their force. In addition, high personnel turnover can be a symptom of poor personnel morale, with consequent impacts upon agency effectiveness.

For these reasons, the NMS surveys queried agency executives on personal recruitment and turnover experience in their agencies. These included attitudinal questions designed to obtain information on whether personnel turnover was a serious problem for their agency, as well as reports on actual personnel turnover rates. These findings are reviewed in the first section of this chapter.

The second section presents projections of recruitment needs in key occupations for the period 1975-85, allowing for both projected employment growth and for replacement needs.

The third section of this chapter reviews trends in employment and recruitment of minorities and women, and analyzes their current distribution by occupation or function. Inadequate representation of minorities and women has been a key personnel policy issue in many law enforcement and correctional agencies. One of the collateral objectives of the present study, therefore, was to provide data which could assist in assessing progress in attaining equal employment opportunity objectives in these agencies.

A. Recent Recruitment and Retention Experience

The National Manpower Survey was conducted during a period when the economy was experiencing higher rates of unemployment than at any time since the 1930's. Under these conditions it was assumed that problems of recruitment and retention of personnel would be minimal. The survey results confirmed this assumption. Only small proportions of executives in any agency category indicated that a lack of qualified applicants was a major factor contributing to current personnel shortages or that

high personnel turnover was their "most serious manpower problem" (Table III-13). Field interviews, conducted in late 1975 and early 1976, also confirmed that, with limited exceptions, personnel recruitment and retention problems were insignificant at that time.

In anticipation of this situation, the NMS questionnaires addressed to agency executives also requested their assessment of the adequacy of manpower supply for their agency and of their personnel turnover problems in the three years immediately preceding the recent recession, i.e., 1971-74. The executives' responses, as summarized in Table V-1, indicated that the proportion of executives reporting such difficulties varied considerably, by type of agency and occupation. Recruitment problems were most frequently reported by heads of small police and sheriff agencies and by wardens of state correctional institutions (with respect to correctional officers). Problems resulting from high turnover, or resignation, rates in line occupations were most frequently reported by wardens, juvenile corrections administrators and prosecutors (Table V-1).

The actual turnover rates in key occupations, in Fiscal Year 1974, are shown in Table V-2. Voluntary resignation rates approximated one-fifth or higher in the case of assistant prosecutors and defenders, correctional officers and child care workers. They were considerably lower in the case of sworn police officers in large and medium-sized agencies (i.e., jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population) and of probation and parole officers. Hiring rates in all of these occupations were consistently higher than resignation rates, due to employment growth as well as to the need for replacing personnel separating for other reasons, such as retirement or disability.

Personnel turnover rates, in most agency categories surveyed, tended to vary inversely with agency size. Thus, among police departments, voluntary resignation rates of sworn officers in 1974 ranged from only 3.2 percent in agencies with 1,000 or more employees, to 6.9 percent in those with 25-74 employees, and 22.4 percent for those with fewer than 25 employees. In prosecution and defender offices, resignation rates of staff prosecutors or defenders were about twice as high in small offices, with fewer than 10 employees, than in offices with 25 or more employees. Similar, although less pronounced, dif-

TABLE V-1
*Percent of Agency Executives Reporting Recruitment and Turnover Problems in Key Occupations
During 1971-74*

Type of Agency	Occupation	Percent Reporting Inadequate Supply of Qualified Applicants	Percent Reporting Significant Problems of Vol- untary Resignations
Police Departments:			
Jurisdictions with 17,000+ popula- tion -----	Sworn police officers -----	26	28
Jurisdictions with less than 17,000 population -----	Sworn police officers -----	47	33
Sheriffs Departments:			
Departments with 10 or more em- ployees -----	Deputy sheriffs -----	25	33
Departments with less than 10 em- ployees -----	Deputy sheriffs -----	47	27
Prosecutor offices -----	Assistant prosecutors -----	25	36
Public defender offices -----	Assistant defenders -----	14	24
Adult corrections institutions -----	Correctional officers -----	42	53
	Treatment personnel -----	28	23
Juvenile corrections institutions -----	Child care workers -----	34	39
	Treatment personnel -----	23	22

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

TABLE V-2
*Hiring Rates and Voluntary Resignation Rates
in Selected Occupations, Fiscal Year
1974*

Occupation	Hiring Rate ^a	Voluntary Resignation Rate ^a
Sworn police officers ^b -----	12.5	3.1
Deputy sheriffs ^c -----	26.1	16.2
Assistant prosecutors -----	30.9	22.1
Assistant defenders -----	33.4	22.3
Corrections officers, State adult institutions -----	32.1	19.1
Child care workers -----	33.6	27.2
Probation and parole officers -----	21.5	12.8

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

^a Hiring rates and voluntary resignation rates are weighted averages, based on employ-
ment as of June 30, 1974. Include both full-time and part-time employees.

^b Agencies in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population.

^c Agencies with 10 or more employees.

ferences by agency size were reported in the case of line correctional personnel and probation and parole officers.

The factors influencing recent personnel turnover rates in these occupations are discussed below, with respect to each of the major agency and occupational groups.

1. *Sworn police officers.* The relatively low voluntary separation rates among sworn police officers reported by the large and medium-sized police agencies in this survey may appear surprising, in view of some of the obvious disadvantages of police work. Police duty is among the most hazardous of peacetime occupations.

Routine patrol activity can be boring and tedious, and the physical work environment in many police stations is often unpleasant.¹ It imposes a high degree of discipline and regimentation upon its incumbents. It often entails undesirable and changing work schedules. Nevertheless, it offers important rewards. The need to expand recruitment of police officers, combined with the rapid growth of police unionism, has resulted in a significant increase in police salaries, relative to wage trends in other occupations during the past 15 years. Based on decennial Census data, median annual earnings of policemen and detectives rose by 70 percent between 1959 and 1969, as compared to an increase of 63 percent for all male workers.² In 1969, median earnings of policemen and detectives aged 25-34 years exceeded the median earnings for all male workers with similar educational backgrounds, for each educational level group from high school dropout to college graduate.³ Between 1969 and 1974 available data indicate that police officers probably maintained their favorable salary differential, compared to other occupations. Entering salaries of patrolmen rose at an annual rate of 6.5 percent; maximum salaries at a rate of 7.4 percent. These compare with annual salary increases of 6.8 percent for public school teachers and of 6.1 percent for clerical workers and beginning technicians.⁴

These comparisons, moreover, do not allow for the value of fringe benefits of police officers, the most important of which is the opportunity for regular retirement at a relatively early age. Typical police pension plans

provide for regular retirement after 20 or 25 years of service at minimum ages between 50 and 55 years.⁵ Since these plans are normally not "vested" or "portable," they provide a very strong incentive for police officers to remain with their agency until the minimum retirement age, after they have completed several years of service. Hence, the turnover which does occur tends to be concentrated among junior officers in their initial years of service.

Finally, the general absence of opportunities for transfer, or "lateral entry," among police agencies above the entry grades serves as another major deterrent to mobility among police officers. Among police executives reporting to the National Manpower Survey, only about one-third indicated that their agencies accepted lateral entrants, even at the rank of private, and only 6 percent—mainly the smaller agencies—accepted lateral entrants into the supervisory ranks. As a result, most police officers who separate voluntarily are likely to move to other occupations, either by choice or because of the limited opportunities to enter other agencies.

The very high rates of voluntary personnel turnover among officers in small police agencies, averaging 33 percent for agencies with less than 10 employees in Fiscal Year 1974, can be attributed—in turn—to the fact that these smaller agencies do not offer similar career opportunities to their personnel. The median minimum salary for officers in 1975 was reported at \$7,545 by agencies with less than 10 employees, as contrasted with an overall median basic salary of \$9,914 for all reporting agencies. Smaller agencies also rely much more extensively on part-time officers than do larger agencies. Finally, personnel in small agencies are much less likely to be protected by civil service regulations or by collective bargaining agreements than those in larger agencies. Only 19 percent of the "small" police departments reported that the basic sworn officer position in their agencies was regulated by civil service, as contrasted to 68 percent of the larger departments, i.e., those in communities with 17,000 or more population. Similarly, only 15 percent of the small agencies participated in collective bargaining with police officer unions, as compared to 51 percent of the larger departments.

2. *Deputy sheriffs.* The substantially higher rates of personnel turnover reported among sheriffs' agencies than for police departments can be explained in large part by some of the factors discussed above. The average voluntary separation rate among deputy sheriffs, about 16 percent in 1974, was twice as great as that reported for police officers. Quit rates exceeded those for police officers in each agency size group, typically by ratios of 2 to 1 or higher, and rose to 58 percent in the case of small sheriffs' agencies with fewer than 25 full-time or

part-time employees.

One of the factors contributing to these high turnover rates in sheriffs' agencies is the difference in their occupational duties, as compared to those of police officers. One of the principal functions of all sheriffs' agencies is to operate the local jail or lock-up facility. A significant proportion of sworn officers in sheriffs' agencies are assigned to this function—particularly in the case of smaller agencies. These custodial duties are generally less desirable than those related to patrol or other law enforcement functions, as evidenced by the relatively high turnover rates among correctional officers in state adult institutions, which averaged 21 percent in Fiscal Year 1974, according to NMS surveys.

Another factor is the general absence of civil service protection for officers in sheriffs' agencies. Only about 10 percent of the sheriffs' agencies with less than 10 employees, and 35 percent of the larger sheriffs' agencies, reported that the deputy sheriffs' positions were regulated by civil service. Appointment as a deputy sheriff, in most smaller agencies, tends to be on a personalized basis—particularly in view of the fact that nearly all sheriffs are elective officials.

Finally, the survey results indicate that sheriffs' salaries are significantly lower on the average than those of police officers. The median entry salary for deputy sheriffs was reported as \$9,540, as compared to \$9,904 for police officers.

3. *Assistant prosecutors and defenders.* The need to improve the attractiveness of both prosecution and defender positions, and to increase the average tenure or experience level of attorneys in these offices (as well as to reduce reliance on part-time personnel), was recognized in the reports of both the President's Crime Commission and of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. The former report noted that—under prevailing practices—most newly hired assistant prosecutors were compelled to "learn by doing." Although some larger offices provided for a routine progression of assignments, others often assigned important responsibilities to inexperienced assistants with inevitable adverse effects upon quality of performance.⁶ Neither of these reports considered it realistic to press for compensation levels in these public agencies which would be fully competitive with alternative salary opportunities in private legal practice over a lifetime legal career. The NAC report did, however, recommend that salaries of assistant prosecutors and defenders in the first five years of service should be comparable to those in private practice and observed that "retention of assistant prosecutors (and defenders) for at least five years would represent a substantial increase in the average length of service."⁷

The recent rates of personnel turnover among assistant prosecutors and defenders, as well as continued employment growth, have resulted in a low average experience level among incumbents in these positions. As shown in Table V-3, over 60 percent of assistant prosecutors and defenders included in the 1975 Census survey of criminal justice personnel reported less than four years of service, while only 23 percent of the assistant prosecutors and 16 percent of the assistant defenders had six or more years of service with their current agencies. These data, and related comparisons of the age distribution of assistant prosecutors and defenders, confirm earlier findings that these positions have served as threshold jobs for many recent law school graduates, which enable them to obtain the needed practical legal experience prior to entering into more lucrative positions in private law practice.

TABLE V-3

Years of Service With Agency of Assistant Prosecutors and Defenders, 1974
(Percent distribution)

Years of Service	Assistant Prosecutors	Assistant Defenders
Less than 2	40.2	32.4
2-3	22.7	30.0
4-5	14.1	22.0
6-10	12.6	15.6
11-15	5.1	—
16-20	2.2	—
21 and over	3.0	—
Total	100.0	100.0

Source: Census Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Estimates based on responses by prosecutors and public defenders to the NMS survey further indicate that, on the average, only about one-fifth of all recently hired assistant prosecutors, and about one-third of the defenders had prior trial experience. The latter, moreover, are found mainly in smaller agencies, and probably include a large proportion of part-time attorneys who combine their public duties with a private law practice.

The above comparison has been limited to staff attorneys, exclusive of chief prosecutors or defenders. However, the comparative data available indicate that the latter, too, are younger and less experienced on the average than their counterparts in private practice. Thus, whereas the median age of all lawyers in the labor force in 1970 was about 43 years, the median age of chief prosecutors and defenders responding to the NMS survey was only 37 years. Moreover, over one-half of all chief prosecutors and nearly all chief defenders had less than

6 years of service with their agencies, according to the Census Employee Characteristics Survey. The relatively limited experience of prosecutors is due in part to the fact that a large proportion of all prosecutors are elected, typically for 4-year terms, or else hold office by reason of political appointment. Among prosecutors responding to the NMS, 72 percent were originally selected by election and 27 percent by appointment. Public defenders generally were appointed to their position by state or local officials or by the judiciary. In either case, virtually none of these positions have civil service status or similar tenure protection, thus contributing to both voluntary and involuntary turnover among these key personnel.

Some insight into factors contributing to the high turnover of staff attorneys in prosecution and defense agencies was obtained from a question included in the NMS surveys of chief prosecutors and defenders concerning the factors which, in their judgment, most contributed to turnover of staff attorneys in their agencies. As would be expected, "inadequate salaries" were most frequently cited by both prosecutors and defenders, as the primary reason for separation. However, while 65 percent of the prosecutors selected this factor, only 36 percent of the heads of defenders' offices offered this as the "most important reason." Another extrinsic factor directly related to compensation, i.e., "limited promotion opportunities," was identified by less than 5 percent of the prosecutors and less than 4 percent of the defenders, as the primary reason for high staff turnover. In contrast, such intrinsic job factors as excessive workloads and job frustration, were identified as most important (in combination) by 36 percent of the defenders, but only 16 percent of the prosecutors. The desire for broader legal experience by staff attorneys—which may be related to interest both in career advancement and in a broader scope of professional assignments—was identified as "most important" by 19 percent of the defenders and 11 percent of the prosecutors (Table V-4).

Thus, while pay and pay-related considerations were identified as the most important factor in staff turnover, it is clear that defenders, as a group, place much greater emphasis on the role of other job factors, such as excessive workloads and related job frustrations, than do prosecutors. The greater emphasis placed upon pay-related issues by the prosecutors is also consistent with their responses to an earlier question concerning the most important factor contributing to personnel problems in their agencies. Nearly one-fourth (24 percent) of the prosecutors identified inadequate pay as the "major contributing factor" as compared with only 8 percent of the defenders.

Data on minimum salaries of assistant prosecutors and

defenders were compiled from the NMS surveys of prosecutors and defenders conducted in late 1975. These minimum or entering salaries averaged \$12,403 for assistant prosecutors, and \$13,761 for assistant defenders, based on medians weighted by employment in agency size groups (Table V-5). Small agencies, i.e., with fewer than five employees, generally offered lower salaries than did larger agencies, particularly in the case of the prosecutor offices surveyed. These salary levels can be compared with an average entry-level salary of \$15,000 for attorneys in private employment, as of March 1975, based on the Bureau of Labor Statistics national survey of pay in key professional and other occupations.⁸

TABLE V-4

Executive Responses on Most Important Factor Contributing to Voluntary Resignations of Prosecutor and Defender Attorneys (Percent distributions)

Most Important Factor	Prosecutors	Defenders
Salaries inadequate	65.3	35.6
Excessive workload	11.8	26.7
Desire for broader legal experience	11.2	19.1
Frustration, low status, etc.	4.4	9.8
Limited promotion opportunities	2.7	5.3
Total	100.0	100.0
Number of responses	(1205)	(225)

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

The higher median entering salaries for attorneys in public defender offices than for attorneys in prosecutor offices, as shown in Table V-5, must be interpreted with some caution, in view of the fact that defenders' agencies are more highly concentrated in larger metropolitan areas (where pay rates generally tend to be high) and that many states and local governments (such as New York City) rely primarily upon contractual arrangements for provision of indigent defense services. The latter were not included in the scope of the NMS survey. A survey of both categories of defender agencies conducted by the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association (NLADA) in late 1972, found that 76.5 percent of full-time chief defenders actually received less compensation than the chief prosecutor in their jurisdiction.⁹

In any event, the above comparisons confirm the continued existence of substantial gaps between earning opportunities for attorneys in state and local criminal justice agencies and those in other alternatives. Although direct comparisons are not available, it is probable that this adverse differential becomes progressively wider in the case of attorneys with substantial periods of experience,

thus creating strong incentives—under normal conditions—for attorneys to leave positions in prosecutors' and defenders' offices after relatively short periods of service.

TABLE V-5

Minimum Salaries for Assistant Prosecutors and Defenders, by Size of Agency, 1975

Agency Size (Number of Employees)	Median Minimum Annual Salary	
	Assistant Prosecutors	Assistant Defenders
All agencies ^a	\$12,403	\$13,761
1-4	8,679	12,848
5-9	11,088	14,171
10-24	12,499	13,667
25-74	13,600	13,821
75-179	13,269	
150 or more	13,500	
Number of responses	562	138

^a Weighted Median.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975

4. *Corrections personnel.* Personnel problems resulting from difficulties in recruiting qualified personnel and from high turnover rates appear to have been chronic in many correctional agencies during the past decade, particularly with respect to correctional officers. This is suggested by a comparison of the results of the NMS survey with those of an earlier survey conducted in 1967 for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training (Table V-6). The two sets of survey results are not precisely comparable because of differences in survey design. However, while the comparisons indicate a considerable easing of the labor supply situation with respect to treatment and training specialists, very little improvement had apparently occurred between 1967 and the early 1970's in the capabilities of adult correctional agencies to recruit and retain line correctional officers. Moreover, despite the slowdown in growth of juvenile corrections agencies in the latter period, relatively high proportions of these agencies' executives continued to report difficulties in both recruitment and retention of child care workers.

The continuation of significant retention problems for both correctional officers and child care workers during the early 1970's is further illustrated by a comparison of separation rates in these occupations, based on the two surveys. In 1967, the separation rate for all causes among non-supervisory correctional officers in adult institutions was 22.6 percent, according to results of the Joint Commission survey. This compares with an estimated average voluntary resignation or quit rate of 19.1 percent in 1974 for all correctional officers, based on the

TABLE V-6

Percent of Correctional Administrators Reporting Recruitment and Retention Problems in Key Occupations, in Joint Commission Survey for 1967 and in National Manpower Survey for 1971-74

Type of Agency and Occupation	Joint Commission Survey (1967) ^a		NMS Survey (1971-74 experience) ^b	
	Recruitment Problems	Retention Problems	Recruitment Problems	Retention Problems
Adult Institutions:				
Correctional officers -----	53	52	42	53
Treatment personnel -----	} 60	40	28	23
Training personnel -----			20	15
Juvenile Institutions:				
Child care workers -----	51	50	34	39
Treatment personnel -----	65	43	23	22
Training personnel -----	41	27	15	12

^a Source: *A Time to Act, Final Report of Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training*, 1969, p. 13 and supplementary unpublished materials.

^b Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975. Percent with retention problems is total of responses indicating "critical or serious problem" and "moderate problem."

NMS results. Since the latter rate excludes separations due to such causes as deaths and retirements (estimated at 1.5 percent) and refers to all correctional officers, including supervisors—whose turnover is normally lower—the comparison suggests little net change in the high rate of turnover among custodial personnel between these two periods. Similarly, the quit rate of 27.2 percent for child care workers in 1974, based on the NMS, can be compared with a total separation rate among child care workers, or "cottage parents," of 28.3 percent in 1967, as reported in the Joint Commission survey.

The persistence of high rates of personnel turnover among line correctional personnel—at least until the recent recession—has had obvious implications for the effectiveness of correctional institutions. One of the concomitants of high turnover is a lower average experience level among line personnel—those in day-to-day contact with offenders. The risks of extensive reliance upon inexperienced personnel for these duties are illustrated by the findings of the New York State Commission on the Attica riot which identified the lack of experience of many of the prison's officers as one of the major factors contributing to this disastrous riot.¹⁰ Yet, as a result of high turnover and of continued employment growth, the available evidence suggests a significant decline, rather than increase, in experience level of line correctional personnel between 1968 and 1974. In 1968, a sample survey of correctional personnel conducted for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training found that one-half of all correctional line workers (adult and juvenile) had 7.0 years or more of experience in correctional work.¹¹ In 1975, the median years of service of line correctional officers in adult institutions was 4.8 years, and was 4.2 years for custodial personnel in

juvenile institutions, according to the Census Employee Characteristics Survey.¹²

The 1968 survey of correctional personnel for the Joint Commission included a question concerning reasons for leaving correctional work. Leading the list was "economic reasons, low pay," which was identified by 63 percent of the line workers in the sample. Next in importance, particularly among juvenile workers, were "pressures of the field, lack of success," and "lack of advancement opportunities." Additional insights were obtained from related questions concerning aspects of their jobs most liked or disliked by correctional personnel. Low pay was the job aspect most frequently disliked by line personnel. However, next in importance were such factors as "lack of staff," "disorganization," "our failures," and "not being able to meet the needs of offenders," all of which addressed in different ways the frustrations of personnel with the correctional field and its work environment. Thus, both economic factors, such as pay, and intrinsic characteristics of the work itself appear to have contributed to high personnel turnover.¹³

Since the time of the above survey, there has been some relative improvement in employment conditions of correctional personnel. Thus, between 1967 and 1973, average monthly earnings of full-time correctional employees in state and local agencies rose by 51.3 percent, as compared with smaller increases of 42.8 percent in gross average weekly earnings, and of 46.3 percent in hourly earnings for all non-supervisory or production workers in private non-agricultural establishments.¹⁴ Nevertheless, salary rates of line correctional employees continue substantially below those of line personnel in police and sheriffs' agencies, as indicated by the following comparisons for 1975, based on the NMS surveys.

*Median Minimum
Entry Salary, 1975 **

Police officers -----	\$ 9,914
Deputy sheriffs -----	9,540
Probation and parole officers -----	9,533
Correctional officers, adult institutions -----	8,328
Child care workers, juvenile institutions -----	7,798

* Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975

NMS staff field visits also confirm that many of the personnel problems noted in the Joint Commission studies continue to prompt high personnel turnover, as illustrated by the following comments.

"Correctional officers, adult institutions. The majority of the turnover was due to voluntary resignations and the reasons most often cited were lower salaries than other agencies and the tension and overcrowding of institutions. Moreover, the location of institutions far away from urban populations was reported to be a major factor in staff turnover."¹⁵

"Child care workers. Two primary factors contribute to turnover. One, as could be expected, is the opportunity to get better jobs. The other is the poor career progression available for personnel in key occupations. . . especially for those having positions in institutional facilities. In community-based programs, reasons for turnover tend to be more program specific. The variety of reasons offered includes intensity of the work, lack of regular time off, lack of seeing very many juveniles become successful, disinterest in the program, change in management, and requirement for longer term program commitment by staff than previously."¹⁶

B. Projected Recruitment Needs

Recruitment needs for personnel in criminal justice occupations will be determined both by trends in future personnel turnover, i.e., "replacement needs," and by trends in total requirements for such personnel, i.e., "growth needs." Despite the relatively rapid recent growth in employment in most criminal justice occupations, a major portion of new hiring in line criminal justice occupations in Fiscal Year 1974 was to replace losses of personnel resulting from either voluntary resignations or other causes, such as deaths and retirements. As shown in the first column of Table V-7, the proportions of total accessions needed for replacement purposes ranged from nearly two-thirds, for assistant defenders, to over 90 percent, for child care workers, in Fiscal Year 1974. Hence, estimates of future personnel separation rates are a key element in any projection of recruitment needs.

The most important, and volatile, factor in personnel separations in the occupations under review has consisted of voluntary resignations or "quits." Separation rates for such reasons as retirements or deaths are generally determined by such factors as the age distribution of personnel in each occupation and—in the case of retirements—by provisions of pension plans. These rates were estimated as of 1974 based on available Census survey data on the age distributions of personnel in these occupations and on collateral statistics on death and retirement rates by age, and were assumed to remain constant during the period through 1985. Voluntary resignation rates, on the other hand, normally fluctuate widely in relation to general labor market conditions. An analysis of quit rates of manufacturing workers for the period 1956-75 has indicated that, on the average, a 10 percent increase in the unemployment rate was accompanied by an 8 percent reduction in the quit rate. Since the average levels of unemployment projected for the period 1975-80 have been assumed to be substantially higher than those experienced during Fiscal Year 1974, corresponding reductions were made in projected voluntary separation rates, based on this relationship, with some modifications for specific occupations. For example, in the case of attorneys, available data indicated significant weakening in job opportunities for recent law school graduates in the period 1970-74, as a result of the sharp growth in law school graduations during this period. Recent reports have, however, indicated a slowdown in the rate of growth in law school enrollments and graduations, and a more favorable placement experience and outlook for graduates.¹⁷ Based on these assessments, a more moderate reduction in voluntary resignation rates of assistant prosecutors and defenders, between Fiscal Year 1974 and the period 1975-80, was projected than for the other occupations (Table V-7).

Voluntary resignation rates in all of these occupations are expected to increase in the period 1980-85, based on the assumed reduction in the unemployment rate from about 7 percent to 5 percent, during this period. They would, however, remain somewhat lower than in Fiscal Year 1974, when the unemployment rate averaged 5.6 percent.

In view of the uncertainties concerning both the personnel turnover and employment growth projections by occupation, the resulting estimates of annual recruiting needs should be construed as general indicators of the probable direction and magnitude of change over this period, under the stated assumptions. The projections do suggest, however, a generally favorable recruitment climate for criminal justice agencies during the coming 10-year period. Annual recruitment needs are expected to be lower during 1975-80 than in Fiscal Year 1974 in

TABLE V-7

*Estimated Annual Recruitment Needs in Selected Criminal Justice Occupations: Actual, Fiscal Year 1974;
Projected 1975-80, 1980-85*

Occupation	Actual, FY 1974 ^a	Projected (Annual Average)		
		1975-80	1980-85	
Sworn Officers:				
Police Protection Agencies:				
Total recruitment needs -----	61,700	50,400	56,400	
Replacements -----	45,600	37,000	48,900	
Growth -----	16,100	13,400	7,500	
Custodial Officers,				
State Adult Institutions:				
Total recruitment needs -----	13,400	9,500	12,400	
Replacements -----	8,600	7,100	10,500	
Growth -----	4,800	2,400	1,900	
Child Care Workers,				
Juvenile Institutions:				
Total recruitment needs -----	6,000	3,900	4,700	
Replacements -----	5,200	3,700	4,600	
Growth -----	800	200	100	
Probation and Parole Officers:				
Total recruitment needs -----	4,800	3,800	4,600	
Replacements -----	3,100	2,600	3,700	
Growth -----	1,700	1,200	900	
Staff Attorneys, Prosecution and Legal Service Offices:				
Total recruitment needs -----	7,200	6,700	9,500	
Replacements -----	5,100	4,400	1,600	
Growth -----	2,100	2,300	8,000	
Assistant Defenders,				
Public Defender Agencies:				
Total recruitment needs -----	1,200	1,000	1,400	
Replacements -----	900	800	1,100	
Growth -----	400	200	300	

^a Estimates for FY 1974 based on personnel turnover rates from Table V-7, and on NMS employment estimates by occupation. Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

all of the six occupations analyzed, by amounts ranging from only 7 percent for prosecutors, to 35 percent for child care workers. If the economy improves during the 1980-85 period, higher personnel turnover will result in an increase in annual recruiting needs in all of these occupations, despite the projected slowdown in employment growth. In the latter period, annual recruitment needs for assistant prosecutors and defenders would be higher than in Fiscal Year 1974, but would be substantially lower in the case of sworn police officers, adult corrections officers and child care workers.

It should be noted that these recruiting needs projections include both full-time and part-time personnel. The latter account for a disproportionate amount of personnel turnover in such occupations as police officers and assistant prosecutors. Any trend towards consolidation of small agencies, and a consequent reduction in part-time personnel, would substantially reduce the projected total annual recruitment needs in these occupations.

C. Utilization of Minority Personnel and Women

Increased representation of blacks and other minorities in law enforcement and correctional occupations has been strongly recommended by various national Commissions, both on grounds of fair employment practices and because of the belief that it can contribute to overall effectiveness in communities or in correctional institutions with large minority populations. Actions taken by the courts in enforcing federal equal employment opportunity laws, including establishment of racial hiring quotas in some jurisdictions, have accentuated the pressures upon many agencies to increase recruitment of blacks and other minority personnel.

In the case of police agencies, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals had recommended: "When a substantial ethnic minority population resides within the jurisdiction, the police agency should take affirmative action to achieve a ratio

of minority group employees in approximate proportion to the makeup of the population.”¹⁸ This report, as well as previous studies, had noted that lack of adequate minority representation had contributed to past tensions and conflicts between residents of urban ghetto areas and the predominantly white police forces patrolling these areas.

In the case of correctional institutions, such assessments similarly concluded that the gross disparity between the racial composition of inmate populations, which consisted predominantly of blacks or other minorities in many institutions, and of the custodial force, which was predominantly white, had contributed to inmate-guard tensions and conflicts—notably in the Attica prison riot.¹⁹

Analysis of available statistics on the racial and ethnic composition of police officers and of custodial officers in state and local agencies indicates that there has been some increase in minority representation in both of these occupations since 1960. Between 1960 and 1970, the percentage of blacks employed as policemen and detectives in state and local agencies rose from 3.6 percent to 5.3 percent, according to a special analysis of data from the decennial Census of Population (Table V-8). Over the same period, the percentage of blacks employed as “guards and watchmen” in state and local agencies—the occupational group which includes correctional officers—rose from 6.6 percent to 10.7 percent (Table V-9). Statistics compiled by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for 1973 and 1974, although not strictly comparable in occupational coverage, suggest

that further increases in minority representation had occurred in the early 1970’s. Based on this source, the percentage of blacks among law enforcement officers was 6.5 percent in 1974 and 17.7 percent of all correctional officers were black in that year. Persons of Spanish origin accounted for an additional 2.3 percent of law enforcement officers, and for 3.1 percent of custodial officers, in 1974.

TABLE V-8

*Employment of Blacks and Spanish-Americans,
as Percent of All State and Local Law
Enforcement Officers: Selected Years:
1960-1974*

	Percent Black	Percent Spanish Origin
1960 ^a -----	3.6	—
1970 ^a -----	5.3	—
1973 ^b -----	6.4	2.3
1974 ^b -----	6.5	2.3

^a Source: Tabulations by NMS from the decennial Census of Population, 1960 and 1970, public use samples. Based on data for persons employed as “policemen and detectives,” and as “sheriffs, bailiffs, marshalls and constables,” in state and local agencies. Data for Spanish origin officers not available on a comparable basis.

^b Source: Tabulations by NMS from reports of state and local governments to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC-4). Based on data for persons in “protective service” occupations, in state and local law enforcement agencies.

Despite these indications of progress in employment of minority personnel, their representation in the uniformed police and correctional forces of state and local agencies was still substantially below the proportions of minorities in the “service populations” of these agen-

TABLE V-9

*Percent of Minorities Employed in Line Custodial Positions in State and Local Correctional Institutions,
Selected Years: 1960-74*

Data Source/Occupation/Year	Percent Minorities		
	Percent Black	Percent Spanish-American	Percent Women
Census of Population, “Guards and Watchmen” ^a :			
1960 -----	6.6 ^b	N.A.	5.8
1970 -----	10.7	2.0	8.8
EEOC Reports, “Protective Service Workers” ^c :			
1973 -----	15.4	2.9	9.3
1974 -----	17.7	3.1	9.8
Census Employee Characteristics Survey, “Line Custodial Workers” ^d :			
1974—Total -----	19.4	2.9	14.0
Adult institutions -----	17.8	2.6	7.5
Juvenile institutions ^e -----	32.4	2.7	33.7
Sheriffs jails -----	13.3	3.8	17.3

^a Source: Based on special tabulations of public-use sample tapes for state and local employees from the 1960 and 1970 Censuses of Population.

^b Defined as “non-whites.”

^c Source: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEO-4 Reports, 1974. Includes state, county, and municipal employees.

^d Source: Based on NMS tabulations from Census Employee Characteristics Survey, 1974. Excludes custodial supervisors.

^e Based on responses indicating that employee has contact with juveniles as part of custodial duties.

cies, in 1974. The deficiency has been particularly great in the case of state and county police protection agencies, where only 1.5 percent and 4.7 percent, respectively, of all police officers or deputy sheriffs were black, as compared to 7.8 percent in city police agencies.

Geographical comparisons also been made, by state, of the proportion of blacks in two major occupation categories: police officers in city police agencies and custodial officers in state prisons, with the corresponding proportion of blacks in the service populations of these agencies:

- *Police officers.* The proportion of black police officers in city police agencies was found to be much lower than the proportion of blacks residing in urban areas in almost all states and LEAA Regions (Table V-10). The most pronounced disparities were found in Region IV and VI, which include most of the Southern States. In Region VI, the proportion of black city police officers was only about one-third of their corresponding urban population ratio. Western States, on the other hand, reported much closer

correspondence between black police officer employment, and the proportion of blacks in their urban population. However, among states with sizable proportions of blacks in the population (10 percent or more) only one state, Pennsylvania, had attained "parity" in its proportion of police officers by 1974.

- *Custodial officers.* A comparison was made of the percentage of blacks holding custodial officer positions in state prisons with the percentage of blacks among the inmates of these prisons (Table V-11). In none of the 41 state prison systems for which such data were available did the racial composition of their guard force approach parity with that of their inmate populations. Among 17 reporting state systems with large proportions of black inmates, i.e., 40 percent or more, only 5 states—South Carolina, Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and Arkansas—reported percentages of black custodial officers which were one-half or more of the corresponding percentage of black inmates.

TABLE V-10

Percent of Black Policemen and Detectives in City Police Agencies, 1974 Compared to Percent of Blacks in Total Urban Population, by LEAA Region and State

LEAA Region and State	Percent of City Police Officers Who are Black	Percent of Urban Population That is Black	Ratio of Percent Black Officers to Percent Black Urban Population
Total, U.S. -----	7.8	12.3	.63
Region I, Total -----	2.8	4.1	.68
Connecticut -----	5.6	7.5	.75
Maine -----	0.2	0.4	.50
Massachusetts -----	2.1	3.5	.60
New Hampshire -----	0.0	0.5	"
Rhode Island -----	2.7	2.9	.93
Vermont -----	0.0	0.2	
Region II, Total -----	8.4	13.0	.65
New Jersey -----	7.9	11.4	.69
New York -----	8.6	13.6	.63
Region III, Total -----	11.6	16.2	.72
Delaware -----	13.2	13.9	.95
Maryland -----	14.0	19.2	.73
Pennsylvania -----	11.8	11.7	1.01
Virginia -----	10.0	17.6	.57
West Virginia -----	1.8	5.3	.34
Region IV, Total -----	10.7	21.8	.49
Alabama -----	7.8	28.0	.28
Florida -----	6.0	15.7	.38
Georgia -----	17.9	28.3	.62
Kentucky -----	5.2	10.8	.48
Mississippi -----	15.7	33.6	.47
North Carolina -----	11.9	23.9	.50
South Carolina -----	13.3	26.5	.50
Tennessee -----	13.1	21.5	.61

TABLE V-10 (Continued)

Percent of Black Policemen and Detectives in City Police Agencies, 1974 Compared to Percent of Blacks in Total Urban Population, by LEAA Region and State

LEAA Region and State	Percent of City Police Officers Who are Black	Percent of Urban Population That is Black	Ratio of Percent Black Officers to Percent Black Urban Population
Region V, Total -----	9.1	11.7	.77
Illinois -----	13.0	15.2	.86
Indiana -----	9.1	10.3	.88
Michigan -----	11.1	14.6	.76
Minnesota -----	0.6	1.3	.46
Ohio -----	5.8	11.7	.50
Wisconsin -----	1.6	4.3	.37
Region VI, Total -----	5.2	16.1	.32
Arkansas -----	7.1	20.2	.35
Louisiana -----	10.3	30.6	.34
New Mexico -----	1.9	2.6	.73
Oklahoma -----	3.7	8.1	.46
Texas -----	4.2	13.1	.32
Region VII, Total -----	7.1	8.6	.83
Iowa -----	0.8	2.0	.40
Kansas -----	5.2	6.8	.77
Missouri -----	10.5	13.9	.76
Nebraska -----	2.7	4.3	.63
Region VIII, Total -----	2.2	2.1	1.05
Colorado -----	3.4	3.7	.92
Montana -----	0.0	0.4	0
North Dakota -----	0.0	0.4	0
South Dakota -----	0.3	0.2	1.50
Utah -----	1.3	0.7	1.86
Wyoming -----	0.0	1.2	0
Region IX, Total -----	5.0	7.0	.71
Arizona -----	2.5	3.4	.74
California -----	5.3	7.5	.71
Hawaii -----	0.0	1.1	0
Nevada -----	3.8	6.7	.57
Region X, Total -----	1.2	2.3	.52
Alaska -----	2.2	4.8	.46
Idaho -----	0.2	0.4	.50
Oregon -----	0.8	1.7	.47
Washington -----	1.6	2.7	.59

^a Percent of city police who are black from Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEOC-4 Report, 1974.

^b Percent of urban population that is black from U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970 Census of Population.

Black and other minority employees of law enforcement and correctional agencies (both uniformed and non-uniformed) were also found to be disproportionately concentrated in the lower paid and lower status positions of these agencies. Thus, EEOC reports for 1974 indicate that minority employees—including blacks, Spanish-American and other minorities—accounted for 34 percent of the work force in “service maintenance” jobs of police protection agencies in 1974, although they held less than 9 percent of the officer positions and 3.6 percent of the managerial positions. The disparity was somewhat less pronounced in the case of state and local correctional agencies, where minorities held 26 percent

of the maintenance positions and 12 percent of the managerial positions.

The more favorable representation of minorities in top-managerial positions of correctional agencies than in police agencies is also confirmed by the results of the NMS surveys of executives of these agencies in 1975. Minority members then constituted the following percentages of all administrators or wardens of correctional agencies: adult institutions, 9 percent; juvenile institutions, 13 percent; and probation and parole agencies, 4 percent. In contrast, blacks and members of other minority groups held 1 percent or less of police chief or sheriff positions.

TABLE V-11

*Blacks as Percent of Custodial Officers and of Inmate Populations in State Prisons for Selected States,
by LEAA Region, 1973-74*

State	Percent Black Custodial Officers, 1974 ^a	Percent Black Inmates, 1973 ^b
Region I:		
Maine -----	0.0	2.0
Vermont -----	0.0	0.4
Region II:		
New Jersey -----	25.6	49.7 ^c
New York -----	20.3	58.3
Region III:		
Delaware -----	38.0	60.1
Maryland -----	42.7	74.0
Pennsylvania -----	10.2	56.5
Virginia -----	13.9	59.3
West Virginia -----	0.8	15.3
Region IV:		
Florida -----	8.5	56.2
Georgia -----	6.7	63.5
Kentucky -----	4.8	26.9
Mississippi -----	27.1	63.0
North Carolina -----	16.0	54.0
South Carolina -----	40.8	58.6 ^c
Region V:		
Illinois -----	23.7	57.5
Indiana -----	13.2	41.4
Michigan -----	5.9	58.5
Minnesota -----	0.0	16.1
Wisconsin -----	1.4	30.1
Region VI:		
Arkansas -----	33.3	47.6
Louisiana -----	15.8	71.1
New Mexico -----	0.0	11.6
Oklahoma -----	11.4	26.3
Texas -----	4.9	43.4
Region VII:		
Iowa -----	0.9	19.1
Kansas -----	6.7	31.7
Nebraska -----	9.3	29.7
Region VIII:		
Colorado -----	3.2	19.3
Montana -----	0.0	1.6
North Dakota -----	0.0	1.8
South Dakota -----	0.0	1.9
Utah -----	0.4	9.2
Wyoming -----	0.0	4.2
Region IX:		
Arizona -----	4.0	21.5
California -----	11.7	31.8
Nevada -----	1.0	21.8
Region X:		
Alaska -----	0.0	16.0
Idaho -----	1.6	1.0
Oregon -----	2.7	13.3
Washington -----	2.8	17.4

^a Source: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEO-4 Report, 1974.

^b Source: U.S. Department of Justice, LEAA, Unpublished Reports. States for which either percent of Black custodial officers or Black inmates were not available, were omitted.

^c Includes "other races."

In addition to the above data on the actual proportions of minority personnel employed, by occupation, an analysis was made of recruitment and attrition rates of minority personnel in law enforcement and correctional officer positions in 1974. In Fiscal Year 1974, a special analysis of EEOC reports indicated that 13.1 percent of all new hires of police officers and sheriffs were minority group members (blacks or Spanish-Americans), a significantly higher proportion than their share of total officer positions in these agencies at the end of Fiscal Year 1974 (9.3 percent). Similarly, 27.4 percent of all new hires to custodial officer positions were minority group members, as compared to their current proportion of 22.9 percent, of total custodial officer positions in these agencies. These higher recruitment rates, in combination with lower attrition rates for minority group incumbents, had contributed to the net increases in their share of total officer positions in these law enforcement and correctional agencies during fiscal year 1974.

The above data refer to experience during a year of relatively high personnel turnover and employment growth. There is no assurance that the favorable recruitment differentials for minority group members can be maintained during the period 1975-85 when competition for these positions may be more severe. Projections of minority group employment in police and sheriffs' agencies were made, however, under an initial assumption that minority group members would maintain the same ratio of new officer accessions and the same relative attrition rates as in 1974. Based on these assumptions, the percentage of minority group members in police officer or deputy sheriff positions in the 3,400 jurisdictions covered by the EEOC reports would increase from 9.3 percent in 1974 to 13 percent in 1985. The latter percentage would, however, remain below the projected proportion of blacks and Spanish-Americans in the U.S. population of 17.6 percent in 1985.

A second set of estimates was also prepared to determine the average percentage of minority group members who would have to be hired by these agencies each year between 1974 and 1985, in order to attain parity with their projected overall population ratio of 17.6 percent in 1985. Attainment of this proportion of minority group members in state and local police officer and sheriffs' positions would require an increase in the percentage of minorities to be recruited from 13.1 percent in Fiscal Year 1974, to an average of 18.1 percent per year, between 1974 and 1985. In the absence of greatly intensified minority recruitment efforts, including appropriate modifications of selection criteria, it appears unlikely that this ratio will be attained.

Women. With limited exceptions, police officer and correctional officer positions have traditionally been con-

sidered as "men's occupations." The relatively few women employed in these positions have been typically assigned to specialized roles. In the case of police protection agencies, sworn women police officers have been most frequently used in juvenile units, in sex criminal investigations, as matrons in jails or lock-ups, or in various clerical or technical functions. In addition, women uniformed personnel are used extensively in auxiliary non-sworn positions, such as part-time school crossing guards, or as parking meter attendants or "meter maids". In correctional institutions, women officers are mainly assigned to supervision of female or juvenile inmates, and to non-contact roles in adult male institutions, for example, in inspection of female visitors to prisons.

Among the discriminatory practices of police agencies noted in the report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals were the maintenance of fixed quotas or ceilings on recruitment of women officers, discriminatory hiring, and discriminatory promotional practices. In both the police and correctional fields, emphasis in equal employment opportunity programs has been placed on a broader scope of duty or occupational assignments—for example, to regular patrol duties, in the case of women police officers.

As in the case of minority recruitment, pressures for change in these practices have come mainly from sources outside of the criminal justice agencies themselves. A 1970 Supreme Court decision (*Griggs v. Duke Power Company*, 401, U.S. 424) required that employment selection criteria must be nondiscriminatory, specifically job-related, and validated. In 1972, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission was empowered to enforce Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as it applies to discrimination against women. The growth of the "women's rights" movement, exemplified by the pending Equal Rights Amendment, has provided further impetus to measures to eliminate sex discrimination in hiring. In addition, recent labor market developments—notably the decline in job opportunities in some traditional women's fields, such as teaching—has encouraged many well educated women to seek alternative employment in previously male occupations, including the law enforcement and correctional fields.

The available statistics indicate that there has been a small but measurable increase in the proportions of women employed as police or correctional officers. As shown in Table V-12, the proportion of women employed as police officers rose slightly between 1960 and 1970, based on both Census and FBI statistics for these years, and reached 3.0 percent in 1974, based on EEOC reports for the latter year. The proportions of women employed as correctional, or line custodial officers, has

been found to vary significantly, depending upon the occupational classifications followed in the various data sources; hence, no valid estimates of trends are available.

In police agencies, an analysis of female employment, based on the NMS occupational groupings, indicates that—among sworn officers—women are disproportionately assigned to support functions or duties, as compared to line functions, or to positions in line management and supervision (Table V-13). In correctional agencies, women comprised a much larger proportion (33.7 percent) of line custodial personnel in contact with juveniles, as compared to 7.5 percent, in adult institutions and 17.3 percent in sheriffs' jails—the latter includ-

ing detention facilities for both adults and juveniles.

On the basis of recent recruitment and turnover experience, only limited progress in utilization of women in line law enforcement positions can be expected in the next decade. An analysis of EEOC reports indicates that the proportion of women recruited as police officers in fiscal year 1974 was 6.0 percent, a significantly higher proportion than their share of total police officer positions, of 2.8 percent. However, attrition rates for women police officers were also slightly higher than for men. A continuation of the 1974 recruitment and attrition experience would result in only a modest net growth in their share of total police officer positions, to about 3.9 percent in 1985, due in part to the overall slowdown in growth of police employment indicated by our projections.

In the correctional sector, a key factor which will tend to check the growth in the proportion of women in line custodial positions is the very slow net employment growth projected for child care workers in juvenile institutions, where a relatively large proportion of women are employed. Thus, in the absence of a significant change in current recruitment and assignment practices for women in adult correctional institutions, it is unlikely that their overall share of line custodial positions will increase materially in the coming decade.

D. Conclusions

Our examination of recent personnel turnover experience in key criminal justice occupations and of related personnel issues has identified a number of significant personnel management problems, which have adversely affected the overall performance of many law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. High personnel

TABLE V-12

Percent of Women Employed as Law Enforcement Officers in State and Local Agencies, Selected Years: 1960-1970

Source and Years	Percent
Census of Population ^a (policemen, detectives, sheriffs):	
1960 -----	1.9
1970 -----	2.9
FBI ^b (sworn officers):	
1960 -----	2.0
1970 -----	2.5
EEOC ^c (protective service workers):	
1973 -----	2.7
1974 -----	3.0

^a Source: Based on special tabulations from decennial Censuses public-use tapes from the 1960 and 1970 Censuses of Population.

^b FBI, *Uniform Crime Reports*, 1971, Table 53; 1974, Table 58. Excludes state police agencies.

^c Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEO-4 Reports, 1973 and 1974.

TABLE V-13

Employment of Women in State and Local Police Agencies, by NMS Occupational Group: 1974

	Total Employees	Women	
		Total	Percent of Total
All employees -----	520,413	78,711	14.6
Police Officers:			
Sworn officers, excluding auxiliary officers, total -----	398,115	6,337	1.6
Management and supervision -----	61,610	101	0.2
Line patrol and investigation -----	302,215	4,216	1.4
Direct support -----	17,117	1,244	7.3
Indirect support -----	17,164	776	4.5
Auxiliary officers and trainees (school crossing guards, meter checkers, police aides, etc.) -----	36,243	21,615	59.6
Civilian employees, total ^a -----	86,055	50,758	59.0
Direct support -----	26,988	10,754	39.9
Indirect support -----	58,303	40,000	68.6

^a Includes 763 civilian personnel classified in line management and supervisory positions.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Employee Characteristics Survey*, 1974.

turnover rates, as well as difficulties in recruitment of qualified applicants, had been experienced by many agencies during the early 1970's, in such key occupations as assistant prosecutors and defenders, correctional officers, child care workers and law enforcement officers in the smaller police and sheriffs' agencies. Low salaries, lack of career opportunities and the difficult working conditions characteristic of many of these jobs were identified as important contributing factors. High personnel turnover had served to reduce the average experience level of personnel in these positions, and had entailed substantial investments in recruitment and initial training of replacements.

The reductions in personnel turnover experienced since 1974, in turn, appear to have been due primarily to external labor market factors, i.e., the growth in unemployment accompanying the recent economic recession, rather than to any basic improvement in the relative pay or conditions of employment in these occupations. To the extent that the labor market continues to provide a surplus of job seekers, in relation to available openings, personnel turnover and recruitment problems will be reduced in the years immediately ahead. From a personnel management standpoint, this will, at least temporarily, provide favorable conditions for more selective recruitment and for a shift of emphasis in training programs from quantity to quality.

However, our longer-range assessment, predicated on restoration of more favorable economic growth rates by the early 1980's, indicates the likelihood of an increase in personnel turnover unless corrective actions are taken. Some of these actions, such as needed adjustments in salary structures, are normally not within the authority of agency executives, themselves. However, more can be done, in many agencies, to improve career development programs, to correct adverse working conditions and to make jobs more challenging. Organizational reforms, such as consolidation of very small police or prosecutor agencies and unification of court systems, would also help to reduce personnel turnover, by broadening training and advancement opportunities.

An additional personnel policy issue, discussed in this chapter, has been the assessment of progress by law enforcement and correctional agencies in providing equitable employment opportunities to minority personnel and women. Based on available statistics, progress has been limited and uneven. The percentage of black officers is still very low in state and county police and sheriffs' agencies, and few states or regions have achieved parity between the proportions of blacks in their population and that in their police forces. Although the proportions of blacks among correctional officers was found to be generally higher than in police agencies,

none of the state prison systems with substantial proportions of black inmates had approached similar ratios in their correctional staffs. Finally, our assessment of the employment of women in line law enforcement or correctional positions has revealed very limited overall progress in broadening employment opportunities for women outside of the traditional "female-type" positions in these agencies.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. For a discussion of personnel problems of police agencies in the late 1960's, see Charles B. Saunders, Jr., *Upgrading the American Police* (The Brookings Institution, 1970), Chapter Three.
2. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, 1960, PC (2) 7A Occupational Characteristics*, Table 27 and *Census of Population, 1970 PC (2) 7A Occupational Characteristics*, Table 24.
3. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population, 1970, PC (2)-8B Earnings by Occupation and Education*, Table 1.
4. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1975, p. 368.
5. *Municipal Year Book* (International City Management Association, 1974), Table 28.
6. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: The Courts* (1967), p. 74.
7. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Courts* (1973), pp. 233 and 275.
8. U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical, and Clerical Pay* (March 1976), Bulletin 1931.
9. NLADA 1972 survey of defenders, p. 19.
10. The Official Report of the New York State Special Commission on Attica, 1972.
11. *Corrections, 1968: A Climate for Change*. Report of a survey made by Louis Harris and Associates for the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training (1968), Table 42.
12. These comparisons overstate the extent of decline, to some extent, since the 1974 Census survey question referred to experience of personnel in their current agency rather than in correctional work as a whole. However, in view of the limited opportunities for mobility of personnel among correctional systems, the difference between average length of total correctional service, and service in the agency of current employment is probably small for line personnel.
13. *Corrections, 1968: A Climate for Change*, pp. 34 and 39.
14. Average earnings of correctional employees from U.S. Bureau of the Census, Annual Survey of Governments, *Public Employment in 1974*. Average earnings of private non-agricultural employees from *Monthly Labor Review*, February 1976, p. 77.
15. NMS Final Report, Volume VIII, Part 2, p. 341.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 469.
17. *New York Times*, November 28, 1976, p. 55, and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Occupational Projections and Training Data*, Bulletin 1918 (1976), p. 32.
18. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Police* (1973), p. 329.
19. See, for example, *Reform of the Correctional System*. A report by the Select Committee on Crime, June 26, 1973, House Report No. 93-329, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess., p. 18.

CHAPTER VI. HIGHER EDUCATION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE PERSONNEL: THE LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION PROGRAM

In addition to surveying the quantitative personnel needs of criminal justice agencies, a central task of the National Manpower Survey was to assess the adequacy of the training and education of personnel in these agencies and of existing federal assistance programs for these purposes. The largest and most visible of these LEAA-funded programs has been the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP). Expenditures for this program exceeded \$41 million in Fiscal Year 1975 and accounted for more than one-half of total LEAA funded expenditures for training and academic assistance. During the 8 years following its authorization by the Congress in June 1968, the LEEP program is estimated to have provided financial assistance to a quarter of a million employees, or potential employees, of criminal justice agencies, with a total cumulative expenditure of \$234 million.

The premise underlying the LEEP program is that an upgrading of the educational level of criminal justice personnel, particularly police officers, is a necessary condition for improving the performance of these personnel. The first section of this chapter presents evidence bearing on this issue based on a combination of research approaches, including occupational task analyses, executive assessments, and empirical research on the relationship between educational attainment and job performance of police officers. It also presents data on current and projected educational standards for entry into these positions.

The second section assesses the role played by the LEEP program in contributing to the educational upgrading of criminal justice personnel, including both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the LEEP-funded college programs.

The third section examines the implications of future trends in agency personnel needs and resources for LEEP or other federal academic assistance programs.

The final section summarizes our findings concerning major needs and priorities for academic assistance, based on these assessments.

A. The Issue of Educational Standards

1. *Major commission recommendations.* Although

the need for college-educated administrators in both law enforcement and correctional agencies has long been recognized, recommendations that all line officers in these activities be required—or encouraged—to pursue their education beyond the high school graduation level are of more recent origin and have been largely confined to the law enforcement field. Such diverse organizations as the Police Foundation, the American Bar Association and the International Association of Chiefs of Police have become proponents of higher education for police, as part of a process of “professionalizing” the police occupation. Perhaps the greatest impetus for educational upgrading of police officers, however, has come from the two national commissions convened during the past 10 years to recommend improvements in the criminal justice system.

- The Report of the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (1967) proposed an immediate requirement of a baccalaureate degree for all police officers in supervisory and executive positions and a similar four-year degree requirement for all sworn police officers as an “ultimate aim.” The latter recommendation was coupled, however, with a proposal for establishment of three levels of entry into police work: (1) a “community service officer” who would serve in an apprentice or para-professional role, without general arrest powers; (2) a sworn police officer; and (3) a new position of “police agent,” with broader scope and higher qualifications than the general police officer. The “community service officer” position would not require a college education and would provide a channel of entry into police work for motivated younger persons, who might not otherwise qualify for sworn officer positions. The educational standards for the sworn police officer would be progressively raised from the then-prevailing standard of a high school diploma to that of a college diploma. The proposed “police agent” position in turn, would initially require a two-year college degree, and an ultimate four-year degree.¹

- The report of the National Advisory Commission on

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973) also proposed a phased increase in minimum educational standards for all new entrants into sworn officer positions, from an immediate requirement for completion of one year of college, to an ultimate requirement of a bachelor's degree by 1972.²

In contrast to the above recommendations on police officer standards, the national commissions, as well as professional associations in the correctional field, have generally supported a more modest minimum standard of high school graduation for the line correctional officer position. These recommendations have no doubt been influenced by the narrower range of responsibilities of most line correctional officer positions than of police officers, and by lesser agency emphasis on minimum educational standards for correctional officers than in the case of police officers. Thus while the President's Crime Commission reported, in 1967, that over 70 percent of police departments required a high school diploma for police candidates, and that a number of departments had already established a requirement for some college work, a survey of state correctional systems that year indicated that only 59 percent of the states required a high school diploma or GED for selection as a line correctional officer. Although there has been little support for establishment of a higher educational standard as a requirement for entry into basic correctional officer's positions, the President's Crime Commission Task Force on Corrections, as well as professional organizations such as the American Correctional Association, have recommended upgrading of educational levels of correctional officers, generally, through continuing education programs, as part of career development of correctional officers for supervisory and managerial positions and for increased assumption of certain counseling functions by these personnel.

The proponents of a college-level educational requirement for entry into police officer positions have supported this recommendation on several grounds. These have included job complexity and scope, organizational considerations and labor market factors:

- *Job complexity.* The wide variety of tasks and responsibilities of police officers, including many involving considerable use of discretion, have been cited as requiring personnel with a broad understanding of social and behavioral problems, including particularly those relevant to community relations, to crisis intervention and to juvenile delinquency behavior. In addition, the introduction of new technology into both the patrol and investigative functions, as well as the requirement for increased legal sophistication as a result of recent

Supreme Court decisions, have, it is claimed, further increased the intellectual and educational demands of the police officer position.

- *Organizational considerations.* In addition to justifications based on the specific duties and knowledge needs of the basic patrol officer, others have emphasized that career development considerations require a large pool of college trained line police officers, since selection of investigators, supervisors and managerial personnel is almost entirely from internal sources. It has also been contended that, although college education may not be essential for performance of many police officer tasks, the better educated personnel are more proficient in certain of these tasks, are more trainable for more complex or specialized assignments, are likely to be less authoritarian and are more apt to support or adapt to innovative approaches, such as team policing, thus creating an impetus for systems change and improvement.
- *Labor market trends.* The increasing educational attainment of the labor force—and the growing trend towards extension of the normal educational period to include at least 2 years of college—has increased the pool of potential applicants for police positions with at least some college education. It has been contended that if police departments continue to maintain a high school graduate standard of entry, they will—in effect—be lowering their standards in relation to other occupations and to the general educational level of their service populations. In addition, as opportunities for higher education are “democratized,” the smaller pool of non-college trained applicants will tend to become increasingly less qualified, in terms of motivation and ability.

Not all authorities, either inside or outside of the police profession, have accepted the above reasoning. Opponents of a mandatory minimum educational standard above the high school graduate level, although not challenging the desirability of continuing higher education for police officers, have questioned the relevance of college education, *per se*, to the performance of the tasks of the basic patrol officer, contending that many other aptitudes—such as motivation, innate intelligence, honesty and inter-personal skills—are more relevant to police performance. Moreover, in the absence of demonstrated job relevance, they have contended that establishment of higher educational standards has the effect of discriminating against otherwise qualified applicants from minority groups and thus is incompatible with equal employment opportunity policies.

Several approaches were taken, in the present study, to assess the validity of the above positions. These have included: (1) an analysis of police officer tasks, and related skill and knowledge requirements, based on occupational analysis rating procedures; (2) a review of available empirical research on the relationship between educational attainment and police performance; and (3) a survey of police executive opinion concerning relative performance of college and non-college trained officers. These findings are summarized in the following sections.

2. *Occupational analysis findings.* In the course of NMS field visits to law enforcement agencies, data were collected from small samples of police officers on tasks performed, on skill and knowledge requirements for these tasks, and on the ways in which these skills had been learned, or could best be acquired, in the judgment of the respondents. Two measures of the educational level needed for each task were applied to these results by NMS job analysis. The first was the General Educational Development rating scale, on which each of the tasks was rated for level of complexity along three dimensions—reasoning, mathematics, and language skills. The second measure was the incumbent's own assessment as to whether college education was "necessary or highly desirable" for each of the tasks performed.

Of the more than 30 tasks performed by most patrol line officers in the agencies visited, none was identified by either method as requiring college education. In contrast, a significant number of tasks performed by supervisors and by managerial-level officers was considered as requiring college education, based upon one or both of the above criteria. Generally, either special training or informal on-the-job experience or training (from co-workers and supervisors) were considered to be the best ways to learn all the patrol officer tasks, as well as many of those performed by higher ranking officers.

The above appraisals cannot, however, be considered as definitive, for several reasons. The GED rating procedure is designed to measure the complexity and sophistication of a given task, but not explicitly to indicate whether college education is required. Both the GED ratings and the incumbents' ratings were based on the judgments of a small number of individuals and are subject to their biases and preconceptions. Furthermore, the establishment of a content link between a task and an area of knowledge is inherently difficult and judgmental with respect to many of the more broadly defined tasks performed by police officers.

3. *Empirical research findings.* Although college education may not be essential for performance of any specific patrol officer task, it is possible that college-

educated personnel, as a group, do in fact perform better than other police officers. In the past decade, a number of empirical studies have attempted to test this hypothesis. One group of studies has attempted to measure the relationship between education, other personnel characteristics and actual performance. A second group has, less directly, attempted to measure the relationship between educational background and certain psychological traits presumed to be desirable for police work.

a. *Studies of relationship between education and police performance.* One of the most comprehensive of these studies, by Cohen and Chaiken of the Rand Corporation, was based on a longitudinal sample of 1,915 police officers in New York City for the period 1957-1968 and included 33 "predictor" variables and 12 measures of performance. Based on simple correlations, officers with higher educational attainment were found to be more likely to be promoted rapidly and less likely to have been subject to disciplinary action. However, when other variables were included through multiple regression analysis, educational level was not found to be a significant performance factor, except with respect to the frequency of civilian complaints.

Some confirmation of the relationship between educational level and rapidity of promotion of police officers is provided by an analysis of the relationship between college education and occupational level of police officers, based on the results of the Census Bureau's 1974 Survey of Characteristics of Employees of Criminal Justice Agencies. Table VI-1 shows the percentage of police officers who have completed one or more year of college, by length of tenure, in each of four occupational categories: basic patrol officers, investigators, supervisors and managers. Among officers with the same length of tenure, the proportion of college educated officers was found to be higher in each of the higher-level occupational categories—investigators, supervisors and managers—than among the basic patrol officers, with the exception of those with fewer than 6 years of agency tenure. Thus, among officers with 16 or more years of tenure, about one-half of all supervisors, but only about one-fifth of basic patrol officers, had some college education. On the other hand, within each tenure group other than those with 21 or more years of service, the proportion of college educated officers at the managerial level—such as chiefs and deputy chiefs of police—was smaller than those at the supervisory level. This apparent anomaly is probably due to the fact that a relatively large proportion of managerial level officers are employed in the smaller, less-urban agencies, where general educational levels of personnel tend to be lower, whereas both supervisors and investigators are more concentrated in the larger agencies.

TABLE VI-1

*Percentage of Sworn Law Enforcement Personnel
With One or More Years of College,
by Occupation and Years of Service
in Present Agency, 1974*

	Less Than 6 Years Tenure	6 to 10 Years Tenure	11 to 15 Years Tenure	16 to 20 Years Tenure	21 or More Years Tenure
All sworn personnel --	50.9	47.6	45.4	35.1	31.6
Patrol officers -----	53.2	44.3	35.1	22.6	20.2
Investigators -----	70.7	62.9	59.4	52.4	27.2
Supervisors -----	49.6	70.3	63.1	48.2	50.9
Managers -----	34.5	46.6	48.7	46.3	39.8

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1974.

An additional study, designed to identify characteristics related to field performance of Chicago police officers, found a significant relationship between education and performance ratings for one of the groups of white officers studied, but for none of the groups of black officers included in the study.

On the negative side, there is some evidence, in these and other studies, indicating that college educated officers are more likely to resign voluntarily. Although higher turnover is not a direct measure of performance, it does entail a cost to the employing agency for recruitment and training of replacements.

b. *Education and police officer attitudes.* A number of studies have attempted to measure the relationship of college education and authoritarian attitudes among police officers. Studies by Smith, Locke and Walker, based on samples of New York City police officers, indicate that officers attending college are less authoritarian than other officers. On the other hand, a study by Smith and Ostrom found only weak and inconclusive relationships between college education and certain responses to authoritarian attitudes.

* * *

Although the above citations are not intended as a comprehensive summary of research on this issue, the results are generally representative. Only limited correlations have been established between college education and police performance. This research is not sufficient either to "prove" or "disprove" that such relationships exist. It is, however, quite clear that many factors, other than number of years of formal education, contribute to both police performance and to attitudes of police officers.

4. *Police chief appraisals.* The NMS survey of law enforcement executives requested police chiefs in juris-

dictions with 17,000 or more population to compare the performance of college-educated police officers—those who had earned college degrees—with that of other officers, both in terms of overall performance and in terms of seven more specific tasks or performance criteria. The results revealed a sharp division of opinion among police chiefs:

- About 40 percent of the nearly 1,100 police chiefs responding to this question considered that college-educated officers as a group made better officers. However, 35 percent saw no difference between college and non-college men in overall performance, and 13 percent rated non-college educated officers as superior. An additional 12 percent expressed no judgment on this issue (Table VI-2).
- Among the seven aspects of police performance with respect to which separate ratings of college educated men were requested, a majority of those expressing opinions considered college men superior in only two categories: "handling paperwork" and "achieving promotion." More than 40 percent of all respondents also rated college men as superior in "dealing with juveniles" and "dealing with citizens." On the other hand, less than 30 percent gave superior ratings to the college officers in performance of patrol duties, in "making quality arrests" or "generating fewer citizen complaints."
- College-educated personnel were more often perceived as superior to other officers by chiefs of large agencies than by chiefs of small agencies. In all of the performance dimensions but one ("quality of arrests") the percentage of chiefs rating college graduates superior rose with each succeeding size category (see Table VI-3). Among very large agencies (400 or more employees) a majority of respondents rated college-educated officers as superior in all the performance dimensions except "patrol" and "making quality arrests." In each size category, the dimensions in which college officers were rated the highest were those most associated with urban policing—paperwork and dealing with citizens and juveniles.
- Executives' overall appraisals of college and noncollege personnel were strongly correlated with their own educational achievements and their ages (Table VI-4). Seventy-four percent of the chiefs with graduate work and 64 percent of those with bachelor's degrees rated college graduates as superior, as compared with only 29 percent of the chiefs with only a high school diploma. Similarly, 63 percent of the chiefs aged 30-39 years, but only 33 percent of those 60 years or over, considered college officers to be superior to those who do not have college degrees.

TABLE VI-2
*Police Chief Appraisals of Performance of College-Educated
and Non-College Educated Officers, 1975^a*
(Percent distribution)

Performance Criterion	All Responses	College-Educated Officers Are Superior	Non-College- Educated Officers Are Superior	No Dif- ference	Don't Know
Patrol	100.0	27.3	17.3	41.6	12.6
Dealing with juveniles	100.0	43.7	12.7	33.3	9.7
Dealing with citizens	100.0	41.8	10.0	36.1	10.2
Making quality arrests	100.0	29.3	10.4	46.3	11.1
Handling paperwork	100.0	72.3	5.2	19.1	3.4
Achieving promotion	100.0	49.7	8.7	35.6	6.5
Generating fewer citizen's complaints	100.0	26.2	11.0	48.2	14.5
Overall performance	100.0	39.9	13.1	34.6	11.6

^a Based on responses of 1,093 chiefs of police agencies in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population.
Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding
Source: NSM Executive Survey, 1975.

TABLE VI-3
*Percentages of Police Chiefs Rating College-Educated Officers as Superior to Non-College Officers,
by Size of Agency^a*

Performance Dimensions	All Agencies (n=1093)	Size of Agency		
		0-149 Employees (n=857)	150-399 Employees (n=139)	400 or more Employees (n=97)
Patrol	30.4	29.2	34.4	35.6
Dealing with juveniles	49.3	48.2	52.3	56.0
Dealing with citizens	46.2	44.9	49.2	54.5
Making quality arrests	32.1	31.0	38.7	32.8
Handling paperwork	75.0	72.9	83.1	83.1
Achieving promotions	52.9	49.9	60.7	66.3
Generating fewer citizens' complaints	30.1	28.5	40.7	36.8
Overall performance	45.0	44.4	44.4	52.1

^a Chief of agencies in jurisdictions of 17,000 or more.
Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

TABLE VI-4
*Executives' Opinions on Overall Performance of College Educated and Non-College Educated Police Officers, by Age
and Educational Attainment of Respondent, 1975^a*

Age and Education of Police Chief	Number of Reports	Percent Distribution		
		College Edu- cated Officers Superior	Non-College Officers Superior	No Difference or No Opinion
Age:-				
30-39 years	120	62.3	10.0	26.7
40-49 years	418	48.1	13.9	38.0
50-59 years	366	39.6	12.8	47.5
60 years and over	94	33.0	21.3	45.7

TABLE VI-4

Executives' Opinions on Overall Performance of College Educated and Non-College Educated Police Officers, by Age and Educational Attainment of Respondent, 1975^a—Continued

Age and Education of Police Chief	Number of Reports	Percent Distribution		
		College Edu- cated Officers Superior	Non-College Officers Superior	No Difference or No Opinion
Educational Attainment:				
Graduate work -----	177	74.0	4.0	33.0
Bachelor's degree -----	76	60.5	6.6	32.9
Some college -----	462	41.6	14.5	43.9
Less than high school -----	13	23.1	30.8	46.2

^a Source: NMS Executive Survey of police chiefs in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population, 1975.

Note: Detail may not add to 100.0 percent due to rounding.

* * *

In summary, there is no more of a consensus among police chiefs than among researchers concerning the effects of college education on police performance. To a considerable extent, the judgment of police chiefs on this issue appears to be strongly influenced by their own background and role perceptions: younger and college-educated executives and those in the larger urban agencies express a strong preference for college educated officers, whereas the older, less-educated executives are much less likely to have a positive appraisal. Police executives, generally, see little difference in performance between the two groups in terms of those dimensions of police work most closely associated with the duties of the basic line patrol officers, i.e., patrol performance and quality of arrests. The task which is most closely correlated with academic ability, i.e., handling of paperwork, is the one aspect in which a large majority do recognize the superiority of college trained personnel. Police executives, by a smaller majority, also recognize that college trained personnel are more likely to be promoted more rapidly—a finding consistent both with results of available empirical research and with the NMS occupational analysis findings on the relevance of college education to key tasks of supervisory and managerial-level officers. Finally, college men are rated higher, by a plurality of respondents, on certain peace-keeping functions, such as “dealing with citizens” and “dealing with juveniles.” The latter functions, as well as paperwork demands are likely to be more significant aspects of the police role in the larger, urban police departments and may—in turn—help to explain the more positive assessment of college trained officers, by the heads of these agencies.

5. *Agency standards and practices.* In addition to obtaining the opinions of law enforcement executives on the relationship of education to performance, the NMS

questionnaires also elicited information on current agency selection standards for new entrants into line positions, as well as on agency policies with respect to continuing education of their personnel. Such information was obtained from heads of sheriffs' agencies and adult and juvenile correctional agencies, as well as from police chiefs.

As shown in Table VI-5, a high school diploma was the standard minimum entrance requirement for sworn officers in police and sheriff agencies accounting for more than 80 percent of all police employees. About 13 percent of police agencies and 16 percent of sheriffs' agencies had no formal educational standard or one less than a high school diploma, while only small proportions—about 5 percent of the police agencies and 2 percent of the sheriffs' agencies—had requirements for one or more years of college. Smaller police and sheriffs' agencies, i.e., with fewer than 150 employees, tended to have lower minimum educational standards than did large and medium-sized agencies.

Educational standards for line correctional officer positions in state adult institutions were somewhat lower than for police or sheriffs' agencies. Twenty-three percent of heads of adult institutions reported that their agency had no formal minimum education standard or had a standard less than a high school diploma, while the remainder—77 percent—required only a high school graduation.

Educational standards for child care workers in juvenile institutions varied more widely than for any of the other line positions surveyed. Nearly one-fifth (19 percent) of the juvenile corrections administrators reported no minimum educational standard for child care workers or one less than a high school diploma, whereas a nearly equal proportion (18 percent) required completion of at least one year of college education. Only a bare majority (52 percent) had established a high school

TABLE VI-5

Current Minimum Educational Standard for Entry Into Line Police Officer and Custodial Officer Positions, by Type of Agency, 1975

Maximum Education Level	Police Agencies ^a (Sworn Officers)	Sheriff Agencies ^a (Deputy Sheriffs)	Adult Corrections Institutions (Custodial Officers)	Juvenile Corrections Institutions (Child Care Workers)
Number of responses -----	2,639	550	213	576
Percent Distribution:				
No minimum requirement -----	11.2%	13.1	10.3	12.1
Less than high school diploma -----	2.1	2.7	12.7	7.1
High school diploma -----	81.3	81.8	77.0	52.0
One year of college -----	1.9	1.1	—	3.1
Two or three years of college -----	3.3	0.9	—	14.8
Bachelor's degree -----	0.3	0.4	—	0.3
Total -----	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a Weighted averages, by size of agency.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

Note: Detail may not add to 100.0 percent, due to rounding.

graduate standard. This variation probably reflects the considerable difference in roles of child care personnel in different institutions, ranging from strictly custodial functions in some agencies to much more direct involvement in counseling and supervision in others.

Although directly comparable survey data are not available for earlier periods, the available data do suggest that there has been a trend towards general adoption of the high school graduate standard by police and correctional agencies, but limited momentum towards establishing higher college-level standards. However, when executives were queried as to the likelihood that a higher minimum education standard would be adopted by their agencies within the next 2 years, between one-fifth and one-fourth of all police chiefs and sheriffs surveyed regarded a higher standard in their agencies as either probable or almost certain to be adopted in the next 2 years. About one-fifth of heads of juvenile corrections institutions similarly predicted an increase in standards for child care workers. On the other hand, only 8 percent of the administrators of state adult institutions predicted establishment of a higher standard for their correctional officers.

In interpreting these forecasts, it should be noted that establishment of entrance qualifications for police or correctional officer positions is subject to civil service regulation in many jurisdictions. Nevertheless, the responses do suggest some trend among law enforcement agencies to further increases in minimum educational standards, including gradual adoption of a requirement for some college work.

In contrast to the limited and cautious adoption of a requirement for some college education as a mandatory entrance standard, the NMS survey found a much broader consensus among police and correctional execu-

tives in support of continuing higher education for their in-service line personnel. In response to a question as to whether their agencies should encourage line personnel to pursue a college degree program once they began their police or correctional careers, a very large majority of all respondents replied in the affirmative—ranging from 72 percent of the heads of small police and sheriffs' agencies to 95 percent of heads of the larger police agencies and 96 percent of the heads of adult corrections institutions.

A majority of executives in each category of law enforcement and correctional agencies also reported that their agencies had adopted at least one of a number of policies designed to encourage their staff to continue their higher education. The most frequent practice, reported by more than one-half in each category, was the adjustment of schedules to facilitate class attendance. The incentive, however, which was ranked by executives as "most effective" in encouraging higher education was "provision of increased pay based upon accumulated college credits or academic degrees." As shown in Table VI-6, this policy was reported as in effect by 46 percent of the police chiefs, in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population, and by 27 percent of the sheriffs in agencies with 10 or more employees, but by much smaller proportions of heads of other agency categories. On the other hand, correctional executives more frequently reported use of academic education as part of the basis for promotion of their line officers or child care workers, than did the police chiefs or sheriffs.

This strong support for continuing education of line personnel, by law enforcement and correctional executives, stems in part from career development considerations. Whereas only modest proportions of executives in most agency categories had recommended a

TABLE VI-6

*Percent of Law Enforcement and Correctional Executives Reporting Use of Selected Policies
to Encourage Continuing Education of Line Personnel, 1975^a*

Agency Category	Adjustment of Work Schedules for Class Attendance	Allowing Time Off to Attend Classes	Agency Sub- sidies for Books and Tuition	Increased Pay Based on Col- lege Credits or Degrees	Academic Edu- cation as Basis for Promotion
Police agencies, "large" ^a -----	68	26	47	46	27
Police agencies, "small" ^a -----	54	40	28	13	12
Sheriff's agencies, "large" ^b -----	73	35	30	27	31
Sheriff's agencies, "small" ^b -----	51	45	13	5	13
State adult corrections agencies -----	77	26	31	7	56
Juvenile corrections agencies -----	72	35	32	17	43

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

^a "Large" police agencies are defined as those in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population. "Small" police agencies are those in jurisdictions with less than 17,000 population.

^b "Large" sheriff's agencies are defined as those with 10 or more employees in 1974. "Small" sheriff's agencies are those with less than 10 employees.

college education requirement as a condition for selection into the basic line positions in their agencies, much larger proportions expressed the opinion that completion of one or more years of college should be required for advancement to the first supervisory level as shown below:

*Percent of Executives Recommending Completion of One
or More Years of College for Promotion to
Supervisory Positions*

Police agencies, "large" -----	53
Police agencies, "small" -----	27
Sheriff's agencies, "large" -----	38
Sheriff's agencies, "small" -----	17
Adult corrections agencies -----	32
Juvenile corrections agencies -----	61

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

Support for a college training requirement for supervisors by law enforcement executives was much more extensive among heads of larger police and sheriff agencies than among heads of the very small agencies, probably due in part to the more complex tasks and roles of supervisors and line managerial personnel in the larger urban agencies. Similarly, the much greater support of college training for child care supervisors in juvenile corrections agencies, than for supervisory officers in adult institutions, can be attributed to the broader responsibilities of the former personnel for counseling and related non-custodial functions.

There is clearly even more extensive recognition of the need for at least a four-year college education standard for appointments to the top executive position in police and correctional agencies. Thus, although opinions on these issues were not directly elicited in the NMS survey, a recent LEAA-funded study by the Police Chief Executive Committee of the International Association of Chiefs of Police—based on a comprehensive survey of both

police executives and local officials—recommended that a baccalaureate requirement should be immediately established for future police chiefs in agencies with 75 or more employees. It also recommended an immediate requirement for completion of two years of college for smaller agencies, and the establishment of a four-year degree requirement for the latter agencies by 1982.³ These findings are reinforced by the NMS occupational analysis assessments of anticipated changes in the knowledge and skill requirements for police executives. Among these trends are an expected requirement for an increased awareness, by executives, of contemporary social problems affecting the police role in their communities, an increased knowledge of modern techniques of management, budgeting, planning, personnel administration and labor relations, as well as increased professional expertise in crime resistance techniques and in such technical fields as criminalistics.⁴

B. The LEEP Program

1. *Program objectives and guidelines.* The Law Enforcement Education Program was initiated in 1968, under a provision of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which authorized the Administrator of the LEAA "to carry out programs of academic educational assistance to improve and strengthen law enforcement."⁵ Review of the legislative history of this provision indicates that it received strong impetus from the concurrent issuance of the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, which had strongly endorsed higher education requirements for law enforcement personnel. Although initially oriented to law enforcement personnel only, subsequent amendments, in 1970, extended the coverage of the program to all categories of criminal justice personnel.

The program provides for loans and grants to individuals for higher education in criminal justice or related studies. Loans are provided to individuals engaged in full-time study directly related to the criminal justice field. Grants are provided, through approved institutions, to in-service students enrolled in degree programs related to law enforcement or other criminal justice fields or in courses considered suitable for persons employed in these fields. Under the 1973 amendment to the law, loans are authorized up to \$2,200 per year, and grants, up to a maximum of \$250 per academic quarter or \$400 per semester.

The LEEP program is administered by the regional offices of LEAA, under guidelines and regulations promulgated by the national office. Funding is allocated among the LEAA regions on the basis of a formula which gives equal weight to population and to the number of criminal justice personnel in each region. Allocations to states are based upon formulas which vary among regions, with some following the same procedures used in the allocation among regions. These funds, in turn, are allocated to individual institutions in their states in cooperation with the state planning agencies, typically based on the number of applicants for LEEP assistance and on the population distribution within the region or state. The award of grants or loans to individual students is administered by the educational institutions, themselves, in accordance with the priorities or other guidelines established by LEAA.

Although both pre-service and in-service personnel were initially eligible for LEEP assistance, a list of priorities, established in 1973, had the effect of virtually terminating grants to pre-service students. The new system provided that students were to be funded in the following order:

- all returning LEEP recipients;
- new local or state criminal justice personnel on academic leave;
- other new state or local criminal justice personnel;
- criminal justice teachers;
- federal criminal justice personnel;
- new pre-service students; and
- criminal justice personnel working toward a law degree.

Since the number of continuing LEEP-funded students and the number of new applicants from among in-service criminal justice personnel effectively exhausted—or exceeded—the available LEEP appropriations, the effect of the above priority sequence was to virtually preclude grants or loans to new pre-service students or to personnel newly enrolling in graduate programs.

In addition to the above priority sequence for student eligibility, a number of guidelines or general criteria

have been established by the LEAA for qualification of institutions and programs for LEEP funding. Thus, the official guideline manual for the program, issued in 1975, includes the following criteria:

- *Content of criminal justice programs.* Emphasis to be placed on courses teaching broad principles and problem-solving techniques, rather than narrowly technical or “how to” skills, which can more appropriately be learned on the job or in recruit training.
- *Academic qualifications of faculty members.* Faculty members should preferably possess at least a master’s degree; some should possess doctoral degrees.
- *Use of part-time faculty.* No crime-related degree program to be conducted with only part-time faculty members.
- *Student-faculty ratio.* The ratio of full-time equivalent majors in crime-related studies to full-time equivalent faculty shall be no more than 60 to 1.

The above, and related, guidelines have not been established as mandatory requirements for institutional eligibility, but apparently serve as general guides to regional office or other personnel responsible for administering the program. Moreover, no provision has been made for formal academic accreditation of programs, either by LEAA or by non-governmental accrediting institutions, as a condition for eligibility.

2. *Current LEEP issues.* LEEP was initiated in fiscal year 1969 with a first-year appropriation of \$6.5 million. Appropriations for the program were increased in succeeding years to a level of \$40 million by fiscal year 1973 and were maintained at that level in fiscal years 1974–76. The President’s Budget for fiscal year 1977 included an appropriation of \$40 million for the transition quarter, July–September 1976 but did not provide for any funds for fiscal year 1977. This amount would have been sufficient to finance the program at its present level during academic year 1976–77, but it would have required termination of LEEP at the end of the year. However, the Congress voted, and the President signed, an appropriation of \$40 million for the transition quarter and another \$40 million for fiscal year 1977. With the transition-quarter appropriation available to finance LEEP during the 1976–77 academic year, the fiscal 1977 appropriation provides advance funding for academic year 1977–78.

Through the end of fiscal year 1976, appropriations for the program have totaled \$234 million. LEEP financial aid has been provided to roughly 1,200 educational institutions and to a cumulative total of approximately 250,000 students. The program, by all accounts, has been a major factor in the very rapid expansion of criminal justice education programs throughout the country. It

has also received strong support both from law enforcement and other criminal justice administrators and from employee groups who have been beneficiaries of the program. This aid program, and the criminal justice education programs which it has helped to support, have—at the same time—been subject to severe criticism from a number of sources, including academic leaders in the criminal justice education field, itself. Some of these criticisms have focused on the issue of the quality of many of the education programs offered, including—for example—the lack of adequate academic standards or clearly defined curriculum objectives, excessive concentration on narrow technical training subjects, lack of adequately qualified full-time faculty and other institutional shortcomings, and disproportionate LEEP concentration on law enforcement subjects and personnel. Among major administrative shortcomings noted in a recent GAO review were the absence—to date—of any systematic program for evaluation of the LEEP program.

Although the NMS study guidelines did not require, or provide for, a comprehensive review of all aspects of the LEEP program, an assessment of its role in upgrading of criminal justice personnel and of certain qualitative aspects of the educational programs supported by LEEP was undertaken, using several major data sources. These included: information provided by LEEP-funded institutions in their annual grant applications to LEAA, field visits by NMS representatives to a small number of LEEP-assisted institutions; conferences and consultations with leading educators in the criminal justice field; and collateral information based on other available data sources, such as the 1975 Census survey of criminal justice employees. The results of this analysis are summarized in the following sections.

3. *Impact of LEEP on educational attainment of criminal justice personnel.* The establishment of specialized programs of higher education in law enforcement and other crime-related fields—and increased participation in these programs by personnel of criminal justice agencies—were trends which had gathered considerable momentum prior to the initiation of the LEEP program. Academic institutions such as the University of California, Berkeley; Michigan State University; Northwestern University; and Texas A&M had pioneered in offering degree programs in criminology or police administration in the 1930's and 1940's, or had offered academic course work in these fields. In 1959, one study had identified a total of 77 crime-related programs offered in 36 different institutions.⁸ In 1965, a directory compiled by the International Association of Chiefs of Police listed 125 such programs, in the field of police science alone. By 1969, at the time of initiation of the LEEP program, the number of such identified programs had approximately doubled.

Since initiation of the LEEP program, the number of "law enforcement" courses or programs has grown at an extremely rapid rate. Thus, the 1975 IACP Directory listed a total of 1,245 separate law enforcement and criminal justice programs—an 890 percent increase in a single decade. By the 1975-76 academic year, a total of 1,024 academic institutions were receiving some LEEP financial aid including many of which offered more than one criminal justice program. The rates of expansion indicated by these summary figures may well be unparalleled in the history of higher education in the United States and—in turn—have contributed to many of the qualitative problems, reviewed later in this chapter.

An initial question addressed by the NMS analysis was the extent to which the LEEP program had contributed to increasing the educational attainment of law enforcement or other criminal justice personnel. As shown in Table VI-7, about one-fifth (20.4 percent) of all employees of state and local criminal justice agencies (excluding courts) had received some financial assistance under the LEEP program. This corresponds to a total of nearly 200,000 employees based on responses to the Census 1975 survey of criminal justice personnel. Excluded from this total, in addition to courts personnel, were students who had received LEEP assistance, either as pre-service or in-service personnel, but who were not employed in state or local criminal justice agencies in late 1974. When allowance is made for the latter categories, as well as for newly qualified LEEP recipients after 1974, it is probable that at least 250,000 college students were aided by the program between its inception and the 1976-77 academic year.

TABLE VI-7

Percent of Employees of State and Local Criminal Justice Agencies Who Had Received LEEP Assistance, by Sector, October 1974

Sector	Percentage of Incumbents
All criminal justice system personnel, excluding courts -----	20.4
Law Enforcement -----	23.0
Police -----	23.6
Sheriffs -----	20.0
Corrections -----	14.2
Adult corrections -----	14.0
Juvenile corrections -----	14.2
Sheriffs' jails -----	15.3
Probation and parole -----	25.8
Others -----	3.5

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey (1975).

The Census survey also indicates that LEEP assistance had been heavily concentrated among personnel in the law enforcement sector. Over 81 percent of all recipients were employees of police and sheriffs' agencies (other than jail personnel). An additional 13 percent were employees of state or local corrections institutions. Employees of probation and parole agencies accounted for 4.6 percent of the total. Less than one percent of LEEP recipients were employed in prosecution or public defender offices (Table VI-8).

More detailed analyses of LEEP participation rates by sector and occupation indicate that over one-fourth of all sworn law enforcement officers and of probation and parole officers had utilized this program, in contrast to an average of only 14 percent of personnel in correctional agencies. Several factors have probably contributed to the greater use of LEEP by police officers than by correctional officers. Educational standards for entry into police officer positions, and promotional and pay incentives for continuing education in the larger police agencies, have tended to be greater than for correctional officers. As a result, the Census survey data indicate that about 81 percent of all police officers in 1974 were in the educational category of high school, but non-college graduates, the group which has been the primary recipients of LEEP assistance. In contrast, only 74 percent of line correctional officers in adult institutions were in this educational range. Other factors, such as the geographical location of many large correctional institutions in rural communities, the 24 hour work schedules of correctional institutions, and the more limited availability of criminal justice educational programs adapted to the correctional, rather than police science field—may also have contributed to the lower participation of correctional officers in such programs.

TABLE VI-8

*Distribution by Sector of Criminal Justice System Personnel Who Have Received LEEP Support
October 1974*

Sector	Percentage Distribution
Total, excluding courts -----	100.0
Law enforcement, total -----	81.4
Police -----	73.6
Sheriffs -----	7.8
Correctional institutions, total -----	13.2
Adult corrections -----	8.6
Juvenile corrections -----	2.9
Sheriffs' jails -----	1.7
Probation/Parole -----	4.6
Prosecution -----	.7
Defense -----	.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey (1975).

Although the extensive use of LEEP aid by police officers has been clearly documented, the extent to which this aid has contributed to raising the educational level of police personnel is more difficult to quantify. Available Census data do indicate that the proportion of police officers with some college education rose much more sharply between early 1970 and late 1974—during the period when the LEEP program was in effect—than it had in the preceding decade. As shown in Table VI-9, the proportion of police officers with one or more years of college rose from 20 percent to 31.8 percent between 1960 and 1970, based on Census of Population data, but apparently increased at a much more rapid rate, to 46.2 percent, in 1974 based on the results of the special Census survey for the latter year. If the proportion of officers with some college education had continued to increase at the 1960-70 rate, the number with this level of education in 1974 would have been about 42,600 lower than the number actually reported, based on the 1974 Census survey.

The latter cannot, however, be solely attributed to the LEEP program, since several concurrent influences were operating to upgrade the educational level of police personnel, including the general increase in educational attainment of new entrants into police officer positions, the availability of veterans' educational benefits (as well as LEEP assistance) to large numbers of recently discharged servicemen who entered the police ranks, and the increased adoption by police agencies of policies designed to encourage continuing education.

Because of these limitations, a second method was used in order to attempt to measure the LEEP impact. Based on information provided by respondents to the 1974 Census survey of criminal justice personnel, estimates were made of the proportions of police officers and of custodial officers who had attained college degrees within specified periods following the period of their entry into service in their agency. Such estimates were made for officers who had originally entered service in two periods: 1960-64 and 1965-69, and who were still employed in 1974. The results for police officers, as shown in Table VI-10, indicate that only 2.0 percent of the officers who had originally entered service in 1960-64 had earned a college degree during the following 5 year period, 1965-69. In contrast, 12.0 percent of those who had originally entered during 1965-69 had earned degrees during the period 1970-74, when LEEP assistance was available. Moreover, an additional 10.0 percent of the earlier, 1960-64, entry group had earned degrees during 1970-74. A similar analysis, for custodial personnel in correctional institutions indicated that only 1.0 percent of those who had entered during 1960-64 and were still employed in 1974 had earned degrees

TABLE VI-9
Educational Attainment of Sworn Police Personnel, 1960-74

Educational Attainment	1960		1970		1974	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Totals -----	271,000	100.0	392,000	100.0	444,100	100.0
Less than high school -----	100,000	36.9	73,300	18.7	45,740	10.3
High school graduate -----	116,300	42.9	193,600	49.4	193,180	43.5
College:						
Less than 2 years -----	27,100	10.0	67,400	17.2	70,170	15.8
2-3 years -----	19,800	7.3	42,700	10.9	95,480	21.5
4 years or more -----	7,300	2.7	14,500	3.7	39,520	8.9
Subtotal:						
Some college -----	54,200	20.0	124,600	31.8	205,170	46.2

Note: Detail may not add to totals because of rounding.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey (1975); 1960 and 1970 Census of Population Public Use Sample tapes; U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Governments, 1972; Federal Bureau of Investigation, Uniform Crime Reports data tape.

TABLE VI-10
College Degrees Earned by Two Entry Cohorts of Sworn Law Enforcement Officers During Comparable Periods Following Their Entry

Degrees Earned	Entrants in 1960-64 Who Earned Degrees During 1965-69		Entrants in 1960-64 Who Earned Degrees During 1970-74		Entrants in 1965-69 Who Earned Degrees During 1970-74	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total entrants still in service in 1974 -----	60,507	100.0	60,507	100.0	127,912	100.0
Associate degree -----	1,040	1.7	3,599	5.9	10,676	8.3
Bachelor degree -----	170	.3	2,413	4.0	4,629	3.6
Master's degree -----	24	*	349	.6	171	.1

* Less than 0.05 percent.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey (1974).

during 1965-69, whereas 9.4 percent of those who entered during 1965-69 had earned degrees in the following 5 year period, 1970-74. These results, therefore, suggest a significant contribution by LEEP to educational upgrading of both police and custodial officers.

This analysis, however, is also subject to significant limitations, as a measure of the direct LEEP impact. The analysis necessarily excluded those officers who had separated from their agency prior to the time of the 1974 survey. There is reason to believe that officers with college degrees were more likely to voluntarily resign from police or custodial officer positions than those with lesser education, in part because of their greater alternative job opportunities.

In view of these limitations, the above analyses cannot be considered as providing definitive estimates of the net gains in educational attainment of law enforcement personnel, which can be directly attributed to the LEEP program. The evidence available does suggest that this program was a significant contributing factor. However,

other influences, including the availability of veterans' readjustment allowances to many criminal justice personnel, the increased policy emphasis upon continuing education, and concurrent labor market trends also probably contributed, to some degree, to these increases in attainment of college degrees.

4. *Qualitative assessment of criminal justice education programs.* The ultimate objective of the LEEP program is not merely the accumulation of course credits or college degrees by criminal justice personnel, but the development of knowledges, skills and perspectives which will contribute to improved performance, and to an increase in the overall effectiveness of the agencies in which they are employed. Such assessments are difficult at best. One research approach to evaluating the effect of this contribution, through the conduct of a systematic follow-up survey of LEEP students, had been proposed to LEAA by the NMS project staff, but had been disapproved, presumably because of cost and time constraints. Several less direct measures of quality of criminal justice

education programs were available, however, based on information provided to LEAA by LEEP-funded educational institutions. These included analyses of: (1) the content of criminal justice education programs, to differentiate between those which appeared academically oriented and those narrowly training-oriented; (2) the academic qualifications of criminal justice faculty; (3) the proportion of full-time and part-time faculty members; and (4) the student-faculty ratio. The actual characteristics of LEEP institutional programs, in each case, have been compared with the standards provided in existing LEEP guidelines, and—where available—with comparable data for all higher education institutions.

a. *Program content.* Although LEAA guidelines have stressed that criminal justice courses “should teach broad principles and problem-solving techniques”⁷ rather than narrow technical skills or procedures, a significant proportion of course offerings under LEEP-funded programs are of the latter type. An analysis of the 14,640 courses related to criminal justice, listed by LEEP-associated institutions in their submissions for the 1975–76 academic year, indicated that about 15 percent of these courses could be classified as “training-type” courses, under very conservative classification criteria. Since the latter were classified simply on the basis of those course titles which appeared to be unambiguously training in nature, they are likely to understate the total number of courses which have little or no academic content. About 35 percent of all law enforcement courses were classified in this category, as compared to much lower proportions in other criminal justice fields (Table VI-11).

Inclusion of “training-type” courses was most frequent among the two-year colleges, where about one-fourth of all courses were in this category, as compared to less than one-tenth of the criminal justice course offerings in four-year colleges or universities. Based on NMS field studies and collateral information, it is clear that the two-year colleges are also characterized by a relatively heavy curriculum reliance upon the field of law enforcement. Over one-half of all associate degree programs in the academic year 1975–76 were specifically identified as law enforcement or police science, as contrasted with only about one-fourth of the bachelor’s degree programs and one-tenth of those at the master’s degree level.

The emphasis upon “practical” job-related law enforcement training in many of the two-year community college programs has also created problems of articulation of course offerings, and transferability of course credits, between these institutions and the four-year colleges or universities. However, based on NMS field visits to a small sample of these institutions in 1975–76, it appears that this problem was not as extensive as it had

TABLE VI-11

Total Criminal Justice-Related Courses and “Training-Type” Courses Offered by LEEP-Supported Institutions, by Field Emphasis of the Courses, Academic Year 1975–76

Field Emphasis	All Courses Related to Criminal Justice ^a	Training-Type Courses ^b	Training Courses as Percentage of all Courses
Totals	14,640	2,132	14.6
Law enforcement	4,771	1,666	34.9
Corrections	1,267	123	9.7
Judicial administration	109	12	11.0
Probation/Parole	210	7	3.3
Juvenile justice	690	25	3.6
Security	195	25	12.8
Criminal justice	1,912	220	11.5
Other	5,486	54	1.0

^a Courses listed by LEEP institutions as directly related to criminal justice and other are identifiable as belonging to one of the field emphasis categories. Courses related to criminal justice but not exclusively related to one of the field emphases (e.g., criminal law) are classified under “other.” Only courses whose titles or descriptions imply that a system-wide approach is taken are classified under the emphasis category “criminal justice.”

^b Each course was assigned an academic emphasis classification. Only courses that appeared to be unambiguously training in nature are listed in this category. Courses coded as training include: traffic control techniques, report writing, polygraph, defensive techniques, and correctional operations and procedures. Courses that may or may not be primarily skill training depending on how they are taught (e.g., techniques of criminal investigation and correctional custody) are excluded from this category.

Source: National Manpower Survey LEEP Forms Analysis (1976).

been in the earlier years of the LEEP program.

b. *Faculty qualifications.* Although the LEEP guidelines specify that “it is preferable that faculty members possess at least a master’s degree” and that some faculty members should possess doctoral degrees, 32 percent of part-time faculty members in LEEP-supported criminal justice programs, and 12 percent of full-time faculty members, were reported as not possessing at least a master’s degree in the 1975–76 academic year. The largest proportions of faculty members failing to meet this standard were found among the two-year public colleges, where 44 percent of the part-time faculty and 32 percent of the full-time faculty had not achieved this degree level. As shown in Table VI-12, the proportions of faculty members with at least a master’s degree were lower in criminal justice faculties than among college teaching faculty generally, with the difference most pronounced in the case of the two-year colleges.

NMS field visits indicate that the lower academic credentials of criminal justice faculty members, particularly in two-year institutions, is due in part to the considerable emphasis given to criminal justice occupational experience, e.g., police service, by many of these institutions.

c. *Full-time vs. Part-time faculty.* The LEEP guidelines establish a minimal standard, that “no crime

TABLE VI-12

Criminal Justice Faculty Members With at Least a Master's Degree at LEEP-Supported Institutions Compared With All Faculty Members at All Institutions, by Type of Institutions

Types of Institution	Faculty Members with At Least A Master's Degree As a Percentage of All Faculty Members	
	Criminal Justice Programs in 1975-76	All Institutions in 1972-73
All institutions -----	76.7	92.6
Public -----	72.6	NA
Private -----	88.8	NA
2-Year colleges, total -	59.7	87.7
Public -----	59.3	NA
Private -----	75.7	NA
4-Year colleges, total -	89.5	95.3
Public -----	91.8	NA
Private -----	75.7	NA
Universities, total ----	89.7	92.3
Public -----	89.3	NA
Private -----	90.0	NA

NA: Data not available.

Source: NMS LEEP Forms Analysis (1976); Alan E. Bayer, *Teaching Faculty in Academia: 1972-73* (American Council on Education, 1973), p. 26.

related degree program will be conducted with only part-time faculty members." In the academic year 1975-76, only 73 percent of all LEEP supported institutions with criminal justice programs had at least one full-time faculty member (Table VI-13). Utilization of part-time faculty, moreover, was much more extensive in criminal justice programs than among all college or university faculty members. These part-time faculty represented 52 percent of all faculty members in all LEEP-assisted criminal justice programs, as compared to only 24 percent in all college and university faculties. The largest proportion of part-time faculty was found among the two-year college criminal justice programs (72 percent), whereas they represented only about one-half of the total criminal justice faculty in the four-year colleges and universities.

d. *Student-Faculty ratios.* The LEEP guidelines specify that the ratio of full-time equivalent students enrolled in criminal justice degree programs to full-time equivalent teaching faculty should not exceed 60 to 1. Available data from the institutional application forms submitted by LEEP-aided institutions do not permit a direct computation of this ratio for each institution. An alternative ratio based on the relationship of the total number of students enrolled in criminal justice degree programs to the number of full-time faculty members has been computed. Based on collateral evidence, it has been assumed that a ratio of 75 students per one full-time faculty member is roughly equivalent to the 60 to 1 ratio

(based on "full-time equivalents") specified in the LEEP guidelines. Only about 40 percent of all LEEP-aided institutions met this alternative criterion in the 1975-76 academic year. The proportions of institutions with a ratio of 75 students per full-time faculty member in criminal justice degree programs ranged from only 30 percent, for two-year colleges, to about 55 percent in universities. In the case of the two-year colleges, over one-fourth reported ratios of 120 or more students per full-time faculty member.

TABLE VI-13

LEEP-Supported Institutions With Criminal Justice Programs That Have at Least One Full-Time Faculty Member, by Type of Institution, Academic Year 1975-76

Type of Institution	Number with Criminal Justice Programs	Number with at Least One Full-Time Faculty Member	Percentage With At Least One Full-Time Faculty Member
All institutions -----	871	637	73.1
Public -----	695	522	75.1
Private -----	176	115	65.3
2-Year colleges, total -	454	324	71.4
Public -----	439	318	72.4
Private -----	15	6	40.0
4-Year colleges, total -	162	112	69.1
Public -----	60	51	85.0
Private -----	102	61	59.8
Universities, total ----	255	201	78.8
Public -----	196	153	78.1
Private -----	59	48	81.4

Source: National Manpower Survey LEEP Forms Analysis (1976).

In summary, the preceding assessments are generally consistent with recent criticisms to the effect that many current programs fail to meet minimum standards of academic acceptability. In terms of course content, our findings are consistent with those expressed in a recent report by the American Bar Association:

...that many of them have a strong vocational orientation. . . . They do not meet the kinds of needs that have led to urging the police to undertake college work. At best, such programs constitute good training, at worst, they're lending status to an effort that serves only to reinforce the most parochial concepts prevalent in the police field.⁸

The *sine qua non* of an education program is its faculty, and the two most widely referenced measures of the quality of a program's faculty are the proportion of its members who are associated with the program on a full-time basis and the proportion who have at least a master's degree. On both counts the criminal justice programs at LEEP-supported institutions of every type fall short of the prevailing standards at the same type of

institutions. The discrepancies are exceptionally large at the two-year college level.

C. Implications of Future Manpower Trends

Any decisions concerning the future scope and direction of the LEEP program or of any similar programs of educational assistance for criminal justice personnel must consider not only the past performance of the program but also the implications of future trends in personnel needs and resources. Future employment growth rates, changes in job functions or roles, and in the educational levels of personnel entering key criminal justice occupations will all be relevant in establishing priorities for such educational assistance programs.

1. *Employment trends.* Based on the projections presented in Chapter IV, the outlook for the coming decade is for continued employment growth of the major occupational groups whose personnel have received most of the LEEP assistance. However, the rates of employment growth will vary considerably among these occupations, as illustrated below:

	Percent Increase, 1974-75
Sworn officers, police protection agencies -----	28
Custodial officers, state adult institutions -----	53
Child care workers, juvenile institutions -----	7
Probation and parole officers -----	65

Although sworn law enforcement officers will still constitute the largest single occupational group among personnel of criminal justice agencies, their share of total employment is expected to decline from 46 percent in 1976 to 41 percent in 1985. Conversely, employment of correctional officers in adult institutions and of probation and parole officers is expected to grow at a much more rapid rate over this period. Certain other occupational groups, such as non-sworn (civilian) police employees and non-judicial staff of state trial courts of general jurisdiction—which have made limited use of LEEP assistance to date—are also expected to grow at a relatively rapid rate. These trends thus suggest the need for a significant shift in curriculum emphasis of criminal justice education programs to include better coverage of corrections and courts-related subjects, as against the current heavy concentration on line law enforcement personnel.

2. *Trends in job functions and roles.* The results of our field analysis of key occupations, and concurrent survey information on major criminal justice trends, suggest that the coming decade will witness only gradual changes in task emphasis, and in related skill and knowledge requirements, for a number of key criminal justice occupations. In general, the direction of change where it

occurs will be toward a broadening of scope in a number of the line positions, which in turn will require a broader understanding of crime-related behavior, of social problems and of the criminal justice system as a whole. Thus, the trend toward team policing and towards greater involvement of the community in crime prevention may require an increased understanding by police officers of community relations issues as well as additional training in basic investigative skills, while the trend towards community-based correctional facilities may have the effect of expanding the counseling role of custodial personnel, particularly in juvenile institutions.

More significant changes in roles are likely to occur in the case of executive and other managerial-level personnel in line law enforcement and correctional agencies. A variety of pressures and constraints are resulting in a basic change in the traditional, command-style of management of these agencies, including increased pressures for improved efficiency and for use of more sophisticated management techniques; increased accountability to the courts in treatment of offenders; and the growth of public sector unionization. One illustration of this trend is the emergence of separate operational planning units to assist management in utilization of staff and other resources. Two-fifths of all police chiefs in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population, reported the existence of such units in their departments. Field analysis of their functions indicate that most of these units are still at a rudimentary stage; for example, only about one half of the police planners sampled analyzed crime and workload statistics as part of their duties and fewer engaged in *bona fide* planning or research activities.⁹ These limitations can be attributed at least in part to the limited training of both management and of planning staffs in the role of systematic management planning, and in the technical skills entailed. Pressures for increased management sophistication will be accompanied by a demand for more broadly educated personnel in these key positions, and for more comprehensive management training programs.

3. *Trends in educational attainment.* NMS projections indicate that a continuation of recent trends will result in a sharp increase in the proportion of sworn law enforcement officers with at least some college education in the next 10 years. The percentage of officers who have completed one or more years of college is projected to increase from 46 percent in 1974 to 75 percent by 1985. In the latter year nearly 19 percent of all law enforcement officers are expected to be college graduates, or more than twice the proportion in 1974. These projections assume that the rate of educational upgrading among current sworn law enforcement officers, who will remain in this occupation to 1985 will be the

same as that experienced by groups of officers with similar lengths of service in the periods prior to 1974.

They also reflect the replacement of older, less-educated officers, separating due to retirement or other causes, by better-educated young recruits. A combination of factors, as noted in Chapter V, is expected to contribute to the expected increase in educational attainment of new police recruits. These include: (1) the projected reduction in annual police recruitment needs, hence permitting greater selectivity; (2) the higher levels of unemployment projected for the period 1974-80, which will increase the supply of qualified applicants; and (3) the continuing trend towards increased college enrollment among those who will comprise the pool of potential new entrants into police positions during the coming decade.

One of the major implications of these trends is that—with the continued increase in the proportions of personnel who will already have completed one or two years of college work—a growing proportion of applicants for LEEP assistance will consist of personnel enrolled in the third or fourth years of undergraduate study at four-year colleges or universities, or in graduate programs. Such programs tend to be considerably more costly than those in public two-year colleges. If LEEP funding levels were to continue at the same absolute dollar level, as was the case between Fiscal Years 1973 and 1977, or were even to increase only in line with general increases in tuition costs, the effect would be to impose a need for reduction in the number of enrollees and, probably, in the number of eligible institutions.

D. Findings and Recommendations

1. *Major findings.* The issue addressed in this chapter has been the future role, and direction of, the LEEP program or of any similar program of academic assistance for criminal justice personnel. Several analytical approaches have been used for this purpose, including a review of evidence bearing on the relationship between higher education and personnel performance, an assessment of the quantitative and qualitative results of the LEEP program, and an identification of key manpower trends relevant to future needs and priorities for federally funded academic assistance programs.

An inescapable conclusion from the available evidence, is that the LEEP program—if it is to be continued—must be substantially restructured to remedy major qualitative deficiencies and to adapt it to changing manpower needs of criminal justice agencies. This conclusion is based on the following specific findings:

- The basic premise of the LEEP program—that higher education *per se*, is closely associated with

improved job performance—cannot be clearly supported in the case of the basic line officer positions, whose incumbents have been the primary beneficiaries of LEEP assistance. Empirical research evidence is inconclusive and opinions of law enforcement executives on this issue, although generally supportive, appear to be strongly influenced by their own backgrounds. The strongest justification for such assistance appears to be on career development grounds, i.e., to develop a broader pool of educationally qualified personnel for advancement to supervisory and managerial level positions.

- The available evidence indicates that LEEP was clearly a major factor in the very rapid growth in criminal justice education programs during the period since its inception, and that it was probably a significant contributing factor in the recent rapid increase in educational attainment of police and correctional officers. However, the academic quality of much of the LEEP-financed education has been significantly deficient, as measured by such criteria as program content, faculty characteristics, or student-faculty ratios. In part, these qualitative weaknesses are attributable to the very rapid growth of LEEP-funded criminal justice education programs and the inadequate initial resources of qualified faculty and of educational materials. There is little evidence that these programs adequately address the broader social issues associated with crime and crime prevention, or with the interface between the criminal justice system and the broader community. Course emphasis, as well as student participation, have also been disproportionately concentrated in the law enforcement field.
- From a manpower perspective, the outlook is for much more rapid growth in correctional positions, than for sworn police officers, thus indicating the need for increased emphasis on correctional subjects in criminal justice programs. A growing proportion of all line personnel in law enforcement and correctional agencies will have completed at least one or two years of college, in large part because of the rising educational level of new entrants into these occupations. As a result, a greater proportion of available assistance funds will be needed to assist those enrolled in the upper years of four-year undergraduate programs or in graduate study.
- In addition to these trends, assessments presented elsewhere in this report have highlighted significant existing deficits in education among mid-level and managerial personnel in law enforcement and correctional agencies, as illustrated by the fact that less than one-fourth of all law enforcement executives

were college graduates in 1975. It is likely that, despite substantial progress, a majority of managerial incumbents in law enforcement agencies will continue to be non-college graduates in 1985. In view of the growing need for application of sophisticated management techniques in criminal justice agencies, and of the increasing constraints and pressures for accountability on these executives, an increased allocation of resources to education and training programs in the field of management should command a high priority in future academic assistance programs.

2. Recommendations

- *Firm action should be taken by LEAA to enforce the existing qualitative standards for institutional qualifications for LEEP assistance as provided in current LEAA guidelines.* In order to upgrade the qualitative level of these programs, LEAA should assist the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences or other appropriate potential accrediting organizations in accelerating on-going plans to develop accreditation standards for these programs. After some reasonable notice, programs which do not meet either LEEP guideline standards, or appropriate accreditation standards, should be disqualified from further LEEP assistance.
- *In view of the growing proportion of personnel who have already completed one or two years of college, guidelines for academic assistance to institutions and individual applicants should be revised to provide for a phase-out of LEEP assistance for the first two years of undergraduate study.* Implementation of this policy should, however, recognize the wide differences in existing educational attainment of line criminal justice personnel by regions, state and locality, which may justify early action in some states and much slower implementation in others.
- *LEEP funds made available by the above proposed policies could appropriately be reallocated to the following higher priority educational needs:*
 - (1) *Management education programs.* A special program of grants for undergraduate and graduate work in management-related subjects is recommended, to help alleviate deficiencies in the education and training of current incumbents or of individuals otherwise eligible for advancement to managerial positions. The grants should be made available to middle-level supervisors and managerial personnel in all categories of criminal justice agencies; should provide for full support of up to one year of resident study; should be nationally administered by LEAA and awarded on a competi-

tive basis, with consideration given to equitable geographical distribution.

(2) *Graduate programs.* A significant proportion of LEEP funds should be made available for direct grants to criminal justice related graduate programs, to support increases in the number of students planning to teach in the field or to engage in planning, research or evaluation functions in criminal justice agencies.

(3) *Doctoral dissertation grants.* A special program of grants to support doctoral dissertations on crime-related subjects should be instituted, as an additional means of strengthening the quality of research and of education in this field.

- *Guidelines and criteria for allocation of LEEP assistance should be modified to encourage adoption of broader curricula, with increased emphasis on the needs of personnel in correctional and judicial process agencies, since the latter categories have received a relatively small share of total LEEP assistance and are expected to experience the most rapid employment growth in the coming 10-year period.* Similarly, as non-sworn personnel assume a larger share of total law enforcement positions, including those in technical and planning functions, such personnel should be assisted in advancing their education in crime-related subjects, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- *It may be desirable to reassess the current policy which virtually precludes authorization of LEEP grants to any new pre-service students.* It is clear that the overall adequacy of supply of applicants for line police and correctional positions does not warrant a general re-opening of the LEEP programs to pre-service personnel in the first 2 years of college. Exceptions should be considered in the case of qualified applicants for advanced undergraduate or graduate study in crime-related fields, where state and local agencies can establish a need for such personnel and can provide some assurance of placement opportunities, when they have completed their education.
- *Finally, if the LEEP program is continued, measures should be initiated to conduct a continuing, comprehensive evaluation of this program.* This should include systematic follow-up surveys of students who have received LEEP training, as well as assessments by employing agencies of the utility of such training. The practice adopted by other federal agencies, in setting aside a small percentage of the program budget for evaluation, should be adopted by the LEAA.

E. Conclusions on Educational Standards

The above assessments of educational standards for line positions in law enforcement and correctional agencies support the following general conclusions.

1. The available evidence—whether based on task analysis, on empirical research or on attitudinal responses of agency executives—does not support a mandatory requirement for college education as a condition for satisfactory performance in basic police officer or line correctional officer duties, as these positions are traditionally organized.

2. There is some evidence, however, that college trained police officers as a group do perform better than officers in certain tasks, such as in preparation of reports or in service-oriented police practices, such as dealings with juveniles or with citizens. Moreover, to the extent that the role of the basic police or correctional officer is broadened—for example, through greater involvement of police officers in community relations activities or through assignment of a greater counseling role to line custodial officers—a stronger case for college-trained personnel can be made.

3. Generally, however, the strongest justification for support of higher education for these personnel relates to career development needs in view of the more widespread recognition of the requirement for such education for supervisory and, particularly, managerial level positions. Since line police and correctional agencies rely very largely—if not exclusively—upon internal promotions to staff these key positions, the development of a large pool of more educated officers in the basic entry-level positions is viewed as a necessary condition for the future educational upgrading of the higher echelon staff in these agencies.

4. Finally, the recent infusion into the executive ranks of criminal justice agencies of younger, more educated officers—who have expressed the strongest support for upgrading of educational standards—clearly points to an increasing emphasis upon higher education as a condition of both entry and advancement in these agencies. This trend is likely to be reinforced, moreover, by the favorable recruitment outlook for most of these agencies, resulting from reduced personnel turnover and growth needs and from the increased pool of college-educated applicants for police and correctional agencies, as discussed in Chapter V of this volume.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (1967), pp. 108–110.
2. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Police* (1973), p. 369.
3. The Police Chief Executive Committee, *The Police Chief Executive Report* (International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1976), p. 17.
4. See NMS Report, Volume VIII, *Field Analysis of Occupational Requirements and Personnel Management in Criminal Justice Agencies*, pp. 267–269.
5. Public Law 93–83, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess., August 6, 1973, 87 Stat. 197 (Crime Control Act of 1973).
6. A. C. Germaine, "Law Enforcement Training and Education in the United States," *The Police Chief* 24 (October 1957): 22–28.
7. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Third Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1971, p. 82.
8. American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice, *The Urban Police Function* (1972), quoted by Larry T. Hoover, *Police Educational Characteristics and Curricula* (National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, LEAA, 1975), p. 35.
9. See NMS Final Report, Volume VIII, p. 219.

CHAPTER VII. TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CORRECTIONAL OCCUPATIONS

In contrast to the broader educational objectives of academic degree-granting programs, training programs are primarily designed to develop more specific job-relevant skills, knowledge and perspectives. Such training may be provided in a formal classroom environment, such as that of law enforcement or correctional academies, or may be acquired through some combination of structured on-the-job training and of informal on-the-job learning experiences, through observation of, and guidance by, supervisors or peers.

On-the-job training and learning experiences have been—and continue to be—the predominant source of development of practical job skills for most law enforcement and correctional officers. Nevertheless, increased emphasis has been placed upon more formal training programs for these personnel, including entry-level training in basic skills, and in-service training to provide for maintenance of these skills or for development of more specialized or technical skills, including those related to assumption of supervisory duties.

This growing emphasis upon formal training programs has stemmed in large part from a recognition of the limitations of more informal procedures to provide the needed skills and knowledge. During the 1960's, rising crime rates, urban unrest, prisoner riots and demonstrations, and a series of Supreme Court decisions protecting offender rights all highlighted the fact that many law enforcement and correctional personnel had been poorly prepared to exercise their responsibilities. An extension and strengthening of formal training programs was recommended, therefore, as both a means of improving the basic job-relevant skills and proficiencies of these key personnel, and of promoting more rapid adjustments to changing policies and crime-fighting strategies or to changes in the social environment, itself.

This chapter assesses the current status and adequacy of these training programs, separately for law enforcement officers and for correctional personnel—other than those at the managerial level, whose training and education needs are reviewed in the following chapter. A point of departure in these assessments is the definition of training standards based on findings and recommendations of expert Commissions, the results of NMS occupational analysis findings and of related survey findings.

These have provided guides as to desirable minimum lengths of training, frequency of training (for in-service personnel) and training contents. These standards have been compared with current agency practices, as reported by executives in response to the NMS surveys, and with information on specialized training actually received by agency employees, where available. Recommendations on needed improvements in existing programs are presented in the final section of the chapter.

A. Training for Law Enforcement Officers

1. *Entry-level training.* The need for formal entry-level training for new police recruits has long been recognized. Such training had been provided by the larger police departments for many decades, beginning with the opening of the New York City Police Department's School of Pistol Practice in 1895. However, until recently, many smaller agencies continued to rely on informal on-the-job training methods. Moreover, police courses—where provided—were often very restricted in scope, with primary emphasis on procedures or specific skills, rather than basic principles.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, and the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals both recommended that entry level training of at least 400 classroom hours be mandated for all new police recruits. The latter Commission further recommended a distribution of course time to cover the following subject areas.¹

	Percentage of Course Hours
Introduction to the criminal justice system	8
Law	10
Human values and problems	22
Patrol and investigation procedures	33
Police proficiency	18
Administration	9
Total	100

Other specific recommendations of the National Advisory Commission included: (1) establishment of performance objectives for training programs; (2) a shift

from the traditional lecture methods of training to methods designed to increase trainee participation and interest, such as role playing, group discussion, self-paced individualized instruction; (3) improved instructor training and increased utilization of full-time instructors; and (4) establishment of a field training program under supervision of highly qualified officers, to be combined with the formal recruit training program. The President's Crime Commission, as well as the National Advisory Commission, also strongly supported establishment of statewide or regional academies for law enforcement training, and of state commissions on police selection and training standards, which would have the authority to establish mandatory minimum standards for training and qualification of police officers in each state.

The necessity for formal entry training of police officers was further validated by the results of NMS job analysis studies. Samples of incumbent patrol officers were asked to identify the skill and knowledge requirements for adequate performance of various police officer tasks. The respondents rated 14 of these tasks as requiring a high degree of skill or knowledge upon entry. Among these were knowledge of police authorities and responsibilities, criminal law, investigative techniques, use of firearms, report writing and defensive tactics—all requiring some period of initial formal training. Thus, even under a specific task-oriented approach, entry training was clearly indicated as essential for satisfactory police performance. The length of course time necessary to acquire these and other essential skills or knowledge could not, however, be established by this procedure, since this is likely to depend upon such variables as student and instructor capabilities, intensity of training, the teaching methods used and the specific content matter required by different agencies. Law enforcement training experts in a panel convened by the NMS for this purpose have, rather, stressed the need for clearly defined performance objectives for each aspect of training, as well as the importance of structured field training as a supplement to more formal classroom work.

Considerable progress has been made in approaching some of the quantitative goals for police entry training recommended by these Commissions. By 1974, 44 states had established state commissions on police standards and training, as compared to 33 in 1970. The institutional resources for provision of such training have also expanded rapidly, including a rapid growth in the number of state and regional academies for provision of training to small and medium-sized agencies. Thus, of a total of about 240 law enforcement academies which responded to a recent survey of the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training (NASDLET), 66 percent were established within the last

10 years.² Financial support provided by the Federal Government has been an important factor in this growth, as illustrated by the fact that 23 percent of these academies reported receiving financial assistance directly from LEAA in 1975 while 17 percent received aid from state and criminal justice planning agencies.

The extent of progress in provision of entry-level training is also suggested by a comparison between the proportion of all incumbent sworn officers who had ever received police academy training with the proportion of agencies currently requiring such training for new entrants. As shown in Table VII-1, 77.5 percent of all sworn officers employed in law enforcement agencies in 1974 reported in the Census employee survey that they had ever attended a police academy. This proportion ranged from 52 percent for officers in agencies with less than 25 employees to 95 percent, in agencies with 1,000 or more employees. In contrast, over 82 percent of all law enforcement executives responding to the NMS surveys in 1975 reported that their agencies were currently providing entry-level training to all their new recruits, including all but a very small proportion of agencies with 25 or more employees. Moreover, among the smallest agencies—those with less than 25 employees—69 percent of the police agencies and 78 percent of the sheriffs' agencies now provided some formal entry-level training to all recruits (Table VII-2).

TABLE VII-1
Sworn Law Enforcement Personnel Who Had Attended Police Academies, by Size of Agency, 1975

Size of Agency	Number of Personnel	Personnel Who Had Attended a Police Academy	
		Number	Percent
All law enforcement agencies ----	502,254	389,451	77.5
0-24 employees -----	83,005	43,497	52.4
25-149 -----	138,073	94,118	68.2
150-399 -----	54,788	41,229	75.3
400-999 -----	52,453	45,267	86.3
1,000 or more -----	173,935	165,340	95.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Criminal Justice Employee Characteristics Survey, 1975.

The proportions of all police officers who had received formal training were found to vary considerably among the 50 states, ranging from only about one-half of all officers in several rural states, such as North Carolina, West Virginia and New Hampshire, to about 90 percent, in New York, California, and the District of Columbia. Generally, states with above average educational levels among police officers also tended to have a higher proportion of academy-trained personnel, probably reflecting the combined influence of higher state training and selection standards, greater urbanization and differences

in overall education and training resources among the states.

Several types of academies or training agencies have been used to provide police recruit training. These include agency affiliated academies, state or regional (intrastate) academies and academies operated by educational institutions, such as community colleges. NMS survey reports indicate that law enforcement agencies which accounted for about 57 percent of total law enforcement employment in 1975 provided training through agency-operated academies; an additional 36 percent, through state or regional academies, and only about 7 percent, in academies operated by educational institutions. Whereas about three-fourths of agencies with 500 or more employees relied on their own academies, a majority of small and medium-sized agencies used state and regional academies or local education institutions for this purpose.

As shown in Table VII-3, the extent to which recruit training courses conform to the National Advisory Commission standard of 400 or more course hours varies directly with agency size. Among agencies with 400 or more employees, over 90 percent of all police departments and 72 percent of sheriffs' agencies provided recruit training of 400 hours or more, whereas only small percentages of agencies with less than 25 employees met this standard. A distribution of these agencies, weighted by their employment, indicates that agencies employing nearly three-fifths of all sworn officers provided entry training of 400 or more hours in 1974-75 (Table VII-4). Average course lengths were substantially longer in agency affiliated academies than in state or regional academies or those affiliated with educational institutions.

TABLE VII-2

Police and Sheriffs' Agencies Providing Formal Entry-Level Training, by Type and Size of Agency, 1975

Type and Size of Agency	Percent of Agencies Providing Entry-Level Training
Police agencies, total -----	82.2
1-24 employees -----	69.2
25-74 -----	95.1
75-399 -----	98.1
400 or more -----	100.0
Sheriffs' agencies, total -----	82.6
1-24 employees -----	77.6
25-74 -----	93.1
75-399 -----	99.1
400 or more -----	100.0

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

In addition to the continuing deficiencies in the availability and length of police recruit training in smaller agencies indicated by the above comparisons, the following qualitative limitations in law enforcement academy training were indicated by the NMS surveys.

- *Course contents.* A comparison of actual course time distribution by major training topics, based on the NASDLET survey of over 200 academies, with that recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, indicates that recruit training course contents were much more procedurally oriented than proposed by the Commission. Thus about 67 percent of course hours were being devoted by academies to patrol and investigation procedures and to "police proficiency" subjects, as compared to a recommended allocation of only 51 percent of time to these purposes. Conversely, training in "human values and problems" received only 7 percent of actual course time, whereas 22 percent had been recommended for this purpose. The latter include subjects such as community relations, juvenile delinquency, crisis intervention and minority relations, subjects which have been strongly recommended for increased emphasis in the major Commission studies, particularly in the case of urban police departments.
- *Teaching methods.* Despite recommendations supporting more extensive use of more individualized teaching methods, the formal lecture method continues to be the primary mode of instruction at academies for nearly all subjects, other than physical conditioning and firearms. Only small percentages of academies reported use of alternative methods such as group discussion, operational practice, case study or programmed instruction. A panel of law enforcement training experts, convened by NMS in 1976, strongly recommended that the institution of improved teaching techniques and materials should be given a high priority.
- *Field training.* Despite strong emphasis upon field training in Commission recommendations, only about 36 percent of all academies responding to the NASDLET survey included such training in their program. Field training was provided, to some extent, by 50 percent of agency-affiliated academies but by only 25 percent of state or regional academies, and by 17 percent of those affiliated with colleges. NMS panelists also noted that field training, when available, is often indifferently structured and sometimes suffers from a lack of strong management support—findings confirmed by the available literature and by NMS field visits.
- *Instructor quality.* Despite Commission recommen-

TABLE VII-3

Distribution of Hours of Formal Entry-Level Training Provided by Police and Sheriffs' Agencies to New Recruits, by Size and Type of Agency, 1975

Length of Entry-Level Training	Police Departments						Sheriffs' Departments				
	Total (n=2723)	Size of Agency					Total (n=2412)	Size of Agency			
		1-24 Employees (n=1431)	25-74 Employees (n=752)	75-399 Employees (n=432)	400 or More Employees (n=100)	1-24 Employees (n=1997)		25-74 Employees (n=477)	75-399 Employees (n=202)	400 or More Employees (n=36)	
All departments -----	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
No training provided -----	17.8	30.8	4.9	1.9	0	17.8	22.4	6.9	.9	0	
1-159 hours -----	5.0	7.1	2.5	3.5	0	9.3	9.8	8.3	7.4	5.5	
160-399 hours -----	43.7	43.8	51.1	39.1	9.3	61.1	60.3	68.9	56.4	22.2	
400-799 hours -----	31.6	18.0	40.6	53.0	63.9	11.4	7.0	15.7	35.1	66.7	
800 or more hours -----	1.9	.3	.9	2.5	26.9	.4	.4	0	0	5.5	

Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

TABLE VII-4

Estimated Percentage Distributions of Sworn Law Enforcement Officers, by the Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided, 1974-75^a

Duration of Entry- Level Training	All Law Enforcement Agencies	Police Agencies	Sheriff Agencies
Total -----	100.0	100.0	100.0
No training -----	7.2	7.3	7.2
1-159 hours -----	3.2	2.4	7.7
160-399 hours -----	30.7	27.2	51.2
400-799 hours -----	47.0	49.5	32.1
800 or more -----	11.9	13.7	1.6

^a Percentage distribution weighted on basis of employment in each agency size group.
Note: Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.
Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

dations in support of increased utilization of full-time, adequately trained instructors, the NASDLET survey found that nearly 80 percent of all academy faculties consisted of part-time instructors. About 83 percent of the responding academies required that their instructors be certified, mainly by State Training Commissions or Departments of Education. In spite of this apparent progress, the panel of NMS training experts felt that many instructor training programs are inadequate, particularly for non-procedural subjects.

- *Class size.* The National Advisory Commission has recommended that recruit class sizes be limited to a maximum of 25 trainees, with 20 as a preferred limit. The NASDLET survey found that nearly one-half (49.3 percent) of agencies responding to the survey actually had class sizes in excess of 25 recruits, with the largest class sizes reported by state and regional academies.

2. *In-service training.* For purposes of this report, in-service training includes all agency-provided training that incumbents receive after basic or entry-level training. It includes courses designed to improve or upgrade directly job-related skills, such as investigative methods or firearms use, as well as training to prepare incumbents for new assignments or specialized functions, such as dispatching, evidence handling or computer programming. Supervisory training, as well as training and education programs for managerial-level personnel, are discussed later in this report.

Both the President's Commission and the National Advisory Commission recommended that all sworn law enforcement officers receive periodic formal training. The latter Commission recommended that 40 hours of in-service training be provided annually to all sworn employees up to or including the rank of captain or its equivalent in order to maintain, update and improve necessary knowledge and skills.³ Similar recommendations have been made by numerous other assessments of police personnel and training needs.

A large proportion of the executives responding to the NMS survey reported that their agencies provided *some* in-service training to their personnel. Agencies offering at least some in-service training accounted for about 84 percent of all police employees and for 74 percent of all sheriff agency personnel in 1975. Nearly all of the larger agencies, with 400 or more employees, offered some in-service training, as compared with only 63 percent of the agencies with less than 75 employees. However, only a small proportion of officers had actually attended formal in-service courses during 1975. Thus among the police agencies with 400 or more employees, 92 percent reported that less than one-fourth of their officers had attended an in-service course (other than "roll-call" training) in 1975, and only 5 percent reported that 75

percent or more had attended such a course. These findings tend to be corroborated by police officer responses to the 1975 Census survey of criminal justice personnel, which indicated that only 36 percent of all sworn officers had completed at least one specialized training course relevant to their current job.

Subject matter coverage of in-service training also appears to be limited in most agencies. The three topics most frequently offered, based on the NMS survey, were: "criminal law and legal procedure," "weapons training," and "criminal evidence and procedures." Despite the emphasis in the prescriptive literature upon the "peace-keeping role" of police officers, subjects such as crisis intervention, juvenile policies and procedures and community and race relations were offered much less frequently than the more basic courses.

Executives in 27 of the 31 agencies visited by NMS staff also perceived a need for considerable expansion of in-service training. Personnel and budget shortages were cited, however, as major obstacles.

3. *Supervisory training.* There is a wide consensus that formal training is necessary for newly appointed supervisors in sworn law enforcement positions, typically at the sergeant, or equivalent, rank. Such positions entail administrative and planning responsibilities, as well as a mastery of law enforcement processes and techniques. The NMS occupational analysis of line supervisory positions thus identified some 12 major tasks, performed by line supervisory positions, which are not normally performed by patrol officers. These include such responsibilities as assignment of personnel, review and processing of reports, investigation of complaints and planning of unit operations. Moreover, most police agencies are required by law to promote from the ranks of incumbent officers, using such criteria as written knowledge tests or evaluations of performance as a patrolman—neither of which necessarily measure competence in supervisory skills.

A requirement to attend a supervisory training course, either prior to or shortly after promotion to a supervisory position, was recommended by both the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals as well as by other major study groups, such as the National Advisory Group on Productivity in Law Enforcement. About 90 percent of all police chiefs and about 80 percent of the sheriffs responding to the NMS surveys also agreed that supervisory training should be required.

NMS survey results indicate that such training is not currently required by a substantial majority of all law enforcement agencies. Only 37 percent of all executives of police agencies surveyed and 29 percent of the sheriffs' agencies, reported that their agencies required

supervisory training either before or after promotion. However, 63 percent of large police departments with 500 or more employees required such training, as contrasted with only 23 percent of the smallest police agencies. Since supervisory-level personnel tend to be concentrated in the larger agencies, the overall proportions of such personnel currently required to take such training is probably considerably higher than suggested by these unweighted statistics.

Among all incumbent supervisory personnel, however, a much lower proportion reported that they had ever received such training. Only 15 percent of patrol supervisors and 25 percent of detective supervisors reported that they had ever received formal administrative training, in the Census survey of criminal justice personnel. The limited scope of such training, for current incumbents, is also confirmed by the results of NMS field job analysis reports. A large majority of the 261 supervisory personnel sampled, in 31 agencies, reported that they had learned all of the tasks specific to their jobs primarily through on-the-job experience. Many of these personnel felt themselves inadequately prepared in two groups of tasks, including those related to personnel administration and to planning or recommendation of improvements in departmental policies or procedures.

The above findings thus suggest the need for more extensive supervisory training, particularly in many of the smaller agencies. It is clear, however, that the effectiveness of such courses will depend upon correction of the qualitative deficiencies in existing academy programs, described above, or on establishment of alternative institutional arrangements for provision of such training.

B. Line Personnel in Adult Corrections

1. *Entry-level training.* Training of line custodial officers in adult corrections institutions has been characteristically much shorter, and less well developed, than for law enforcement officers. Although the need to upgrade the competence and training of correctional staff was recognized by most major assessments of the correctional field, issues such as training lengths or contents were generally not addressed. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals did, however, recommend that all new staff members should receive a minimum of 40 hours of entry-level training and an additional 60 hours of training during their first year of employment.

Systematic entry-level training for correctional officers is a relatively recent development in most correctional systems. Available survey data for various periods in the mid- or late 1960's suggest that, in this period, such training was provided in some form by between 50

percent and 70 percent of state adult corrections institutions. In contrast, nearly all (97 percent) of all executives of state adult corrections institutions responding to the 1975 NMS survey indicated that their agencies now provided formal entry-level training to all new correctional officers. Moreover, in contrast to earlier practices, when participation in such training was often voluntary, 96 percent of these agencies now required training at entry for all newly employed officers. From this and collateral evidence it is clear that a major growth in correctional officer training has occurred, made possible—in large part—by provision of federal funds as “seed money” for these programs.

Correctional officer entry training is most frequently provided at statewide correctional academies. Fifty-six percent of respondents to the NMS survey reported that they utilized state training facilities for all or part of their training, as compared to 41 percent providing such training entirely or in part, in their own facility. Twelve percent used regional training facilities and about 10 percent reported using other correctional agencies or local educational institutions for this purpose. Comparison of these findings with results of earlier surveys indicates a definite trend towards statewide correctional training academies, many of which have been recently established with LEAA funding assistance. Responses by executives, moreover, indicated a continuing trend towards use of state training academies, with a moderate decline in the proportion of agencies planning to rely on training in their own, or other, correctional facilities.

As shown in Table VII-5, somewhat less than half of all correctional agencies (44 percent) met or exceeded the standard of 100 hours which had been proposed by the National Advisory Commission for total length of training for new correctional officers during their first year of employment. However, as compared to an aver-

age course length of 116.6 hours (based on a weighted mean), agencies accounting for 22.5 percent of correctional employees in this sample provided 40 hours or less of training, whereas 25.5 percent provided 160 or more hours. Training courses tended to vary directly with agency size, except for the agencies in the largest size group (400 or more employees) whose course lengths approximated the overall average.

These variations in course lengths reflect equally wide variations in state standards. Among the 24 states for which desired or mandated training levels have been determined, the range of hours specified is between 16 and 301 hours. Only 9 of the states, however, specify a desirable or required period equal to or longer than the 100 hours suggested by the National Advisory Commission. The most frequently specified training periods are 40 hours and 80 hours.

It is clear, however, that those agencies whose course lengths are governed by state agencies provide significantly longer training than those where the length of training is established at the agency level. Thus 59 percent of all agencies whose course lengths were established by state agencies provided 81 or more hours of training, as compared to only 15 percent of the agencies which established their own standards.

The NMS survey also indicates a definite trend towards expansion of length of correctional officer entry training. About 80 percent of agency executives indicated that they had increased the length of their training courses in the past 5 years and about 40 percent expected course lengths to increase in the immediate future—the latter including many of the smaller agencies, whose course lengths have been below average. However, availability of funding—either from federal or state sources—will be a key factor influencing the future growth in these training programs.

TABLE VII-5

Distribution of the Duration of Entry-Level Training for Adult Corrections Officers, by Size of Agency, 1975
(Percent of agencies)

Hours of Training	Totals		Size of Agency				
	Agencies	Personnel *	1-24	25-74	75-149	150-399	400+
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1-40	25.0	22.5	58.8	30.0	20.6	17.9	21.1
41-99	30.6	31.6	23.5	30.0	29.4	31.3	34.2
100-160	19.9	20.2	11.8	20.0	23.5	17.9	23.7
161-240	15.8	15.5	5.9	17.5	14.7	20.9	10.5
240 or more	8.7	10.0	0.0	2.5	11.8	11.9	10.5
N=	(196)	—	(17)	(40)	(34)	(67)	(38)
Estimated mean length of training (hours)	107.2	116.6	60.5	97.9	119.8	218.3	113.2

* Agencies weighted by distribution of personnel.
Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

The content of training for correctional officers may be classified into eight general areas. These are:

- agency policies and procedures;
- custodial functions;
- emergency functions;
- "treatment" or "programmatic" functions;
- legal topics;
- human values, problems, and behavior;
- principles of corrections and the criminal justice system; and
- specific skill proficiency development.

Based on NMS survey responses, the primary emphasis in entry-level training for adult correctional officers appears to be in the generic areas of policies and procedures, and custodial functions. These topics are covered in the entry-level training programs of virtually all agencies providing such training. A lesser order of emphasis in entry-level training appears to be placed on such areas as legal topics, emergency functions, human relations, and skill proficiency training. These topics are provided with more frequency as the size of the agency increases, suggesting that they are either less relevant to smaller agencies or, that the amount of time devoted to training in smaller agencies is insufficient to permit coverage of these topics.

Two approaches were used in assessing the adequacy of course coverage. The first was to query correctional executives on the relative emphasis they recommended for different entry-level training topics. With few exceptions, present training coverage was found—not unexpectedly—to closely reflect the priorities which correctional executives placed on each topic. Subjects related to primary custody roles and to general agency policies and procedures received the highest ranking based on this criterion.

The second approach was based on the results of the NMS field occupation analysis of correctional officer duties and skill and knowledge needs. This analysis confirmed that the principal duties of correctional officers related primarily to custody and security matters, such as the observation of inmates, conducting searches, responding to emergency situations and maintaining the overall security of the institution. However, a large number of officers also devoted considerable time to non-custodial activities, such as advising inmates, assigning tasks to inmates and supervising their work on these tasks. Comparison of the skill and knowledge demands of these tasks with current training course contents suggests that entry-level training is least adequate in the area of staff-inmate relations.

The occupational analysis indicated that incumbent officers generally believed themselves to be insufficiently prepared to advise inmates regarding their prob-

lems. Correctional supervisors and executives equally stressed the importance of the ability to anticipate inmate problems and to avoid the use of force in dealing with inmates. Thus, while training should stress skills in these areas, a significantly smaller proportion of agencies currently train new officers in subjects such as human relations and behavior, counseling and race relations, than in areas more closely related to custody or security.

Based on field interviews with agency officials, increased emphasis on these subjects can be expected in the future. Over half of the state agencies visited by NMS staff indicated that training will be modified in the next 5 years to include topics such as inmate rights, humane methods of inmate treatment and revisions in the role of the correctional counselor.

2. *In-service training.* The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals had recommended in 1973 that all correctional staff inmates should receive a minimum of 40 hours of in-service training annually. Although progress has been made in provision of in-service training opportunities to correctional officers, the NMS survey results indicate that this goal is still far from realization.

About 85 percent of all adult corrections agencies covered by the NMS survey indicated that they had some provision for in-service training of corrections officers. As in the case of entry-level training, this appears to be a significant improvement over the situation in the late 1960's. Moreover, of the agencies not currently providing such training, nearly four-fifths indicated that in-service training would be instituted in the next 2 years.

However, only a small proportion of officers actually attend in-service training courses each year. Virtually all agencies responding to the NMS survey indicated that no more than 10 percent of their staffs had attended courses in the previous fiscal year. The low frequency of in-service training is probably attributable, in large part, to the recency of formal training programs in most correctional institutions and to the priority assigned to entry-level training courses during this period.

A relatively larger proportion of in-service training, than of entry training, is provided by correctional institutions at the facility itself. Fifty-four percent of all agencies providing in-service training reported that this training was conducted in whole or in part at the facility itself, as compared to 40 percent which used state academies for this purpose.

Executives were also asked to estimate the average length of in-service training for personnel in their agencies. Such estimates are likely to be judgmental, in view of the wide diversity of courses available. However, nearly 60 percent of the executives reported an average

duration of 40 or more hours, for those actually attending in-service courses.

More significantly, training emphasis in in-service training courses was found to closely parallel that in the entry-level courses. Topics dealing with agency policies, custodial and security functions were most frequently covered; those related to staff-inmate relations and treatment functions generally were less frequently covered. Thus areas which appeared to be neglected in the entry-level courses tended also to receive lower priority for in-service personnel. This pattern suggests that, in considerable degree, recent in-service training has focused on provision of some formal training, at a basic level, for many of the older correctional officers who had never been required to take such training at the time of their original entry into correctional employment.

In view of considerable attention, in the literature, to the desirability of expansion of the counseling role of corrections officers, special questions were addressed to this issue in the NMS survey of executives of adult institutions. Nearly 90 percent of all adult corrections executives responded favorably to the principle of providing some training in counseling to corrections officers and more than half of the agencies reported that they currently assign their officers to such duties, mainly on a selective basis. Among the latter agencies, a variety of training and education programs are used for such training, including special in-service courses (35 percent), encouragement of enrollment in appropriate college courses (23 percent) or special courses at regional or state academies (15 percent). About one-fifth reported that such training was provided, entirely or in part, as part of basic entry-level training.

It should be emphasized that the counseling role or function, in the correctional context, is used in a much looser—and less technical sense—than in professionally oriented counseling activities, which normally require an advanced degree in this field.

C. Child Care Workers in Juvenile Institutions

1. *Current status of training.* Child care workers perform the custodial function in a diverse range of juvenile correctional institutions including detention facilities, shelters, reception and diagnostic centers, training schools or reformatories, ranches, camps or farms, and halfway houses or group homes. Although the training schools, detention centers, and ranches tend to be relatively secure facilities, other types of juvenile agencies typically employ small numbers of employees and tend to maintain lower levels of security. The small average size of juvenile facilities and the lower level of security required in many of these facilities in turn appear to be factors affecting the scope and length of staff training programs in these agencies.

As shown in Table VII-6, the extent of training provided to child care workers was substantially lower than for correctional officers in state adult institutions. Only about one-half of the juvenile agencies whose executives responded to the NMS survey provided entry training to their child care staff. About 20 percent provided in-service training only, while an additional 29 percent reported that they provided no training at all.

The extent to which staff training was provided varied significantly by type of agency. Whereas over 90 percent of the juvenile ranches, camps or farms, and nearly 80 percent of the training schools provided some training to their child care staff, only about two-thirds of the juvenile detention or halfway house facilities reported that they provided either entry or in-service training. The latter are typically locally based and smaller in size than the state-operated training schools, ranches or similar facilities.

2. *Entry-level training.* In contrast to the pattern for training of adult correctional officers, entry training of child care workers is primarily conducted at the facility

TABLE VII-6
Percent Distribution of Juvenile Corrections Agencies by Extent of Provision of Entry-Level and In-Service Training and by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Number of Agencies	Percent of Agencies				
		Total	Entry-Level Only	In-Service Only	Both Entry and In-Service	No Training Provided
Total: all agencies	533	100.0	8.1	20.1	43.0	28.9
Juvenile detention	241	100.0	6.6	20.7	39.0	33.6
Training schools	116	100.0	7.8	16.4	54.3	21.6
Ranch, camp, farm	64	100.0	7.8	25.0	57.8	9.4
Halfway house	89	100.0	13.5	21.3	29.2	36.0
Reception and diagnostic	12	100.0	0.0	16.7	58.3	25.0
Juvenile shelter	9	100.0	11.1	11.1	22.2	55.6
Non-resident program	2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

where they are employed. NMS survey data indicate that only a small proportion use state or regional facilities, and an even smaller proportion use local colleges or other agencies for this purpose. Juvenile agency heads did, however, forecast a gradual increase in use of outside providers of training for their staffs.

Course lengths for entry training were typically quite short. The estimated average length of entry training of child care workers was about 30 hours, or about one-fourth that for adult corrections officers (Table VII-7). The average length of training tends to increase with agency size, from 25 hours for agencies with less than 25 employees, to an average of about 35 hours in agencies with 75 or more employees. The larger, more secure facilities, such as training schools, tend to provide somewhat longer courses than do detention centers or halfway houses.

As in the case of adult corrections officer training, course emphasis for child care workers was in the areas of custody, agency policy and security. Moderate coverage was provided for such topics as report writing, counseling and child psychology, while subjects such as juvenile law, race relations, drug and alcohol treatment and sex education were less frequently included. The frequency of inclusion of these topics in entry training curricula was found to correspond fairly closely to the judgments on desired course emphasis, expressed by agency heads. One exception, however, was the subject of child and adolescent psychology, which was included in only 41 percent of the training courses offered, even though 55 percent of the executives considered this subject should receive "strong emphasis."

Occupational analysis information, obtained for a small field sample of child care workers, indicated that the primary duties of these personnel are, in fact, of a custodial nature, including prevention of internal disruption

and the control of resident movement and behavior. In addition to these basic functions, child care personnel do perform certain programmatic type activities, including orientation of new inmates, advising them concerning their personal and other problems, and supervising residents' activities.

Juvenile corrections executives and supervisors, interviewed in the course of the NMS field visits, identified a large number of skill and knowledge areas where they considered newly assigned child care personnel to be deficient. Primarily, these deficiencies related to the custodial role of these personnel, rather than to program-oriented functions. These include subjects which are covered, to some extent, in formal entry training courses, where such courses are provided. Thus, the primary need implied by these assessments is for initiation of formal entry training in those agencies not now providing such training, and for more adequate coverage of basic subjects, where such courses are now offered.

3. *In-service training.* About 64 percent of all juvenile corrections agencies reported that they provided some form of in-service training to their experienced child care workers. In about one-fifth of all agencies, in-service training was the only form of training provided. Moreover, in contrast to the situation for adult corrections officers, juvenile agency heads reported that, where such training was available, an average of over 70 percent of child care staff members received such training each year. This training is predominantly provided at the facility itself, with modest proportions of agencies reporting any use of external training sources, such as state or regional training facilities or local educational institutions. Average in-service training course length was reported to be 34 hours, about the same as for entry-level training.

Course contents of in-service training programs were

TABLE VII-7
*Duration of Entry-Level Training Provided to Juvenile Corrections Child Care Workers,
by Size of Agency, 1975*

Size of Agency (Number of Employees)	Number of Agencies	Estimated Average (in hours)	Percentage Distribution by Hours of Training Provided				
			Total	1-40	41-80	81-99	100 or more
Total: all agencies providing training	282	30.4	100.0	81.2	13.8	3.9	1.1
1-24	106	25.0	100.0	88.7	9.5	0.9	0.9
25-74	103	32.7	100.0	80.6	14.6	3.8	1.0
75-149	44	35.8	100.0	68.1	18.2	11.4	2.3
150 or more	29	33.5	100.0	75.9	20.7	3.4	0.0
Weighted percentage	—	32.8	100.0	76.3	17.0	5.6	1.1

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

found, also, to be heavily oriented towards custody and security topics. However, coverage of treatment-oriented subjects, such as counseling techniques and child and adolescent psychology was found to be more frequent in the in-service training programs, than in entry-level training. Course emphasis was also found to vary somewhat by type of agency. Thus, halfway houses more frequently covered such topics as counseling techniques and sex education, and placed lesser emphasis on custody-related subjects than did detention centers or training schools.

Fundamentally, however, the limited length of both entry-level and in-service training courses suggests that—even when subjects were reported as “covered” in these training programs—such coverage was typically limited to brief and necessarily superficial orientations. These limitations in total course lengths, combined with the significant proportion of juvenile agencies providing no training at all, highlight very serious weaknesses in the quality and sufficiency of training for this key occupation.

D. Training for Probation and Parole Officers

1. *Education and training needs.* Probation and parole officers are responsible for a broad range of duties which vary—to some degree—depending upon the client group supervised (adult or juvenile)—and the specific functions of their agency. Generally, these duties fall into two major categories: (1) the provision of counseling and rehabilitation services to offender clients, either directly or by referral to appropriate community agencies; and (2) the investigation, monitoring and supervision of probationers or parolees, and preparation of reports or recommendations to appropriate agencies such as the courts or parole boards. In addition to these primary duties officers may also be required to serve in quasi-managerial roles, involving coordination and evaluation of services provided by external agencies or supervision of volunteers and paraprofessional aides, as well as other probation or parole officers, employed within the agency itself.

In contrast to the “line” law enforcement and correctional officer occupations, the probation and parole officer is generally recognized as a professional, requiring considerable specialized pre-service education or relevant work experience for effective job performance. Thus, the minimum educational standards for entry, proposed by various professional or public interest organizations in recent years, have provided for graduation from an accredited college or university with a major in the social or behavioral sciences and either one year of graduate study in social work or a related field, such as counseling or guidance, or one year of full-time paid

social work experience in a recognized welfare agency. The “preferred” standard is completion of two years of graduate study in an accredited school of social work or comparable study in criminology, sociology or a related field. These standards have been endorsed with minor variations by the American Bar Association, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the American Correctional Association.⁴

A lower minimum standard was proposed, however, by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in its 1968 report, which suggested a minimum requirement of a bachelor's degree, preferably with a major in the social or behavioral sciences, rather than one requiring specialized graduate study. This lower standard, based on the Commission's appraisal of the realities of the manpower situation in the probation and parole field, was premised—however—upon the development of adequate entry or in-service training programs to assure that personnel in these positions would be adequately prepared to carry out their duties.⁵

NMS survey results indicate that a bachelor's degree—rather than any advanced degree requirement—was the prevailing minimum educational requirement for entry into probation and parole officer positions in 1975. Of a total of about 2,000 agencies surveyed, over 80 percent had adopted this standard, as compared to 15 percent with lower educational standards and less than 1 percent of the agencies, which reported a master's degree requirement. The actual educational attainment of probation and parole officers in 1975 was somewhat higher than suggested by these minimum standards. Nearly 90 percent of all incumbent probation and parole officers had a college degree, and 36 percent reported completion of at least one year of graduate study, according to the Census Bureau survey of criminal justice personnel. A considerable proportion of probation and parole officers also enter these positions after prior experience in related criminal justice or social service agencies. Thus, among administrators of probation and parole agencies responding to the NMS survey, about 60 percent reported prior work experience in such agencies as correctional institutions, law enforcement agencies or welfare agencies.

The results of the NMS field analysis, based on visits to a small sample of probation and parole agencies, suggest that neither the general educational background of most newly appointed probation or parole officers nor their prior work experience adequately prepares them for most of their basic tasks. New entrants were considered to be significantly deficient with respect to such important subjects as knowledge of investigative techniques; the ability to develop plans for probationers and parolees; preparation of case histories; development of community

resources, and specific agency policies and administrative procedures. Although some of the more operationally oriented tasks can be satisfactorily developed through on-the-job training, others are most effectively provided by formal training in education programs. Thus, five training subjects were recommended for "strong emphasis" in entry-level training by two-thirds or more of all probation and parole executives responding to the NMS survey. These include such basic subjects as case supervision, investigative and counseling techniques, community resource utilization and case report writing. The same subjects also ranked highest in priority for emphasis in training of more experienced in-service personnel.

2. *Current status of training.* The extent to which formal entry-level or in-service training was provided by various categories of probation and parole agencies is summarized in Table VII-8. Only about 58 percent of responding agencies provided entry-level training; an additional 22 percent provided in-service training only, and 20 percent provided no formal training at all. Parole agencies, as well as agencies combining probation and parole functions, reported considerably higher frequencies of training than did probation agencies. The former categories of agencies are typically centralized on a state-wide basis; hence larger in size, more formally structured and in a better position to undertake systematic training programs for their personnel. Among probation agencies with no parole functions, 36 percent of adult probation agencies reported no formal training programs as compared with 25 percent of the juvenile agencies.

3. *Entry-level training.* Among the agencies providing formal entry-level training, the most frequent location of the training, reported by about one-third of the agencies, was at the local agency, itself. Nearly one-fifth (19 percent) reported use of programs conducted by state probation and parole offices, while 9 percent reported use of local educational institutions for this purpose. As in other correctional agencies, a gradual trend was reported towards use of state-level facilities, as well as of local educational institutions, in preference to agency-operated programs.

In 1975, over one-half (56 percent) of all entry-level training programs were 40 hours or less in duration. An additional 20 percent were between 41 and 80 hours. Only 20 percent met or exceeded the proposed National Advisory Commission standard of 100 hours. Only limited variation in course lengths by type of agency was indicated by the survey responses.

The survey results indicated a definite trend towards expanding the scope and length of entry-level training programs. Nearly two-thirds of all executives reported that the length of their entry courses had increased in the past five years, and about two-fifths indicated that they expected an increase in course lengths in the coming two years.

A review of training topics covered in entry-level courses shows a reasonably close correspondence to the topics recommended for "strong emphasis" by most of the probation and parole executives. Thus, the five topics ranked highest in priority by the executives were also included among the top six topics, in terms of frequency of actual coverage in current entry-training programs.

TABLE VII-8
Training Provided to Probation and Parole Officers, by Type of Agency, 1975

Type of Agency	Number of Agencies	Percent Distribution of Agencies by Type of Training Provided				
		Total	Entry Level Only	Inservice Only	Both Entry and In-Service	No Training Provided
All agencies	1,748	100.0	8.4	22.0	49.8	19.9
All probation agencies	774	100.0	7.9	24.5	39.7	27.9
All parole agencies	157	100.0	7.6	19.1	59.9	13.4
Combined probation/Parole agencies	620	100.0	9.2	20.0	59.5	11.3
Adult probation	184	100.0	7.6	23.4	32.6	36.4
Juvenile probation	335	100.0	8.7	26.9	39.1	25.4
Adult and juvenile probation	255	100.0	7.1	22.4	45.5	25.1
Adult parole	50	100.0	10.0	8.0	72.0	10.0
Juvenile parole	75	100.0	8.0	25.3	45.3	21.3
Adult and juvenile parole	32	100.0	3.1	21.9	75.0	0.0
Adult probation and parole	319	100.0	9.4	16.0	66.1	8.5
Juvenile probation and parole	183	100.0	10.3	22.2	54.6	13.0
Adult and juvenile probation and parole	116	100.0	6.9	27.6	49.1	16.4
Other agencies	197	100.0	8.1	20.8	50.8	20.3

Source: NMS Executive Survey (1975).

Included in the latter category, also, was "office policies and procedures," which received somewhat lesser emphasis in the executives' ranking, probably because such training can more often be provided on-the-job. Relatively little variation in frequency of coverage of specified topics, by agency type, was reported, except in subjects relating to specialized client groups, such as juveniles.

4. *In-service training.* About 72 percent of all probation and parole agencies provided some form of in-service training to their personnel in 1975. In 22 percent of all agencies, in-service training was the only form of training provided, while about 50 percent reported offering a combination of both entry-level and in-service training.

Among agencies providing in-service training, the proportion of officers reported as receiving such training in 1975 averaged 75 percent—much higher than in the case of either line law enforcement or adult correctional officers. Although such training was most frequently provided at the local agency or at state agency facilities, 36 percent of all agencies with in-service training programs reported some use of local educational institutions for this purpose—a much higher proportion than for entry-level courses.

The average (mean) duration of in-service training courses was reported as approximately one week (38 hours). Some in-service programs are designed to provide basic orientation for junior personnel, similar to those provided in entry-level courses where the latter are not offered. However, a comparison of frequency of coverage of selected topics indicates that in-service courses—as would be expected—tend to be more specialized and place more emphasis upon topics such as counseling techniques, community resource utilization and alcohol and drug problems, with correspondingly less emphasis on office procedures, investigative techniques or case report writing.

5. *Major problem areas.* As in other aspects of correctional training, the available evidence indicates that significant progress has been made in the past 5 years in expanding the scope of training for probation and parole officers, due in part to LEAA financial assistance. This improvement is indicated by responses by office heads concerning the trend towards greater course lengths, as well as by NMS field visits. Thus, the NMS field report on training of officers in adult agencies notes: "The current training that is available appears to represent a substantial improvement over that available 5 years ago. In over half of the states (among those visited), training has become more systematic or has been developed from "scratch" when necessary. This trend will apparently continue as illustrated by one state which

anticipated a doubling of pre-service training expenditures over the next 5 years.

Nevertheless, in view of the demanding responsibilities of the probation/parole officer role and of the modest educational standards in effect for entry into these positions in most agencies, the existing training programs continue to suffer from significant quantitative and qualitative deficiencies.

- Only about one-half of all agencies provide both entry-level and in-service training, and about 20 percent still provide no formal training at all.
- The length of training course, where offered, appears to be inadequate in a majority of agencies, particularly in view of the general lack of either specialized education in case worker roles or of directly related job experience on the part of most entrants into these positions.
- Although course topic coverage appeared to generally correspond with both the priorities of agency heads and with NMS occupational analysis findings, some areas such as training in legal requirements appear to receive insufficient emphasis. In view of recent court decisions concerning rights of probationers and parolees, increased priority is needed in training of officers in court-related skills and knowledge.
- A more general trend, suggested by our field analysis, is the increased use of paraprofessionals and volunteers, in probation and parole offices, for the more routine administrative type duties, in order to enable officers to concentrate on often neglected responsibilities for counseling and treatment planning. In turn, however, this will require increased specialized training for the latter primary functions, as well as training in the effective use of both support staff and of community resources.

E. Training of Correctional Supervisors

The position of supervisor in corrections agencies, as in most other organizations, requires both a mastery of the functions performed by line personnel, as well as an ability to organize and motivate personnel and to translate management policies into concrete procedures. Other typical responsibilities include the conduct of on-the-job training and the preparation of various administrative reports. When incumbent officers and executives were asked to indicate the tasks for which supervisors were inadequately trained, most of these basic supervisory functions were identified as deficiency areas.

In practice, correctional supervisors reported that virtually all of these supervisory skills were learned "on-

the-job" rather than through formal training programs. However, one of the limitations of on-the-job learning is that a significant period may elapse between the time of promotion to supervisory ranks and adequate performance of supervisory duties. For this reason, a very large proportion of all heads of correctional institutions and of probation and parole officers surveyed by the NMS supported a requirement for a special course in supervisory techniques either prior to or immediately following promotion to supervisory positions. However, only a small proportion of the agencies currently required such training, including about 8 percent of adult corrections agencies and less than 13 percent of juvenile corrections and probation and parole agencies. It is possible that considerable additional supervisory personnel actually take such courses on a non-mandatory basis. Nevertheless, as in the case of law enforcement supervisory training, the available information supports the need for considerably more emphasis on this aspect of in-service training.

F. Overall Assessment:

Major Findings and Recommendations

1. *Findings.* The basic premise in our assessment of the status of training for line personnel in law enforcement and correctional agencies has been that well-designed formal training programs for both new and experienced personnel are an essential element of any comprehensive program to up-grade personnel capabilities and overall performance in these agencies. The results of the NMS field occupational analysis studies of these occupations, as well as the collective judgments of agency executives responding to our surveys confirmed earlier findings of national commissions and of major professional organizations in the law enforcement and correctional field on the need for mandatory training for all entry-level personnel in these occupations and for well structured programs of in-service training.

Significant progress has been made in recent years in the systematic provision of such training. The impetus provided by the availability of federal financial assistance and by state-level training commissions and planning agencies has resulted in an extension of formal training programs, particularly among many of the smaller law enforcement and correctional agencies which previously were not in a position to provide such training. The growth of state and regional training academies has made a particularly important contribution. At the same time, existing training programs have been expanded in scope, as suggested by recent or projected increases in course lengths, particularly in the law enforcement section.

Nevertheless, progress has been uneven and serious quantitative and qualitative deficiencies persist. Among the quantitative deficiencies documented by NMS survey findings, the following appear to be the most severe:

(1) The continued absence of any provision for formal entry-level training for line personnel in about one-half of all juvenile corrections agencies, over 40 percent of probation and parole agencies, and about one-fourth of small law enforcement agencies, employing fewer than 25 employees.

(2) The limited participation of line law enforcement and correctional officers in in-service training programs.

(3) The very small proportion of agencies (particularly in corrections) which require formal training for new supervisors, despite the widespread consensus as to the desirability of such training.

Although it was clearly impracticable to make a comprehensive assessment of all qualitative aspects of the available training programs, a number of major inadequacies have been identified.

(1) A majority of all agencies surveyed failed to meet the minimum course length standards or norms for entry-level training, proposed by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. This was particularly true of the smaller agencies in law enforcement and corrections.

(2) Training courses generally placed greatest emphasis upon specific technical or procedural topics, with limited coverage of broader "human relations" subjects such as those relevant to the community service functions of police officers or to the "counseling" aspects of correctional officers' positions.

(3) The effectiveness of training in law enforcement academies was further limited by excessive reliance on traditional lecture methods and on part-time faculty, by inadequate use of field training and relatively large class size. It is believed that many of these limitations apply equally to academies for line correctional officers.

Although quantitative or qualitative deficiencies in training programs were found, to some degree, in all of the major line occupations, they appear to be most severe in the case of child care workers in juvenile corrections agencies, in contrast to much more adequate provisions for training of law enforcement officers in the medium and larger agencies. Confirmation for this assessment was provided by responses of agency executives to the following question: "On the whole, how satisfied are you with all aspects of training for your facility?" Respondents were offered a range of six choices from "extremely satisfied" to "extremely dissatisfied." As shown in Table VII-9, nearly one-half of executives in most agencies reported that they were "satisfied" with their agency's program—a relatively neutral response.

TABLE VII-9

Overall Satisfaction of Executives of Law Enforcement and Correctional Agencies With Their Agency's Training Program, by Type of Agency

Type of Agency	Percent Distribution			Ratio of "Dissatisfied" to Highly Satisfied
	Highly Satisfied ^a	"Satisfied"	"Dis- Satisfied" ^b	
Police departments, jurisdiction with 17,000 or more population	19	46	36	1.9:1
Police departments, less than 17,000 population	13	47	40	3.1:1
Sheriffs departments, 10 or more employees	17	50	33	2.5:1
Sheriffs departments, less than 10 employees	21	48	32	1.5:1
Probation and parole agencies	16	44	40	2.5:1
Adult corrections agencies, (exe. jails)	12	49	39	3.3:1
Juvenile corrections agencies	11	43	46	4.2:1

^a Includes "extremely satisfied" and "very satisfied" responses.

^b Includes "dissatisfied", "very dissatisfied" and "extremely dissatisfied" responses.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

However, the proportion of executives expressing varying degrees of dissatisfaction exceeded those who were "extremely" or "very" satisfied, by substantial margins. The ratio of "dissatisfied" to those indicating considerable satisfaction provides a useful index of training adequacy as perceived by the agency executive. With one exception, this index is consistent with our own assessment. Thus, the highest level of dissatisfaction, based on this ratio, was reported by heads of juvenile corrections agencies, followed by heads of adult corrections facilities and of small police agencies. Chiefs of large police departments, as well as sheriffs in agencies with less than 10 employees, reported the lowest levels of dissatisfaction. The response in the latter case, is not consistent with the continued absence of any formal entry-level or in-service training programs in many small sheriffs' agencies and may be attributable, at least in part, to the more limited range of responsibilities of deputy sheriffs in small, typically rural, agencies.

2. Recommendations

- Concerted action is required by state criminal justice planning and training agencies, with LEAA support, to assure that all personnel newly entering into line criminal justice positions—whether as correctional officers, child care workers, probation and parole officers, or as police officers or sheriffs in small agencies—receive adequate formal entry-level training. These actions should include: (1) establishment of appropriate training standards on a state-wide basis for these occupations, where such standards do not yet exist; (2) establishment or strengthening of state-wide or regional training programs for these occupations; and (3) provision of assistance to local agencies to facilitate attendance of personnel at these programs.

- Increased emphasis is required on development of comprehensive programs of in-service training, which will assure that all personnel are systematically trained with respect to new laws, policies and techniques affecting their functions, and are adequately prepared for assignment to more responsible, or specialized, positions in their agencies, as part of a comprehensive career development plan. Available evidence indicates that only small percentages of line law enforcement and correctional officer staffs currently participate in such training and that most agencies still do not require training for newly appointed supervisors despite the widespread recognition of the need for such training.
- Assistance to established law enforcement and correctional training academies or similar institutions should give priority to needed improvements in the scope and quality of their programs, including introduction of more innovative and individualized training methods, increased use of full-time and adequately trained instructors, and increased emphasis upon human relations aspects. Community-based colleges and other training institutions can prove a useful complement to existing resources in many locations.
- Although specific training needs will vary, to some extent, among agencies, there is a need for development and testing of model curricula and related materials for training of line law enforcement and correctional staffs, which will include the core elements of a comprehensive training program, subject to appropriate modifications at the state or local levels. LEAA should provide assistance for development of such curricula for entry training of

police officers, sheriffs, correctional officers, child care workers and probation and parole officers.

- Finally, there is an urgent need to initiate a program of evaluation of the effectiveness of LEAA-assisted training programs, using both objective performance criteria and survey techniques. A modest portion of LEAA and state training assistance funds should be earmarked for this purpose, as well as for overall improvements in criminal justice manpower planning, as discussed in Chapter X of this report.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Police* (1973), p. 394.
2. NASDLET, Survey of Law Enforcement Academies (1975).
3. National Advisory Commission, p. 404.
4. National Council on Crime and Delinquency, *Standards for the Selection of Probation and Parole Personnel* (1968), pp. 5 and 6. American Correctional Association, *Manual of Correctional Standards* (1974), p. 171.
5. Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, *A Time To Act* (1969), p. 30.

CHAPTER VIII. MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND EDUCATION

This chapter assesses the current status of management training and education in law enforcement and corrections. The initial section reviews the critical role of managerial personnel, their functions and responsibilities, and the major skill and knowledge requirements for these positions, based on NMS survey results and collateral sources. The second section provides information on the characteristics of incumbent executives, including their education, work experience and training, and identifies gaps in their educational and training background. The third section reviews existing management training programs for these personnel. The final section includes recommendations for strengthening of management training and education programs.

A. Management Roles and Responsibilities

Law enforcement and corrections managers include agency executives, such as police chiefs, sheriffs, wardens and heads of probation and parole offices, as well as their deputies and other line command or administrative staff who exercise broad authority in agency direction and in establishment of agency policies. A total of over 55,000 managerial-level personnel were employed in state and local law enforcement and corrections agencies in 1974, including about 45,000 in police protection agencies and over 10,000, in correctional facilities or probation and parole agencies. These agencies vary widely in size and jurisdiction, from very small agencies with only a few employees to large urban police departments or state prisons with many hundreds or thousands of employees. Thus, whereas nearly one-fourth of all managerial-level personnel in police protection agencies were in agencies with less than 10 employees, an additional one-fifth of the total were employed in agencies with 1,000 or more employees in 1974.¹

Although managerial staffs accounted for less than 7 percent of total employment in police protection and correctional agencies in 1974, they clearly play a critical role in establishing agency goals and priorities, in allocation of agency resources, and in determining how effectively these resources are utilized. Collectively, they were responsible in 1974 for management of the efforts

of 300,000 law enforcement and correctional personnel and for expenditures of \$10 billion.

In many respects, these criminal justice executives exercise very broad authority in enforcement of the law and in decisions affecting offenders under their control, as well as over their staffs. For the most part, they dwell in an authoritarian environment, which is paramilitary in structure. At the same time, they have been increasingly subject to constraints in the way they exercise these authorities, particularly as a result of recent court decisions affecting the rights of those accused of crimes and of those in correctional custody. They have also been held increasingly accountable for results by cost-conscious state and local officials and by the public at large. Moreover, the growth of collective bargaining in both the police and correctional fields has imposed the need for changes in traditional styles of personnel management and discipline. Thus, the management of a police force or correctional activity requires a blending of professional expertise, of management and communications skills, and of personal qualities of leadership, tact, and sensitivity.

In order to identify the most significant functions performed by these executives, the NMS executive survey questionnaires requested respondents to identify which three functions—from lists of up to ten functions—they considered as posing especially difficult decisions and problems for them. The five most frequently cited functions of law enforcement and correctional executives are shown in Tables VIII-1 and VIII-2. Included among these functions are such basic managerial duties as personnel and fiscal management, planning and evaluation, and dealing with officials, as well as responsibility for operational law enforcement or correctional activities. Heads of very small police or sheriffs' agencies most frequently cited operational field activities as their most important duty. Heads of larger agencies gave relatively greater emphasis to such functions as personnel management and planning and evaluation, than did those in the smaller agencies. Other functions such as dealing with the public, with the news media or with other criminal justice agencies were generally cited less frequently than the activities listed in these tables.

Executives were also asked to identify what kinds of

special training courses they would recommend as especially useful for future incumbents in their positions. The proportions of respondents recommending particular courses are shown in Charts VIII-1 and VIII-2. The highest priorities, based on responses of police, sheriffs and correctional facility executives, were generally assigned to courses in administration, personnel management and budget or fiscal management. Courses in community relations were also cited by eight out of ten law enforcement executives, but by lower proportions of correctional executives. Sheriffs and wardens, on the other hand, placed much greater emphasis on courses on legal topics than did either police chiefs or juvenile corrections agency heads. Less frequently recommended were courses on specialized professional subjects, such as criminalistics, police intelligence or crisis intervention—for law enforcement executives—or specific correctional treatment program areas, for correctional administrators.

Heads of probation and parole agencies similarly gave highest priority to courses in administration, but also emphasized professional subjects such as community resource development and counseling, probably reflecting the more direct operational role of executives in many of these agencies.

TABLE VIII-1

Most Frequent Problem Areas for Law Enforcement Executives^a

Function	Police Chiefs ^b		Sheriffs ^c	
	"Large" Agencies	"Small" Agencies	"Large" Agencies	"Small" Agencies
Personnel management -----	48%	37%	30%	27%
Operational field activities ---	40	64	47	65
Budget and fiscal management	38	43	44	50
Dealing with local officials ---	33	39	34	28
Planning and evaluation -----	30	25	31	20

^a Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975. Based on responses to question concerning functions entailing "especially difficult decisions and problems." Respondents were requested to identify the three most important functions, based on frequency with which problems arose. Table shows the five most frequently-cited functions.

^b "Large" police agencies are those in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population.

^c "Large" sheriffs agencies are those with 10 or more population.

With some obvious differences, the above responses—as well as the results of NMS field occupational analyses—confirm the high priority assigned by these executives to systematic training in the science and techniques of management, as distinct from additional specialized training in professional law enforcement or correctional subjects.

Several recent trends have reinforced this interest:

- *The trend towards "scientific management."* Peter Drucker points out that true management autonomy does not exist in criminal justice agencies.² Such

TABLE VIII-2

Most Frequent Problem Areas for Corrections Executives^a

Function	Adult Agencies	Juvenile Agencies
Facility operation -----	72%	61%
Dealing with officials -----	30	34
Planning and evaluation -----	23	25
Personnel management -----	22	28
Budget and fiscal management -----	19	21


^a Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975. Based on responses to question concerning functions entailing "especially difficult decisions and problems." Respondents were requested to identify the three most important functions, based on frequency with which problems arose. Table shows the five most frequently-cited functions.

agencies are usually characterized by a hierarchical control which comes down from elected officials, both executive and legislative. Under program budgeting procedures, these officials require that operations be conducted under a disciplined system of objectives and priorities. All along the line there is pressure for measuring program results—with a corresponding need to expand capabilities for audit, analysis, and performance measurement. This trend emphasizes setting concrete standards for agency accomplishments, defining minimum acceptable results, setting deadlines, and making designated individuals accountable for obtaining results within the framework of laws, policies, and agreements shaped by elected officials.

Results from the NMS field interviews have underlined this trend. Executives expressed growing concern about the skills and knowledge needed to manage within the unique structures of the criminal justice system. Governors, mayors, county executives, councils, and legislatures are growing more concerned with program and performance budgeting, and there appears to be less acceptance of traditional approaches. There is a trend toward reviewing organizational objectives, eliminating those that are no longer serviceable or attainable, and setting new goals. Current pressures for reevaluating goals in the correctional system and its institutions illustrate this trend.

- *Emphasis on productivity and performance evaluation.* A closely related trend is the emphasis upon use of productivity measurement and related program evaluation techniques as management tools—particularly in view of the fiscal pressures facing many state and local governments. In the law enforcement field, the Police Foundation—in cooperation with federal agencies such as LEAA—has sponsored research into productivity and perform-

Chart VIII-1


Training Courses Recommended by Criminal Justice Executives

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

Chart VIII-2

Chart VIII-2

Training Courses Recommended by Probation and Parole Executives



Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

ance evaluation methods. These include improved measures of individual or small unit productivity, as well as more global measures of performance of the organization as a whole. A current example of the latter approach is found in a comprehensive study in the Montgomery County, Maryland Police Department, which is attempting to increase productivity by restructuring of jobs, a more stringent setting of goals without cost increases and the introduction of systems for performance measurement.³

- *The trend to collective bargaining.* Unionization among police and correctional employees has grown rapidly in the past decade. The NMS found that the following percentages of agencies participated in collective bargaining with unions or employee associations representing their line personnel, in 1975.

	Percent
Police departments ^a -----	50
Sheriffs departments ^b -----	33
Adult corrections agencies -----	28
Juvenile corrections agencies -----	31

^a Police departments in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population.

^b Sheriffs' agencies with 10 or more employees.

According to a report published by the International City Management Association, in 1976, 36 states provide for collective bargaining rights by public employees. In 29 of these states and the District of Columbia, police unions had formal recognition and collective bargaining rights.⁴ Unionization is also growing rapidly among prison and other correctional employees according to officials of the American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees, the largest organization in this field.

Collective bargaining in the public sector is, in many ways, more complex than in the private sector. Negotiations are multilateral, including elected public officials or their representatives, as well as executives of operating agencies, such as the chief law enforcement officer or correctional administrator. It is governed by specific legislation, covering both the obligation to participate in collective bargaining and the permissible scope of such bargaining. Although agency executives do not normally participate directly in such negotiations they often provide major inputs to the negotiating team. More importantly, many of the resulting agreements establish rules and standards governing a wide range of personnel management and assignment practices previously considered solely as management prerogatives, e.g., recruitment, promotion standards, job assignments, disciplinary procedures, number of shifts, squad car manning and work schedules. As a result, there has been a growing demand for more

systematic training in many aspects of collective bargaining for executives, other managers and supervisors in agencies covered by collective bargaining procedures.

In addition to the above, other trends influencing the need for management training include the increased recognition of the community service aspects of police agency activities, the challenge for improved personnel utilization resulting from the increased educational level of line police and correctional officers, and continuing improvements in the development of more sophisticated information systems, which can—if properly used—greatly increase the capabilities of management for more effective control over resources.

B. Educational and Training Status of Executives

To aid in assessing the adequacy of the preparation of incumbent executives for their demanding roles, the NMS surveys requested information on their education, training and prior experience. This information, obtained from large proportions of all executives, was supplemented by additional information obtained from field interviews with small samples of executives in 10 states. The following composite profiles emerge from these surveys (Table VIII-3).

Age. Law enforcement executives, as a group, tend to be somewhat older than heads of corrections agencies. The median ages of police chiefs and sheriffs in the larger agencies are 48 years and 50 years, respectively. The median ages of heads of corrections agencies range from 39 years, in juvenile corrections agencies, to 44 years in adult corrections agencies.

Prior experience. Virtually all agency heads, with the partial exception of sheriffs, have had substantial experience in their respective fields. A substantial majority of all categories of executives, other than sheriffs, had been advanced to their current positions from within their agencies, and most of those appointed from outside the agency reported holding one or more prior positions in law enforcement, corrections or closely related fields. Since sheriffs generally hold elective office, their background was more diverse; nevertheless, a majority of the latter also reported prior law enforcement experience, either in their present agencies or elsewhere.

Education. The sharpest contrast among various categories of law enforcement and corrections executives is found in their educational attainment. A four-year college education, supplemented by graduate training in corrections, social work or related fields, has long been recommended as the desirable background for correctional executives. About three-fourths of all heads of

TABLE VIII-3

Selected Characteristics of Law Enforcement and Correctional Executives, 1975

Type of Agency	Median Age	Percent Promoted From Within Agency	Percent College Graduates		Percent With Some Specialized Training
			At Time of Entry Into Field	Current	
Police departments "large" ^a	48 yrs	75%	6%	26%	99%
Police departments, "small"	43	60	3	9	90
Sheriff departments, "large" ^b	50	53	14	20	99
Sheriff departments, "small"	49	44	2	4	95
Adult corrections facility	44	86	50	63	98
Juvenile corrections facility	39	76	74	90	98
Probation or parole office	42	61	75	81	98

^a Police departments in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population.

^b Sheriffs departments with 10 or more employees.

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975.

juvenile corrections and of probation and parole agencies in fact had completed college prior to entering the field. Of these, 18 percent of all juvenile agency heads and 14 percent of the probation and parole office heads had already attained graduate degrees. Adult corrections executives reported somewhat lower levels of educational attainment. Only 50 percent of the wardens entered the corrections field with a college degree and 63 percent reported that they were currently college graduates. Those who had entered as college graduates were typically employed previously in treatment or educational roles or in administrative positions. However, about one-half of all wardens reported that they held the position of a line correctional office earlier in their career—a position whose educational requirement is still generally only a high school diploma.

Among law enforcement executives, only a small minority in all categories reported that they were currently college graduates. Only 26 percent of police chiefs, and 20 percent of sheriffs, in the "larger" agencies—and much smaller proportions of those in the smallest agencies—currently were college graduates, even though a college graduate standard has been consistently recommended by all recent assessments of the law enforcement executive's position.

All categories of executives reported significant progress in educational attainment subsequent to entry into their law enforcement or correctional careers, as illustrated by the considerably higher proportions who were currently college graduates. Thus, 69 percent of all police chiefs in larger departments had continued their academic education after entering police work. Of these, the principal sources of financial assistance, in order of frequency, were the LEEP program, aid from their own agency and veterans allowances under the G.I. Bill. Similarly, between 50 and 70 percent of all other

categories of executives, other than sheriffs in "small" agencies, reported that they had engaged in continuing academic education programs, and in each case, identified the LEEP program as the most frequent source of financial aid.

Training. All executives were also queried as to whether they had ever attended special training courses, workshops, training sessions or seminars, relevant to their substantive professional field or their managerial roles. They were also asked to identify the subject areas in which they had received specialized training. As would be expected, all but a very small proportion of the executives had attended at least one special training course in their field. However, the proportions who had attended courses in particular subject areas varied significantly, as illustrated in Tables VIII-4 and 5, based on responses of police chiefs in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population and of adult corrections executives. These tables also compare the proportions who recommend such courses with the proportion of police chiefs or wardens who have taken training in each subject area. The differences between these proportions provide a useful indicator of the subject areas in which additional training is needed, based on the judgments of incumbent executives, themselves.

For police chiefs, the "most needed" additional training, based on this criterion, was in management-related subjects, such as budgeting and planning, labor relations and personnel management. In contrast, relatively small proportions recommended additional training for their successors in specialized professional subjects such as criminology, criminal law, drugs or riot control as compared to much larger proportions who had actually taken such courses in the course of their careers.

The responses of the correctional executives reveal much more sizable training deficits and in a much wider

range of subjects. In almost all types of courses related to management and administration, the proportions of adult correctional executives reporting having attended such courses were substantially lower than among police executives. As a result, 11 out of 15 subject areas were identified as deficit areas for the former, as compared to only 5 out of 15, in the case of the police chiefs. However, in both of these surveys—as well as in the four other executive categories covered by the NMS surveys—the highest priorities for additional management training, based on these comparisons, were the subject areas of budget management and planning and evaluation. As shown in the summary of “most needed” additional courses appearing in Table VIII-6, courses in administration, personnel management and community relations also received high rankings by two or more of the surveyed groups, as did community resource development for the correctional and probation/parole executives.

TABLE VIII-4

Percent of Police Chiefs Who Recommended Courses, and Percent Who Have Taken Courses, in Selected Law Enforcement and Management Subjects, 1975^a

Subject	Percent Recommending Course ^b (1)	Percent Who Attended Courses (2)	Difference (1)-(2)
Law enforcement budget- ing/planning and evaluation -----	93%	74%	19%
Labor relations/collec- tive bargaining -----	74	60	14
Personnel management	94	87	7
Police administration --	95	92	3
Community relations --	83	82	1
Hostage negotiation ---	35	35	—
Race/ethnic relations --	56	61	- 5
Police intelligence ----	40	52	-12
Crisis intervention ----	29	44	-15
Organized crime -----	41	58	-17
Applied criminology --	20	47	-27
Criminalistics -----	16	43	-27
Criminal law/crimi- nal procedure -----	43	82	-39
Drugs -----	22	63	-41
Riot and crowd control -----	30	75	-45

^a NMS Executive Survey, 1975. Based on responses of police chiefs in jurisdictions with 17,000 or more population.

^b Based on responses to question: “Based upon your experience, what kinds of special courses, workshops, training sessions or seminars would you recommend as *especially* useful for your successors to take?” In addition to the specified courses, 41 percent of the 1,208 respondents indicated other, nonspecified courses.

TABLE VIII-5

Percent of Adult Corrections Executives Who Recommended Courses and Percent Who Had Taken Courses, in Selected Corrections and Management Subjects, 1975^a

Subject	Percent Recommending Course ^b (1)	Percent Who Attended Course (2)	Difference (1)-(2)
Budget management/planning and evaluation -	84%	52%	32%
Facility management --	76	51	25
Community resource development -----	60	36	24
Criminal law/correc- tional law -----	84	64	20
Hostage negotiation ---	48	32	16
Use of women in security and custody positions--	35	16	19
Personnel management	88	74	14
Prevention and control of disturbances ----	68	55	13
Labor relations and col- lective bargaining --	53	41	12
Race/ethnic relations --	58	47	11
Vocational education pro- gram management --	25	23	2
Applied criminology and criminalistics ---	41	46	- 5
Classification/reclass- ification policies ---	51	57	- 6
Personal/family counseling -----	34	43	- 9
Drug abuse/alcohol abuse program management -----	31	31	-10

^a NMS Executive Survey, 1975. Based on responses from 220 correctional executives in state institutions or facilities.

^b Based on responses to question, “Based upon your experience, what kinds of special courses, workshops, training sessions or seminars would you recommend as *especially* useful for your successors to take?”

In short, the survey results indicate that executives recognize the essentiality of systematic training for management positions, particularly in courses related to resource allocations, planning and personnel, but that many have not received specialized training for these functions—even when measured by the necessarily crude yardstick of having attended *any* type of course or training session in the field, no matter how short. Managerial training appears to have been significantly less adequate for correctional executives than for those in the larger law enforcement agencies. In contrast, executives in all categories consider themselves—or their successors—to be much better equipped by training and experience to deal with many of the more substantive professional

TABLE VIII-6

*"Most Needed" Additional Training Courses for Law Enforcement and Correctional Executives,
Based on Differences Between Percentages Recommending and Percentages Who Have Taken Courses*

Type of Agency	Course	Differences between percent recommending and percent who attended courses
Police, "large"	Law enforcement budgeting/planning and evaluation	19
	Labor relations/collective bargaining	14
	Personnel management	7
Police, "small"	Law enforcement budgeting/planning and evaluation	29
	Police administration	21
	Personnel management	16
	Community relations	14
	Police intelligence	9
Sheriffs, "large"	Law enforcement budgeting/planning and evaluation	23
	Personnel management	12
	Community relations	10
	Correctional administration	9
	Law enforcement administration	8
Sheriffs, "small"	Law enforcement budgeting/planning and evaluation	29
	Law enforcement administration	5
	Personnel management	5
	Law enforcement intelligence	5
Adult corrections	Budget management/planning and evaluation	32
	Facility management	25
	Community resource development	24
	Criminal law/correctional law	20
Juvenile corrections	Budget management/planning and evaluation	30
	Facility management	29
	Prevention of disturbances and maintenance of discipline	25
	Crisis intervention	25
	Community resource development	22
Probation and parole	Budgeting/planning and evaluation	21
	Community relations	19
	Identification and use of community resources	16
	Probation/parole administration	14
	Vocational education programs	12

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

aspects of their responsibilities. This is understandable, in view of their typically long experience in the field and of the specialized training in these technical aspects which has been provided to most incumbent executives by agency training programs, and by external sources.

The above findings were confirmed by the results of NMS staff field visits—particularly in the case of corrections agencies. Thus, in summarizing findings with respect to training for administrators of adult corrections facilities, the field analysis report notes: "Almost without exception, the information and evidence collected from field visits to correctional departments and agencies point to the need for administrators to have better planning and management skills. And almost without exception the evidence suggested that training in these areas was inadequate or non-existent."⁵ With respect to administrators in juvenile institutions, the report similarly

notes that "little or no in-service training for administrators is now provided," but that about one-half of the states visited plan to increase or initiate such training in the next 5 years.⁶

C. Current Management Training Programs

Training programs or courses for executives for executives and other management personnel in criminal justice agencies are provided in a wide range of institutional settings, including:

- Local and state law enforcement academies;
- Federal agency programs, such as those of the FBI Academy;
- University-sponsored courses or programs; and
- Programs offered by professional associations, such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Although law enforcement academies or correctional academies have been the major source of in-service training of line officers or supervisors, their role in management training has been quite limited, in view of the small number of managerial personnel available for such training in all but the largest agencies and the reliance of these academies upon part-time staff drawn from the mid-level ranks of the agency itself. Thus, among over 200 law enforcement academies which conducted some in-service training, responding to a survey conducted by the National Association of State Directors of Law Enforcement Training (NASDLET), a total of only 20 courses, each, were reported as being offered in executive or mid-management training subjects. Such courses, where provided, are most likely to be offered by large municipal departments or in state or regional-level academies.

Among federal agencies providing training directly to criminal justice managers or executives, the most prominent is the FBI Academy. The FBI's National Academy offers an 11-week college-level training course to about 1,000 carefully selected personnel of state and local law enforcement agencies each year of whom a large proportion are at the mid-management or supervisory levels. Included in the program, in addition to various courses in such fields as forensics and law, are a number of management training courses, covering specialized subjects such as financial management and police labor relations as well as more general management topics. The Academy also offers numerous short specialized courses as well as field training through its field office staffs, including some courses in law enforcement administration or management.

In Fiscal Year 1976, the FBI instituted a new training program, the National Executive Institute, which is targeted at top management of law enforcement agencies. The initial program, consisting of four separate four-day sessions, was limited to chiefs and sheriffs of the 30 largest departments and included broad coverage of major national crime-related issues and trends, as well as more specific subjects of management interest, such as police labor relations, police-media relations and minority recruitment.

The extent to which the FBI Academy has contributed to the training of law enforcement executives is indicated by the fact that 29 percent of all incumbent police chiefs and 21 percent of sheriffs who responded to the NMS surveys—exclusive of those in the very small police or sheriffs' agencies—had attended the FBI Academy program at some stage in their career. No counterpart to this program exists at present for correctional executives.

A third source of management training—and the most diversified—consists of programs in executive or management training offered by colleges and universities.

These range from courses offered as part of undergraduate or graduate-level criminal justice curricula, or of graduate degree programs in public or business administration, to institutes, seminars or workshops specifically designed for criminal justice executives or management personnel. An examination of course offerings in criminal justice education programs, based on a sampling of school catalogs, suggests that these courses are mainly focused on administrative subjects, rather than on the broader issues of resource allocation, planning and evaluation which were identified as the most critical functional training needs of executives, based on our survey results. This may be attributable, in part, to the fact that the student bodies in these programs consist predominantly of more junior line or supervisory personnel, or of pre-service students, rather than those at the mid-management ranks or above.

Current examples of university programs and cooperative efforts providing for management training include the criminal justice offerings of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Southern California, the State University of New York at Albany, California State University at Long Beach, the Southern Police Institute at the University of Louisville, John Jay College, Babson College (New England Institute of Law Enforcement), and the Traffic Management Institute of Northwestern University.

A large number of universities offer more general executive development or management training programs, usually conducted in separate institutes, workshops or seminars. Analysis of a sample of 23 of these programs indicates that they range in duration from 2 weeks to 14 weeks (with a median length of 5 to 6 weeks). The courses are heavily business-oriented; hence, not well adapted to the special needs and problems of criminal justice or other public administrators.

Finally, professional organizations such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police sponsor a considerable number of training programs—normally short courses of topical interest. Many of these courses relate to substantive law enforcement topics. However, subjects of managerial concern—such as labor relations—are also included.

Although a comprehensive review of course contents for this very diverse range of programs was not practicable, our analysis of the available literature and consultations with management training experts suggest the following generalizations concerning the current programs:

- Management training courses offered in academies or as part of criminal justice curricula tend to deal with the more operational aspects of police or correctional administration, rather than with the

broader issues of primary concern to senior management personnel. This stems, in part, from the composition of their student body, and—in part—from the extensive reliance of these programs on incumbent, or recently retired staff personnel from police or correctional agencies, as the source of faculty recruitment. Hence, they may not be effective as a means of introducing new management methods and perspectives.

- The diverse educational backgrounds of incumbent management personnel poses a difficult problem in design of management training programs. The law enforcement field and—to a lesser extent—the correctional field suffer from an educational “generation gap” in which many senior line management personnel have less formal education than many of their subordinates. Thus, the more theoretical course materials and texts designed for use in conventional academic management courses may not be suitable

for a more mature—but less formally educated—group of law enforcement executives.

- The relatively short length of most criminal justice management training courses has been designed to facilitate attendance by busy executives. The result, however, is often a rather brief and superficial orientation to functional subjects whose effective coverage requires much more extensive treatment. One illustration is provided by training in the field of labor relations. This ranks high among the areas of concern of many police executives, and is of growing importance to correctional executives, as well. The scope of management interest in the collective bargaining process is suggested by the list of issues relevant to various levels of management personnel (Table VIII-7). Adequate coverage of these issues may require specialized training of several weeks, in contrast to the typical “short” courses currently provided.

TABLE VIII-7
Areas of Management Interest in the Collective Bargaining Process

	Top Management	Middle Management	Supervisory (First Line)
Organization:			
Understanding statutory regulations	X	X	X
Solicitation		X	X
Authorization	X	X	X
Petition for recognition		X	
Unfair labor practices		X	X
Recognition:			
Card check	X	X	
Unit determination	X	X	
Elections	X	X	X
Certification	X		
Recognition			
Negotiations:			
Negotiation team	X	X	X
Scope of bargaining	X		
Management rights	X	X	
Good faith bargaining	X	X	
Impasse	X	X	X
Impasse resolution	X		
Contract ratification		X	X
Contract Administration:			
Informing management staff and employees	X	X	
Implementing agreement	X	X	X
Grievance procedure	X	X	X
Preparation for next negotiations	X	X	X
Management Techniques:			
Commitment on part of management	X	X	X
Interpersonal communication	X	X	X
Group decision making	X	X	X
Management by objectives	X	X	X
Organizational development	X	X	X

Source: “Impact of Collective Bargaining on Law Enforcement and Corrections,” *Public Safety Research Institute Inc.*, 1976.

- In addition to courses in specific management functions and skills, there is a need for development of more general management skills, especially for mid-level managers. These relate to problem identification and establishment of management priorities, rather than to the more technical skills associated with problem solving and decision-making. Reviews of existing criminal justice management courses suggest insufficient emphasis on problem identification as a training objective. Increased emphasis is needed, too, on strengthening of leadership skills, which relate to development of peer relationships, motivation of subordinates, negotiation, resolution of conflicts and decision-making under conditions of ambiguity and risk.
- Finally, in contrast to the variety of specialized and uncoordinated management training courses currently available, there is a need for development of an integrated, vertical sequence of management training courses, closely geared to overall agency career development objectives. Management training experts from both the public and private sector who participated in an NMS panel on the subject strongly endorsed the development of an integrated program with continuity from first line supervisors through top managers.

D. Summary and Recommendations

The preceding sections have documented significant quantitative and qualitative deficiencies in the training and education of criminal justice executives and other managerial personnel, for performance of key managerial functions:

- The need for comprehensive, systematic management training programs for criminal justice executives is particularly critical because neither their formal educational backgrounds nor their prior experience, typically in line law enforcement or correctional positions, have adequately prepared many of them for key managerial-level roles and responsibilities. These roles, moreover, are undergoing major changes as a result of recent developments affecting law enforcement and correctional programs, of growing pressures for public accountability, and the growth of public sector unionism.
- Substantial proportions of law enforcement or corrections executives have never received any specialized training in such key functions as budget management, planning and evaluation or personnel management, even though these are given high priority by executives as essential areas of management training.

- Although a considerable variety of separate management training and education courses are available, many of these programs are too fragmented, too short and specialized or—when university sponsored—are often too theoretical in content and approach. An integrated approach to criminal justice management training, as part of a comprehensive career development program for managers and executives, is generally lacking.

To remedy these deficiencies, we recommend that LEAA place high priority on (1) planning and development of comprehensive management training and education programs for criminal justice executives, including development of model curricula and course sequences, suitable for each level from first-level supervisor to top executives, and (2) establishment of regional educational centers for criminal justice management personnel for conducting such programs. The planning should be conducted with active participation, in each region, of state planning and training agencies, of state operating agencies and of leading educators in the field of management development. We believe that a broad regional approach is needed to provide an adequate institutional base, in terms of highly qualified faculty, curriculum development, use of advanced training methods and an affiliated research program. Emphasis in curricula should be placed on development of broad leadership and managerial skills, as well as on those functional areas where additional training is found to be most needed, by various categories of executives.

The establishment of regional centers does not preclude the continuance of university-based management training programs. Academic credit arrangements should be made with universities to provide incentives for supervisors, mid-level managers, and executives to complete degree programs in public management and administration, or in criminal justice with management emphasis. The intent of the centers should be to provide more accessible courses and to integrate courses to meet specific agency training needs. Special programs on a continuing basis should be established within the centers to include the senior level officials: state and local executives, judicial and legislative officials, state planning executives, and other senior officials. In addition, each center should establish and maintain a personnel assessment facility to advise agencies on the selection and career development of supervisors, mid-level managers, and top executives.

Existing management training centers operated under state auspices may be found to meet the needs of some areas for regional centers. Private executive training programs furnishing training in certain subject matter could be integrated in the regional centers. Regional centers

might be established in an academic setting, utilizing existing programs.

Instructor training programs should be provided in conjunction with center programs, and should introduce knowledge of educational technology. Most instructors should have had experience within the criminal justice system. Rotating instructorships could be geared to agency manager development programs, with a stint at the center for 1-2 years being an integral part of career development.

The urgent need for improved management training suggests that regional management development centers be established as soon as possible, if funding can be provided. In order to facilitate this action, a national advisory planning group should be established to develop program offerings and the administrative structure for these centers.

In advancing this recommendation, as one of the highest priority areas for educational and training assistance, we are fully cognizant of the costs entailed in establishing intensive management training programs, specially designed to meet the needs of the criminal justice system. We are also aware that it may be difficult to attract to these courses, for periods as long as three months, the type of busy executives and upwardly-mobile mid-management personnel who can most benefit from such

training, and who are or will be in a position to apply this training to the management process in their own agencies. We believe the latter obstacle can be overcome if emphasis is placed upon making the proposed training institutions truly "centers of excellence" in the field of management training and by gearing program content and methods to meeting the capabilities, interests and needs of the potential student body. With respect to costs, we can identify few other investments in the field of training and academic assistance which have higher potential returns, in terms of achieving needed improvements in orientation, organization and operation of our nation's law enforcement and criminal justice agencies.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Based on NMS Analysis of Census Survey of Criminal Justice Personnel, 1974, and on supplementary source data for correctional agencies.
2. Peter Drucker, *Management* (Harper, 1974), pp. 158-166.
3. The Montgomery County, Maryland Police Department study in *Management by Objectives Manual* (Montgomery County Department of Police, June 1976).
4. Ilene Bergsmann, *Police Unions* (International City Management Association, March 1976), p. 3.
5. NMS Final Report, Volume VIII, Part 2, p. 407.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 479, 489.

CHAPTER IX. PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING FOR JUDICIAL PROCESS OCCUPATIONS

This chapter reviews the specialized training needs of judges, prosecutors and indigent defense counsel and of professional court administrators, and assesses the adequacy of current programs in relation to these needs.

In view of the pivotal role of the law school as the primary source of specialized professional education for most of these occupations, the initial section of this chapter includes data on the extent to which undergraduate law school programs provide adequate preparation for future criminal justice practitioners and identifies those skill or knowledge needs which require supplemental agency training.

The following three sections review, separately, the current scope of entry-level and in-service training, for staff attorneys in prosecution and indigent defense agencies, for chief prosecutors and defenders, and for judges.

The professional court administrator—his functions, characteristics and training needs—are discussed in the final section, based on the results of the NMS survey of incumbent state and local court administrators.

A. The Role of Law Schools in Preparation for Criminal Justice Careers

Graduation from a law school is a requirement for admission into the bar in almost all states. As noted in Chapter V, most newly recruited attorneys in prosecution and indigent defense agencies enter these positions shortly after law school graduation, with little or no previous trial experience. Similarly, a large proportion of newly elected or appointed judges are likely to have had limited experience in criminal justice practice. Thus, the extent to which undergraduate law school education prepares graduates for roles in the criminal justice field has important implications for their ability to perform effectively in these positions.

The prevailing educational philosophy of the undergraduate law schools focuses on mastery of legal analytical skills, combined with a broad overview of the substantive principles of law. Since formal accredited specialization—analogueous to that in the medical field—has not yet emerged in the practice of law, emphasis is

on introductory and broad survey courses, and on development of basic legal research and analytical skills, to develop the competence of "thinking as a lawyer." This philosophy implies that the more practical legal skills, including pretrial and trial procedures, as well as specialized expertise in particular fields of law, will be mainly acquired through a process of on-the-job "apprenticeship" or practical experience, either as a law clerk or as a junior practicing attorney.

An analysis of criminal law course offerings of ABA accredited law schools indicates that, in 1975, nearly all law schools had an established requirement for completion of a course in either criminal law or criminal procedures by first-year students and that, between 1966 and 1975, there was a modest overall increase in the proportion of criminal justice courses in the total law school curriculum—from 4.3 percent in 1966 to 6.8 percent in 1975. However, only one-third or fewer of the law schools offered advanced courses or seminars in criminal law or process or on related criminal justice subjects.

A sample analysis of course contents and texts, moreover, indicated a number of significant limitations of these materials, from the standpoint of preparing law school graduates for criminal law practice. Thus, in most law school texts, procedural matters are presented in a manner that emphasizes constitutional issues rather than addressing the dynamics of criminal justice procedures, e.g., the role of plea bargaining and its relationship to prosecutor charging and judicial sentencing practices.

In order to compensate, in part, for the limited coverage of procedural subjects and of related operational skills, a large and growing proportion of law schools offer clinical experience to advanced undergraduate law students, normally in their third year. In 1975, 124 of the 163 ABA-accredited law schools offered clinical law programs.¹ Of these, 65 percent included a criminal justice component: defense, prosecution, or corrections. Such programs, in conjunction with summer internships in prosecution and defender agencies, provide day-to-day exposure to the realities of criminal justice operations.

The NMS executive surveys indicated that 55 percent of prosecutors and 59 percent of defenders gave hiring preference to law students with clinical law experience.

About 11 percent of the reporting prosecutors permitted law students to prosecute felony cases under supervision. An additional 15 percent permitted misdemeanor prosecution by law students in their offices.

At the same time, it must be recognized that only about 20 percent of all law graduates were found to have clinical law experience, and a much smaller percentage have criminal law experience.² Thus, clinical programs for criminal law are still more important for their potential, than for their present, contributions.

The limitations of undergraduate law school programs as a direct preparation for the positions of assistant prosecutor and assistant defender—suggested by the preceding analyses—are further confirmed by responses of chief prosecutors and public defenders to the NMS survey. As shown in Table IX-1, a large proportion of the respondents considered law school graduates as inadequately prepared for such functions as trial advocacy, criminal trial procedure, and juvenile family law and court procedures, in contrast to much more favorable assessments of their preparation on such subjects as substantive criminal law, constitutional law and legal ethics.

TABLE IX-1
Assessment of Adequacy of Preparation of Law School Graduates by Heads of Prosecution/Defense Offices^a

Functional Area of Preparation	Percent of Office Heads Assessing Preparation as Adequate	
	Prosecution	Defense
Juvenile family law and court procedure -----	36	18
Criminal trial procedure -----	32	27
Trial advocacy -----	32	26
Law of evidence -----	60	53
Substantive criminal law -----	64	60
Constitutional law -----	79	79
Legal ethics -----	85	74

^a Percentages adjusted for "no response."

Source: National Manpower Survey, Prosecutors and Public Defenders, 1975.

One of the results of inadequate preparation of most law school graduates for criminal justice-related positions is to place a greater burden upon employing agencies to provide supplementary training to newly hired personnel, through closely supervised on-the-job learning experiences, as well as formal courses. The following summary, based on the report of NMS field visits to a number of large and medium-sized prosecution and defender offices, describes the prevailing practice in these offices:

"Once hired, new attorneys are never sent into the courtroom to sink or swim. Every office (of those visited) has some system for developing

the attorney's skills without causing undue harm to the office, the public or the accused. In addition to formal and informal orientation programs, the young attorney is led through a series of assignments graduated in difficulty . . . The length of time spent in each of these training cycles varies with the individual and the opportunities to move, but most offices feel that it takes a year to become a minimally competent trial attorney."³

It must be emphasized, however, that the above description of practice in larger prosecution or public defender agencies clearly cannot apply to the situation of the large number of smaller offices often staffed by only one or two attorneys. The latter offices normally have little or no in-house training capabilities. Moreover, it is clear that, in view of the high turnover among these staff attorneys, a substantial proportion have less than the minimum length of experience needed to become "minimally competent" in the full range of required skills.

From the standpoint of the law schools, the following improvements are therefore recommended:

- Increased emphasis should be placed on closely supervised clinical programs, preferably in the setting of an operational agency.
- Curriculum offerings in criminal justice should be expanded with increased emphasis on practical legal skills.
- Faculty and institutional improvement should also be encouraged by supporting such activities as greater involvement in criminal justice research, internships in criminal justice agencies and development of better linkages between law faculty and operating criminal justice agencies.

B. Assistant Prosecutor and Defender Training

1. *Background.* Since the publication of the Wickersham Commission reports in 1931, there has been growing national recognition of the need to improve the competencies of judicial process personnel for effective and equitable administration of justice.⁴ This was reaffirmed by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967.⁵ Similarly, the American Bar Association Project on Criminal Justice Standards called for in-house training of prosecutors, supplementing earlier ABA standards which advocated defense training.⁶ The most recent and fullest expression of national concern for adequate training was that of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (NAC), which proposed formal entry-level training programs for all newly appointed assistant prosecutors and defenders, as well as

provision of in-service training and continuing legal education programs on a systematic basis.⁷

The NAC report included a number of specific recommendations on training content:

- *Prosecution training.* Entry training for new assistant prosecutors should begin with orientation into office structure, procedure, and policies; the local court system; and the operation of the police agencies, lasting about one week. In-service training should feature seminars on such subjects as law of search and seizure, confessions, substantive criminal law, exercise of prosecutorial discretion, and trial strategy.
- *Defender training.* Training content for defenders would vary according to its source. National training would emphasize entry-level skills in a two- to four-week program on such topics as constitutional law, trial skills, criminal investigation, and appellate advocacy. Local orientation programs should emphasize local court structure and procedure, bail practice, office procedure, plea negotiation practices of the prosecutor, and community resources available to aid the defendant in formulating sentencing alternatives. Statewide training for new defenders should offer substantive criminal law procedure and post-conviction remedies unique to the state.

Since the establishment of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, substantial progress has been made in strengthening the institutional infrastructure for provision of judicial process training and education, in accordance with some of the key Commission recommendations. With the stimulus of LEAA assistance and growing state recognition of the need for judicial and legal continuing education, there now exist national, state, and local training and continuing legal education (CLE) programs in far greater numbers than in the past. LEAA funding supports the two national colleges for defense and prosecution. A National Institute for Trial Advocacy assists both defense and prosecution in acquiring these crucial skills. Block grant funding by LEAA has supported the establishment of statewide prosecutor and defense training agencies and programs, and has enabled local agency personnel to be paid travel and other expenses to attend national training programs. In addition to these direct training efforts, LEAA funding also supports a variety of technical assistance programs and provides limited management and planning training as well.

2. *Occupational analysis findings.* Confirmation of the importance of adequate entry-level training for assistant prosecutors and defenders was provided by the results of NMS field occupational analyses of prosecutor and defender tasks and training needs.

Prosecutors—Among the prosecutor tasks which ranked high in terms of time spent were development of evidence through interviews and other sources, negotiation with defense counsel and actual prosecution of cases in a criminal court. Substantial proportions of respondents indicated that they had insufficient training for these tasks, ranging from 19 percent for negotiation with defense counsel, to 30 percent for court trial prosecution, and 40 percent for development of evidence and related screening activities.

The level of proficiency of typical newly assigned prosecutors was reported to be below the level needed for capable performance for all major aspects of task-related skills and knowledges including, particularly, knowledge of jurisdictional rules and procedures, knowledge of criminal law procedures, case preparation practices and conduct of trials.

Defenders—The responses of public defender staff suggested even more pronounced deficiencies in prior training for key tasks than those for the prosecutors. An average of about 40 percent of those interviewed reported they had received insufficient training for such tasks as interviewing clients, review of evidence, negotiation with prosecutors or judges, and representation at clients' trials or sentencing. In all of these and in related practical legal tasks and knowledges, the defenders had relied primarily upon on-the-job learning, and—minimally—upon their law school education as the source of training. With limited exceptions, the proficiency of typical newly assigned personnel was found to be much lower, on all of the applied skill and knowledge requirements, than that considered needed for effective job performance.⁸

The implications of this field assessment are clear. Significant proportions of the practitioners in both occupations who were interviewed by the NMS staff considered themselves inadequately trained for some of their major tasks, and virtually all considered that newly recruited personnel were generally deficient in the practical skills and knowledges required for effective performance of these roles.

It must be emphasized that the above findings were based on small and not necessarily representative samples. They are, however, consistent both with the assessments of the limitations of existing legal education and training programs, made by the National Advisory Commission and other expert groups, and with related findings on the criminal justice content of undergraduate law school programs, reviewed in the preceding section.

3. *Entry-level training programs.* As indicated in the preceding section, the development of the needed professional skills of attorneys—whether in criminal or civil practice—relies upon a process of on-the-job experience

and specialized training to supplement the broad foundations provided in undergraduate law school courses. Traditionally this process—in common with that in many other professional and skilled occupations—has consisted primarily of progressive assignments under supervision of more senior personnel, i.e., informal on-the-job orientation and “learning by doing.” Exclusive reliance upon this process has some obvious limitations, as previously noted, particularly in small organizations and in situations where workload pressures compel immediate assignment of junior attorneys to more complex and demanding tasks. These have resulted in development of more formal entry-level training, or orientation, programs for both assistant prosecutors and defenders, normally provided shortly after their entry into employment.

Not all new entrants to assistant prosecutor or defender positions have an equal need for such training. Based on responses to NMS surveys of chief prosecutors and defenders, we have estimated that about one-fifth of all assistant prosecutors, and about one-third of assistant public defenders, hired in 1974–75 had prior trial experience, while others may have become familiar with agency practices through prior experience with the agency as an intern, in a clinical program or as a law clerk. Nevertheless, as suggested by the results of the NMS field analyses, most entrants do need systematic orientation or entry-level training.

The extent of such training is summarized in Tables IX–2 and IX–3. Nearly one-half of all prosecutor and defender offices reported that their agency provided no formal entry-level training or that such training was limited to brief orientations of one day or less; about one-fourth, in each case reported that these courses lasted from two days up to one week, while only 8

percent of all agencies offered entry courses lasting more than two weeks.

Among prosecution agencies, the larger agencies were much more likely to have formal entry training programs than smaller offices. As a result, a weighted average, based on total employment in each agency size group, indicates that prosecution agencies employing about two-thirds of all assistant prosecutors offered formal entry training of two days or more to newly hired assistant prosecutors. The average length of training courses was also significantly higher in the larger offices. Thus, about one-half of all agencies with 10 or more assistant prosecutors met the recommended NAC standard of courses of one week or longer, as compared to less than one-fourth of the smallest agencies:

Available evidence suggests that there has been a significant growth in both prosecutor and defender training programs since the late 1960's. A major factor has been the growth of statewide training programs, particularly for prosecutors. Thus one recent study, by the National District Attorneys Association indicates that 29 states had statewide training programs that provided training to both new assistants and new chief prosecutors.⁹

4. *In-service training.* The NMS survey also requested information on the provision of in-service training, or continuing legal education, to experienced attorneys, i.e., those without at least one year of experience within the agency. In the case of prosecution agencies, about two-thirds of all agencies and about 90 percent of the larger agencies reported that they provided some assistance for external continuing education in the field of prosecution, whether in the form of administrative leave, tuition support or other means. Nearly three-fourths of all public defender agencies (74 percent) simi-

TABLE IX–2

Percent of Prosecution Agencies Providing Formal Entry-Level Training for Assistant Prosecutors and Length of Training, by Agency Size, 1975
(Percent distribution)

Length of Training	All Agencies	Agency Size—Number of Assistant Prosecutors			
		1–4	5–9	10–24	25 and Over
No formal training	38.1	45.1	31.4	15.9	10.2
One day or less (basic orientation only)	8.5	8.0	11.0	7.2	10.2
Total, none or one day or less	46.6	53.1	42.4	23.1	20.4
Two days to one week	25.8	23.9	31.4	31.9	25.4
One to two weeks	19.4	16.6	21.2	27.5	32.2
More than two weeks	8.2	6.4	5.1	17.4	20.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of reports	(811)	(565)	(118)	(69)	(59)

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975. Covers state and county prosecution or legal services agencies. Responses are for agencies with one or more assistant prosecutors.

TABLE IX-3

Percent of Public Defender Agencies Providing Formal Entry-Level Training for Assistant Defenders and Length of Training, 1975

Length of Training	Percent of Agencies
None	32
One day or less (orientation only)	15
Total, none or one day or less	47
Two days to one week	24
One or two weeks	21
More than two weeks	8
Total	100

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975. Based on 191 responses.

larly provided such assistance. However, only about one-third, in each category, had established policies requiring experienced assistant prosecutors to participate in some type of job-related continuing education. Considerably smaller percentages—28 percent of the defender offices and 15 percent of the prosecution offices—reported that they provided in-house formal in-service training, and these consisted predominantly of the larger agencies, i.e., those with 25 or more employees. A supplemental survey of 32 contract defender offices in larger cities also found that such training was limited to agencies with 25 or more staff attorneys.

Some indication of the sources of external training is provided by responses to a question requesting executives to identify the agencies from which their office had received assistance for training, including training provided to chief prosecutors or defenders as well as to staff attorneys. For prosecution offices, the major sources of training, as shown in Table IX-4, included two national-level organizations—the National District Attorneys Association and the National College of District Attorneys, followed by programs sponsored or operated by state level prosecution or attorney general offices and by the state bar associations. Similarly, the corresponding national-level defender institutions—the National College of Criminal Justice Lawyers and Public Defenders and the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association—were among the major providers of continuing legal education for public defenders, followed by the state defender office and state bar associations.

Information on training content was also obtained, for both entry and in-service training, from those agencies which conducted in-house training programs. With limited exceptions, general subject coverage of in-service programs was found to parallel those of the entry-level courses. For prosecution agencies, topics such as constitutional law, law of evidence and criminal trial procedures were included by nearly all programs.

TABLE IX-4

Sources of Training Assistance for Prosecution and Defender Offices

Source	Percent Receiving Assistance	
	Prosecution Offices	Defender Offices
National District Attorneys Association	38%	—
National College of District Attorneys	29	—
National College of Criminal Defense Lawyers and Public Defenders	—	32
National Legal Aid and Defenders Association	—	17
State Prosecutor Office	27	—
State Defender Office	—	21
State Bar Association	22	15
State Attorney General	20	—
Accredited Law Schools	12	5

Source: NMS Executive Surveys, 1975. Percentages not additive since agencies may use multiple training sources.

Certain procedural subjects, such as screening policies and charging practices were more frequently covered in entry-level courses, while in-service programs more frequently included topics such as trial advocacy and substantive criminal law developments. Subjects which were less frequently covered included juvenile and family law procedure, pretrial diversion and appellate advocacy, in part because many prosecution agencies and/or staffs do not have responsibility for these functions. Similar patterns were evident in the responses of defender agencies, with subjects such as constitutional law and criminal trial procedure ranking high in both entry and in-service courses, while procedural subjects such as case investigation, plea negotiation practices and preliminary hearing procedures received more emphasis in the entry-level courses.

5. *Adequacy of staff training programs.* The above survey findings have documented some of the positive aspects as well as quantitative limitations, of available training programs for prosecution and defender staffs. As compared to the situation in the late 1960's, substantial progress has been made in establishment of an infrastructure for provision of training, including the combined resources of in-house programs, statewide programs and national-level programs. The most apparent deficiencies are the continued absence of entry level and/or in-service training opportunities for staff in many of the smaller agencies and the very short duration of most of the available entry courses. This implies heavy reliance upon on-the-job training and experience as the primary method of professional development. Unfortunately, heavy

agency workloads and the limited availability of supervisory or senior personnel, for this purpose, afford limited opportunities for systematic "on-the-job" training in many agencies.

Confirmation for the above assessment was provided by responses of chief prosecutors and defenders to the following question: "On the whole, how satisfied are you with all aspects of training at your office?" The choices available, as shown in Table IX-5, ranged from "extremely satisfied" to "extremely dissatisfied." As in the case of responses by other categories of criminal justice administrators, summarized in Chapter VII, the most frequent response—indicated by nearly one-half of the prosecutors and defenders—was "satisfied." A more sensitive index of degree of satisfaction is provided, however, by the ratio of those expressing varying degrees of dissatisfaction, to those who indicated that they were "extremely" or "very" satisfied with their agencies' programs. These "dissatisfaction ratios" exceeded four to one for both prosecutors and defenders, and were higher than for any other category of criminal justice executive surveyed, with the exception of heads of juvenile correctional agencies.

Executives were also queried as to the extent to which each of several factors was a limitation on the overall effectiveness of training in their offices. These included such constraints as inadequate training budgets, high workloads and lack of the necessary training responses in their areas. Although inadequate training budgets were most frequently cited as a serious limitation by both prosecutors and defenders, the effect of high agency workloads in limiting availability of staff for training purposes was also cited as a serious limitation by nearly one-half of the respondents. Hence provision of additional training funds may not, alone, be sufficient to assure that personnel will be available for needed training in many agencies.

C. Training for Chief Prosecutors and Defenders

The preceding section has focused on training provided to staff attorneys—assistant prosecutors and defenders—rather on the training needs of heads of prosecution and public defender agencies. The professional tasks performed by many chief prosecutors and defenders in small offices overlap with, and are frequently identical to, those performed by the staff attorneys in larger offices. Thus, among all chief prosecutors and defenders responding to the NMS survey, 69 percent of the prosecutors and 53 percent of the defenders identified the task of preparation, supervision and review of legal cases among the three major responsibilities which were

TABLE IX-5
*Overall Satisfaction of Chief Prosecutors and Defenders
With Agency Training Program*

Satisfaction Rating	Percent Distributions	
	Prosecutors	Defenders
Extremely satisfied -----	3	3
Very satisfied -----	7	8
Satisfied -----	47	44
Dissatisfied -----	37	35
Very Dissatisfied -----	3	4
Extremely dissatisfied -----	3	6
Total -----	100	100
Ratio of all "dissatisfied" to "highly" or "very" satisfied -----	4.3:1	4.1:1
Number -----	(812)	(160)

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975.

most important in their position, as compared to much smaller proportions who indicated that their managerial or liaison duties were the most demanding. However, in larger jurisdictions, the role of the chief prosecutor and chief defender becomes that of a manager, who—in addition to direct participation in, or supervision of, the more important and difficult legal prosecution and defense cases—must also establish office policies, serve as the official spokesman and representative of his agency with other governmental agencies and the community, and must conduct all the normal responsibilities of management, including settling priorities, monitoring case flows, and fiscal and personnel administration. Moreover, although prosecutors and defenders may enter these positions—whether through election or appointment—with varying degrees of competency and experience in criminal law practice, they are, with few exceptions, lacking in professional preparation for many of their policy and managerial responsibilities.

For this reason, chief prosecutors and defenders were requested, in the NMS survey, to identify those specialized training subjects, or courses, which they would recommend as being especially helpful for future incumbents in their position, as well as to separately indicate which of these courses they themselves had taken. A total of 16 areas was listed, ranging from traditional legal subjects, such as constitutional law and trial advocacy, and more specialized technical subjects, such as forensic pathology, to non-legal subjects, including general management training, human relations and community relations. Their responses are summarized in Tables IX-6 and IX-7.

In response to the question concerning recommended specialized training courses for chief prosecutors and

defenders, the types of course most frequently recommended by both categories were those related to professional legal subjects: law of evidence, trial advocacy, constitutional law and substantive criminal law developments. These were the only subjects recommended—in that order—by one-half or more of both the prosecutors and public defenders responding to the NMS survey. Since over three-fourths of the prosecutors in this survey, and nearly 60 percent of the defenders, were in small agencies—those with fewer than 10 employees—this emphasis upon professional legal subjects is understandable. In the latter agencies, particularly, the principal tasks of the prosecutor or defender are directly related to actual handling of cases or to direct supervision or review of the work of staff attorneys.

One method for identifying significant gaps in prosecutor and defender training programs is to compare the proportions of respondents recommending particular training subjects with the proportions who have actually received training in these subjects. These differences are shown in the last columns of Tables IX-6 and IX-7. For prosecutors, these differences were 20 percent or higher in the following subjects: law of evidence (34 percent), trial advocacy (29 percent), community relations (23 percent), constitutional law (21 percent), juvenile law (20 percent), and human relations (20 percent). For defenders, the "most needed" additional training courses, based on this criterion, were: human relations (27 percent), general management/administration (26 percent),

psychiatry and the law (23 percent) and community relations (20 percent). Thus, for both prosecutors and defenders, these comparisons indicate, that in addition to further specialized courses in legal subjects, there is a need for increased emphasis on certain subjects outside of the traditional CLE curricula and which provide needed perspectives to prosecutors and defenders in their roles as criminal justice executives. The limited exposure to such training for prosecutors and defenders is illustrated by the fact that only about 5 percent of the respondents had taken any specialized courses in community relations or human relations, and that only about one-fifth had taken a course in management subjects.

Chief prosecutors and defenders were also queried as to whether they had taken any comprehensive or "omnibus" prosecutor training courses, of the type offered by the National Colleges of District Attorneys or Defenders, or by state prosecutor or defenders training programs. A majority of the respondents—56 percent of the prosecutors and 61 percent of the defenders—reported that they had attended such courses. Based on responses to this and the preceding questions, it appears that a large proportion of all incumbent prosecutors and defenders have had some specialized post-law school training relevant to their current position. However, in view of the brief duration of most of the available training courses and of their primary focus upon professional legal content, there have been significant gaps in adequacy of this training—particularly for the policy and managerial aspects of their positions.

TABLE IX-6

Recommended Specialized Courses and Actual Courses Taken by Chief Prosecutors, 1975

Training Topic	Percent Recommending Course	Percent Who Attended Course	Difference (1)-(2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Law of evidence	73	39	34
Trial advocacy	71	42	29
Constitutional law developments	55	39	16
Juvenile justice law	37	17	20
General management/Administration	37	19	18
Jury selection	36	21	15
Scientific evidence identification	36	22	14
Plea negotiation practices	30	15	15
Community relations	29	6	23
Forensic pathology	26	14	12
Psychiatry and the law	25	13	12
Human relations	25	5	20
Appellate advocacy	20	7	13
Program management (e.g., pre-trial diversion, defender prosecution)	20	10	10
Polygraph use	13	9	4

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975 (N=1344).

TABLE IX-7

Recommended Specialized Courses and Actual Courses Taken by Chief Defenders, 1975

Training Topic	Percent Recommending Course	Percent Who Attended Course	Difference (1)-(2)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Law of evidence -----	62	44	18
Trial advocacy -----	61	46	15
Constitutional law -----	56	47	9
Substantive criminal law developments -----	51	41	10
General management/Administration -----	49	23	26
Psychiatry and the law -----	41	18	23
Scientific evidence identification -----	37	29	8
Jury selection -----	36	25	11
Human relations -----	33	6	27
Plea negotiation practices -----	31	19	12
Appellate advocacy -----	31	14	17
Forensic pathology -----	31	18	13
Juvenile justice law -----	30	16	14
Community relations -----	24	4	20
Program management (e.g., pre-trial diversion, defender prosecution) -----	20	8	14
Polygraph use -----	19	16	3

Source: NMS Executive Survey, 1975 (N=252).

D. Judicial Training

1. *Judicial functions and training needs.* The judicial role entails tasks and responsibilities distinctive from those required for general law practice. These include such basic duties as presiding over criminal trials and hearings, setting bond, issuing instructions to juries, imposing sentences and management of the court calendars. NMS field staff conducted interviews with about 40 judges, most of whom presided over courts of general jurisdiction. Of those interviewed, 20 percent reported that they had received insufficient training for presiding over criminal trials, 24 percent were insufficiently trained for their sentencing roles, and 37 percent, for management of the criminal calendars. These and almost all other specialized judicial tasks had been primarily learned "on-the-job." Formal training ranked second—but much lower—in order of importance, while law school education was consistently ranked last as a source of training for judicial skills.

Analysis of responses to the skill and knowledge checklist for judges revealed that in almost every category the level of proficiency of typical newly assigned judges was substantially below that considered necessary for capable performance. The gaps appeared to be particularly critical in such areas as knowledge of criminal law rules and procedures, policy regarding exercise of discretion, conduct of trials and sentencing practices.

Unlike many other countries, the United States does not provide any formal pre-service education or training

to specifically prepare individuals for serving as judges. Since most judges are either elected or are appointed by political officials, selection criteria vary widely from state to state and by type of court. Even a law school education is not always a requirement for selection in the case of many limited jurisdiction courts. In view of these limitations, particular emphasis has been placed by the various national commission studies upon provision of, and improvement of, judicial training.

Thus, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals recommended that each state should maintain a comprehensive program of continuing judicial education, including establishment of its own state judicial college and a requirement that all new trial judges should attend both local and national orientation programs as well as one of the national judicial education courses within three years of assuming judicial office.¹⁰

2. *Recent developments.* Prior to the advent of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration little specialized training was available for judges other than that provided in a few national programs. One of the first of these programs, the Appellate Judges Seminar sponsored by the Institute for Judicial Administration, was initiated in 1956. In the early 1960's, the National Colleges for State Trial Judges and Juvenile Justice were established. But no national training programs were yet available for the great majority of the judiciary, particularly those judges serving in courts of limited jurisdiction.

Since the establishment of the LEAA, considerable

progress in judicial training has been made. In addition to the three earlier programs, LEAA discretionary funding now supports judicial training through the American Academy for Judicial Education and the American Bar Association Appellate Judges' Conferences. LEAA assistance has also contributed to establishment of and strengthening of state judicial training programs, and a number of states have established training requirements for their judicial personnel.

The current status of these programs is reviewed in the following sections, based primarily on NMS field visits to selected court systems in ten states and on summary data from other recent surveys.

3. *Entry-level training.* Table IX-8 summarizes the extent to which states (including the District of Columbia) provide entry-level training for new judges. Despite the critical need for such training, only about one-half of the states provided such training for new judges in courts of general jurisdiction and only about two-fifths, in courts of limited jurisdictions. Of the 38 states still employing lay justices of the peace, 26 provided entry training for these personnel.

TABLE IX-8

Number of States Providing Entry Training for New Judges, by Type of Court, 1975

	General Court	Limited Court ^a	Lay Justice of Peace ^b
Number of states with specified type of court -----	51	47	38
Number of states providing training -----	24	19	26

^a Excludes states with unified court systems that have no lower court and no separate training for parajudicial personnel.

^b States with lay justice training provided by attorney general or a judicial association are included in this table.

Source: NMS Survey of State Court System Administrators and National Center for State Courts data file.

While entry training may be available, it is not necessarily mandatory nor is it always utilized. Only seven states require entry training for all judges; one state requires entry training only for its general court judges, and two states require entry training only for limited court judges. Twenty-one states do not require entry training for any judges, but provide entry training with attendance voluntary for trial judges. In many instances, judges are "expected" to attend training, although it is voluntary.

Several of the states listed as providing entry training for trial judges in Table IX-8 do not provide the training themselves, but use one or more LEAA-funded national judicial training programs. A few other states send

judges for entry training to the National Colleges in Reno, Nevada; Denver, Colorado; or Boulder, Colorado.

In addition to formal training programs, in at least 13 states an "advisory," or experienced, judge volunteers to assist new trial judges.¹¹ In many of these states, the judicial education office has prepared guides to assist the advisory judge. It is often suggested that new judges first sit as observers on the bench beside the advisor judge, before taking cases.

Other orientation programs in various jurisdictions are offered during the course of the incumbent's first year and concentrate on problems identified by the new judges as well as selected substantive law and procedural issues. Some judges prefer this type of orientation program to preservice training because it offers judges time to gain practical experience prior to classroom training. The teaching techniques utilized in orientation programs are similar to other in-service sessions and may include: lecture, seminars, workshops, film, and video tape presentations. The time set aside for orientation training may range from a long weekend session to a two week course totaling over 64 hours of instruction. In the latter case, instructional materials developed by the training coordinators have filled five volumes consisting of over 2,500 pages.

4. *In-service judicial education.* As shown in Table IX-9, all but a few states report that they have some on-going state-coordinated program for continuing education of their judicial personnel in 1976. In-service training programs were reported as provided for general court judges in 46 states and the District of Columbia, and in 44 jurisdictions, for limited court judges. (In two states, there are no limited courts). A smaller number—31 states—reported such programs for state appellate court judges.

A majority of states offering judicial training programs use a combination of in-state and national training resources. However, a number of states—typically those with smaller numbers of judges—relied solely upon national judicial training programs. These data were based upon reports submitted to NMS by state court administrative officials, supplemented by data available from the National Center for State Courts. However, a review of LEAA block grants for 1975 indicated that three of the four states which did not report a state-wide judicial training program had received 1975 LEAA funding for sending some local trial judges to national programs. Thus, virtually all states now appear to have some provision for continuing education of their judicial personnel.

a. *State programs.* Based on NMS field visits to 10 states, the state-level training programs offered to sitting judges are very diverse in their structure and content. In some states, format and subject matter is modified from

TABLE IX-9

Number of States Providing In-Service Judicial Education by Type of Judge, and by Source of Training, 1976^a

Source of Training	Category of Judge		
	Appellate	General Trial Court	Limited Jurisdiction Court ^b
Total, all sources -----	31	47	44
In-state only -----	11	6	11
In-state and national	8	32	27
National only -----	12	9	6

^a Including the District of Columbia.

^b Two jurisdictions do not have limited courts nor parajudicial officials with criminal law responsibilities.

Sources: NMS Survey of State Court Administrator Offices, 1976 and National Center for State Courts data file, 1976.

year to year, whereas other states have established more standardized structures. The types of state in-service training seem to be organized into four different models, in the jurisdictions visited, including: (1) an "adjunct" program; (2) a weekend training session; (3) a special training session or institute; and (4) a more comprehensive "omnibus" training course.

- The adjunct program is so identified because it is usually offered as part of some other judicial activity, usually the annual or semi-annual meeting of the judicial conference made up of either all or specific classes of judges within a state. Usually held on a weekend at a hotel or conference center, these sessions provide lectures and workshops on preselected topics such as evidence, recent decisions, rules changes or sentencing. This training model was considered of limited value by some respondents because it is mixed with other business and social events; hence training "may get lost in the shuffle."
- The second model is a two or three day session—traditionally held on weekends—which is devoted exclusively to training and held once or twice a year. Normally the agenda will include five or six topics of general interest to all judges such as evidence, recent developments in the law, recent appellate court actions, sentencing, and one or two special topics such as taking guilty pleas, or judicial relationships with the press. A number of states now mandate that all judges receive some continuing legal education each year, and this type of program or model usually provides a way to meet such requirements. One alternative approach to this model was to offer two programs, one in the spring and one in the fall, making attendance at one mandatory and attendance at the other optional.
- The third model is the special session; it is usually

directed at a special group of judges and deals with one special topic for a short period of time. For example, one state visited has an annual sentencing institute; only issues related to this topic will be on the agenda. A program at one of these sessions might include presentations by members of various post adjudicatory agencies such as the parole board, community-based treatment programs, and drug and alcoholic diversion programs. In addition to lectures, workshops are often used as are video taped mock sentencing proceedings, so judges may observe their behavior and be critiqued. As with most other training session, key speakers from national organizations or other court systems make presentations on timely topics. Another type of special session is directed at special classes of judges and even non-judicial personnel. For example, many states have annual sessions for traffic court or juvenile court judges. State training offices are also providing programs for court clerks, reporters and even bailiffs or court officers at special seminars held annually.

- The final model is a longer term training program lasting up to two weeks and just beginning in a number of larger states, including California, Florida, Indiana, Michigan, Texas and Ohio. These extended in-state programs, like some of the national judicial training efforts, are often called judicial colleges. Thus, in addition to orientation and training programs for new judges, the California Center for Judicial Education and Research conducts three institutes for justice, municipal, superior, and juvenile court judges and referees.

In addition to sponsorship of these formal sessions or courses, a number of state judicial training offices offer various specialized training services to assist judges. The service most often cited is the provision of printed and recorded materials, including deskbooks and bench books, that allow judges to have easy access to vital information, such as instruction and advice to defendants who choose to plead guilty. The bench book can provide a script to insure that the judge asks all appropriate questions of defendants and can give guidance for further action according to the responses received. These books are regularly updated with the most current rule changes and procedures for implementing appellate court findings and decisions. By outlining step-by-step procedures, the bench book can be of benefit not only to the new judge but also to the more experienced jurist who finds that after trying civil matters for over six months, he must suddenly preside in juvenile hearings. Audio cassettes have also become very popular among judges as a quick way to receive essential information about specific

topics. Even video tapes are presently being utilized by some states to supplement their training programs.

The final aspect of special services may include the preparation and distribution of printed materials, newsletters, and reporter services including the most recent decisions of state and federal trial and appellate courts. These services may be the only way for some judges to keep current on a regular basis.

b. *National programs.* Despite the recent growth of state-level training activities, a number of national-level organizations continue to be the major providers of systematic training for various categories of judicial personnel. These include five LEAA-funded programs: The National College for State Trial Judges, the American Academy for Judicial Administration, the National College for Juvenile Justice, the Institute for Judicial Administration Appellate Judge Services, and the American Bar Association Appellate Judges' Conference. In addition, the Institute for Court Management offers educational programs for court administrators and juvenile court personnel, both of which may include judges. Some national training programs are also offered by other national professional organizations, such as the National Conference of Metropolitan Court Judges, the American Judicature Society and the National Center for State Courts. Short descriptions of three of these programs are presented below.

- The largest of these programs is that of the *National College of State Trial Judges*. Every jurisdiction visited by the NMS field survey had sent judges to the College; a number of participants had returned two or three times. The National College, located in Reno, Nevada, primarily offers two residential programs: a four-week summer program for general jurisdiction judges, and a two week program for special court judges. In addition, a variety of graduate programs, lasting one or two weeks, is offered for more experienced judges who have completed the initial core program. In 1975, the National College conducted 23 resident sessions, 29 judicial seminars and 6 special programs, which were completed by a total of 1,071 judges.

Courses provided in the resident sessions included such subjects as criminal law, evidence, search and seizure, family law, sentencing, traffic law, probate law, alcohol and drugs, the judge and the jury, and court administration. Extension programs on similar topics were offered in 29 locations to 2,552 participants. About 18 of these courses included or were directed solely at judges of limited jurisdiction courts.

In the 11 years of its existence, the college has graduated 2,638 judges of general jurisdiction

courts (over 50 percent of such judges), and 585 judges of limited court jurisdiction. Its 239 regional seminars have had 14,208 attendees—judges of both general and limited jurisdiction courts.

A series of evaluations of the National College conducted by outside evaluators found no major problem with the content or quality of the program. What caveats appeared were related primarily to class size. Also noted by the evaluators were the unsatisfactory relationships between national and state training programs. In several instances, the establishment of a state judicial college has had the effect of precluding that state's judiciary from attendance at national programs.

- *The American Academy of Judicial Education* directs the vast majority of its national and in-state programs to judges of limited jurisdiction courts. In 1974, it sponsored 11 national programs attended by 420 judges. Two week orientation programs are offered to newer judges and advanced one week graduate courses are also provided.

Unlike the National College, however, the Academy focuses on the development and programming of in-state training conferences. In 1974, 31 of these conferences were held and attended by almost 2,500 judges. These conferences are always initiated by the states themselves with the Academy providing support in such areas as program development, planning, faculty selection, and materials. The Academy assists the states in procuring funds (primarily from LEAA) for financing these sessions. The Academy also uses video tapes, cassette instructor's guides and outlines in specific substance and procedural areas as individualized training materials for each state. Like the National College, the Academy conducts research for the purpose of updating and developing new materials as well as publishing its own journals and newsletters.

States visited that have taken advantage of these cooperatively developed training programs have found them to be beneficial and well received. However, the future of the Academy is uncertain for several reasons. Unlike the National College, the Academy relies on the LEAA for most of its financial support; this support may not always be forthcoming. Some problems have also developed between the College and the Academy over possible conflicts or overlapping in the training of limited court judges. Finally, there may come a time in the near future when many jurisdictions possess the in-state capability to provide the services and training the Academy now offers.

- The LEAA-funded *National College of Juvenile Justice* sponsors four two-week residential programs for judges and other juvenile justice personnel each year and joins with other organizations in presenting regional programs, which are often cooperative efforts with state agencies. The curriculum is interdisciplinary, with an emphasis upon the behavioral and social sciences. In 1975, the College participated in a number of such programs. Many of these were, however, for corrections and probation personnel, rather than for the judiciary. Only four training programs were held in 1975 for judicial personnel in conjunction with the state courts.

It should be noted that the organizational locus of juvenile courts varies from state to state, and that in many jurisdictions, there are no specialized judges whose responsibilities are limited to juvenile cases. Such cases may be handled by a division of a general or limited jurisdiction court, by an element of a probate or family court or by a separate juvenile court. Nevertheless, the special status of juveniles under the law and the need for close linkages with probation agencies and with a variety of community resources and programs, requires specialized knowledge and training not adequately provided either in undergraduate law school programs or in non-specialized CLE programs for judges or other adjudicative personnel.

5. *Training for lay judges.* The use of lay judges in criminal proceedings occurs under three conditions. A lay judge may act as a judicial officer in: (1) preliminary hearings and issuances of warrants; (2) criminal trials including instances of defendants' waiver of a right to a judge trained in the law; and (3) sentencing hearings, through waiver of a right to trial, plea of guilty, and right to a law-trained judge.

The use of lay judges in criminal proceedings is authorized in 38 states, in all but one of which the judges may sentence defendants to incarceration after trial. Most of these lay judge courts have general misdemeanor jurisdiction and may therefore sentence defendants for up to one year in jail. In 14 states, however, they have limited sentencing authority, ranging from 30 days to 6 months.

In all of these states there are upwards of 11,000 judicial positions for which lay judges are authorized. In the absence of legal training, the only manner in which these judges can be qualified for such positions is through entry training. In 27 states, entry training is available for lay judges, including the one state where lay judges have no incarceration sentencing authority. This includes also the state of West Virginia, which has mandated training for new magistrates, beginning in

1977. Excluding West Virginia, 22 states have mandated training for lay judges, and 4 have voluntary training for their lay judges.

It should be noted that not all "mandatory" programs are equally stringent. For example, in New York, program attendance is required of the lay judges for only 80 percent of the classes. The length of the training programs for lay judges also appears inadequate. In New York, the program lasts six days, and only half of that time is directed at criminal law, evidence, and related topics. Such qualitative limitations are particularly important because there commonly are no educational qualifications for the lay judge position. For example, in Mississippi, the legislature recently acted to place on the ballot a constitutional amendment requiring a high school degree for lay judges. This minimal qualification is typical of states with lay judges are permitted.

In about one-third of the states with lay judges, bench manuals are available for their use. The unavailability of such manuals in the remainder of the states with lay judges is a major concern. Clearly entry training is not sufficient for their legal training. As a result of the absence of adequate training or bench books, lay judges are reported to depend often upon the prosecutor (if one is available) for legal advice. But such reliance does not comply with the requirements that the judicial officer be a neutral, unbiased decision maker.

The prevailing practices in the United States may be contrasted with that in the United Kingdom. The English lay judges receive preservice training before sitting in court, through attendance as observers at court proceedings and through lectures, discussion, and self-learning (books). New magistrates visit penal institutions and attend meetings of their bench. Two booklets are provided: a general manual and one on sentencing. Continuing education is also stressed through conferences, meetings, and seminars. But even with all this training, lay judges in England also have clerks with legal training on whom to rely. This suggests that if non-legally trained judges continue to be authorized here, a combination of more intensive training and of legal support services is required for these key personnel.

6. *Current status of judicial education and training.* The materials presented above support the following conclusions concerning the need for, and adequacy of, existing programs:

a. Our survey and occupational analysis findings have confirmed the need for formalized programs of training, continuing legal education and related supporting services, to prepare new entrants into judicial positions for their critical and unique responsibilities and to assure maintenance and enhancement of their professional competencies. Neither undergraduate law school educa-

tion, nor the typical experience acquired in the private practice of law, adequately equip most new judges for such new duties as presiding at trials, setting bail, sentencing or supervision of court calendars. Yet, these and related functions—all entailing large elements of discretion—have a critical bearing on the functioning of the courts and of the criminal justice system as a whole.

b. Substantial progress has been made in the past decade in developing and improving the institutional base for training and education of judicial personnel, due—in large measure—to the availability of LEAA funding, either in the form of support for national level colleges or programs or through the use by states of LEAA block grant funds for state training and continuing legal education activities. This is illustrated both by the growth of the national-level programs over the decade and by the fact that most states now have state-coordinated programs for judicial training and education.

c. Nevertheless, progress has been uneven. The most critical deficiency appears to be in the availability of adequate entry-level training for new judges. Based on available information, less than one-half of the states systematically provide formal training programs for new judges prior to, or shortly after, their assumption of judicial duties. In addition, 12 of the 38 states utilizing lay judges apparently have no formal programs for their officials. The use of alternative training procedures, such as advisory judges, is preferable to no training at all; nevertheless it has clear limitations.

d. The apparent availability of some form of continuing judicial education in nearly all states, indicated by our summary data, provides a very inadequate basis for assessing the adequacy of such training, in terms of the proportion of judges actually attending such programs, the length and types of training provided, and its usefulness. In contrast to the recent establishment in some states of judicial colleges, with comprehensive resident training programs and supporting services, many other state-level programs are still limited to short two or three-day training sessions often in conjunction with other activities.

e. Since availability of judges for longer training programs is often a critical limitation in provision of such training, supporting services such as bench books, manuals, and evidence guides are an important adjunct, or complement, to formal training sessions. A number of states, such as California, provide models in this respect; however, only a few states have distributed even a single bench book to their judges.

f. Finally, there is a need for improved articulation between state and national-level CLE programs for judges—as well as for prosecutors and defenders—and among the various national programs. Since the LEAA

plays a major role in funding many of these programs—either directly or through block-grants—it should assume the initiative in establishing, or encouraging, more effective coordination among these programs and institutions.

E. Court Administration Training

1. *The court administrator's role.* Although the need for more efficient administration of the courts has long been recognized,¹² this function had typically been performed—and continues to be performed in many courts—as an added responsibility of a judge of the court, in conjunction with an elected clerk of the court and with supporting clerical or secretarial staff. The specialized position of professional court administrator is of quite recent origin. The first state court administrator position was established in New Jersey, by statute, in 1948.¹³ Rapid growth in the number of court administrator positions ensued in the 1960's and early 1970's, as a result of increased emphasis on the need for improvements in court organization and management. A total of 455 state and local court administrators were identified in 1975 in a NMS survey of state offices responsible for court administration in each state.

Court administrator positions now exist to varying degrees at all levels of the court system. At the state level, there has been at least partial establishment of a state court administrator's office, under the authority of the highest state court, in 47 states. (In at least eight of these, however, the state court administrator has limited duties only.) An additional 20 court administrator offices assist statewide trial systems or appellate courts. The large majority of court administrators, however, are attached to lower level courts—primarily trial courts of general jurisdiction. Of 334 court administrators responding to the NMS survey of this profession, 76 percent were responsible for administration of trial courts of general jurisdiction, of whom more than half also had responsibilities for limited or special jurisdiction courts. About 15 percent were attached only to limited or special jurisdiction courts and 9 percent were not responsible for either type of trial court.

The roles and functions of court administrators vary significantly depending upon the types of courts which they serve and the organizational structure of the state court system. At the state level, there are two general types of court administrator offices. The most common is a court administrator office responsible for the entire state court system. In some states, the state office may be responsible to the state supreme court, either for the administrative needs of the entire state court system or for some part of that system, i.e., that court or the general or limited trial courts. In some states, both types

of state administration offices exist, a state court system office and one in which the highest court will have a separate office of the clerk, who acts as the administrator for that court.

The second type of state administrator office is the specialized court administrator, who is responsible for providing services to a state court other than the highest court of the state, either a statewide trial court or an intermediate court of appeals, and who is responsible either to the judges of that court or the state court system office. Where different levels of courts are organized statewide but remain independent of each other, multiple state court administrators to serve each court are required.

The scope of responsibility of state court administrator offices is suggested, in part, by the relative size of their professional staffs. Among the 42 state court administrator offices covered by the NMS survey, the number of professional staff members ranged from none in 3 states to 52 in Michigan. The overall average was 12.6 professional staff members per office.

The range of staff size was found to be even greater in the case of the trial court administrators responding to the NMS. Of the 270 trial court administrators included in the survey, over one-half (146) reported having no professional staff assistants, even though at least one-third served more than one court. On the other hand, an additional 124 trial court administrator offices reported a total of 1,002 professional staff members. Of this total, one large metropolitan city reported 374 employees, while no other office reported as many as 50 staff members. The average number of professional staff members, excluding this one city office, was about five per office,

for those offices reporting at least one such employee, other than the court administrator.

Responses to the NMS survey indicated considerable variation between the responsibilities of the state and of the trial court administrators—and, among the latter group, between those who had professional assistants and those who did not (Table IX-10). Virtually all state court administrators included statistical management, fiscal management and evaluation and planning among their major functions. About 8 out of 10 also reported responsibility for personnel management and for space and equipment management. Relatively small proportions, at the state level, had responsibility for such operational functions as court calendar management, court services management (e.g., probation services) or for jury management. The latter duties are normally performed by the trial courts, whereas the state court system administrator is primarily concerned with oversight, coordination, planning and research as well as the provision of general assistance to the courts. Other statewide administrative functions may include judicial education services, legislative drafting or testimony, and responsibility for the state defender system.

The data on functions performed by trial court administrators indicate a higher frequency of responsibilities for operational functions such as calendar management and jury management, but lower frequencies for such functions as fiscal management or evaluation and planning. Trial court administrators without professional staff are much less likely to have certain management functions than those with staff assistants. The most frequent responsibilities of those without staff are for calendar management and statistics, whereas more than 80

TABLE IX-10
Responsibilities of Court Administrators, by Level and Type of Court Served and by Presence of Professional Staff
(Percent performing selected functions)

Function	Total *	State Court System	Trial Courts	
			With Staff	Without Staff
Statistical management	89	100	90	81
Fiscal management	76	98	84	54
Evaluation and planning	69	95	72	59
Criminal management	72	80	88	60
Space and equipment management	75	77	83	60
Calendar management	78	34	86	82
Court services management	40	25	51	36
Jury management	53	11	70	51
Number of reports	332	44	124	96

* Also includes administrators for statewide trial and appellate courts and for limited or special jurisdiction courts.
Source: NMS Court Administrator Survey, 1976.

percent of trial court administrators with staff also report fiscal, personnel and space management, among their key functions. On a composite basis, 42 percent of all trial court administrators with staff performed all of the itemized management and administrative functions, other than management of court services, compared to only 19 percent of those without professional staff assistants.

The above responses thus suggest that the management scope of many incumbent trial court administrators is much more limited than that normally implied in the role of a professional court administrator. Further insight on this point was obtained from the following assessment based on NMS field visits to 15 trial courts, 13 of which were served by personnel bearing the titles of court administrator or courts coordinator:

"of these 13 individuals, six were performing a wide range of duties related to court administration and management, while the remaining seven performed duties more typically limited to the functions of a court clerk and may simply have had their job titles changed during the past few years."¹⁴

As suggested by the above description, the title of court administrator is currently used to describe positions which vary considerably in responsibility and scope, ranging from those requiring broad management and legal skills, to others with closely circumscribed administrative and clerical duties. These differences in job functions are reflected in the selection standards for court administrators and in the diverse educational backgrounds, and work experience, of current incumbents, as described in the following section.

2. Profile of court administrators.

a. *Educational background.* The educational attainment of incumbents of court administrators provides

a useful indicator of both the nature of their positions and of the extent to which these incumbents have the basic educational background for assuming the full range of responsibilities associated with that of the professional court administrator. As shown in Table IX-11, respondents to the NMS court administrator survey have a very diverse range of educational backgrounds. At one extreme, 12 percent of the respondents reported only a high school level of educational attainment and an additional 24 percent had some college, but less than a four-year college degree. At the other extreme, 29 percent were law school graduates and an additional 12 percent had a master's degree or higher. The educational background of the state court system administrators was substantially higher than those in trial courts. Thus, over 80 percent of the former held law degrees, as contrasted with only about 30 percent of the trial court administrators.

b. *Experience.* In view of the recency of most court administrator positions, a large proportion of all incumbent court administrators had been in their current positions for only a few years. About one-fourth of all respondents had less than 2 years of service in their current positions, and over 70 percent, less than 5 years of service.

A substantial proportion of court administrators had, however, held prior positions in the field of court administration. Thus, whereas the mean length of service of court administrators in their current position was less than 4 years, their total experience in the field of court administration averaged 8 years, and nearly 30 percent reported 10 or more years of total experience in this field.

c. *Prior positions.* Almost one-half (48 percent) of all incumbent court administrators had held prior court positions, mainly as administrators or as Clerks or Deputy Clerks of courts. Included in this category too, were

TABLE IX-11
*Educational Attainment of Court Administrators by Level and Type of Court Served
and by Presence of Professional Staff*
(Percent distribution by specified level of educational attainment)

Educational Attainment	Total *	State Court System	Trial Courts	
			With Staff	Without Staff
No college -----	12	—	5	22
Some college -----	24	—	20	30
College degree -----	23	5	29	18
Master's degree -----	12	14	14	14
Law degree -----	29	81	31	17
Total -----	100	100	100	100
Number of reports -----	331	43	120	99

* Also includes administrators for statewide trial and appellate courts, and for limited or special jurisdiction courts.
Source: NMS Survey of Court Administrators, 1976.

a small number of former judges, mainly serving as state-level court administrators. An additional 24 percent of court administrators had held other managerial or administrative positions in non-court agencies or functions, while 14 percent had previously been employed as attorneys or law clerks. The remaining 14 percent had last been employed in a number of other non-court-related positions.

These variations in prior work experience are closely related to the differences in court administration functions in different types of courts. Thus, based on field visit reports, the trial court administrators whose functions were more clerically-oriented were likely to have been employees of the judicial system or of the local government for some time. Prior employment, usually in the clerk's office, had provided the practical experience and qualifications for the court administrator position, rather than specialized education or training. The professional management-oriented court administrators, on the other hand, were likely to be younger and better educated, with diverse backgrounds in law and business administration, as well as in other professional court administrators positions. Such individuals were likely to be more mobile, and with considerable interest in court management as a career field, as well as in other areas of public administration.¹⁵

3. Professional education and training for court administrators

a. *Extent of specialized programs.* As illustrated by the diverse educational and work experience backgrounds of current court administrators, the field of court administration has not yet established commonly recognized standards for qualification for these positions. This is due, in part, to the fact that specialized courses or programs for court administration are of quite recent origin. Prior to the 1950's, only a few law schools and political science programs included course components relating to judicial administration. Most of these earlier programs were directed at lawyers or judges. The first major program designed specifically for training of court administrators was that of the Institute for Court Management, established in 1970 as a six-month certificate program on the campus of the University of Denver Law School. This program, supported by LEAA funds, graduated nearly 250 certificate holders in its first 6 years of operation and has provided a model judicial administration program for other educational institutions in this field.

The recent growth of interest in education for court administration is indicated by the fact that, by 1976, a total of 48 educational institutions offered courses or programs in judicial administration, including undergraduate law schools, other colleges and universities,

and specialized institutes. Of these only 15 offer degrees or certificates in the field of court administration, whereas other institutions offer courses without specialized degrees in this field.¹⁶

LEAA funding provides a limited amount of institutional support for these programs, including an annual grant of \$225,000 to I.C.M. and smaller amounts to certain other national programs. An analysis of state block grant allocations in Fiscal Year 1975 indicates that an additional \$180,000 was allocated for travel expenses and related costs, for attendance of court administrator staff at these national programs.

b. *Recommended education and training programs.* Court administrators responding to the NMS survey were requested to identify both the general academic fields and the more specialized training subjects considered most useful for court administration. The academic fields preferred by the largest number of respondents, among all categories of court administrators, were management, law and public administration, in that order. All of these fields were included among the top three choices by about one-half or more of all respondents. In contrast, criminal justice specialization—or more technical specialization in computer sciences or accounting—was recommended by much smaller proportions of administrators.

Academic field preferences of court administrators tended to be correlated with the functional needs of their own offices or positions, as well as with their own educational backgrounds. Thus, among state court administrators—of whom about 80 percent were lawyers—an undergraduate law degree ranked first in preference, by a wide margin, followed by public administration and management subjects. Among trial court administrators, whose duties include much greater emphasis upon administrative and operational tasks, the management field was most frequently recommended, followed by law, public administration and business administration. Criminal justice specialization was considerably more popular among the trial court administrators than among the state court administrators, but nevertheless was recommended by only about one-third of all trial court administrators.

Similar differences in emphasis, in terms of training course content, were indicated by the responses of different categories of court administrators (Table IX-12). Courses on court information systems ranked first in preferences among state court administrators, followed by courses on methods of program planning and evaluation. Trial court administrators gave first priority to courses on case flow management, followed by courses on court information systems, but gave less emphasis to program planning and evaluation courses—reflecting the

TABLE IX-12

Recommendations of Court Administrators on Training Courses Especially Useful for Court Administrators
(Percent recommending)

Subject	Total	State Court System	Trial Court	
			With Professional Staff	Without Professional Staff
Caseflow management -----	85	66	85	98
Court information systems and record keeping -----	82	91	77	85
Personnel administration -----	70	70	71	65
Budget and fiscal management -----	69	66	68	53
Program planning and evaluation -----	67	75	65	70
Computer applications -----	62	68	65	56

Source: NMS Court Administrator Survey, 1976.

lesser frequency of broad management responsibilities among trial court administrators.

c. *Specialized training received by court administrators.* Court administrators were also queried on the extent of their own specialized training in the field of court administration. Only about one-fourth (26 percent) had completed a special program of study in judicial administration before entering their current position. Of the latter, nearly one-half had attended the Institute for Court Management, while others had attended a number of other university programs or those of other national colleges, such as the National College of the State Judiciary. In view of the fact that significant numbers of incumbent court administrators had had prior experience in court administration in such roles as deputy court administrator or clerks of court, it is likely that very few had in fact completed these programs prior to entering this field. Thus, educational credentials in the form of completion of specialized programs in judicial administration have not yet apparently been required as a condition of qualification for the large majority of court administrator positions.

In contrast, a large proportion of court administrators have participated in specialized training or educational programs since entering the field of court administration (Table IX-13). A total of 261 court administrators, or 79 percent of all respondents, reported that they had attended workshops or other special training sessions subsequent to entering court administration work. As shown below, the major sources of this training were the Institute of Court Management and the training programs sponsored by state agencies such as the State Court Administrator's or the State Judicial Conference. Other major providers of such training were the National Association of Trial Court Administrators and university-related centers for continuing education.

TABLE IX-13

Percent of Court Administrators Attending Training Programs, by Source

Source	Percent of Total Court Administrators *	Percent of Court Administrators With Training *
Institute for Court Management -----	43	55
State Court Administrator's Office -----	33	42
State Judicial Conference -----	22	28
National Association of Trial Court Administrators -----	22	28
University-related Centers for Continuing Education -----	19	25
National College of the State Judiciary -----	7	8
Institute for Judicial Administration -----	4	5
Other -----	16	20
Number of Reports -----	(330)	(261)

* Percentages do not add to 100 since respondents may have attended more than one program.

Source: NMS Court Administrators Survey, 1976.

LEAA funding, including block grants, was the most important source of financial assistance for attendance at these programs. Over three-fourths (77 percent) of the administrators who had received in-service training, reported this had been financed by LEAA funds at least in part. Nearly one-half also had received financial assistance from their own agency for such training. A relatively small proportion (16 percent) reported that they had financed their own attendance. It is likely, moreover, that these responses understate, to some extent, the relative contribution of LEAA to support of court administration training since they do not take into account indirect LEAA financial support through institutional grants or

through funding assistance to court administration offices.

4. *Findings on court administrator training.* The adequacy of the training and education of court administrators can only be assessed in the context of their roles and responsibilities. From our summary of functions performed by court administrators, it is evident that at least two—and probably more—distinct categories of positions are included within the scope of the “court administrator” position. The first category, typified by many state court systems administrators and by some administrators of large trial courts or groups of courts, exercises a broad range of managerial responsibilities, under the general policy supervision of the chief judicial officer of the court or court system. These can include such functions as planning, organizing, staffing, directing, controlling and coordinating the court and its non-judicial personnel. The second category of administrators has more restricted responsibilities for such functions as calendaring, record keeping and statistical reporting, as well as for staff functions, including supervision of non-judicial personnel, accounting, space and equipment or data processing. The key distinction between the two positions is the degree of control over resources and personnel, and the ability to initiate or implement major changes.

The lack of sufficient delegated authority for a broader managerial role has been identified as one of the important limitations of the current court administrator position in many courts. When court administrators were queried by NMS as to whether there were any specific areas in which insufficient authority was delegated to effectively administer the courts under their supervision, 30 percent of all respondents reported that this was a problem for them, and identified a range of difficulties, generally associated with lack of clearly defined authority over certain categories of non-judicial personnel or functions.

The educational qualifications for the court administrator position, and the amount and type of in-service training required, will clearly vary, depending upon the scope of his authority and responsibilities. Although these responsibilities will always be broader for the state court system administrators than those at the trial court level, there appears to be wide variation among the latter category, as illustrated by the results of our surveys and field visits. Those courts which have assigned a limited role to their court administrators may have done so for a variety of reasons, including reluctance of the judiciary to relinquish some of their own authority and control over court management. In part, however, it may be assumed that lack of professional qualifications of personnel appointed to court administrator positions has been a contributing factor. To this extent, a strengthen-

ing of existing training and education programs—as well as of court administrator selection criteria—can contribute to enhancement of the court management function.

Based on the premise that the desirable goal is to “professionalize” the court administration function, by providing current and future administrators with a broad range of managerial, as well as technical or administrative skills, the following priorities for training and academic assistance are suggested.

a. *Pre-service court administrator programs.* Our survey findings have indicated that current court administrators have very diverse educational and work experience backgrounds and have equally varied preferences concerning the most desirable academic preparation for future entrants into this occupation. The major preferences are, however, for either a law school degree or for a major in public administration. In either case, existing undergraduate programs provide little scope for specialization in the field of judicial administration. Incumbents in court administration positions have mainly acquired their specialized knowledge and skills through on-the-job experience and in-service training programs. On-the-job training, however, is clearly insufficient if the objective of training is to promote implementation of new policies and procedures, rather than to perpetuate existing practice. Reliance upon in-service training, alone, implies a substantial loss of time between assumption of responsibilities and acquisition of needed knowledge and skills. Moreover, workload constraints often limit availability of key personnel for courses lasting more than a few days, particularly in small agencies.

These considerations point to the need for support of graduate level residential judicial administration programs for personnel planning to enter court administration careers as well as for those employed in more junior-level court positions. In view of the diversified undergraduate background of prospective entrants into such programs, course offerings and curricula should be adapted to individual needs. Thus, lawyers will probably require greater emphasis upon basic management courses, whereas public administration majors will require more intensive study in such subjects as court jurisdiction or administrative law.

b. *In-service court administrator training.* The traditional objectives of in-service training programs are to enable practitioners to maintain professional competence in their field by keeping them informed of new methods and approaches, as well as to remedy any deficiencies in their basic skills. The latter objective has understandably, been given greater emphasis, in view of the limited academic preparation of most incumbents in the field of judicial administration.

One of the critical needs, suggested by our survey findings, is to upgrade the technical skills of many trial court administrators for performance of their most urgent operational responsibilities. These include such tasks as the development of improved methods of identifying backlog or delayed cases, improvements in court statistics and records, and improved methods of calendaring—all of which were cited by 40 percent or more of court administrators as in need of change in their courts, or court systems. In addition, our review of the contents of existing residential programs, such as these offered by the Institute for Court Management, suggests the need for increased emphasis on certain managerial skills, notably in the techniques for program review and evaluation. The process of "change making" requires a better appreciation of research and evaluation methodology than is common today. The latter may not be immediately required by many administrators with limited current management responsibilities, but can help to qualify them for a broader management role in the future.

In addition, the resource limitations of any comprehensive residential program indicate the need for supplementation, through expanded regional training services, on more advanced management topics than are offered in the basic residential program. The present ICM regional programs are largely aimed at those administrators who do not, or cannot, attend the residential program. While these are needed, they should be supplemented by efforts to provide more advanced training for ICM graduates.

c. *Judicial training and orientation on court administrator roles.* The preceding recommendations have focused on the training needs of the professional court administrator. There is an equally important requirement for training of judicial personnel who are responsible for selection and policy supervision of court administrators. One of the major barriers to more effective utilization of professional court administrators in many jurisdictions is

the lack of familiarity by the judiciary with their potential. We therefore recommend that judicial training programs include orientations on the court administrator function, to assist judges in properly selecting and supervising professional court administrators in their courts.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Clinical law school programs are defined as law school courses taken for academic credit involving student practice of law under supervision in a field setting; such as a law school operated clinic, government law office, private law office or legal aid law office.
2. Based on unpublished information provided by William Pincus, President, Council on Legal Education for Professional Responsibility, Inc., 1976.
3. See NMS Final Report, Volume VIII, p. 846.
4. The National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (Wickersham Commission), *Report on Prosecution* (1931).
5. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: Courts* (1967).
6. American Bar Association, Project on Criminal Justice Standards (14 volume report).
7. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Courts* (1973). (Hereinafter referred to as NAC, *Courts*).
8. NMS Final Report, Volume VIII.
9. National District Attorneys Association, *An Analysis of Training Coordinator Functions: A Comparative Study* (1976).
10. NAC, *Courts*.
11. Feeney, "The Effects of Heavy Caseloads." Paper delivered at American Political Science Association Meeting (September 15, 1975).
12. Ad Hoc Committee on Grievance Procedures of the Association of the Bar of New York Report on the Grievance (1976); B. Agala, "Report to Federal Judicial Center on Admissions and Discipline of Attorneys in Federal District Courts." (August 1974). See also, S. Krantz, et al., *Right to Counsel in Criminal Cases: The Mandate of Argersinger v. Hamlin* (Ballinger, 1975).
13. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, *Courts*, p. 178. Although an office of state court administrators was established in Connecticut in 1932, the first appointment to that position, in that state, was in 1967.
14. NMS Final Report, Volume VIII.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Based on data in Council of State Government, *Judicial Administration: Education and Training Programs* (1975) and collateral sources.

CHAPTER X. PRIORITIES FOR TRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AND FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANPOWER PLANNING

A central objective of the assessments of personnel needs, and of training and education needs, presented in the preceding chapters, has been to provide an informed basis for establishment of "needs priorities" for training and academic assistance programs in the criminal justice field, as required under existing legislation.

The opening section of this chapter discusses the concept of "needs priorities," in the context of the respective roles of LEAA and of the state planning agencies. It differentiates between the desirability for relatively broad statements of such priorities, at the national level, and the need for more specific determinations of such priorities for operational use at the state or local levels.

The second section presents the major national-level priorities for assistance identified by the National Manpower Survey.

The third section discusses the manpower data needs for a continuing manpower planning function, at both the national and the state levels, and suggests approaches to meeting these needs in a cost-effective manner.

A. Priority Concepts

Although the concept of "priorities" has been widely used, it has often lacked a clear-cut operational definition. In certain contexts, priorities refer to an absolute ranking of various claimants for resources, under which all of the needs of claimants in the highest categories, in sequence, must be filled, before any funds or other resources are allocated to those in lower-ranking categories. The guidelines for student eligibility for LEEP assistance illustrate this use of the priority concept. Educational institutions are required to give first priority to all returning LEEP recipients before other categories of students can be provided LEEP assistance.

Alternatively, priorities can be defined in relative, rather than absolute terms to govern the shares of resources among different categories of training or academic assistance. To illustrate, if graduate level programs had received 10 percent of all LEEP assistance, an increased priority for such programs might raise their allocation to 20 percent with a corresponding reduction

in the share going to undergraduate programs.

Our assessments have identified some quantitative and qualitative deficiencies in existing training or educational programs in virtually all sectors of the criminal justice system, and for all major categories of personnel surveyed. For this reason, establishment of absolute priorities among sectors or among training program categories is not generally desirable. At the same time, considerable evidence has been developed indicating that the relative extent of training deficiencies varies widely among the major categories of personnel and agencies. Such information, as well as our assessments of projected manpower trends, provide a basis for establishment of relative priorities, which can guide shifts in fund allocations among various training and education programs and recipient groups.

A second consideration in establishment of priorities is the need to clearly define the respective roles of the federal and state agencies responsible for administration of training and academic assistance programs for law enforcement and criminal justice personnel. Certain educational assistance programs, such as LEEP, the Educational Development Program and the Section 402 Training Programs are directly administered by the national office and the regional offices of the LEAA. Various national colleges or institutes are also directly funded by these offices. The LEAA is therefore in a position to establish more specific policies and guidelines for the allocation of resources among such programs. In contrast, federal financial assistance to state and local training activities of all types is mainly administered by state criminal justice planning agencies from block grant funds, subject to submission and approval of state plans. Thus, the degree of control which can be exercised by LEAA over specific projects of the latter type is considerably more limited.

The decentralization of authority for administration of a major portion of LEAA funding to the states is, of course, an integral feature of the current law. It recognizes the great diversity in needs of criminal justice agencies in the 50 states, including needs for training and educational assistance. A corollary of this approach

is that only relatively broad or general guidelines for state-administered training assistance grants appear appropriate at the national level.

The priority recommendations in the following section therefore differentiate between those applicable to LEEP and other directly administered educational or training assistance programs, and more general recommendations applicable to those categories of training assistance primarily administered by the state agencies.

B. Priority Recommendations

1. *Educational assistance programs.* Our assessment of the relationship between education and job performance requirements in the basic line law enforcement and correctional occupations has failed to provide convincing evidence for an underlying premise of the LEEP programs as presently constituted, i.e., that higher education leading to college degrees is required for all basic line personnel in law enforcement or correctional activities. Although the LEEP program has probably contributed to the recent sharp increases in the proportion of police and correctional officers with some college education, it is likely that this proportion will continue to grow, even in the absence of the LEEP program, because of the rising educational attainment of new entrants into these positions. These findings, in combination with serious qualitative deficiencies of many of the LEEP-funded programs, point to the need for a major shift in orientation of LEAA academic assistance, from emphasis on quantity, to a more selective quality-oriented program.

At the same time, our surveys have identified serious deficiencies in the educational preparation, as well as training, of large proportions of mid-level and managerial level personnel, in law enforcement and criminal justice agencies. Concurrently, the key agency personnel who are or will be in a position to effect needed improvements in the criminal justice system in the coming decade will have growing demands upon them for increased management expertise in such areas as budget formulation, planning and labor relations, for development of new managerial styles and for increased sophistication generally, with respect to the systems- and community-wide implications of their agencies' activities. These deficiencies are most apparent in the case of law enforcement executives, reflecting the educational "generation gap" between senior officers and more recent entrants. In addition, there appear to be shortages of academically qualified personnel, with advanced degrees and specialized competencies in criminal justice planning, research and evaluation, and as full-time faculty in criminal justice education programs.

These findings suggest the need for major changes in

priorities in LEAA educational assistance programs, as outlined below:

- Priority in assistance to criminal justice education programs should be given to those institutions which fully qualify under existing LEEP qualitative standards or under such additional standards which may be established by appropriate academic accreditation agencies such as the Academy of Criminal Justice Science. After a short transition period, institutions which do not fully meet such standards should be precluded from eligibility.
- Among qualified institutions, priority should be given to students in advanced undergraduate programs and to those in graduate programs, in crime-related studies and in the management sciences, as a means of improving the qualifications of present incumbents or prospective entrants into the supervisory and managerial ranks of these agencies. In view of the growing proportion of personnel who have already completed one or two years of college work, financial support for students in the first two years of undergraduate study should be progressively phased out.
- In order to provide equitable opportunities for relevant educational assistance to potentially eligible personnel in all sectors of the criminal justice system, priority should be given—among otherwise qualified programs—to those which provide broader and more balanced curriculum offerings, including corrections and court-related subjects in addition to those in police science, in communities where a need for such courses has been established. The more rapid projected employment growth in the corrections and court sectors reinforces this recommendation.
- Special programs of direct grants for full-time graduate study in crime-related and in management studies should be established, with particular emphasis on (a) top level executives and administrators, (b) mid-level managerial personnel, and (c) students preparing for careers in criminal justice planning, research or teaching.
- Although there is no apparent manpower need to provide LEEP assistance to undergraduate law school students, assistance should be provided to selected undergraduate law schools to develop model law school curricula, texts and educational methods in the field of applied criminal law practice, to better prepare graduates for careers in the criminal justice system.

2. *Training assistance programs.* NMS research findings, presented in Chapters VII-IX of this report, have documented the need for more and better formal entry-

level and in-service training programs in all of the major law enforcement and criminal justice occupations. A number of general indicators of the qualitative adequacy of this training have been used for this analysis including data on course lengths, course contents, faculty composition and training methods used. Additional insights have been provided by the information provided by agency executives on their own training and on the adequacy of their agency's programs. These assessments, supplemented by the results of our manpower projections, suggest the following major priority categories for training assistance programs.

- A major deficiency, in all agency categories, is the absence of any integrated program of management training for law enforcement and criminal justice personnel, which provides opportunities for acquisition of needed supervisory and management skills as part of an overall career development plan. The FBI Academy programs and certain other national-level programs only partially meet this need in the law enforcement sector, and management training resources in other sectors are even less adequate. The NMS has therefore recommended that high priority be given to development of fully integrated regional management training centers, or institutes, adapted to the specialized needs for management training of criminal justice executives and managerial level staffs.
- In all major sectors of the criminal justice system, the smaller—more isolated—agencies have been found to be the most deficient in their current staff training programs. They are typically not equipped to provide in-house training to their personnel, except on an informal basis, and cost and workload constraints often limit their capability to send personnel to external programs. Progress has been made in meeting these needs through state level programs, often assisted by LEAA grants. However, the latter programs vary considerably in scope and quality, and need additional support in many states.
- Among the major categories of criminal justice agencies, juvenile corrections and court-related agencies appear to be the most in need of additional training assistance, as evidenced by the continued absence of any formal entry-level training for line staff in many of these agencies and by the greater degree of dissatisfaction with existing training expressed by executives of these agencies.
- In sectors where some entry-training is now generally provided to new line personnel, priority should be given to qualitative improvements in training contents and methodology, of both entry-level and

in-service programs. Training programs for line law enforcement and correctional personnel should place increased emphasis on human relations subjects, and should be adjusted to meet the needs and capabilities of the better-educated personnel currently being recruited for these positions. The recent reductions in personnel recruitment—and, hence, in entry-level training requirements—should enable many agencies to enrich existing programs without any substantial increase in total training outlays.

The above generalizations are based on national-level data and will not be equally applicable to the 50 states, in view of wide interstate variations in existing personnel resources, training capabilities and training standards. One of the most critical needs, therefore, is to improve the information base and the manpower planning capabilities of state criminal justice planning agencies to enable them to establish more specific "needs-oriented" priorities for their own jurisdictions as discussed below.

C. The Role of Criminal Justice Planning

Manpower planning can be defined as a process for systematically determining the numbers and kinds of personnel required to achieve program objectives and for development of programs for personnel recruitment, training and utilization, to assure that these manpower needs are met. This process can be applied to an individual firm or government agency, to an industry or functional area (such as the criminal justice system), or to the nation's economy as a whole. The need for manpower planning, its scope and frequency, will depend upon the role and responsibilities of the planning organization.

The role of the state planning agencies in manpower planning derives from their responsibilities for administration of the LEAA block grants for their states and from their overall responsibility for development of comprehensive statewide plans, as prescribed by the LEAA. In addition, the state planning agencies, to varying degrees, are utilized for broader state level program planning, budgeting and legislative functions, with respect to their states' criminal justice system.

One of the collateral responsibilities of the National Manpower Survey project was to "enhance law enforcement and criminal justice personnel development planning at federal, state and local levels." As a point of departure, the following major categories of data needs were identified:

- Employment and personnel turnover data
- Agency workload data
- Job characteristics data

- Personnel characteristics data
- Training and education programs data
- Opinions of executives on agency manpower needs, training and education needs and related personnel issues
- Employee opinions on the usefulness of the training and education received and on desirable changes in training or other personnel development programs

Such data were generally needed for each of the major types of criminal justice agencies and occupations, usually further classified by agency size and location. Moreover, for purposes of projecting future manpower training and education needs, reliable data on past trends in employment, personnel training, workloads and other key variables were also required.

A systematic review of all available national-level criminal justice data sources indicated that—despite considerable progress in development of comprehensive statistics on overall criminal justice employment since the 1960's—many categories of needed personnel data were still incomplete or lacking. These included, for example, statistics on employment and personnel turnover in the major criminal justice occupations, data on characteristics of personnel in those occupations and on the various criminal justice training and educational programs. Many, although not all, of these manpower data needs were met by special surveys conducted for the present report, supplemented by the concurrent LEAA-funded Census survey of employees of state and local criminal justice agencies. These, however, were very costly, "one-time" survey efforts, designed primarily to meet national-level data needs.

Our review of the data resources and capabilities for systematic manpower planning at the state agency level indicated that these resources were deficient, in many states. LEAA guidelines in effect in 1975 had required inclusion of a considerable amount of relevant data on agency personnel and training in the state annual plan submissions. However, an analysis of a sample of state plans for 1976 indicated that none of these state plans had complied with all of the pertinent guidelines. There was even less evidence of any program for systematic analysis of the available data, for use in arriving at decisions concerning allocations of funds for criminal justice manpower development or related purposes.

In addition to the lack of adequate state level manpower data, these deficiencies appeared to be due to a lack of staff resources in many of the SPA's for manpower analysis and planning, the inadequate training for manpower analysis and planning of many of those assigned to this function, and—more fundamentally—to the limited role of many of the SPA's in decision-making with respect to the programs, policies and training

activities of the criminal justice agencies in their jurisdictions. At the state level, the latter responsibilities continue to be vested in the various state operating agencies or in separate agencies responsible for setting standards and/or conducting training for law enforcement or other criminal justice personnel. Hence, in the absence of authority to coordinate the relevant manpower development policies and programs for the criminal justice system as a whole, the development of comprehensive statistics on personnel and workloads has lacked a programmatic context in many state planning agencies.

Despite these limitations, it was evident that both LEAA national-office staff and a number of state criminal justice planning agencies were actively interested in strengthening their manpower analysis and planning capabilities. To assist in development of a manpower analysis and planning function at the national level, detailed technical specifications for updating of the NMS manpower projections model have been included in Volume VI of this report. In order to provide current and reliable data for this purpose, we recommend that—to the maximum extent practicable—emphasis be placed upon use of existing established federal statistical programs, with appropriate modifications to meet the needs of LEAA and the state planning agencies. These include, for example:

- Inclusion of more specific classifications and codes on criminal justice agency functions and occupations in the Census of Population, which will be conducted at 5-year, rather than 10-year, intervals in the future, under recent legislation.
- Use of the Census Bureau's *Current Population Survey* for annual updating of occupational employment data, for major criminal justice occupations, at the national level.
- Modification of the annual statistical reports of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for state and local governments, to provide improved current data on personnel turnover and racial/ethnic characteristics, by agency and major occupation group.
- Modification of the Bureau of Labor Statistics occupational employment statistics reports to provide for more detailed occupational employment data, by state, for criminal justice agencies.

There will, in addition, be a need for initiation of new or expanded data collection programs for certain categories of essential data, particularly on training and education programs for criminal justice employees and on the extent of training received by employees. Particularly essential, in our judgment, is a program of evaluation of such training, including programs for systematic follow-up surveys of recent students. Since such pro-

grams are costly, priority should be given to those sectors where training and education needs appear to be most critical and where available data is most deficient.

The above recommendations—and the more specific technical recommendations for conduct of state-level criminal justice manpower surveys included in Volume VI—presume a policy commitment to a manpower planning process as a useful management tool, at both the national and state levels. This implies, also, provision of sufficient resources for professional staff, for adequate training of such staff, and for the essential data collection and processing activities needed to implement this program. Specific recommendations for LEAA and for state agencies, to implement a manpower planning activity are:

- A Manpower Analysis and Planning Office, or unit, should be established within LEAA, which will be responsible for maintaining a continuing assessment of current and projected personnel needs and resources for the criminal justice system, for development of national-level priority guidelines for training and academic assistance and for provision of technical assistance to state agencies in their manpower planning activities—including funding of prototype or model state planning projects.
- A specialized unit should be established within the

appropriate LEAA or Department of Justice statistical office, to plan, coordinate and execute statistical programs in the field of criminal justice manpower, and to effectively represent the Department of Justice in assuring that its needs are considered in overall federal statistical planning, such as that related to the Censuses of Population and Governments. This unit should maintain close liaison with the proposed Manpower Analysis and Planning Office.

- State planning agencies should be encouraged to establish parallel functions as ongoing activities in their agencies, to include at least one professionally qualified full-time staff member.
- LEAA annual plan guidelines should be revised to require inclusion at stated intervals—but not necessarily annually—of a comprehensive assessment of state criminal justice manpower training and educational assistance needs. (This should replace the current requirement for submission of routine manpower data in the annual plan.)
- A national clearinghouse of planned and ongoing annual criminal justice manpower surveys should be established in cooperation with state agencies, to avoid possible duplication of effort and to facilitate a systematic pooling of available data and research.

APPENDIX A

NATIONAL MANPOWER SURVEY ORGANIZATION

The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System was conducted by a consortium of three non-profit research institutions: The National Planning Association, The American Institutes for Research and the Bureau of Social Science Research, all based in Washington, D.C. The National Planning Association, as prime contractor, was responsible for overall project direction, for the conduct of manpower assessments and projections, for the studies of criminal justice training and education programs, and for the preparation of all final report volumes, except Volumes VII and VIII. The American Institutes for Research conducted the field analyses of occupational requirements and personnel systems, and related qualitative assessments, whose findings are reported in Volume VIII of this report. The Bureau of Social Science Research executed the mail

questionnaire surveys of law enforcement and criminal justice executives and of courts, and designed the prototype surveys of North Carolina law enforcement and criminal justice agencies as described in Volume VII, and in Appendix C, Volume VI.

Harold Wool of the National Planning Association served as Project Director. Frank McKernan, also of NPA, was Deputy Project Director, with special responsibilities for coordination of the NPA training and educational program studies and of the occupational analysis and personnel systems studies of the American Institutes for Research. The full list of professional staff of the Project, other than short-term personnel or *ad hoc* consultants, appears in Exhibit A-1.

A list of the members of the NMS Advisory Board appears in Exhibit A-2.

EXHIBIT A-1
PROFESSIONAL STAFF OF THE NATIONAL MANPOWER SURVEY
OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

National Planning Association (NPA)

Office of Project Director

Harold Wool, NMS Project Director
Frank McKernan, NMS Deputy Director
James Stinchcomb, Consultant
Loraine Halsey, Research Administrator
Elizabeth McGovern, Librarian

Manpower Analysis and Projections Group

Mark Kendall, Senior Economist
Harry Greenspan, Senior Economist
Linda Harris, Senior Research Associate
Bernard Gilman, Social Scientist
Albert Gillespie, Research Assistant
Robert Kramer, Research Assistant

Training and Education Program Group

Robert Rafuse, Senior Economist
Neal Miller, Senior Research Associate
Michael Genz, Research Associate
Paul Radtke, Research Associate
Rigney Hill, Research Assistant

Bureau of Social Science Research (BSSR)

Shirley A. Star, BSSR Project Director, July 1974–
June 1975

James Kretz, BSSR Project Director, July 1975–
September 1976

Gloria Hamilton, Director of Field Operations

Carol Kalish, Special Assistant to the Project Director
(Temporary)

Barry Feinberg, Research Associate
Celia Pavis, Assistant Director of Research Operations
Mary Dixon, Research Analyst
Carol Sosdian, Research Analyst
Gary Nordlinger, Research Analyst
Neil Bomberg, Research Analyst
Ellen Stern, Research Assistant
Paula Freedman, Research Assistant
Andrea Golden, Research Assistant

American Institutes for Research (A.I.R.)

Albert S. Glickman, Senior A.I.R. Project Director
Robert W. Stephenson, Associate A.I.R. Project
Director

Daniel Felkner, Research Scientist *
Dorothy S. Edwards, Principal Research Scientist
Gary B. Brumback, Senior Research Scientist
Robert Frey, Research Scientist
Barry Goodstadt, Research Scientist
Louis O. Richardson, Program Specialist
William M. Trencher, Associate Program Specialist
R. Dennis Osterman, Associate Program Specialist
Marian Fox, Administrative Associate/Project
Librarian
Tania Romashko, Associate Research Scientist
Clifford P. Hahn, Staff Consultant
Harry I. Hadley, Consultant

* Mr. Felkner served as A.I.R. Project Director in the final phases of the study and supervised preparation of the final A.I.R. Report (Vol. VIII).

EXHIBIT A-2
ADVISORY BOARD TO THE NATIONAL MANPOWER SURVEY
OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Donald H. Riddle, *Chairman*
Chancellor, University of Illinois
Chicago Circle

Sherman Day
Director, National Institute for Corrections
U.S. Bureau of Prisons

Edward B. McConnell
Executive Director
National Center for State Courts

Norval Morris
Dean, Law School
University of Chicago

Patrick Murphy
President
Police Foundation

Vincent O'Leary
Professor, School of Criminal Justice
State U. of New York at Albany

Albert Reiss
Professor, Department of Sociology
Yale University

Gerald Somers
Professor, Department of Economics
University of Wisconsin

Anthony Trivisono
Executive Director
American Correctional Association

Richard Wertz
Executive Director
Governor's Commission on Administration of Justice
Maryland

END