



**INSLAW**  
**BRIEFING PAPER**  
INSTITUTE FOR  
LAW AND  
SOCIAL RESEARCH

Number 15  
Revised  
August, 1976

**Police Intake**  
**Worksheet**

**PROMIS**  
PROSECUTOR'S MANAGEMENT  
INFORMATION SYSTEM  
An Exemplary Project of LEAA

INSTITUTE FOR  
LAW AND  
SOCIAL RESEARCH  
1125 15th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

44764<sup>ca</sup>  
79177

PROMIS (Prosecutor's Management Information System) is a management information system (computerized or manual) for public prosecution agencies and the courts. Developed under a grant from the United States Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), PROMIS has been in operation in Washington, D.C., since January 1971 and is in various implementation stages in more than 30 other jurisdictions.

LEAA has designated PROMIS an Exemplary Project. Such designation is reserved for criminal justice programs judged outstanding, worthy of national attention, and suitable for adoption by other communities.

The Institute for Law and Social Research (INSLAW) has prepared a series of 21 briefing papers to explain to nontechnical audiences of prosecutors, court administrators, criminal justice planners, and members of the bar the underlying concepts of management and organization inherent in PROMIS. It is expected that these briefings will assist other jurisdictions to evaluate and when appropriate, implement PROMIS in part or in its entirety. The implementation can range from adoption of the concepts of management and organization, to the use of PROMIS forms and paperwork procedures, to the application of the manual or semiautomated version of PROMIS, and, finally, to the installation of the computer software.

Other PROMIS documentation produced by INSLAW under grants from LEAA includes a handbook on *PROMIS For The Nonautomated or Semiautomated Office*, research designs for using PROMIS data bases in statistical studies of criminal justice policies, a six-volume set of computer software documentation, and a 20-minute color documentary of PROMIS (16mm film or video cassette) for nontechnical audiences. The 21 briefings are as follows:

1. Management Overview of PROMIS
2. Case Screening
3. Uniform Case Evaluation and Rating
4. Special Litigation (Major Violators) Unit
5. Witness Notification Unit
6. Paralegals
7. Comprehensive Training
8. Reasons for Discretionary and Other Actions
9. Counting by Crime, Case and Defendant
10. Research Uses of PROMIS Data
11. Uniform Crime Charging Manual
12. Police Prosecution Report
13. Crime Analysis Worksheet
14. Processing and Trial Preparation Worksheet
15. Police Intake Worksheet
16. Standardized Case Jacket
17. Interface with Other CJIS
18. Privacy and Security
19. Analysis of Costs and Benefits
20. Transferability
21. Optional On-Line Inquiry and Data Input Capability

Copyright © Institute for Law and Social Research, 1976.

Reproduction in whole or in part permitted for any purpose of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration of the U.S. Department of Justice, or any other agency of the United States Government.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright holder.

This project was supported by Contract No. J-LEAA-016-76 awarded 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.

Copyright privileges reserved by the Institute for Law and Social Research.

JAN 27 1978

**PROMIS**  
**BRIEFING SERIES\*****ACQUISITIONS****15. Police Intake  
Worksheet**

Even strong cases can be lost through cracks in the prosecutory system. Especially in high-volume jurisdictions, one such crack that may develop is inadequate police-prosecutor coordination after charges are filed.

A frequent result may be lost cases due to insufficient follow-up or to misunderstandings by both prosecutor and police officer regarding the latter's ongoing case-related tasks, such as those pertaining to additional investigation, reports, etc., needed prior to a future court or prosecutive proceeding. This is a potential danger regardless of whether police department personnel or the district attorney's own staff are involved in these follow-on efforts.

The problem of poor post-filing police-prosecutor coordination was highlighted by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. One standard notes that "prosecutors should maintain relationships . . . that maximize coordination of the various agencies of the criminal justice system."<sup>1</sup>

Another standard proposes that the larger police departments "consider the use of a case preparation operation to insure that all evidence that may lead to the conviction or acquittal of defendants is systematically prepared and presented for review by the prosecuting authority. . . . Policies and procedures should be developed in cooperation with representatives of the local prosecutory and judicial systems. . . ."<sup>2</sup>

ONE JURISDICTION'S SOLUTION

To help maximize post-filing coordination with police, prosecutors in Washington, D.C., utilize the Police Intake Worksheet.<sup>3</sup> Illustrated on the following page, the Police Intake Worksheet is designed to provide police officers with clear instructions relating to subsequent action they are

\*One of a series of 21 Briefing Papers for PROMIS (Prosecutor's Management Information System), this publication was prepared by the Institute for Law and Social Research (INSLAW), Washington, D.C., under a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which has designated PROMIS as an Exemplary Project. Such a designation is reserved for criminal justice programs judged outstanding, worthy of national attention, and suitable for adoption by other communities. Presenting a bird's-eye view of PROMIS capabilities, the Briefing Papers are one facet of INSLAW's LEAA-funded program designed to assist local prosecutors evaluate and, when appropriate, implement PROMIS. In January 1971, the computerized information system was initiated in Washington, D.C., where prosecutors continue to rely upon PROMIS to help them manage more effectively an annual work load involving allegations of 8,500 serious misdemeanors and 7,500 felonies. (A manual version of PROMIS is also available and parallels the capabilities of the computerized system.)



**U. S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE**  
 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
 SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION  
 POLICE INTAKE WORKSHEET

<b>CASE IDENTIFICATION</b>			<b>COURT CASE NO.</b>		<b>PDID NO.</b>
DEFENDANT'S NAME (LAST) FIRST MIDDLE					
OFFENSE		M/F	LOCATION		DATE
					TIME
OFFICER IN CHARGE OF CASE		BADGE NO	UNIT	WORK PHONE	HOME PHONE

<b>LINE-UP DATA</b>			
LINE-UP DATE	TIME	SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS	
NOTE OFFICER IN CHARGE HAS RESPONSIBILITY TO SEE THAT THESE WITNESSES ARE AT THE LINE-UP	WITNESSES - NAMES		WORK PHONE

<b>GRAND JURY PRESENTMENT</b>		WITNESSES - NAMES		WORK PHONE	HOME PHONE
NOTE OFFICER IN CHARGE HAS RESPONSIBILITY TO SEE THAT THESE WITNESSES ARE AT THE GRAND JURY PRESENTMENT  DO NOT BRING ANY WITNESSES TO A PRELIMINARY HEARING					

<b>INVESTIGATIVE DATA AND MATERIAL TO BE PROVIDED BY POLICE OFFICER IN CHARGE OF THE CASE</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> ADDED INVESTIGATION	<input type="checkbox"/> PRELIMINARY HEARING OR MISDEMEANOR TRIAL
	<input type="checkbox"/> GRAND JURY
_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____	

PRELIMINARY HEARING OR MISDEMEANOR TRIAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GRAND JURY <input type="checkbox"/> PD 251 <input type="checkbox"/> LINE-UP SHEET <input type="checkbox"/> LINE-UP PHOTO <input type="checkbox"/> TEST FIRE CERTIFICATE <input type="checkbox"/> CERTIFICATE OF NO LICENSE <input type="checkbox"/> CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION <input type="checkbox"/> CERTIFICATE OF NO REGISTRATION <input type="checkbox"/> MEDICAL REPORTS <input type="checkbox"/> CERTIFIED COPY OF THE FOLLOWING PRIOR CONVICTIONS: CHARGE                      COURT CASE NO.                      DATE _____ _____	PRELIMINARY HEARING OR MISDEMEANOR TRIAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GRAND JURY <input type="checkbox"/> HANDWRITING ANALYSIS REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> FINGERPRINT REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> CHEMIST REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> PHOTOGRAPH(S) OF VICTIM <input type="checkbox"/> PHOTOGRAPH(S) OF DEFENDANT <input type="checkbox"/> PHOTOGRAPH(S) OF SCENE <input type="checkbox"/> PROOF OF PROPERTY OWNERSHIP <input type="checkbox"/> DIAGRAM OF _____ <input type="checkbox"/> CRIMINAL RECORDS OF _____ <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER _____ WITNESS STATEMENTS _____ _____
--	---

\_\_\_\_\_  
 POLICE OFFICER SIGNATURE

\_\_\_\_\_  
 ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

\_\_\_\_\_  
 DATE



expected to take prior to preliminary hearings, grand jury presentments, and misdemeanor trials.

These instructions pertain to the responsibility of officers to assure witness attendance at lineups and presentments, to conduct additional investigations, and to obtain various reports (chemist, fingerprint, handwriting, etc.), photographs (of victim, defendant, or the crime scene), and documents (such as test fire certificates and proof of property ownership).

After being filled out and signed by both prosecutor and officer as a final step in the screening<sup>4</sup> of those cases going forward, the original of the two-part Police Intake Worksheet is given to the officer and the copy retained for insertion in the case jacket.<sup>5</sup>

The Police Intake Worksheet, whose format is adaptable to the needs of different jurisdictions, is a natural extension of other forms compatible with, and supportive of, the PROMIS concept, but is not necessary for all jurisdictions. For those offices whose case load mandates assembly-line processing and attendant fragmentation of responsibility and control, the Police Intake Worksheet is a convenient, economical, and effective method by which (1) to communicate with police or with internal investigative staff and, subsequently, (2) to monitor those frequently recurring tasks that are essential to a case and that must be completed by officers prior to a future proceeding. This monitoring could be an appropriate responsibility of paralegals.<sup>6</sup>

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING

In contrast to oral instructions or hurried notations on a pad of paper, the Police Intake Worksheet raises the visibility of post-filing police tasks to the point where deficiencies in their execution can be identified. This permits feedback to the personnel involved and serves as input for upgraded training of police or internal investigative staff.

The standards of both the National Advisory Commission and American Bar Association (ABA) advocate prosecutory participation in such training. The commentary to the applicable ABA standard refers to mistakes of police (often entirely inadvertent) in carrying out such routine duties as interrogating persons in custody and conducting lineups for identification purposes.<sup>7</sup>



And the commentary to the pertinent standard of the National Advisory Commission states that, as the chief law enforcement official in the local jurisdiction, the prosecutor "should continue to have the responsibility to provide legal advice to the police, particularly in those areas of law enforcement that affect the performance of the prosecution function. . . ." <sup>8</sup> (Emphasis added.) The Police Intake Worksheet helps to spotlight one such area.

#### IN CONCLUSION . . .

Not only does the Police Intake Worksheet facilitate clear and timely communications with police or office staff regarding certain case-related follow-up tasks in the post-filing period but the form may be utilized to identify training needs as well.

As a vehicle for improved communications, the Police Intake Worksheet helps to prevent the formation of cracks in the prosecutory process; as a means by which to highlight training deficiencies, the form helps to expedite the repair of those gaps that do occur.



FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Courts (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973), p. 247.

<sup>2</sup> National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Police (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973), pp. 233-234.

<sup>3</sup> In the District of Columbia, the U.S. Attorney serves as the local prosecutor. About 75 lawyers are assigned to the D.C. Superior Court (equivalent to a state court of general jurisdiction), where prosecution of local "street crime" cases is conducted. About 16,000 allegations of such crimes are considered for prosecution annually.

<sup>4</sup> For additional details about the screening process, see Briefing No. 2, Case Screening.

<sup>5</sup> The functions of the case jacket are detailed in Briefing No. 16, Standardized Case Jacket.

<sup>6</sup> See Briefing No. 6, Paralegals, for an explanation of how the use of paralegals is facilitated by, and supportive of, PROMIS.

<sup>7</sup> American Bar Association Project on Standards for Criminal Justice, The Prosecution Function and the Defense Function (Chicago: American Bar Association, 1971), p. 68.

<sup>8</sup> National Advisory Commission, Courts, op. cit., p. 248.







**END**