

Administrative Concerns in Developing
Standards and Goals

by
Mark A. Cunniff
Janice Zalen Stiers

National Association of Criminal Justice
Planning Directors

This project was supported by Grant Number 76-DF-99-0070 awarded to the National Association of Criminal Justice Planning Directors, by the Office of Regional Operations, 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.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration reserves the right to reproduce, publish, translate, or otherwise use, and to authorize others to publish and use all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication.

Copyright 1978 by the National Association of Criminal
Justice Planning Directors

January 1978

45705

Preface and Acknowledgements

The concept of standards and goals in criminal justice has received considerable attention over the past several years. The pioneering work of the National Advisory Commission and the subsequent emphasis that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration placed on that effort precipitated the involvement of states in the standards and goals developmental process. From there the standards and goals filtered down to local jurisdictions.

In reading the standards and goals literature one is left with the impression that the bulk of the work has been performed--all that is required is for people to read the various documents and their obvious worth will lead to implementation. Unfortunately, the world does not operate in that fashion. One of the interests of the National Association of Criminal Justice Planning Directors is to observe and research how new ideas become operationalized. Thus we welcome the opportunity to examine the development of standards and goals at the local level of government.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the jurisdictions that volunteered to participate in the project with special thanks to the local planning unit directors: Gary Pence (Toledo, Ohio); Timothy Schoewe and Mark Rogacki (Milwaukee, Wisconsin); Theodore Livingston (Provo, Utah); Bill Wasson (Salem, Oregon), Martin Loring (Corvallis, Oregon), Mal King (Ventura County, California); Jeff Silbert (Dade County, Florida). They and their staff greatly facilitated the research by making available the working documents on standards and goals and by arranging the interviews with the participants in the process.

Summary

This report draws upon the experiences of seven jurisdictions around the United States in their attempt to develop standards and goals. The review of site documentation and the conduct of interviews with participants in the developmental process provide a core of information that enables the exploration of various issues involved in such undertakings; for example, breadth of scope, function of the final document, selection of participants, meeting processes, etc. This report is not a cookbook on how to do standards and goals because there is no one way of approaching them. Rather the function of this report is to illustrate various approaches to developing standards and goals and to discuss the common issues that each jurisdiction had to deal with. This kind of information can be useful in the decision making process of other jurisdictions that are about to embark on their own standards and goals developmental process.

There is a companion report to this work. The title of that report is, "Interviews with Persons Who Participated in the Development of Standards and Goals." That report is a compendium of summaries of all the interviews conducted in the course of the project's research. It is intended as a source document for persons who wish to examine individual participants' attitudes or who wish to judge the validity of this report's generalizations and interpretations.

Table of Contents

Preface and Acknowledgements

Summary

Chapter I - Methodology	1
Chapter II - Defining Standards and Goals: Process and Product	7
Chapter III - Standards and Goals at the Local Level . .	19
Chapter IV - Function of the Standards and Goals Document	37
Chapter V - Organizing the Participants	46
Chapter VI - Follow Through on the Development of Standards and Goals	60
Conclusion	69
Bibliography	70
Appendix A - Letter sent to local planning offices inviting them to participate in the project	A-1
Appendix B - Questions asked of local planning directors	B-1
Appendix C - Questions asked of participants	C-1

CHAPTER I. METHODOLOGY

The National Association of Criminal Justice Planning Directors' constituency was interested in knowing about the experience of local planning offices* with standards and goals. Among criminal justice planners, the concept of standards and goals was receiving considerable attention from 1974 to 1976 and the states were generating a number of reports on the substantive content of standards and goals. The purpose of this report is not to add to that substance nor to evaluate how many of those substantive standards and goals have been adopted and effectively carried out, but rather to examine how seven jurisdictions responded to this flurry of activity relating to criminal justice standards and goals. The report focuses attention on how local planning offices organized for the standards and goals effort and on the reactions of participants to the process so that others can learn from their experiences.

To do this, the Association adopted a case study ap-

* Please note that the term local planning offices refers to all types of planning units at the local level of government--Criminal Justice Coordinating Councils, Council of Governments, Regional Planning Units, etc.

proach.* An invitation was sent to all members of the National Association of Criminal Justice Planning Directors--250 local planning offices--to participate in this project. Realizing the diversity of their geographic settings--urban, suburban and rural--there was a conscious attempt to obtain the participation of a cross-section of the membership. Consequently the letter (see Appendix A) noted that this research effort called for two city planning offices, two single county planning offices, and two multi-county planning offices. The letter also outlined criteria that would be used in selecting sites; among these were the availability of written documentation, the written commitment of cooperation from prospective interviewees, the number of criminal justice component areas covered in the "standards and goals" effort, and the length of time since the completion of the process.

Only ten responses were received to this letter of invitation. We believe this limited response, however, reflects

* The case study approach is useful for gathering insight about the phenomenon in which one is interested. It is more of an exploratory type research than an explanatory type wherein "the researcher attempts to obtain enough information to characterize and explain both the unique aspects of the case being studied, as well as those things it has in common with other cases." Sellitz, et al, Research Methods in Social Relations, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

the fact that standards and goals development was a rare phenomenon at the local level. As will be discussed later, the money to define standards and goals went largely to state governments and the additional monies made available to state planning agencies by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) rarely filtered down to local jurisdictions to participate in this standard setting process. The limited response to our invitation, therefore, should not be interpreted as a lack of interest by local planning offices in the research on standards and goals but rather as an indication that they had nothing to report.

Of the ten responses, two were from city planning offices, two from single county planning offices and six from multi-county offices, so the selection criteria were applied only to the multi-county planning offices. Instead of limiting the selection to two multi-county jurisdictions, three were selected because they all scored well on the criteria and because the proximity of two of the planning offices reduced the additional workload. Fortunately the two city and two county planning offices that responded also scored well on the selection criteria so that we obtained the desired cross-section without sacrificing our other concerns--written documentation, the cooperation of prospective interviewees, etc.

The sites selected were:

City	County	Multi-County
Toledo, Ohio	Dade, Florida	Mountainland Association of Governments- Provo, Utah
Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Ventura, California	District III- Salem, Oregon
		District IV- Corvallis, Oregon

In order to facilitate identifying the multi-county planning offices, hereafter the report will refer to them by the name of the city in which they are located; i.e., Provo, Salem and Corvallis.

Once the sites were selected, we reviewed copies of memos, position papers, reports, final products, and other written materials prepared in conjunction with the standards and goals effort. The review of the written materials contributed to the development of schedules of interviews that were used to obtain the observations of participants in the standards and goals developmental process. The interview schedules appear as Appendices B and C.

The interviewees, who were selected by the local planning directors, received copies of the interview schedule

prior to the interview in order to trigger their memories, to help them recall the events, and to gather their thoughts prior to the actual interview. For the most part, the interviewees were very cooperative and were able to recall their experiences and observations rather well.

The interviewees were mostly criminal justice agency personnel, which reflects the fact that most of the participants who were involved in the standards and goals developmental process came from criminal justice line agencies.

Participants Interviewed

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Criminal Justice Agency	28	62
Elected Officials	3	7
Private Citizens	<u>14</u>	<u>31</u>
Total (Not including directors)	45	100

On the average, six participants per site were interviewed. From this number we obtained a variety of individual participant's backgrounds and, in addition, a group perspective, showing how the developmental process worked at each site.

A compendium of all the interview summaries appears under a separate title, "Interviews with Persons Who Participated in the Development of Standards and Goals." Those interviews provide the primary record of what happened in each of the seven jurisdictions studied and thus provide the primary founda-

tion for this report.

This report is a distillation of observations made from conducting the 45 interviews, and reviewing the written materials received from the participating sites and the general literature on standards and goals. It is a reference document for those persons who are about to embark on their own standards and goals developmental effort, but it is useful as a general reference document for initiating change. The report highlights those administrative concerns that one may have in trying to organize a change effort, and draws on the experiences of seven jurisdictions to provide insight as to how those issues may be handled. No matter how appealing one finds standards and goals as a concept, the concept will not implement itself. If one is aware of the issues surrounding the development of standards and goals for criminal justice planning, the person who is about to undertake the process will be better prepared for it.

CHAPTER II. DEFINING STANDARDS AND GOALS PROCESS AND PRODUCT

What are standards and goals? This basic question does not lend itself to a simple response. Standards and goals is not an amorphous concept but it is an ambiguous one in that the user may choose to emphasize different aspects of the concept in order to achieve desired outcomes. It is a multi-stage process involving the development of a consensus (goals), the delineation of the paths to accomplish the goals (standards), and the development of a plan to implement the standards. The user has the choice of emphasizing the process of developing the standards and goals or of emphasizing the product that the process develops. The choice is affected by the user's concern for developing an atmosphere for change in general or for implementing specific changes. The degree of concern for achieving specific changes will also affect the user's concern for attaining compliance with the standards and goals and for developing evaluation criteria relating to adoption and effective implementation of the standards and goals. Thus within the general boundaries that exist concerning standards and goals, the user has wide discretion in determining the shape that one would like to work with. The purpose of this chapter is to report how standards and goals have been viewed in the literature and by LEAA, as well as how stan-

dards and goals have been viewed by the various sites visited for this study.

A. Planning Literature

Traditional comprehensive planners are accustomed to dealing with long range problems that are definable, understandable and consensual. The technique of standards and goals evolved to deal with short range, unclear, and non-consensual problems, particularly the nonconsensual aspects of the problem area.¹

In private sector planning, the standards and goals technique follows a rational decisionmaking process with the accent on optimizing resources. Private sector planning does this by developing a comprehensive overview of the affected policy area in order to define and locate problems. After this problem identification stage, goals are formulated and translated into operational criteria. Then evaluation and feedback mechanisms are established as integral components of the process.²

The private sector approach to standards and goals works well in an environment with a readily available measure of success--profit margin. Public planning usually does not

enjoy such an environment; consequently public planning utilization of standards and goals is geared more toward consensus building and developing general policies rather than formulating specific standards.^{3,4}

The standards and goals developmental process is useful in the public sector because it offers an opportunity for elected officials, professionals, interest groups, and the public to work together in developing a plan. Built into the developmental process is an opportunity for the negotiation of goals between groups having different interests. Usually differences can be resolved; but the minimum result of the goals developmental process should be an understanding, although not necessarily agreement, of each groups needs as well as a clarification of individual agency's goals.⁵ Because many public agencies and service delivery systems do not have clearly defined or consensual goals, a forum to discuss several goals is particularly valuable.

In some situations, getting public sector groups (e.g., criminal justice) to discuss goals may be a major breakthrough; and if the process goes no further, it can be considered a success on that level. Discussing standards and goals, however, can lead to specific actions if the goals developmental process is followed by a standards formulation process.

This provides the policymakers with an opportunity to choose the means to attain their goals. By connecting implementation with policymaking, the opportunity for a smooth change is further enhanced.⁶

Finally the standards and goals technique can also provide an element of stability and consistency if it results in a standards and goals document, or a written plan that does not become obsolete quickly. This document can be an important source of information--the goals provide information of future directions and the standards provide information on routes to reach those future directions. The document can also demonstrate the interconnection between agencies when more than one agency is involved in the effort.

The major limitation of developing standards and goals as a planning tool is the difficulty of determining and locating problems and then defining realistic and practical solutions. Preconceptions and value judgments come into play, creating an opportunity for conflict and ill will. Additionally, goal formulation is a difficult task; goals that are too general are difficult to assess, while goals that are too specific read like program descriptions and confuse goals with standards.

There is a similar problem in formulating standards. On the one hand, general standards can be so vague as to provide no direction to meet the desired goals and, on the other hand,

very specific standards can be so rigid as to prevent the exercise of discretion to meet changing conditions. A further problem is the agencies' limited capacity to explore all alternatives for reaching a goal. Because of time and/or fiscal constraints, the first standard considered often becomes the standard selected.⁸

Standards and goals, as well as any other planning technique, will be affected by the complexity of the problem that it is attempting to address and the target group who will be affected by the defined standards and goals.⁹ The effectiveness and competence of those who direct the effort are important considerations and a measure of that competence and effectiveness is how well those persons can deal with the flexibility that standards and goals afford.

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, standards and goals is a multi-stage process involving the development of a consensus (goals), the delineation of the paths to accomplish the goals (standards), and the development of a plan to implement the standards. Completion of all three stages at once may be difficult, if not impossible, given the situation and the target group. The ideal is hard to achieve but movement in the direction of the ideal is progress, and the challenge to the person organizing standards and goals is to

determine how far the situation will allow one to go.

B. National Advisory Commission

The National Advisory Commission (NAC) on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals began work in October 1971 with the mission to provide substantive leadership in the field of criminal justice. Four priorities were of major concern to NAC: (1) to prevent juvenile delinquency, (2) to improve the delivery of social services, (3) to reduce delays in the criminal justice process, and (4) to increase citizen participation.¹⁰ In approaching these four priority areas, NAC turned to the leading experts in criminal justice in order to draw from their collective insight what the problems confronting criminal justice were and what the potential solutions to those problems might be. The NAC effort also provided a convenient forum for examining recent experimental innovations that were funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) or by nonprofit foundations such as the Ford or the Rockefeller Foundations. Much was made of these solid, field tested successful models that provided concrete examples of the benefits to be gained from developing alternatives to traditional practices. All the work that NAC engaged in was directed at fostering an atmosphere for change in existing criminal justice practices.

The major problem confronting NAC was the fact that it was only an advisory body. State and local governments were responsible for implementing the recommendations that NAC was making and they had to deal with the problems surrounding implementation. NAC was aware of its advisory status and constantly pointed out that its standards and goals should serve as models for states when they attempted to develop their own standards and goals. NAC had faith in the power of the rationale behind its standards and goals and they urged LEAA to make states take the NAC standards and goals into consideration when putting together the state comprehensive plan. NAC believed "that there are elements readily identifiable in certain standards that are essential to any effective criminal justice system, and these elements serve as the basis for minimum standards for funding assistance."¹¹ This exhortation became law with the passage of the 1973 Crime Control Act wherein states were required to undertake a standards and goals developmental process and to include the resulting standards and goals in the state planning agency's (SPA) comprehensive plan.¹² Two observations are in order regarding the requirement that states develop standards and goals and incorporate them into their SPA comprehensive plan.

First we observe the ambivalent nature of the NAC stan-

dards and goals. While the standards and goals were voluntary, nonetheless they had to be considered and acted upon in a mandated state level standards and goals process if the state was to receive money from LEAA. The power of reason was augmented by the power of money (even though the LEAA money constitutes less than 5 percent of total criminal justice expenditures). For example, the state of Oregon was a voluntary participant in a standards and goals developmental process in 1973, but the following year, developing statewide standards and goals was no longer voluntary; LEAA guidelines (M 4100) required it.

The second observation relates to LEAA's heavy reliance on state government to follow through on the standards and goals effort. This reliance on the states ignores the reality that nearly two-thirds of all monies spent on criminal justice comes from local governments and many of the areas that are covered by standards and goals are the responsibilities of local governments--police, jails, prosecution, and some courts. This issue is pointed out because it was state not local governments that received discretionary monies from LEAA to develop standards and goals. Local governments received next to nothing from LEAA or from the states. Of the sites visited, only one (Dade County, Florida) received substantial support for its

standards and goals efforts; the two jurisdictions from Oregon (Salem and Corvallis) received approximately \$3,000 each. The remaining sites received nothing and so had to develop standards and goals out of existing budgets.

The element of compliance, then, seeped into the standards and goals process. LEAA adopted standards and goals as a basic planning tool and forced state planning agencies into using it. A more subtle element of compliance surfaced with LEAA's forcing state planning agencies to entertain the national agenda for crime and criminal justice in its considerations of what the state agenda should be. By mandating a standards and goals developmental process, LEAA also shifted the focus from the process to the product. States were forced to come up with something concrete to place in the SPA comprehensive plan. There was little room for the intangibles of developing consensus or fostering an atmosphere for change.

This element of compliance forced by LEAA established the tone under which state and local jurisdictions first came into contact with standards and goals. Participation was not totally voluntary because involvement was precipitated as a rear action defensive measure on developments emanating from the state.

C. Conclusion

The first step in undertaking standards and goals is to develop a forum where divergent groups can meet to form a consensus. Clearly NAC reached consensus as to what it would like to see happening in criminal justice nationwide. NAC's call for action on the part of state governments may have been premature because the states got involved in standards and goals without the benefit of developing grass roots consensus. The states were preoccupied with LEAA planning guidelines and there was little consideration for internalizing the standards and goals or trying to create a sense of ownership in them. To create a sense of ownership does not necessarily mean re-writing the NAC or state standards and goals. In fact the process followed by most of the seven jurisdictions studied, wherein the NAC and state standards were reviewed, discussed and then accepted, modified or rejected, can lead to a sense of ownership. The seven local jurisdictions that we studied evidenced a good deal of variety in their approach to standards and goals and that variety stemmed partially from the extent to which they were able to progress from consensus building to the actual implementation of standards.

In Chapter III, we will describe how each of the different jurisdictions approached standards and goals. These descriptions

of what actually took place will demonstrate to the reader the variety that can exist in approaching standards and goals or any change concept--a variety that stems from the different and, in some instances, unique characteristics of the local jurisdictions studied. These descriptions will also better prepare the reader for understanding the discussion of the various issues involving a standards and goals developmental process in the subsequent chapters.

-
- ¹ Horst W. J. Rittel and Melvin W. Webber, "Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning," Policy Sciences 4 (1973), p. 158.
 - ² Donald N. Rothblatt, "Rational Planning Reexamined," Journal of the American Institute of Planners (January, 1974), p. 26.
 - ³ Richard R. Nelson, "Intellectualizing About the Moon-Ghetto Metaphor: A Study of the Current Malaise of Rational Analysis of Social Problems," Policy Sciences 5 (1974), p. 411.
 - ⁴ Dennis A. Rondinelli, "Urban and Regional Development Planning: Policy and Administration", Policy Sciences 5 (1974), p. 243.
 - ⁵ Op. cit., Rothblatt, p. 27.
 - ⁶ Thomas B. Smith, "The Policy Implementation Process," Policy Sciences 4 (1973), p. 209.
 - ⁷ Op. cit., Rittel and Weber, p. 159.
 - ⁸ J. Forbes (ed.), Studies in Social Science and Planning (1973), p. 40.
 - ⁹ Op. cit., Smith, p. 209.

- 10 National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, A National Strategy to Reduce Crime (1973), p. 6.
- 11 Ibid. p. 231.
- 12 Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Safe Streets Reconsidered: The Block Grant Experience 1968-1975, p. 78.

CHAPTER III. STANDARDS AND GOALS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

All of the local jurisdictions visited, except Ventura County, California, became involved in developing standards and goals in reaction to what was being done at the state level. That fact is the underlying context for local standards and goals planning, but from there the different jurisdictions developed various strategies and expectations. This chapter describes how the standards and goals process worked in each of the seven sites visited.

Provo, Utah

Involvement with standards and goals coincided with Provo's effort to restructure its Law Enforcement Planning Council (LEPC). The planning council was expanded to include four task forces that were set up along functional lines to deal with: systems development, police services and community crime prevention, youth development and delinquency prevention, and criminal adjudication and adult corrections. This change was made to obtain broader participation in the planning process; thus the planning council changed from a single body of 18 persons to a group of four task forces of approximately 12 persons each. The original planning council assumed a new role in that it now comprises two persons from each of the four task forces

who provide the forum for over-viewing the work of the four task forces.

In order to involve persons and agencies who were previously not involved in Provo's planning efforts for criminal justice, a letter was sent to all criminal justice agencies and many ancillary agencies inviting them to appoint a representative from their agency to one of the task forces. While this effort broadened participation, it did not obtain the participation of the leadership from these various agencies. Nonetheless, a balance among elected officials, criminal justice agency personnel, social welfare agency personnel, and school board personnel was achieved.

The standards and goals developmental process operated within this new planning mechanism. Although the Provo effort was distinct from the State of Utah effort, Provo provided the task forces with copies of Utah's proposed standards and goals, which provided the initial basis of discussion for many of the standards and goals considered for the Provo area. Copies of the National Advisory Commission's (NAC's) reports were also available for consideration.

The Provo planning staff took a strong leadership role in the standards and goals effort. Staff tried to keep the task forces informed on the specific standards and goals

and to provide additional information on issues that arose in the discussion surrounding specific standards. Limited resources--manpower and financial--prevented the planning staff from doing all that it thought the effort required. Only a few position papers were developed and little in the way of statistical analysis was performed. Although the planning staff felt remiss about not providing sufficient information to the task forces, the individual task force members did not complain and felt more comfortable relying on their personal observations rather than on quantitative data.

The Provo planning staff spent approximately 40 percent of its time on standards and goals. In addition to providing as much information as its resources would allow, the staff tried to weave a sense of continuity throughout the process. The staff provided direction to the task forces by encouraging members to focus on the issues posed by the standards and goals process rather than on every individual standard and goal.

The intent of the criminal justice planning director was to make the standards and goals concept a vehicle for creating a multi-year plan for the Provo area. Although the process began in 1975, it is only with the 1978 Provo plan that the standards and goals, which were established by the task forces, became part of the criminal justice plan itself.

Corvallis, Oregon

Corvallis did not become involved with standards and goals definition until after the State of Oregon's standards and goals were drafted and released to the public for comment. The state's standards ignited such an uproar from criminal justice agencies around the state that the state planning agency (SPA) had to promise that nothing would be done with the standards and goals until they could be reviewed at the local level. It was at this time that the Oregon SPA offered the local planning units some financial assistance to carry out this review process (approximately \$3,000).

The Corvallis standards and goals effort began when the planning director sent a questionnaire to all of the criminal justice agency administrators in the district. This questionnaire was designed to gauge each administrator's attitudes toward the various state standards and goals. This survey of administrators' attitudes provided background information that was used in forming the ad hoc committees on standards and goals. Three ad hoc committees were established--one for each county in the planning district--the effort, therefore, was organized along geographical rather than functional lines.

The supervisory board for the Corvallis planning district is the Criminal Justice Technical Advisory Committee. All

members of that committee were invited to participate in the standards and goals process. In order to involve people outside the field of criminal justice, invitations were also sent to people who had previously demonstrated an interest in criminal justice or in community affairs. These names were obtained by canvassing other agencies in the area about citizens who had previously shown an interest in community affairs. To open up the composition of the standards and goals committees even further, information on the effort was provided to the media and media advertising led to recruiting one additional person.

The public response and even the criminal justice agency response were less than was desired. Except for the League of Women Voters, the public expressed little interest in the effort, and outside of the police and sheriff departments, there was little interest expressed by the other criminal justice agencies (prosecutors and judges).

Consequently, instead of getting new perspectives on the criminal justice system, Corvallis benefitted only from the insights of those who were already involved in the criminal justice planning process. That development was a source of disappointment to the participants as well as to the Corvallis planning director because they were hoping to achieve

broader representation from the public in order to hear their concerns and to educate them about criminal justice.

The committees did not feel particularly constrained by the framework imposed on them; i.e., to review and comment on the state's standards and goals. The planning staff played a coordinating role in the standards and goals process. At the outset, staff provided the committee members with the NAC reports, the State of Oregon's drafted standards and goals, The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society, the previous Corvallis district criminal justice plans, and statistical data with interpretation. Background information and instructions regarding the committees' task were presented verbally. Throughout the process, the planning staff provided information to the committees and members felt that they received good staff support. This effort consumed all the money provided for it as well as an additional 3 to 6 months of the criminal justice planning director's time.

This whole effort was primarily geared toward accomplishing a local review of the state standards and goals. The review was sent to the state with the understanding that the review would be taken into consideration when the state revised the standards and goals. To date, after four reviews, the State of Oregon has still not come out with a finalized version of

state standards and goals.

Salem, Oregon

As was the case with Corvallis, Salem became involved only after the State of Oregon drafted the state standards and goals and the state planning agency (SPA) made available approximately \$3,000 for Salem to conduct a review of those state standards.

Salem is unique among the seven jurisdictions studied in that it sponsored a conference in 1971 that brought together all the principals in criminal justice and the public to discuss criminal justice priorities. That conference provided the basic guidance to criminal justice planning in the Salem area for the following 3 years. The experience with that 1971 conference and its product was so good that the Salem planning office decided to use a conference setting as the mechanism for reviewing the state's standards and goals. A two day conference with approximately 100 persons was planned.

All of the members of the Salem Law Enforcement Planning Commission were invited to attend. Invitations were also extended to members of other advisory boards in the district, representatives of related agencies, and representatives of private nonprofit agencies such as the American Civil Liberties

Union and the League of Women Voters. In addition lists of interested citizens were compiled from other sources within the district. The list of the 1971 conference attendees was also utilized. The Salem planning office effectively attained the desired composition of at least 50 percent of the conferees from outside of the criminal justice agencies, and their effort to involve critics of the criminal justice system was also successful.

The conference began with a short orientation on standards and goals. Many participants had been exposed to the state effort prior to their local involvement and were familiar, therefore, with the concept. Each conferee received a copy of the State of Oregon's drafted standards and goals and a booklet that was prepared by the Salem planning office on the standards and goals pertinent to the Salem area.

Following orientation the conferees were then divided into smaller groups along functional lines--police, courts, juvenile delinquency, etc. Each workshop was assigned a recorder, an expert in the functional area, and a facilitator who saw to it that the group moved along. The workshops used the state standards and goals as the basic parameter for conversation but some issues outside of the state document were also discussed.

Along with the resources set aside under the grant, 50 percent of the Salem agency's time was devoted to standards and goals. Even so, the Salem planning office lacked the staff to research, analyze and assess empirically the proposed state standards satisfactorily. Although the planning staff was dissatisfied with the amount of information it could provide to the participants, the participants were less negative. Most felt that the staff was responsive to their informational needs.

In addition to the primary purpose of the conference, which was to review the state's standards and goals and to send that review back to the SPA, the Salem planning director saw the conference as providing an excellent opportunity to generate community interest in criminal justice and to inject community concerns into the criminal justice process. The conference also served to establish parameters for future programs.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The Milwaukee experience with standards and goals was peculiar from the other jurisdictions studied. The Wisconsin SPA ordered all local planning offices to participate in the state process rather than requesting their participation. The thrust of the state effort appeared to be one of coopting the local planning offices by making them participate in the process.

The State of Wisconsin established a special committee to develop statewide standards and goals. This special committee was divided along functional lines into five subcommittees. The entire special committee met at the beginning and at the end of the effort, with the subcommittees meeting separately in between. Committee members were selected by the SPA, but subcommittee chairs were given the opportunity to review the names of those who were to serve on their subcommittee. The desired composition of the special committee was a cross-representation of the functional components of the criminal justice system and the geographical diversity of the state. Some participants felt, however, that while the backgrounds of the members varied, the special committee was stacked to suit the SPA's viewpoint. Although each agency was represented, it was only token representation.

Every local planning director was an ex-officio member of all five subcommittees, invited to attend all subcommittee meetings. Because these meetings sometimes fell on the same day and in different parts of the state, it was not possible for the local planning directors to participate fully. In addition to establishing the special committee on standards and goals, the state held a series of open hearings throughout the state. The local planning offices were told when their regional hearing was scheduled and were asked to publicize it.

The development of standards and goals in Wisconsin was a state orchestrated process with no meaningful role for the local planning offices. On paper the SPA appeared interested in providing local planners the opportunity to input to the standards and goals development process, but in reality this did not occur. For example, the SPA did not consult the local planning offices regarding the selection of members to the special committee. The local planning offices also received no funds for the standards and goals effort, but were required to devote time and resources to it. If they wished to travel to a subcommittee meeting, it was at their agency's or their own expense. In order to keep their boards and constituency up to date on the standards and goals activity, they also reproduced the state documents at their agency's own expense.

In Milwaukee the local planning offices (there are two-- the city and the region) chose to limit their participation to the end of the process because it was absolutely impossible to participate fully in the subcommittees. Their limited resources prevented them from attending all the subcommittee meetings and even at those subcommittee meetings they did attend their participation was restricted. As the standards and goals development process neared an end, both the city and region worked toward protecting local interests by voicing opposition

to those standards and goals that were repugnant to local planning concerns.

The Milwaukee experience was studied because it so clearly illustrates what occurs when any concept is forced upon an agency. Milwaukee and the other local planning offices in Wisconsin resisted the state effort, developed no ownership in the standards and goals, and generally undertook a combative stance directed at defeating particularly odious standards and goals.

Toledo, Ohio

In December 1974, Toledo received the first report from the State of Ohio on standards and goals. The report focused on six areas: recruitment and selection of law enforcement officers, police-community crime prevention, diversion of adults, diversion of juveniles, reducing trial delay, and training for court personnel. The Ohio SPA informed Toledo that it had 90 days to review and to comment on the report.

The local criminal justice advisory council decided to respond to the standards and goals. The chairperson of the advisory council created a task force to review the state's standards and goals. When he selected the members to serve on that task force, he strived to obtain a balanced perspective by designating one representative from each criminal

justice component, as well as private citizens who were known to be articulate and informed about criminal justice. At the start of the process, the Toledo planning office provided the task force members with the NAC Reports, the State of Ohio's drafted standards and goals, and the National Correctional Association's minimum standards. Not much additional information was provided during the review process as the task force was content to rely on their collective experience and judgment, but the local planning office staff was heavily involved in the task force work. They prepared meeting agendas for every task force meeting and kept in close contact with the task force chairperson. The task force met weekly for 6 months, generally during lunch. Although the task force considered breaking up into subcommittees and some subcommittees were established, they never met.

The Toledo task force effort entailed reviewing the state document standard by standard to make sure that the standards were not calling for something that the city could not do. To a limited extent, the group was able to generate some extended discussion in two areas--juvenile status offenders and police recruitment practices. The group concentrated on adopting standards in these two areas.

Although this particular task force had one rather speci-

fic duty to perform--review the state standards--and it has since dissolved, nonetheless, the Toledo planning office continues to be involved with standards and goals. That involvement, however, is generally with rather specific areas (e.g., jail standards) and is directed at achieving immediate and concrete changes.

Ventura County, California

Like Provo described earlier, Ventura County assimilated the development of local standards and goals into its regular planning process. In fact, standards and goals were viewed as the tool that would improve Ventura's planning capacity. They approached standards and goals by way of a two-phase delphi exercise.

The first portion of the exercise involved the distribution of a questionnaire that sought to identify problem areas in criminal justice. The questionnaire was sent to approximately 1,000 criminal justice practitioners in the Ventura area. The responses to this questionnaire were then aggregated by the Ventura County planning staff and the information was recorded into a 50-page document that listed the problems and needs of the Ventura area along with the supporting data. This document was then forwarded to participants in the second portion of the exercise.

The second portion of the delphi exercise dealt with goal-setting. The 100 persons who participated in this portion were drawn from the Ventura criminal justice planning supervisory board, its alternates, and its task forces. No attempt was made to involve others.

The goal-setting portion of the exercise was planned to consist of three rounds. The first round was an open-ended questionnaire that enumerated the various issues confronting criminal justice. Responses to the first round were then aggregated by the planning staff and subsequently forwarded back to the participants for round two. When the responses to round two were returned, the planning staff aggregated the information; however, the second round responses were not forwarded for a third round of comment because the planning board believed that sufficient consensus had been reached and that a third round would not be necessary.

The Ventura County planning office undertook the delphi exercise because of the lack of meaningful goal setting by the supervisory board and the failure of the board to realize its full potential. The delphi technique was viewed as an opportunity to form a comprehensive and systematic planning perspective for criminal justice. While it is depersonalizing and involves considerable paperwork, the delphi exercise did

not consume huge portions of the planning staff's time and it did involve decisionmakers.

Dade County, Florida

Dade County is unusual among the sites studied because it did receive substantial funding from the Florida SPA to participate in a standards and goals developmental process. The Dade County planning office received a \$49,000 grant from the SPA which enabled them to hire two full-time staff persons.

Dade County established five committees to deal with standards and goals divided by functional areas--police, courts, adult corrections, juvenile corrections, and prevention. Members for each committee were selected by the Dade County Criminal Justice Advisory Council, with the assistance of staff at the planning office. The Advisory Council aimed for members who would reflect involvement in the committee's functional area, but whose views and interests were divergent. Committee members were assigned issues in which they were considered expert. The Advisory Council sought private citizen participation in addition to line agency participation and to a large extent it was able to attain it.

Committee members were given the State of Florida's drafted standards and goals. They were also provided with information

on the Dade County standards and goals effort. The committees were free to go beyond the framework of the state's drafted standards and goals and two committees did add sections that were completely outside the state's framework.

In addition to establishing and maintaining a well-organized process, the major function of the two full-time staff persons, who were hired from the SPA grant, was to attend all the SPA meetings on standards and goals to ensure that the local recommendations were incorporated into the state standards and goals document. Although the staff persons prepared information for the committee meetings, most research was conducted by the committee members or their staff. Research was conducted but quantitative data were not compiled or utilized very much.

The Dade County standards and goals effort was geared toward generating input for the state to consider when it prepared statewide standards and goals. The local effort did, however, provide a convenient forum for getting public and private agency officials together and for educating participants about criminal justice.

Summary

As the preceding descriptions have clearly illustrated, there was a degree of variety among the local planning offices in their approach toward standards and goals. Despite the variety, there were a number of concerns common to them all.

In Chapter IV we will examine those concerns and how they relate to the function of the standards and goals endeavor.

CHAPTER IV. THE FUNCTION OF STANDARDS AND GOALS

The standards and goals development process functioned primarily as a tool for local planning, but the application of the tool to local planning processes varied. This chapter explores some of the questions surrounding the local jurisdictions' involvement with standards and goals. Specifically we will examine the motivation for becoming involved with standards and goals, the degree of specificity sought from the process, and the perceived role for standards and goals in the planning process.

A. Motivation

Perhaps the most significant factor observed among the jurisdictions we visited, which influenced their initial and subsequent responses to standards and goals, was whether or not the jurisdiction undertook the process voluntarily. The sites spanned a wide spectrum from totally voluntary (Ventura) to completely involuntary (Milwaukee). Provo's involvement was voluntary, but not totally so because it hoped to prevent the State of Utah from coming in with its own standards and goals at some later time. The remaining four sites did not have to participate in the review of state standards and goals but the suspicion was strong that if they did not, they might live to regret it.

The recurrent fear that the state was trying to put something over on local government cannot be understated. There was

the feeling that the state government was intruding, via standards and goals, on local prerogatives. Past experiences with LEAA and/or the state criminal justice planning agencies which set local priorities, through national initiatives or stringent state "compatibility" requirements, further intensified this distrust. To some degree, therefore, the state-generated standards and goals acted as an impetus towards the development of local standards for reasons of style rather than of substance. This led the local jurisdictions to develop fairly general standards and goals.

B. Levels of Generality

As noted previously, the standards and goals process can be viewed as having three stages--consensus building, standard formulation, and implementation strategy--and each stage operates at a different level of generality. Consensus building is geared toward producing general goals while the standards formulation process and the implementation plan move one in the direction of specificity in attempting to achieve those goals.

Of the seven jurisdictions studied, there was little progress beyond the consensus building stage of the standards and goals process. Consequently, there was little concern about specifics and the scope of the effort tended to be broad in terms of the topical area covered. There was also sparse use of quantitative data in the developmental process. This is not meant to be critical, but rather to point out that these

sites did choose to stay at the goal development stage and to acknowledge that the functions that these jurisdictions created for standards and goals relate very heavily to this fact.

Movement toward the formation of specific standards, however, did occur. Toledo, for example, came up with some specific standards on police recruitment policies and the deinstitutionalization of juvenile status offenders. Provo also developed some specific standards that were incorporated into its local plan and Ventura, in addition to coming up with some specific standards and goals, committed itself to trying to achieve them over a five year period. Nevertheless, none of the sites reached a level that called for a plan to implement the proposed standards and goals with the designation of responsibility and the allocation of resources mapped out. Rather, the standards and goals document was presented as a reference document for the SPA, the local planning office, the local line agencies, local legislative bodies, and local public officials to assist them in their decisionmaking and, in some instances, to act as a benchmark that would assist at some later time in evaluating how well the criminal justice agencies were moving toward desired objectives.

C. Compliance

Given the fact that these jurisdictions remained largely at the consensus building stage, there was not much in specifics that they could look at to see whether or not the affected

agencies were adopting the standards and goals. Furthermore, none of the jurisdictions were really in the position to make agencies comply with standards and goals because they lacked the power and authority to do so. Some of the changes that the standards and goals called for required only policy changes-- changes that would cost nothing financially. Those changes, however, were at the discretion of the particular line agency executives. Other changes required very large expenditures of monies, for example, anything dealing with jail construction, and those changes would require action on the part of the line agency executive and the local legislative body. There was an attempt, especially in Ventura, to go beyond planning for the expenditure of LEAA monies but the standards and goals were not a viable mechanism for forcing change. Some agencies, like the Salem police department, accepted the results and utilized them by examining the agency's policies and procedures in light of the proposed standards and goals. Other agencies, however, evidenced an eclectic approach where they adopted what they liked and ignored what they did not like.

Most of the power available to the local planning offices stems from the LEAA monies and that power is rather marginal when one realizes that those monies constitute less than five percent of total criminal justice expenditures at the local level of government. Many of the participants were uncertain as to how the LEAA monies could be used in implementing

standards and goals. While they were not adverse to using the standards and goals in establishing funding priorities, many of the participants were reluctant to see the standards and goals become a necessary condition for funding projects in fear that a good project would have to be rejected because it fell outside the areas covered by the standards and goals effort.

However, compliance was an issue in another context. While the specific standards and goals may have been perfectly acceptable, forced compliance to something developed at another governmental level was not. To illustrate this point we draw upon the observation made by the Salem planning director. He observed that the standards and goals that Salem developed were not all that different from those proposed by the State of Oregon--the ones that created an uproar. The fact that people had the opportunity to review them with the option to reject them apparently developed some sense of ownership in the standards and goals and so made standards and goals less threatening. This sense of feeling threatened by unknown state designs also generated a different twist on consensus building. Many of the sites spent as much time discussing not only what could be done, but also what could not be done. Consequently, in their review of the state's standards and goals, these local jurisdictions rejected as well as accepted particular standards and goals.

An interesting observation about this review process was made by persons who participated at both the state and local standards and goals development process. They observed the relatively small attention that the state effort paid toward the ramifications of the standards and goals on local line agencies. Consideration of those ramifications did not surface until the standards and goals were discussed at the local level. Opposition to particular standards and goals reflected such concerns as the lack of financial resources or personnel to carry them out, and brought about the modification or rejection of particular standards and goals.

Participants wanted a flexible document that left options open to individuals and their agencies. The fear or mandated standards and goals seemed to be left over from the fear of the state mandating compliance and preempting local government's prerogatives, and even those sites (Ventura and Provo) that voluntarily became involved with standards and goals leaned toward flexibility. One explanation for this, suggested by a participant in the process, was that the implementation dates for the standards and goals were too far in the future for rigid control.

There is a lesson to be learned about compliance from the experiences of the sites visited for this study. Just as these jurisdictions were not inclined to embrace standards and goals from national and state levels of government blindly,

similarly line agencies are not likely to rush to accept standards and goals developed by local planning offices. One may try to obtain compliance through power--political or economic--but local planning offices and state planning agencies do not have that kind of power over line agencies. The power of reason prevails only if the basic premises are accepted. The extent to which one must rely on a compliance strategy is a measure of the extent to which the standards and goals process failed to develop a sense of ownership in those who must work with them.

D. Client

The motivation for becoming involved in the standards and goals development process largely determined who was supposed to benefit from the program. To varying degrees, the effort was to improve planning. However, improving planning for those jurisdictions that did not initiate the process meant first keeping the state planning agency in check by impacting the state standards and goals to reflect local concerns. This primary consideration and other considerations such as improving local planning efforts were basically experiential--taking opportunities as they presented themselves. Thus some planning directors thought that standards and goals would be useful as a means of injecting community concerns into the planning process and others saw them as helping to set priorities.

Because Ventura and Provo initiated the standards and goals process they entered it with much clearer expectations as to how standards and goals could help local planning without having to worry about the added consideration of trying to affect state standards and goals. Ventura used the delphi exercise to assist the planning board in focusing on the major concerns in the county's criminal justice system while in Provo standards and goals provided the basis for a multi-year plan.

None of the jurisdictions saw standards and goals as replacing the planning processes that already existed. Standards and goals were a tool, not an end in themselves.

E. Educational Aspect

Many of the line agency personnel and private citizens who participated in the standards and goals development process acknowledged the usefulness of the final document as a planning tool. However, these persons also saw the process and the product as a valuable educational tool and most underwent a good learning experience in which they also gained a broader perspective on the criminal justice system. The educational benefits of standards and goals were not generally anticipated by many of the planning directors but their value is that they can enhance the prospects for broad based, comprehensive planning.

F. Summary

The standards and goals efforts in these local jurisdictions

did not serve as the basis for revolutionizing the criminal justice system. None of the jurisdictions can be viewed as having followed a true standards and goals model to its final stage although Ventura did come fairly close. Rather the involvement of most of the jurisdictions with the process was affected by a suspicion of state intentions. In a field that was relatively new--local criminal justice planning--they tended to exploit those aspects that were useful to them and to ignore those aspects that were of little assistance to them. In a field that is characterized by a collection of independent agencies divided along jurisdictional and functional lines, it is no wonder that they chose to emphasize the consensus building aspects of standards and goals and to leave the development of specific changes to subsequent processes.

CHAPTER V. ORGANIZING THE PARTICIPANTS

The standards and goals process requires the involvement of persons beyond the planning staff and obtaining that participation is not a simple task. The planning office contemplating the use of standards and goals needs to consider the number of persons it wants to involve and the kind of backgrounds desired--private citizens, elected officials, or agency personnel. Additional decisions must be made concerning the length of time these persons are expected to participate in the process and what type of meeting structure would best suit the planning office's needs. The responses to all these considerations, of course, will be heavily influenced by the planning office's expectation for the standards and goals process; in fact decisions flow easier once these considerations are resolved. The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the various options that are available to a planning office for selecting and organizing participants and some of the merits and problems of the various available options.

A. Selecting the Participants

The first question confronting the planning office deals with the selection of the participants. While it is generally acknowledged that a cross-representation of all the criminal justice components is important, there are several other questions

that need to be raised. They are:

- Should participation be limited to those knowledgeable of the criminal justice process?
- Should there be community representation and to what extent?
- Should the participants be persons in decisionmaking positions?
- How are the desired participants attracted to the process?
- How will the planning office act to maintain participants' interest?

Answers to the first three questions will be heavily influenced by decisions concerning the function of the standards and goals process. If opening up the planning process is one of the anticipated uses of standards and goals, then participation should be broad. If implementation of specific changes is a major concern, the need to have decision makers involved in the process assumes greater importance.

Once the desired composition is taken care of, the next hurdle is to identify specific people. This is particularly difficult for those planning offices that are seeking wide participation with the hope of gaining new perspectives on criminal justice. If the planning office is trying to obtain broader participation from elected officials or agency administrators, the task is manageable because there are organizational charts that can assist in identifying the type of person desired.

Then it is just a matter of matching a name up with an organizational or political position. If, on the other hand, the planning office is trying to obtain broader public participation, then the task becomes less manageable. Allocating slots to representatives from such public interest groups as the League of Women Voters and the American Civil Liberties Union helps; but if the planning office goes beyond that, it is confronted with the simple fact that the public is not organized in the sense that there are specific persons assigned the responsibility to monitor criminal justice activities.

In dealing with this problem of trying to identify interested private citizens, some of the local planning offices began their search by contacting other local agencies to find out which citizens were involved in community affairs. The local planning office then compiled mailing lists and invited these people to participate in the standards and goals process. This procedure worked moderately well in Salem where approximately 50 people were recruited. Media advertising was also used but it did not prove to be very productive, as it produced only one participant in response to a local newspaper advertisement.

If there was one factor that facilitated the selection of participants, it was the lack of controversy surrounding their selection. None of the sites had any problems dealing with political pressures on appointing persons with particular per-

spectives. The standards and goals process was a relatively low profile operation in the sites we visited.

The final problem with respect to getting people involved in the standards and goals process is getting them to attend the meetings. A recurring problem among the jurisdictions visited was apathy on the part of the public and failure to get agency administrators, prosecutors and judges to participate as much as the local planning office would have liked. This was particularly true in those jurisdictions that sought to broaden participation in standards and goals beyond the planning board. It is a difficult problem and none of the sites had an easy solution.

B. The Piggy-Back Approach

A number of planners we interviewed expressed concern about their inability to get people to participate in the standards and goals process. One suggestion to deal with this problem was to have short presentations (less than an hour) on standards and goals before regularly scheduled community meetings such as the PTA, Chamber of Commerce, or the Kiwanis.

Our opinion on this is that it might help if one were to use these meetings to disseminate information about standards and goals, but it might not prove to be productive as a mechanism for obtaining input into the developmental process. Obtaining a group's input would require more than one hour's time; however,

even if one had the opportunity to work with the group over a protracted period of time, there is still some doubt as to how effective it would be. Provo piggy-backed the standards and goals process on to its regular planning process and the planning director was not satisfied with how that worked out. His dissatisfaction stems from the fact that standards and goals were constantly placed on the back burner while the participants discussed more immediate concerns that affected the local planning process.

C. Organizing the Participants

The problem of maintaining the interest of the participants in the standards and goals process can be affected by the amount of time that the planning office expects from them. That expectation will greatly affect the way the effort is organized. There are some rather basic decisions here. How intense should the effort be? How long should it last? In our study we found three major mechanisms:--the delphi, the task force, and the conference.

Some jurisdictions used a mix of all three. Salem, for example, used a conference to get broader input into the planning process and then took the results of its conference and worked them into the on-going planning committee process. The situation was similar for Ventura which used the delphi to help its planning committee to make basic decisions about the future.

In discussing the various techniques we would like to deal with the delphi first because it breaks our cognitive bind when dealing with people; i.e., participation does not require physical presence.

1. Delphi. Delphi is a process of group problem solving and forecasting that does not require face-to-face meetings between the group members (called panelists). The traditional delphi procedure consists of four rounds of questions that are successively distributed to the panelists with the first round being fairly open ended.¹ The results of each round's questionnaires are aggregated as the basis for the next round, until the final round at which stage a consensus is usually reached.²

One major feature of a delphi exercise is that panelists work independently at their home or office. Because panelists find their own time to give thought to the issues, they do not have to be concerned about setting aside blocks of time to meet with other participants in the process. The planning office, therefore, does not have to be concerned about finding a meeting time convenient to most participants. However, the amount of time that each panelist spends on the exercise is an individual decision that cannot be regulated. The delphi exercise is a lot of work for the panelists and the work can become tedious. The ranking procedure is both cumbersome and difficult. Clearly, care must be taken to select responsible individuals to participate in the delphi panel. In Ventura some of the panelists

stated that they had to force themselves to complete the exercise and found that after ranking their preferences, they had to force themselves not to become arbitrary in the rest of the rankings.

A second major feature of the delphi is that each panelist's response carries equal weight regardless of his/her skill, technical expertise, or position. This equality prevents decisions from being made on the strength of a forceful personality, but it has the risk of the results being skewed by less knowledgeable people with narrow interests.

On the one hand, a delphi procedure does eliminate the problem of people haggling with each other (a common task force occurrence); but on the other hand it eliminates the opportunity for useful interactive discussion and thoughtful explanations of issues. Some of the delphi disadvantages can be mitigated to capitalize on the more positive feature by modifying the delphi procedure to suit the jurisdiction's needs. In Ventura instead of ranking the final round responses independently as in a traditional model, the participants met together and decided the final rankings as a group.

) By not using a pure delphi model, Ventura was able to cut its paperwork and to provide an opportunity for some discussion. In doing the final rankings at a meeting instead of individually, they were able to make a smooth transition to the

political realm. At that meeting, there was an opportunity for tradeoffs and political adjustments, but the original delphi structure made the vested interests less influential and made the more participatory than previous planning efforts.

Several modifications to the delphi exercise were suggested by participants in the Ventura process. One such suggestion was to simplify the scoring system by eliminating the weight in responses. If this modification were utilized, the participants' task would be easier, but aggregating the responses would be more difficult. Another suggestion was to use a delphi exercise and then move into task forces, thereby gaining the best of both approaches.

2. Conference. Just as the delphi enables one to involve large groups of people, so too does the conference format and like the delphi, it lasts a relatively short time and requires a good deal of preparation and planning. Salem had the advantage of having staged a conference three years prior so it had a pretty good idea of what was required to undertake this approach.

The conference in Salem lasted two days and contained a rather disparate audience--50 percent were non-criminal justice types. This situation placed an educational burden on the planning office. The planning office also needed to have a structured program in order to funnel participant interests. Consequently the conference began with a plenary

session describing the effort and then the planning office organized the participants into small groups along functional lines--police, courts, corrections, etc. Each group was assigned three people--a recorder who kept a written record of all that transpired, an expert who served as an informational resource, and a facilitator who was experienced with groups whose job was to keep the group from becoming bogged down on side issues. Since the time frame for participant activity is short, less consideration need be given to the long-term dedication of the participants. Although the participants may work very hard and the conference may be very intense, the task is completed in a short period of time. Harnessing initial enthusiasm and excitement is more valuable for this approach than seeking out dedicated individuals. The short time frame enabled people to get away from the telephone and usual office routine and devote their full attention to the standards and goals effort.

The modest time requirements for participants in staging a conference has the advantage of attracting large numbers of people, including decision makers, but at the same time it has the drawback of not affording participants the opportunity to study issues in depth nor to develop a great sense of ownership in the product. If the conference approach is used (as indeed it was used in Salem) to initiate the discussion, to gain an appreciation of what community concerns are

and to feed that information into another on-going process, then one stands to benefit the most from what the conference approach offers.

3. Task Force. The task force approach was used by those jurisdictions that wanted to spend time on the process and work out ideas. The task force can take a number of different forms: a single task force or a group of task forces. If it is a group of task forces, it can be broken down by function, geography, or any other dimension deemed suitable to the jurisdiction and task. The task force approach limits the number of people that one can effectively use. Groups of more than 10 or 12 people become ineffective work groups--there are too many personalities. Membership can be broadened through extensive use of specialized groups although that works against producing an overall perspective.

Selecting the members of the task force is extremely important. Strong personalities need to be balanced by equally strong personalities with different viewpoints. Equally important is selecting individuals who will maintain interest, keep their absences to a minimum, do the required background reading, and see the task through to the end. An individual who demonstrates initial active interest and excitement may seem like a good selection but may have conflicts that would prevent him/her from seeing the process through to the end. It is important

to recognize that task forces meet over a lengthy period of time and the middle and end of the process are as important as the beginning.

Leadership is also very important in a task force setting, particularly when task forces are under a time constraint. The leader is responsible for striking a balance between a thorough discussion of issues and meeting deadlines. For example, in Dade County, several participants attributed the successful completion of the task to the chairperson's abilities to meet deadlines without sacrificing the content of the discussions.

Finally the success of the task force will be affected by how well the group functions together, and good leadership plays a role in this but poor attendance and high turnover are often beyond the leader's control.

Utilizing a small working group approach, as Toledo did in establishing one task force, has both advantages and disadvantages. Reaching a consensus is easier particularly in a situation like Toledo's where the task force members had all worked together before; and by inviting persons with clout to participate, the chances of effecting change were strengthened in those functional areas that were represented in the process. However, because the number of participants was so limited, the process did not produce any broad or immediate impact beyond the changes to police recruitment policies and to the handling of juvenile status offenders.

The single task force approach is efficient and appropriate when the function of the standards and goals document is to lead to specific changes. The efficiency is further intensified by using a group which has worked together before and selecting a strong chairperson.

Establishing several committees, as in Dade County, Provo and Corvallis, provides an opportunity for a broad-based effort with more participants than in the usual planning effort. Recruiting the additional participants, however, is very difficult and involving people not previously part of the criminal justice planning process has both advantages and disadvantages. These individuals bring new perspectives to old issues, but it takes time for the group to function together as people become acquainted with one another and each other's views. The movement toward goals consensus, therefore, is usually slower. In addition, persons not previously involved in criminal justice planning need to be educated on the issues and provided with more information.

Of the three sites using multiple task forces, two (Provo and Dade County) organized them along functional lines--police, courts, corrections, etc. This approach better serves those line agency people who wish to discuss their particular field and citizens who have interests only in particular areas. This approach does not foster an overall system perspective although

Provo did try to compensate by forming a steering committee composed of two representatives from each task force.

On the other hand Corvallis divided its task forces on a geographic basis because of the large land mass that District IV encompasses and because of the strong county identity in each of the three counties. While this keeps a system perspective operating within each working group and reduces travel for the participants, it works against developing a regional perspective.

D. Role of the Planning Office

The local planning office can play a highly directive role in the standards and goals development process or it can simply play a coordinative role. The planning office involvement in the standards and goals effort is affected by the organizational mechanism selected. A planning office undertaking a conference approach or a delphi exercise has to be heavily involved in working out details or the approach will run the risk of failure. A coordinative role is more appropriate for the task force approach. If the task forces are to be in existence for a while they will decide how they want to operate--lunch meetings, evening meetings or whatever. The planning office may then assume the role of a resource that the task forces draw upon.

None of the local planning offices exhibited a strong directive role toward the specific content that was to be covered. The

general parameters were either fait accompli from the state effort or the general areas were discussed in conjunction with the supervisory board. Each jurisdiction allowed participants to explore whatever aspects of the criminal justice system it desired.

D. Summary

The various approaches to developing standards and goals discussed in this chapter certainly do not exhaust the available possibilities. The experiences of the seven jurisdictions studied do, however, point out some of the issues that one must resolve when one undertakes a standards and goals process. The most difficult aspect is usually obtaining interested and qualified participants.

1. Timothy J. Flanagan and Michael R. Buckman, The Delphi Technique: A Tool for Criminal Justice Planners, School of Criminal Justice (SUNY), Albany (1976), pp. 9, 11.
2. Robert W. Poole, Criminal Justice Goal Setting, (1973), p. 4.

CHAPTER VI. FOLLOW THROUGH ON THE DEVELOPMENT
OF STANDARDS AND GOALS

The formulation and quantification of specific standards and goals can be a step of permanent significance in moving from rhetorical arguments toward a working blueprint with built in quantitative and qualitative yardsticks of progress. 1.

This description by the National Advisory Commission of what may happen as a consequence of developing standards and goals does not reflect the experience of the seven sites we visited. The way that the local planning agency follows through on its standards and goals is heavily influenced by its motivation to become involved with the process. When the goal of the standards and goals process is to create an atmosphere for change, follow-through activities may appropriately be limited to publicizing the product as a resource document or referencing the standards and goals in the on-going planning process. When the goal is to create specific changes within the criminal justice system follow-through activities become more specific and attempt to deal with issues involved in implementing the desired changes; i.e., identifying the agency or person responsible for bringing about the change, dealing with resistance to the change, and evaluating how effectively the change was accomplished.

The seven sites did evidence considerable similarity in their use of the standards and goals process; i.e., as a

means of building consensus. Consequently, the thrust of their follow up activities was similarly on a general plane that called for little concerted action in accomplishing specific changes.

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss some of the issues surrounding the standards and goals follow-through process. The standards and goals product may be used as a reference document, as an implementation plan (and a tool to overcome agency resistance to changes), as a standard for evaluating implemented standards and goals and as a follow up mechanism to apprise the participants in the standards and goals process of the results of their efforts. We begin with the use of the standards and goals product as a reference document.

A. Reference Document

The standards and goals document can be useful in channeling interest in criminal justice matters to those areas that have already been identified in the development process. There is no need for wide ranging decisions to recur if the standards and goals process represented the best collective outlook on the various issues within criminal justice planning for the particular jurisdiction. Consequently public interest, either in the form of individual inquiries or press coverage, can be addressed through the framework provided by the standards and goals. The standards and goals document can help

people to refine their inquiries; i.e., by making them more specific, and, where action is called for, to direct changes in the context of the overall problem as described in the standards and goals.

Line agencies can also use the standards and goals document to perform self-assessments of how well they measure up to the expectations found in the document. In Oregon, the Salem police department and the Marion County sheriff's department did this and the process enabled them to evaluate their own agency procedures against the consensus of an independent group in a non-threatening atmosphere.

As persons or agencies begin to refer to the document and to discover discrepancies between desired behavior and actual practice, the standards and goals document can begin to act as a precipitator of change. The impetus for change flows from the power of reason and this kind of situation can generate change if the person or the agency is ready for change. In fact it may be difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether the standards and goals brought about the change or whether they acted as a convenient vehicle for facilitating the implementation of changes that would have taken place regardless of the standards and goals process.

In most of the sites we observed the standards and goals document employed in conjunction with the awarding of LEAA

action monies to fund special projects. This is basically the carrot and stick approach to change wherein the power of reason is augmented by the power of money to induce people to try something new. By having the applicant reference the standards and goals document, the applicant has to demonstrate how the project's goals are in line with the community consensus.

Using the standards and goals document as a reference document has its advantages and disadvantages. The document, just like the NAC reports and the SPA documents, can provide insight into the problems of criminal justice and stimulate conversation about what ought to be done. The importance of the document in terms of providing a rationale for change should not be ignored, but this reliance on the power of reason to bring about change only works well in those jurisdictions where people are predisposed toward change and accept the process on which the standards and goals are based. The disadvantage to relying on the standards and goals product as a reference document is that it will not lead to specific changes by those who are not predisposed toward change and who do not accept the premises on which the standards and goals are based.

B. Implementation Document

As one moves from the arena that is concerned with developing an atmosphere for change to the arena where specific changes are being sought, one needs to address the phenomenon of resistance.

One very important element that decreases agency resistance is that agency's participation in the standards and goals developmental process. At every site, line agency representatives participated in the effort and had an opportunity to consider the ramifications of the proposed standards and goals on their own agency early in the process. The line agency participants admitted that they looked carefully at the standards and goals relating to their functional areas to make sure that their agencies could live with them and that many of the other participants were amenable to modifying the standards and goals to suit the line agencies.

Participation, however, is not enough to overcome resistance. Financial considerations were frequently mentioned as a deterrent to implementing the proposed standards and goals. Some of the participants accepted this argument; others expressed the opinion that while some of the proposed standards and goals did require additional resources, many of the standards and goals did not. Many of the proposed standards and goals could be accomplished through policy changes. None of the sites attempted to deal with this resistance head on and, furthermore, none of the sites attempted to identify who was responsible for implementing the proposed standards and goals. This, of course, comes as no surprise since most of the sites looked upon the process as fostering an atmosphere for change rather than as implementing a specific change. However,

for those jurisdictions that are contemplating a standards and goals process that is expected to produce specific changes, it is important that they pay closer attention to this matter of identifying the person responsible for implementing the change. There should also be greater anticipation for agency resistance and considerable preparation for overcoming that resistance. If there is no provision for active follow through, the agencies are likely to pick and choose among the proposed standards and goals.

There were two sites where there was follow through on the standards and goals. In Toledo there was a conscious effort to focus particular attention on police recruitment policies and on handling juvenile status offenders. These topics received considerable attention and the committee chairperson made it clear that she expected action on these matters. This close attention and active interest in the handling of juvenile status offenders and police recruitment policies were instrumental in accomplishing the changes. Also in Ventura, there was an emphasis on the goals becoming reality. This strong focus on implementation during the development process was a force in the changes actually being accomplished.

C. Evaluation

Because implementation was not a major concern to the seven sites visited, it should be no surprise that there was little consideration for evaluating how well the stan-

standards and goals were implemented. Ventura was the only site that considered evaluation matters albeit at a general level. Ventura attempted to word the standards and goals in performance language.

If a site is interested in achieving specific change, then the planning office should prepare for evaluating the effort at the developmental stage by being specific. This specificity would be in terms of defining the desired changes clearly and delineating the quantitative measures that will be examined and the expected time frame for implementation.

In addition to no preparation for any evaluation of their standards and goals, the sites have taken only limited steps to update the standards and goals. The two sites in Oregon--Salem and Corvallis--have gone through three iterations of the standards and goals but that has been primarily for the benefit of the SPA. Ventura and Provo are using the standards and goals document in their ongoing planning process and if changes are to be made they will be made through the planning process. However, there was no formal updating process triggered by problems or changing conditions in the attempt to implement the proposed standards and goals.

D. Follow up to Participants

In working on standards and goals one can become absorbed with the process and overlook the people who participated in

the process. A number of the participants who were interviewed noted that they were not informed about the outcome of the standards and goals exercise. This was particularly true for those participants who are not members of the ongoing planning process. While this seems like a minor issue, when people volunteer their time and energy for a project, they like to hear if the project ever results in any action.

The lack of follow up to participants probably stems from the planning directors' uncertainty as to what standards and goals were suppose to accomplish beyond keeping the SPA in check. Even if there is nothing to report, the planning director should report back to the participants. This is a simple courtesy that makes the participants feel that they were not forgotten immediately after the completion of the task.

E. Summary

None of the seven sites visited planned to pursue an active follow-through stage in their standards and goals effort, consequently we were unable to discuss in any detail matters such as dealing with resistance, updating the document and rvaluation criteria for measuring the implementation of the standards and goals. The seven sites viewed the standards and goals effort as a consensus building mechanism, and the standards and goals document did not assume the aura of a blueprint for accomplishing specific changes but rather the

more modest role of a reference document to facilitate discussing the future directions of criminal justice in the seven jurisdictions studied.

1. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Executive Summary--Reports of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, (1973), p. 6.

Conclusion

The focus of this report has been on how criminal justice planners at seven sites across the United States have attempted to work with standards and goals. The process did not always follow the script for how it ought to work; there were a number of accommodations that needed to bring the concept to fruition. As we have attempted to demonstrate in this report, the motivation for becoming involved in the standards and goals process plays a crucial role in determining expectations. There is no one right way to approach standards and goals as the seven sites studied here demonstrate. These sites responded to different needs and showed great variety in organizing the effort in ways that they thought would best achieve those needs.

There are problems to be encountered in implementing any concept. This document sought to bring the reader's attention to some of the major concerns in approaching standards and goals and to provide insight as to how to handle those concerns in light of the experiences of the seven jurisdictions we studied.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. "Safe Streets Reconsidered: The Block Grant Experience 1968-1975," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, January 1977.
- Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. "Safe Streets Reconsidered: The Block Grant Experience 1968-1975, Part B Case Studies," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, January 1977.
- American Bar Association Section of Criminal Justice. "Executive Summary of Comparative Analysis of Standards and Goals," Washington, D. C.
- American Bar Association Section of Criminal Justice. "The Fiscal Impacts of Criminal Justice Standards," Washington, D. C.
- Argyris, Chris. "Intervention Theory and Method: A Behavioral Science View," Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Beaudin, Bruce. "How To Implement Criminal Justice Standards For Pretrial Release," Washington, D. C.: American Bar Association, Section of Criminal Justice.
- Bishop, W. Paul. "How State and Local Governments Can Economize By Implementing Criminal Justice Standards," Washington, D. C.: American Bar Association Section of Criminal Justice.
- Blalock, Joyce and Handman, Martha. "How To Implement Criminal Justice Standards Through Police/Bar Cooperation," Washington, D. C.: American Bar Association Section of Criminal Justice.
- Clute, Penelope D. "How To Implement Criminal Justice Standards," Washington, D. C.: American Bar Association Section of Criminal Justice.
- College of William and Mary. "Police Standards and Goals Developmental Program Plan: City of Portsmouth, Virginia," Williamsburg, April 1974.
- Dade County Criminal Justice Planning Unit. "Dade County And The City of Miami Criminal Justice Plan 1975," Miami.

- Eichner, Ian Bruce. "How To Implement Criminal Justice Standards for Speedy Trial," Washington, D. C.: American Bar Association Section of Criminal Justice.
- Flanagan, Timothy J. and Buckman, Michael R. "The Delphi Technique: A Tool For Criminal Justice Planners," Albany: The School of Criminal Justice of the State University of New York at Albany, November 1976.
- Forbes, J. "Studies in Social Science and Planning," Edinburgh. Scottish Academic Press, 1973.
- Goodman, William I. and Freund, Eric C. "Principles and Practices of Urban Planning," Washington, D. C.: International City Management Association, 1968.
- Hunter, Dwight K; Ivy, Susan C. and Kraft, Lois P. "A Local Standards and Goals Development Process," Menlo Park Stanford Research Institute, May 1977.
- Jacobsen, Sally. "How To Measure The Quality of Criminal Justice In Your Community: Story Ideas For Journalists," Washington, D. C.: American Bar Association Section of Criminal Justice.
- Jones, Garth N. "Planned Organizational Change: A Study In Change Dynamics," New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.
- Juvenile Delinquency Interdepartmental Council. "Standards and Goals for Juvenile Justice," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. "Executive Summary-- Reports Of The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. "Standards and Goals: Suggestions For Developing and Implementing Criminal Justice Standards and Goals," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, March 1975.
- Macon and Bibb County, Georgia. "Preliminary Problems, Goals, Standards and Strategies for Criminal Justice (Working Draft)," May 1976.
- Mountainland Association of Governments. "Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice In Mountainland," Provo; August 1977.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. "A Call For Citizen Action: Crime Prevention And The Citizen" Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. "A National Strategy To Reduce Crime," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. "Community Crime Prevention," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. "Corrections," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. "Courts," Washington, D. C. U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. "Criminal Justice System," Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1973.

National League of Cities and U. S. Conference of Mayors Criminal Justice Project. "A Workbook On Standards and Goals: The Police," Washington, D. C., January, 1975.

National League of Cities and U. S. Conference of Mayors Criminal Justice Project. "Criminal Justice Standards and Goals," Washington, D. C., March 1974.

Ohio Criminal Justice Supervisory Commission. "Standards For The Recruitment And Training Of Adult Corrections Personnel in Ohio," Columbus, February 1975.

Ohio Department of Economic and Community Development, Administration of Justice Division. "Criminal Justice Standards and Goals For Ohio, Report No 1," Columbus, January 1975.

Oregon District III Council of Governments. "District III 1980 Standards and Goals," Salem, February 1975.

Oregon District IV Council of Governments. "Fiscal Year 1978 Comprehensive Plan for the Criminal Justice System in District 4," Corvallis, May 1977.

Poole, Robert W. "Criminal Justice Goal Setting," Santa Barbara: Public Safety Systems Incorporated, April 1973.

Rondinelli, Dennis A. "Urban And Regional Development Planning: Policy And Administration," Ithica: Cornell University Press, 1975.

Selltiz, Clarie, et al. "Research Methods in Social Relations," New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.

Singer, Philip B. "How To Mobilize Citizen Support For Criminal Justice Improvement: A Guide For Civic And Religious Leaders," Washington, D. C.: American Bar Association Section on Criminal Justice.

Tennessee Municipal League. "Report Of The National Advisory Commission On Criminal Justice Standards and Goals," Nashville, March 1975.

Toledo-Lucas County Criminal Justice Regional Planning Unit. "1978 Comprehensive Plan," Toledo, 1977.

Toledo-Lucas County Criminal Justice Regional Planning Unit. "Toledo-Lucas County Criminal Justice Standards and Goals," Toledo.

Ventura Region Criminal Justice Planning Board. "Ventura Region 1978 Comprehensive Plan," Ventura, 1977.

Wayson, Billy L. and Monkman, Gail S. "How To Implement Criminal Justice Standards For Corrections: An Economic Analysis," Washington, D. C.: American Bar Association Section of Criminal Justice.

Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice Special Committee on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. "First Draft Report, November 1976," Madison.

Wisconsin Council on Criminal Justice. "1977 Adult Standards and Goals Amendment Draft Programs and 1978 Draft Action Programs," Madison, May 1977.

Articles

Costello, Timothy W. "Psychological aspects: the soft side of policy formation," Policy Sciences, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1970, pp. 20-27.

- Fainstein, Susan S. and Fainstein, Norman, I. "City planning and political values," Urban Affairs Quarterly, March 1971, pp. 341-362.
- Lasserre, Ph. "Planning through incrementalism," Socio-Economic Planning Sciences, June 1974, pp. 129-134.
- Nelson, Richard R. "Intellectualizing about the moon-ghetto metaphor: a study of current malaise of rational analysis of social problems," Policy Sciences Vol. 5, No. 4, Dec 1974, pp. 375-414.
- Rittel, Horst W. J. and Webber, Melvin W. "Dilemmas in a general theory of planning," Policy Sciences 4, June 1973, pp. 155-169.
- Rothblatt, Donald N. "Rational planning reexamined," Journal of the American Institute of Planners, January 1974, pp. 1-16.
- Said, Kamal E. "A policy selection/goal formulation model for public systems," Public Sciences 5, 1974, pp. 89-100.

Appendix A

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING DIRECTORS



March 3, 1977

Chairman
Gary Pence
Toledo OH

Vice Chairman
Ernest E. Allen
Louisville KY

Past Chairman
Ronald Weber
Los Angeles CA

Executive Committee
Gary Benmark
Nashville TN

Vernon L. Brown
Gary IN

Wilfred Benoit
Auburn, ME

Thomas Ellwood
Baltimore MD

Gery Hochanadel
Pratt KS

John F. Jackson
Omaha NE

Frederic W. Keithley
Arlington TX

Suzanne B. Longacre
Northfield, NJ

Martin Loring
Corvallis OR

William J. Mallen
San Francisco, CA

Kenneth Nash
Oklahoma City, OK

Gene Schrader
Riverton, WY

George Shannon
San Jose, CA

Ronald Steger
Falls Church, VA

Harry Yates
LaCrosse, WI

Executive Director
Mark A. Cunniff

Assistant Director
Janice Z. Stiers

Dear Member:

This is in reference to the Association's Grant to study the standards and goals developmental process at the local planning unit level. We will do this by using the case study format. Our research will include examining written reports outlining the procedures to be followed in developing standards and goals, as well as written records of what actually transpired at the meetings that were held. We will also conduct on-site interviews with approximately six officials in the jurisdiction who participated in the developmental process. Finally, there will be some limited examination of how and to what extent the standards and goals were implemented.

The purpose of this letter is to invite you to become one of the six sites that will be examined in our case study approach. We are required, in the grant, to examine the developmental process in two city, two county and two multi-county planning operations. It has been further determined by the Executive Board of the Association that there be a population breakdown of more than 250,000 and less than 250,000 within each of these three groups.

Distribution of Sites to be Selected
in Examining the Developmental
Process of Standards and Goals

	POPULATION		TOTAL
	LESS THAN 250,000	MORE THAN 250,000	
City	1	1	2
County	1	1	2
Multi-County	1	1	2
TOTAL	3	3	6

The following criteria have been developed to assist in the selection of sites within each planning unit and population cell.

Required Criterion

There must be a written commitment of cooperation from the local planning unit to assist staff in obtaining the necessary written documentation and in arranging for interviews with persons who were involved in developing standards and goals at the local level.

<u>Weighted Criteria</u>	<u>Points</u>
1. The availability of written documentation on how the Standards and Goals were to be developed	6
2. The availability of written documentation on what transpired during meetings in the developmental process; i.e., minutes, summary reports, background papers, etc.	6
3. The availability of a final report that contains the Standards and Goals	5
4. The number of areas for which Standards and Goals were developed (Police, Courts, Corrections, Juvenile Delinquency, Planning, Community Crime Prevention -- one point for each)	1-6
5. Written commitment of cooperation from selected participants in the developmental process -- two points for each written commitment to a maximum of six letters	0-12
6. Timeliness -- one point for every six months since the completion date of the Standards and Goals Process	0-5

These weighted criteria are meant to provide staff with some objective means by which sites can be selected.

If you are interested in having your jurisdiction(s) participate in this project, we would ask that you write to the Association's new office at:

NACJPD
1012 14th Street, N.W.
Suite #403
Washington, D.C. 20005

We would ask that, in your written reply, you give us sufficient information on the weighted criteria so that your jurisdiction will obtain its appropriate share of points. We would appreciate your not sending any of the background or final report documentation at this time. However, we would ask that you send your letter of cooperation and as many other letters of cooperation that you can obtain from those who participated in the development of the standards and goals. We would appreciate receiving your reply by March 25, 1977. If you have any questions please call me or Janice Stiers at (202)347-2291.

Sincerely,



Mark A. Cunniff
Executive Director

MAC/npk

Appendix B

Areas to be Explored with the Executive Director and/or his (her) Staff

I. Background

1. How did the LPU find out about the Standards and Goals program?
2. What kind of information was made available about the program; and was the information sufficient to answer the LPU's initial needs?
3. Was participation in the program voluntary?

II. Atmosphere

1. What has your jurisdiction's experience with research been like?
2. What was the political climate toward criminal justice like at the time of the Standards and Goals undertaking?
3. Were there any major stories in the newspapers about criminal justice prior to or during the Standards and Goals process?
4. Were there any dramatic court decisions that affected your jurisdiction's agency operations?
5. How would you describe the relationship among criminal justice agencies, and between criminal justice agencies and the community prior to the Standards and Goals effort?

III. Local criminal justice agencies

1. Please provide a general description of the criminal justice agencies in your jurisdiction, highlighting especially areas of organizational concern. For example, how many police agencies are there, what is their range in size, etc.

IV. Resources for the Standards and Goals effort

1. How much money was specifically given for the Standards and Goals effort?
2. Approximately what percentage of your agency's

time was tied up with Standards and Goals over and above whatever special monies may have been granted?

3. Were staff resources adequate to meet the demands? Did the LPU draw upon the staff resources of line agencies for assistance?
4. Was outside technical assistance requested? Was it provided? Was it adequate?
5. Was there adequate data available to assist in the examination of problems?

V. Approach

1. Were there any attempts to place a limit on the scope of the effort? If limits were set who determined these limits? What were the limits?
2. How were participants chosen? What was the desired composition? Did they get it?
3. What procedures were followed for developing Standards and Goals, eg, Task Forces, open hearings, position papers, etc?
4. How involved was the LPU in providing direction to the Standards and Goals effort?
5. How stable was the process?
6. Did you find the group focusing more on solutions rather than the definition of the problem?

VI. Some side issues within the process.

1. Participation: To what extent was the Standards and Goals effort looked upon as a vehicle to generate community interest in criminal justice? To what extent was it looked upon as a vehicle to inject community concerns into the criminal justice process?
2. Autonomy: To what extent did the line agencies object to outside inspection of their policies and procedures?
3. Responsibility: To what extent did discussion take place over who or what agency was to im-

plement the Standards and Goals? Was the responsibility for implementing accepted by the people so designated?

4. Evaluation: Were procedures and measures discussed that would ascertain whether or not the proposed Standards and Goals were accomplishing what was desired?

VII. Outcome

1. What was the intended use of the final product?
2. Were there any by-products (good or bad) of the Standards and Goals process; eg, increased communication between the community and criminal justice agencies?

VIII. Overall Evaluation

1. What was your understanding of Standards and Goals at the beginning of the process? Did that understanding change as the process proceeded?
2. What were the perceived advantages and disadvantages to the various routes taken in the Standards and Goals effort?
3. What is your prognosis of the Standards and Goals being implemented?

Areas to be Explored with Participants
in the Standards & Goals Process

I. Background

1. What are your observations on how the group on Standards and Goals was formed?
2. How were you notified that you were invited to participate in the Standards and Goals development process?
3. Why do you think you were selected?
4. What kinds of information were you presented with on Standards and Goals when you elected to participate?
5. Was this information sufficient to answer your immediate questions on Standards and Goals?
6. How familiar were you with the local planning process in criminal justice?

II. Experience with the process

1. When you first began your involvement in the Standards and Goals development process, what did Standards and Goals mean to you? Did their meaning change in the course of the development process?
2. How satisfied were you with how the group functioned, for example did the group have enough time, did participants maintain interest, etc?
3. Did you feel that the group received adequate support to accomplish its goals; eg, personnel, supplies, information?
4. How did you view your role in the process; eg, a sounding board, voicing community concerns, making concrete proposals, etc?
5. What were the general assumption(s) under which you worked; eg, affecting cost savings; making the criminal justice system

more effective, improvement in the quality of justice?

6. Were you sensitive to any outside pressures in examining certain issues, eg, impending legislation, appellate court decisions, press coverage, etc.?
7. Was the scope of the Standards & Goals endeavor limited? If so, were you satisfied with how the limitations were decided upon?
8. To what extent did you rely on quantitative data in discussing Standards and Goals? To what extent did you examine the experiences of other jurisdictions that worked with the proposed Standards and Goals?
9. Did you find it easier to identify goals than the standards that would get you to the goals?
10. Did you come into the Standards and Goals process with some priorities to be addressed? What were these priorities and were they addressed to your satisfaction in the group?
11. How manageable was the task?
12. Were you concerned about making provision for implementing and evaluating the Standards and Goals? Were you concerned about the adequacy of resources to carry out the Standards and Goals? How much consideration did you give to the ramifications of the Standards and Goals on the operating agencies?
13. Whom did you see as the audience to which the final product would be addressed, eg, the public, line agency, local planning unit?

III. Conclusion

1. How satisfied were you with the Standards and Goals process? Did you feel that you had sufficient input into the process?
2. Do you have any observations about what would have made the process run more smoothly?



END