Criminal Justice Trending in the 21st Century

Town Hall Meeting Strategy Paper

ARIZONA CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMISSION

Table of Contents

Introduction

In February 2000, during a meeting with U.S. Attorney José de Jesus Rivera, Phoenix Police Chief Harold Hurtt expressed interest in developing a forum in which the future of the criminal justice system could be universally discussed among police, prosecutors, courts, probation, corrections and parole personnel at federal, state and local levels. This idea resonated with high-level criminal justice leaders from around the state. With this concept in mind, the U.S. Attorney's Office, the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, the Arizona Peace Officer Standards and Training Board and the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission set out to create a forum that would facilitate the kind of dialogue Chief Hurtt and others envisioned.

The Town Hall was conceived as a process by which those involved in the criminal justice system could shape and influence the direction and effectiveness of the system by identifying, developing and implementing strategies over the next five to ten years. Although criminal justice leaders have relied on each other in the past to communicate, coordinate and collaborate wherever possible, this Town Hall was unique and represented a shift from "traditional" (wait until the crime occurs) reactive thinking to one of "strategic" (methodically working together) justice. This paradigm shift provided an excellent venue in which to broach topics and explore greater opportunities for technological and systemic improvements.

With those two ideas in mind, the Town Hall Executive Committee set out to develop a forum to explore criminal justice ideas and issues related to improvement at all levels. The most important issues focused on information technology and system improvements. Although seemingly similar topics, they are quite different within the context of the Town Hall Meeting.

The information technology topic sought to explore the criminal justice community's current and future needs for better, faster information. The thought behind this issue was to pull together people who represented various aspects of the criminal justice community, to explore current processes, brainstorm about how to make it better, and discuss where they want information technology to be in five to ten years. Specifically, looking to answer the question: "How do we handle information in a way that provides a myriad of crucial criminal justice information for varied purposes for many users from multiple access points?"

The system improvement portion of the Town Hall Meeting centered on addressing how the criminal justice community can work smarter and better together by specifically looking at "time, people, equipment and money" issues that currently impede the criminal justice system in Arizona. The primary goal in this session was to answer the question: "How can we implement system improvements in a way that will not harm other agencies, but will still create an interactive system and allow us to work smarter together?"

With those two topics in mind, on December 11, 12 and 13, 2000, and with nearly a year of planning, more than 160 criminal justice leaders from all over the state met in Prescott, Arizona, to begin the dialogue to help define Arizona's criminal justice future. This meeting was the first of its kind for Arizona's criminal justice community.

The dynamics and the synergy of these diverse groups provided an effective catalyst for finding common ground on which solutions to long-time criminal justice issues could be effectively addressed *(See Appendix i for participating agency list).* The idea of working smarter, together, was a common theme among all Town Hall attendees.

Specifically, the Town Hall vision was born from the idea of developing a process that would effectively move the criminal justice system into the future by creating strategies for phased implementation throughout the next five to ten years. This paper will strive to explore and explain the goals, objectives, costs, priorities and implementation targets for each of the two topics (information technology and system improvements) as discussed in each of the four breakout groups during the Town Hall Meeting.

Methodologies

Before delving into outputs from the day-and-a-half strategic planning session, it is important to understand the framework for the Town Hall meeting. First, with the two topics clearly defined (information technology and system improvements), the Town Hall Executive Committee strove to provide information about criminal justice futuristics by inviting three renown futures research speakers to establish a base of understanding and orientation for attendees prior to their facilitated breakout session discussions. Town Hall speakers included the Federal Bureau of Investigation's futurist expert Carl Jensen, well known Arizona Economist Elliott D. Pollack and from IBM's Public Safety and Justice team, John Wyatt. The following is a brief synopsis of each speaker's unique qualifications and input into the Town Hall Meeting.

Carl Jensen, III, Supervisory Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

Carl Jensen is a Supervisory Special Agent in the Behavioral Science Unit at the FBI Academy. The science of futures research was conceived and taught by Jensen's predecessor, William Tafoya, until the mid-1990s. Since 1997, Jensen has been teaching futures research at the FBI Academy. During the Town Hall Meeting, Mr. Jensen led a discussion about the study of futuristics for criminal justice and clearly explained what it is, why it's important to criminal justice leaders and provided a base of information to help leaders effectively plan the next five to ten years.

Elliott D. Pollack, President, Elliott D. Pollack and Company

Elliott D. Pollack is president of Elliott D. Pollack and Company in Scottsdale, Arizona. The firm is an economic and real estate consulting firm that was established in 1987. Pollack's company maintains the most comprehensive economic database in Arizona, allowing him to prepare extremely accurate economic forecasting data. Mr. Pollack delivered a 10-year economic forecast for the State of Arizona — providing specific information related to the criminal justice system. He also evaluated and discussed growth patterns in an effort to predict their impact on government and the criminal justice system.

John Wyatt, Public Safety and Justice Team, International Business Machines (IBM)

John Wyatt has been with IBM's Public Safety and Justice Team since 1995 and has more than 23 years of experience in law and justice technology. His focus is on criminal justice policy, procedure and implementation at the city, county and state levels. Mr. Wyatt specializes in interagency justice system analysis, planning and budgeting oversight. His discussion at the Town Hall Meeting explained what is currently happening in Arizona and around the nation and discussed why computer integration is so important to our criminal justice system.

On the morning of December 12th, the Town Hall began with an overview from the FBI's futuristics expert Carl Jensen. Attendees lunched with Arizona economist Elliott Pollack and closed their day with IBM's John Wyatt. Each speaker explained the importance of futuristics in the criminal justice system and stressed that studying today's systems and methodologies helps us universally understand and visualize the possible and preferred criminal justice future.

All three speakers kept Town Hall attendees focused by emphasizing three things to keep in mind as they went into their strategic planning sessions: 1) Evaluate how they are *currently* conducting business; 2) Explain what they *will* be doing; and 3) Brainstorm about what they *should* be doing. By answering these three questions and interacting with each other, Town Hall participants effectively and actively participated in a strategic planning session that will help drive the future of the criminal justice system in Arizona.

The attendees were organized into four breakout groups. Each group had an assigned facilitator, assistant, and a recorder to aid in the discussions. Throughout December 12th, the groups met to discuss information technology and system improvement topic areas. As each group completed their discussion of a topic, the recorder compiled and edited their comments and findings into a draft report. On December 13th, the breakout groups reviewed all the draft reports. The topic areas were then discussed in a plenary session, with input from each breakout group, to identify common themes, issues, priorities and solutions.

Criminal justice leaders from all over the state came together for the Town Hall Meeting to discuss their respective needs and work together to develop and implement a comprehensive, cooperative strategy that accurately reflects the needs of the entire criminal justice system as it

relates to information technology and system improvements. Specifically, this meeting analyzed and explored how we are currently conducting business on local, state and national levels by focusing on what's working, identifying areas for improvement and creating strategies that will help us successfully move into the future.

The following sections of the report set forth these goals, objectives, costs, priorities and implementation targets for the two Town Hall topics and facilitated session outputs.

Information Technology Synthesized Discussion Points

Technological advances and opportunities have been booming since the early 1990s. Regardless of these rapid advances, the public sector is falling behind the technological curve. The Town Hall sought to address this concern through dialogue that would anticipate future needs or answer the question: "Where do we want to be in regard to technology in the very near future?"

Integrated Information Sharing of Common Data

Private industry is creating new technology at exponential rates and because of budget constraints, the criminal justice system has not been as effective in keeping pace with technological change. For instance, many organizations do not have computer systems in place to allow departments to share information with others within their own agency, let alone with another agency. As a result, Arizona, has many criminal justice agencies that cannot "talk" to one another.

The discussion of this topic focused on information technology between agencies at local, state and national levels, with added emphasis on vertical and horizontal compatibility between systemwide technological components.

Key components of a fully integrated system will require system compatibility between all criminal justice agencies as well as a solid infrastructure to drive the transition from analog to digital technologies. Also important to the groups was the idea that much of the duplicative work done in stand-alone databases within agencies should be eliminated so that the data is entered only one time and yet is accessible to law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, corrections, probation and other criminal justice personnel.

Many Arizona agencies are at the beginning of the information curve busily capturing information on disparate computer systems that are unable to communicate with each other. There is no doubt that the information age is bringing agencies closer together, but there remains much work to be done. There is an opportunity in this important initiative to deliver greater checks and balances over the entire criminal justice system by reducing duplicative work, ensuring public and police safety and generally working smarter, together to achieve common goals.

Interestingly, Town Hall participants recommended the creation of a numbering system to consolidate all identification numbers into one unique number to be used by all systems. Currently, Arizona uses the State Identification Number (SID) to track individuals that have previous records in this state through the Central State Repository located at the Arizona Department of Public Safety. Additionally, as mandated in A.R.S. § 41-1750, the State instituted the Process Control Number (PCN) in order to better track criminal offenses. Together, these two numbering systems do a very effective job at tracking individuals and crimes for criminal justice purposes. The SID and PCN numbers, as well as the Arizona Automated Fingerprint Identification System, are fundamentally important in the building, and successful accessibility, of records sharing information between local, county and state criminal justice agencies.

The groups determined that a fully integrated data system would combine local, state, national and even international data platforms to provide comprehensive arrest, prosecution and correctional histories within seconds of entering a query. According to Town Hall participants, the criminal justice community is currently interested in developing a 10-year plan to fully integrate criminal justice data systems at the state level, with special emphasis on knowledge sharing, and wherever possible, linkage to existing Legacy Systems.

To accomplish this particular goal, the groups identified a number of objectives to help complete the process. The first idea was to complete a needs assessment to determine what technology is required and how much it will cost to successfully complete integration between agencies. Within the next year, the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission will be seeking funding to conduct the needs assessment as part of the Criminal Justice Records Improvement Program that has been underway in Arizona since 1995.

Currently, the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission is spearheading the Records Integration Project statewide by providing funding to police departments, sheriffs, county attorney offices, the courts, the Arizona Department of Public Safety and the Department of Corrections to develop common computer platforms that will allow and facilitate the exchange of important criminal justice information between local and state agencies. Coconino County's efforts in the statewide information technology project exemplify how the whole state may function in the future. They have been serving as the state model for information technology

since 1998. The Sheriff's Office, the County Attorney's Office and the Flagstaff Police Department will share important common data electronically.

The anticipated cost to bring Arizona's criminal justice system onto a common information-sharing platform is so high that a price has yet to be determined. The Arizona Criminal Justice Commission expects to be able to deliver a cost projection for information technology after the technological needs assessment is completed within the next year.

In view of the high cost and the complexity of the issues related to information technology, the Town Hall groups placed a 10-year projection for bringing this objective to fruition. Even though they knew it would be costly, they understood that information technology should be an extremely high priority for policy makers. Some participants believed this initiative might require legislative mandates to accomplish.

The benefits of sharing common data among local, state and federal criminal justice entities are immeasurable, not only for the criminal justice community, but also for the communities they serve to protect. Improved technology increases communication between agencies and translates into a process that allows information sharing, while maintaining accurate criminal data.

The Town Hall dialogue about common data sharing raised the question, can turf issues be overcome in regard to sharing information? The answer is yes. One issue is how to utilize crime information in a way that increases officer safety in the field and delivers seamless justice no matter where the crime occurs. Seamless justice is an obtainable goal. By working together, using data gleaned from integrated systems we will be able to help predict and even prevent crime in the very near future. Integrated or talking systems will allow criminal justice agencies to utilize tools to pinmap crime, efficiently allocate resources for improved officer safety and ultimately better protect the community.

Many Town Hall participants believe that information sharing will break down the bureaucracy between agencies because this unique and new approach to criminal justice is "bottom up, not top down" driven. That is to say, end-users will drive the change process to ensure the final product is more user-friendly. The caveat to this statement is that in order for information sharing between and across agencies to exist, stringent policies that address systemwide security issues are extremely important and necessary.

Security Policies for Information Sharing

Sharing common data will undoubtedly reduce and perhaps even blur current jurisdictional lines, but before that can happen, the criminal justice community, needs to determine and define the criminal justice partners and parameters for data sharing privileges.

In addition to concerns about information sharing policies, the groups felt that the criminal justice community will have to handle a number of ethical issues related to individual privacy and the public's right to know. Many feel the criminal justice system must prepare itself for regularly answering questions about whether the information should be public or private. Should the media have access to the information? How and where is the information gathered? Many in the criminal justice arena already feel that we are running into this ethical dilemma.

As this security issue continues to keep pace with technology, the criminal justice community needs to think along two lines: the information needs of management versus the information needs of operational personnel. Clearly, because of different job functions, the information needs of managers and operational personnel are different. We must work together to develop a process that provides the right information to the right person in a timely and accurate manner.

Whenever criminal justice practitioners entertain discussions about information technology and sharing, a debate about how to handle security and firewalls always ensues. The Town Hall discussion was no different. Each of the four breakout groups discussed issues about security and the need to maintain balance between individual privacy and the public's right to know. To work on this goal, several objectives must be met, including determining minimum-security standards for criminal justice information as well as creating a statewide security standard for criminal justice practitioners. The groups collectively voiced the idea that criminal justice agencies need to work together to create policies regarding ethics and information sharing, while constantly revisiting these policies to ensure they adequately address and keep pace with technological changes. There was also a universal concern about how information sharing and security will increase the complexities of jurisdictional issues.

Currently, the Administrative Office of the Courts and the Arizona Department of Public Safety, assisted by the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, are working together to identify common security needs while searching for solutions that are acceptable for all end-users. Once

standards are developed, the entire criminal justice community should implement the security standards statewide. Although group participants rated this objective as a rather high priority, they also determined that this issue would be ongoing and coincide with the evolution of the information technology sharing strategy.

Use of Technology Advancement in the Field

Significant technological advances are taking place to create devices that assist criminal justice professionals in their work. With this concept in mind, Town Hall participants had some very strong ideas about the use of technology in the field. The overriding concept centered on officer safety and ease of use by criminal justice personnel.

The groups determined that if officers and other professionals had access to real-time arrest reports, conviction records, prison, probation conditions, etc. that officer safety in the field would significantly increase and records accuracy would dramatically improve. Each group's "wish list" included tools that would address these issues. Those tools included technology like hands-free voice-activated technology, video conferencing via Mobile Data Terminals and fingerprint scanners in patrol cars and other remote locations.

The groups also wanted to see a nationwide accessible criminal history database available to practitioners in the field. As an example, when a police officer stops someone, he or she would be able to get immediate on-line access to that person's criminal history, if one exists. They also want access to full criminal and probationary information on suspects, regardless of the county or area of court disposition.

The Arizona Department of Public Safety, Administrative Offices of the Courts and a number of county criminal justice agencies have formed the nucleus of a working group to best identify options currently available to facilitate this Town Hall request. Also, an Executive Steering Committee under the Integration and Technology Committee of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission has been designated as the focal point for these efforts. Initial meetings have been held by this group and a project scope is being developed that will provide the backbone for this type of endeavor.

It is extremely important to logically employ the application of technology for criminal justice personnel. They must be able to use the technology to facilitate and concentrate on their

roles in the criminal justice arena. The idea behind this was to employ technology in such a way that it would allow practitioners to spend less time on issues such as repetitive data entry. Several breakout groups supported implementing voice recognition technology for writing reports, updating records and general improvement of criminal justice information.

Town Hall participants also strongly supported setting minimum statewide standards for equipment so line-level users in every agency have similar or interconnected terminals, radios and investigative equipment. For next steps, the groups identified several objectives that should take place in the next three to five years. First, it is extremely important to identify agency needs, understand and grasp the current level of technology in the field and then seek solutions to long term issues. An example could include a private sector partner to help develop the technological improvements they collectively would like to see in the field and, where appropriate, share infrastructure cost.

Participants believe that updating current technologies, implementing new ones and creating more will be a costly venture, but one that is important for effective public safety as well as officer safety. It is estimated that this objective will cost over $100 million to implement statewide.

DNA Technology

The expansion of DNA technology and its use in apprehending suspects was a popular goal among Town Hall participants. Currently, Arizona has five crime labs capable of conducting DNA research. There is discussion about building additional crime labs to process more DNA evidence and reduce the present backlog of cases. This is a huge issue and one that must be agreed upon before moving forward to ensure there are proper resources to handle not only the backlog of current cases, but also to guarantee that future DNA collection samples be handled in a timely, efficient manner.

The problem with the current DNA backlog situation is that crime laboratories in Arizona face difficult prioritization decisions. Due to limited financial and personnel resources, crime laboratories are forced to prioritize their DNA cases. Given the nature of the court schedules and speedy trial rules, labs must analyze cases necessary for upcoming trials first. Most Arizona labs struggle to keep pace with prosecutor demands for DNA results that are being used for evidence

in court and conversely not being used as valuable investigative information because of the significant backlog of cases.

Town Hall participants voiced the need for, and importance of, improved technology to allow for fast and accurate DNA evidence collection and processing. The DNA issue is one that will cost millions of dollars to remedy. Town Hall attendees placed the DNA issue as a very high priority and would like to see changes implemented within the next few years.

Additionally, as a result of several meetings and discussions the Arizona Department of Public Safety is working to make crime laboratory analysis results electronically available via the Internet so police and prosecutors will have faster access to testing results. The Administrative Office of the Courts is working with each county probation office to place computerized juvenile and adult probationer information technology within the reach of every Arizona criminal justice professional through technology they are currently developing.

Dedicated Funding Source

To ensure continued progress on criminal justice technology initiatives, dedicated criminal justice funding sources must be identified. Each group visited the topic of dedicated resources time and again to determine if there was an opportunity for all parts of the criminal justice system to work together to get appropriate funding for criminal justice initiatives like records integration, communication systems, manpower, DNA technology and equipment upgrades for officer use in the field. Many participants believed more federal dollars needed to be injected into the state because current budget levels are not enough to sustain and keep pace with all the technological advances necessary for effective administration of the criminal justice system.

Currently, criminal justice funding is scarce and requires that agencies compete against one another for portions of the same fiscal pie. Compound that issue with the idea that there is much to be accomplished in the area of technological advances. There is a very urgent and specific need to find a dedicated funding source to help bring these initiatives to fruition.

The idea that the criminal justice community needs sustainable financial streams is not a new concept, but perhaps figuring out where the money could come from is. Some thought it seemed appropriate to tie criminal justice dollars to a tax or service fee associated with

technology or with specific programs or projects similar to the funding developed to implement and enhance statewide 9-1-1 systems.

The Arizona Criminal Justice Commission staff has begun forming working groups to identify how other states are currently funding criminal justice programs and projects. Dialogues have begun with key congressmen and state lawmakers, which may pave the way for Arizona's future efforts.

System Improvements Synthesized Discussion Points

The Town Hall Meeting also explored opportunities to improve and increase intra-agency cooperation through systemic improvements. This section of the report will detail many of the common ideas that were generated within this discussion category. Some of the more salient points centered on the idea of resource sharing and inter-agency resource alignment. The groups liked the idea of working in a more coordinated team approach and not being as bound by jurisdictional lines.

In fact, many felt the Arizona criminal justice system should be a transparent or seamless system. That suggests the criminal justice system in Arizona needs to allow for more trust and collaboration among and between agencies, with the overriding idea that the criminal justice system as a whole should take greater priority over its individual parts. Some also thought the criminal justice system should work like an integrated business so that we can do more than just react to crime.

The following summarizes common themes among the Town Hall's four breakout sessions in the system improvement discussions.

Communications/Radios

The ability of different agencies to communicate across jurisdictions is virtually non-existent in Arizona. The ability to do so is called interoperability and often depends on wireless communication systems. Here in Arizona, most agencies still operate on the VHF or UHF band technology from the 1960s and 70s. This outdated equipment is a safety issue for law enforcement personnel due to "dead spots" around the state, frequency interference, insufficient channels, fading and static issues.

Clearly, routine police and probation work requires effective coordination and communication with not only other police agencies, but also with fire departments, emergency medical services and other public service organizations. Currently, many of the State's law enforcement agencies cannot communicate with one another because of this radio issue. A solution to the communication issue needs to be explored, created and instituted statewide.

Currently, the replacement of VHF/UHF with 800 MHz devices is underway in Arizona. Some agencies in Maricopa County, such as the Sheriff's Office, Scottsdale PD, Gilbert PD and

Chandler PD have already converted to the 800 MHz radio system. In fact, the City of Phoenix recently passed a $126 million bond issue that, in part, will allow PPD to also move to the 800 MHz system.

Due to the fact that law enforcement agencies are still utilizing antiquated communication technology, the need to upgrade the system is absolutely critical. Everyone at the Town Hall Meeting agreed that there is an immediate need to integrate digital communications throughout the law enforcement community to increase mobility and eliminate analog issues that currently hamper communications from various parts of the state. To support fingerprints and photographic data exchange between officers in the field and the Central Repository, a digital system is necessary. An updated radio communication system would facilitate getting the right information to the right person at the right time.

Town Hall participants gave this issue a high priority because it involves officer and community safety. They know the cost for upgrading communication systems will be extremely high, but believe this an important initiative that must be completed as soon as possible regardless of the price tag for doing so.

The Arizona Department of Public Safety has formed the Radio Communication Interoperability Group to begin working toward solutions for criminal justice radio communication needs. Members of local county and state entities are meeting to identify how the system should be funded and built to ensure radio systems interface in the future. Also, the Arizona Department of Public Safety and the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission have proposed a plan to the National Institute of Justice to fund a statewide needs assessment and the development of a 10-year plan for radio communications as well as data transmission improvements for Arizona. A new system will move voice and data around the state using the same resources.

Increase the Role of Prevention in Society

The philosophy of "prevention" has been largely overlooked in the criminal justice field due to competing budgets and resource issues. The role of prevention can and should be a comprehensive approach to addressing crime. Prevention is a philosophy and a process comprised of three overriding, but interrelated elements: community, problem solving, and

lasting preventive effects. Participants at the Town Hall generally agreed that prevention should play a larger role in the criminal justice system.

While rehabilitation and treatment programs have their place, an increase in the "front-end" prevention programs for youth are desperately needed. In order to make youth behavior modifications, the Town Hall groups unanimously agreed that the Arizona criminal justice community must increase prevention programs for youth instead of relying upon post arrest and/or conviction rehabilitation programs.

There were many good ideas about how to increase the role of prevention in the criminal justice field. Collectively the groups determined that the criminal justice community should conduct meetings to identify strategy and potential funding sources for prevention programs. It was also suggested that the criminal justice community should consider expanding successful statewide prevention programs.

An interesting idea that emerged from the groups was that of bridging the gap between research, practice and implementation. Crime and criminology are studied, but findings are almost never implemented to improve the system. The criminal justice system has always done things one way … react to crime. It's time to explore how the criminal justice system can get ahead of crime by developing solid prevention strategies around some of the research.

There are several good examples of innovative prevention programs in the State of Arizona. The Weed and Seed Strategy administered by the U.S. Attorney's Office is a good example of a program that works to prevent, control and reduce violent crime, drug abuse and gang activity in targeted high-crime neighborhoods. The program, with help from the community, relies on weeding out the criminal element while at the same time "seeding in" resources to revitalize the neighborhood. The driving force behind this prevention program is coordination. The coordinated efforts of law enforcement and social service agencies, the private sector and community all help prevent crime from recurring. Currently, the U.S. Attorney's Office is working with community-based groups in Flagstaff, Phoenix's Garfield District, Sunnyslope, Capitol Mall areas, South Tucson, Tucson and Winslow on Weed and Seed efforts in Arizona.

The groups did not address specific areas of prevention, only that prevention efforts needed to be improved and that law enforcement needed to be very involved in the process. This

concept could be the basis for future Town Hall topics. The groups also discussed the need for wider dissemination of crime information to the public — building on the idea that doing so would or could serve as a planning base for a deterrence/prevention strategy.

In terms of an implementation target, the groups determined that the creation or expansion of prevention programs was extremely important. They further determined that within three- to five-years public schools, criminal justice agencies, social service groups and youth advocates should have prevention strategies in place or on the drawing board. Town Hall participants felt that the cost level for creating and implementing these prevention programs would not be terribly expensive when weighed against the ultimate community benefit.

Increase Recruitment and Retention Efforts

A strong economy and higher private sector wages have left many law enforcement offices in the state severely understaffed. It is not unusual for the larger law enforcement agencies in Arizona to support a deficit of more than 100 officers at any given time. Between losing seasoned officers to retirement, training newer officers and hiring new recruits, the task of keeping well trained, experienced officers as well as other criminal justice professionals in the work force can be daunting. The Town Hall participants squarely addressed this topic and came up with some very innovative ideas about how to recruit and retain both law enforcement officers and other criminal justice professionals.

One of the ideas to emerge as a common theme among discussion groups was the concept of creating a central law enforcement hiring clearinghouse. The clearinghouse would maintain a computerized applicant pool that would help expedite the hiring needs for all Arizona law enforcement agencies statewide. Included with this discussion was the suggestion that the clearinghouse could institute a statewide law enforcement hiring standard and aid in employing and deploying a sufficient number of officers throughout Arizona.

The other concept to emerge from this discussion addressed the problem of attracting qualified job seekers to criminal justice careers. Many thought that the criminal justice community should cooperatively develop high school programs geared specifically toward law enforcement, prosecutor, court and correction careers.

The other very important topic to be broached in the area of recruitment and retention centered on the idea that there was a significant need to equalize the pay within the criminal justice community to eliminate "shopping" for better paying jobs. Many Town Hall participants thought that stronger mentoring programs would also help to retain more employees.

Additionally, the law enforcement culture needs to evolve somewhat to seek recruits that reflect Arizona's changing demographics. Many thought the objectives presented in this section would be very well served if the criminal justice community would come together to work on outreach programs that reinforce the idea that law enforcement and criminal justice pursuits are more than just jobs — they are careers.

The synthesized objective for this category clearly indicated that the criminal justice community needed to develop a better internal recruitment process and provide clear career enhancement opportunities for personnel. They also thought that improving supervisory and management practices coupled with a younger workforce might help retain staff and encourage people of all ages to develop to their full capacity.

The Town Hall groups placed a high priority on recruitment and retention issues currently facing the criminal justice system in Arizona. They projected that within three- to five-years, a solid statewide plan should be developed to tackle these issues as well as possibly legislative action to address salary issues.

Increase Training Among Practitioners

All of the groups believed that there was an immediate need to provide more focused training among all criminal justice practitioners by developing a unified and standardized system for training.

The groups also thought that a training needs assessment should be conducted among criminal justice agencies to determine current training requirements for various criminal justice groups. An evaluation of current training standards will allow collective development of additional training modules to fill gaps in the educational process and deliver more focused training among criminal justice groups. As a point of information, the courts are currently developing computer-based training that will be available to staff via their Intranet.

In three- to five-years, Town Hall participants want to see remote learning through a computer-based training system.

Increase Customer Service

Many Town Hall participants felt the criminal justice community needed to do more to increase citizen involvement in the criminal justice system by becoming more customer oriented through outreach and community relations. Over and over, Town Hall attendees expressed the need to work better with communities by interacting and collaborating more. The idea that it takes an entire community to provide effective public safety was first proposed as part of the Peelian Doctrine in 1829 and has enjoyed a significant rebirth with Community Policing endeavors. Town Hall participants also recognized and emphasized the importance of interaction with the community on policy development and program implementation.

Town Hall participants were also very vocal about the need for the criminal justice community to do a better job of marketing itself to the community. Collectively the groups felt that current Internet resources create opportunities for community interaction by establishing links between citizens and law enforcement. The idea is to create a more informed public by providing greater public access to information. Also, the groups felt that the criminal justice system in general could do a better job of community policing if the agencies had greater links to the block watch organizations, citizen groups and other important stakeholders.

Conclusion

More than 160 criminal justice leaders from all over the state came together to discuss their respective needs and work together to develop and implement a comprehensive, cooperative strategy that accurately reflects the entire system's future needs. Collectively they explored the current-state of the criminal justice system, engaged in dialogue about what could be done better and developed a criminal justice future-state picture that was depicted in this strategy paper.

The interesting thing about this Town Hall was that regardless of the criminal justice entity or group composition, each group's strategic planning looked very similar to the others. This fact points to the idea that everyone clearly understood what is working well within the system, collectively agreed on how it should look in the future and, in concept, decided on how to deliver the changes. This is good news for Arizona's criminal justice community because it puts everyone on the same page, moving forward together.

This particular Town Hall was so well received that the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission intends to host more of these forums with varying criminal justice related topics. The Town Hall forum encouraged participants to partake in dialogue that ensured the criminal justice community is speaking with one voice. If agencies can successfully come together to deliver viable solutions for information technology and system improvements, Arizona's criminal justice community and the citizens that are served by them will surely benefit from future Town Hall meetings.

Presently, Town Halls are being planned for the criminal justice community on an 18- to 24-month basis. We have yet to delve into the planning for the next Town Hall, but expect to begin the process in the fall 2001.

It is the hope of the ACJC that you found this information interesting and worthwhile. Periodic updates regarding the strategies contained in this report will be forwarded to ensure that information technology and system improvements tactics discussed at the Town Hall are being achieved.

Additional Town Hall Meeting information can be accessed via the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission's website at www.acjc.state.az.us/meetings.html.

Appendix i

Participating Agencies

Arizona Automobile Theft Authority
Arizona Peace Officer and Standards
    Training Board
Arizona Department of Juvenile
    Corrections
Arizona Department of Corrections
Arizona Attorney General's Office
Arizona Department of Public Safety
Arizona Law Enforcement Academy
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission
Arizona Regional Community Policing
    Institute
Arizona Superior Court
Arizona Association of Counties
Arizona Prosecuting Attorney's
    Advisory Council
American Society for Industrial Security
Apache County Adult Probation
Benson Police Department
Chandler Police Department
City of Winslow
Cochise County Sheriff's Office
Coconino County Attorney's Office
Coconino County Sheriff's Office
Drug Enforcement Administration
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Flagstaff Justice Court
Flagstaff Police Department
Gila County Sheriff Department
Gilbert Police Department
Government Information Technology
    Agency (GITA)
La Paz County Sheriff's Office

Maricopa County Adult Probation
Maricopa County Attorney's Office
Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Mesa Police Department
Mohave County Attorney
Paradise Valley Police Department
Peoria Police Department
Phoenix City Prosecutor's Office
Phoenix Municipal Court
Phoenix Police Department
Pima County Attorney's Office
Pima County Juvenile Court
Pinal County Narcotics Task Force
Pinal County Sheriff Department
Prescott Valley Police Department
San Luis Police Department
Santa Cruz County Metro Task Force
Sedona Police Department
Superior Court of Arizona
Supreme Court (Administrative Offices
    of the Courts)
Supreme Court (Adult Probation
Services)
Tucson Police Department
U.S. Attorney's Office
U.S. Border Patrol
U.S. Marshal's Service
Yavapai County Sheriff's Office
Yavapai County Adult Probation
Yavapai County Attorney's Office
Youngtown Police Department
Yuma County Sheriff's Office

Appendix ii

Group 1
Information Technology Discussion

Goals	Cost Level	Implementation Target	Priority	Participating Agencies
Goal 1: Data/System Integration • Define integration efforts What are the objectives • Id the database systems currently out there • Identify the hardware system s • Levels of access/security • Common system – what platform • Develop test program • Implement globally	High	5-10 years	High	All agencies , court, social service agencies, computer people, policy makers, Justice Dept, Government Information Technology Agency (GITA)
Goal 2: GPS • Largely currently available • Funding • Availability • Background hardware • Linking • When is it best to use this technology/Best practices	Medium – High	Dependant upon funding	Medium	Larger community which discusses ethics All CJ agencies

Goal 3: Technology En-hancement • Locate potential vendors • Access current tech • Verify needy • Identify potential con-sumers	High	3-5 years If we can't deliver any faster, things are becoming outdated	Medium	All criminal justice agencies
Goal 4: Information Access • Determine needs • Who will use/for what reason • Legality issues for dis-semination of informa-tion • Identify how people will access info • Identify and implement security levels	High	2-3 years	Medium	Citizens Security Schools Everyone/all citizens
Goal 5: Individual Identifi-cation • Identify current laws • Start to address ethical concerns surround it – define uses/how when info can be accessed and by whom • Determine where info is collected/ Insuring the safeguarding of privacy • Collect info	Low	Within 5 years	Medium	CJ system Venders Entire community because of the ethical issues

Goal 6: Tools • Needs assessment-what are they looking for/what do they need • What's already offered • Development of new technology in coopera-tion with venders • Looking for funding sources • Training	Medium	Within 5 years	Medium	CJ Private venders
Goal 7: Training • ID users • Needs assessment • Funding Sources • Implement	Medium	3-5 years	Medium	CJ
Goal 8: Interoperable Communications • Political work to ID stake holders/participants • Needs assessment tech-nical/equipment • Marketing/Education for participants • Funding Sources	High	5-7 years	High	Public Safety entities

Group 1

System Improvements Discussion

Goals	Cost Level	Implementation Target	Priority	Participating Agencies
Goal 1: Prevention • Conduct meetings to identify strategy and potential funding sources (Ensure current efforts within this area are examined) • Consider expand successful programs state-wide • Develop evaluation model • Require outcome evaluation	Medium	3-5 years	High	Community Public Schools All CJ Social Services Youth Advocate Groups
Goal 2: Criminal Justice Role • Survey CJ agencies of their perceived roll within the system and what, if anything they should be doing differently • Community perception of the LE, Courts, prosecution, corrections, of these agencies rolls within the CJ system and what if anything they should do differently • Tally results with findings and recommendations	Low	18 months – 2 years	Medium	All CJ agencies specifically 　　Tribal 　　State 　　 Local 　　Federal Random samples of public/community

Goal 3: Societal Issues • ID of major issues • Evaluate current standards/training • Develop training to fill gaps • Assess what we are doing to see what's working • Rework what's not working	Low	1-3 years	High	CJ agencies Community groups
Goal 4: Customer Service • Survey customers –assessing state of affairs • Develop/provide system wide training • Develop profile traits for who we want to hire • Examine educational standards • Consolidation of services – One stop shopping for services	Moderate	1-3 years	High	CJ staff Customers
Goal 5: Systems Improvements • Executive buy in • Independent outside audit/consult to see what everyone has • Set priorities • Identify funding responsibilities • Implementation	Medium	3-5 years	High	CJ agencies – specific executives Community groups accessing our information

Goal 6: Public Health Diversion • Publicity, Education, Training within mental health issues • Consult with county/state officials • Legislation for mental health – All aspects of the legislative process • Establish various protocols for in/out patients • Explore private/public partnering • Ensure adequate funding	High	3-5 years	Medium	LE Mental Health Hospitals Legislator Courts Corrections
Goal 7: Personnel Issues • Encourage/work with people to develop capacity • Development of internal training/career enhancements • Improve supervisor /management practices • System integration within agencies - if someone is not suited for LE but may be better suited to another area within the CJ system – be able to transfer more easily between various criminal justice agency components • Money issues Ensuring competitive salaries	Medium	3-5 years Salary dependant on legislative action	High – Either you put your money and energy up front or you don't have anyone to do everything else	All CJ stakeholders Education Human resource officers

with the private sector to encourage people to go into public sector vs. private sector.				
Goal 8: Jurisdictional Issues • Define the reasons focusing on jurisdictions/Why and where do they j exist? • Cooperation/consolation of jurisdiction Identify legal issues surrounding cooperation and consolidation/ Identify necessary legislative changes/ Identify areas of potential legal challenge to jurisdictional consolidations/Identify technical costs involved • Move personnel/ technology as necessary to facilitate cooperation/consolidation efforts • Integration of cooperative efforts	Policy discussions – low cost Medium - System changes which may result in increased costs. IE: legal challenges resulting increased costs	2-3 years	Medium	CJ stakeholders Community in general since they are the customers Policy makers

Appendix iii

Group 2
Information Technology Discussion

Goals	Cost Level	Implementation Target	Priority	Participating Agencies
Goal 1: Funding • Innovation summit, branches of govt • Revenue sharing private sector, fed govt, develop plan for constant and re-newed funding	Moderate	18 months		ACJC Convenes/ moderates meeting of statewide partici-pants to include law enforce-ment, community and legis-lature
Goal 2: **Redefine data sharing partners** • Identify what needs are (risks in sharing)	A. $100,000	A.		ACJC Convenes/ moderates meeting of statewide partici-pants to include law enforce-ment, community and legis-lature
Goal 3: Real time info • Upgrade infrastructure • Shift fingerprint systems, state, federal to auto-mated	Substantial Sub	A. 5 years B. 5-10 years		Info Tech (IT) IT- Design buy-in from man-agers and among agencies
Goal 4: Accurate Integrated system • A Standardized system	Fed govt pays	2010	Legislative Mandate	IT – Design buy-in from managers and among agen-cies
Goal 5: Distance learning • Identify what exists • Satellite tech • Identify our needs • Create access	substantial	A. 6 months – 1 year B. C. 2002 D. 1 year		IT, management, trainers

Group 2
System Improvements Discussion

Goals	Cost Level	Implementation Target	Priority	Participating Agencies
Goal 1: Cultivating a Cooperative Culture • Research existing • Pilot projects • Public Relations	Each entity should pitch in at the beginning; toward the end the costs would be substantial	Pilot within 2 years Full implementation within 5 years	Top	ACJC should oversee Other LE Agencies, legislature and the community
Goal 2: Customer Focused Integrated Information Systems • Intelligence • Information	$100,000	1-2 years to implement	Important	Anyone in the criminal justice system.
Goal 3: Community Safety Partnerships • Community policing	Dollar cost is low; cost in time may be high	Ongoing	Important	Anyone in the criminal justice system, plus community.
Goal 4: Recruitment, Hiring and Retention • Line Staff • IT Staff	May be low for some positions and very high for others e.g., IT. Important to determine the knowledge and skills of the staff we want to recruit. Can use things like alternate work schedules and education benefits and retirement programs to retain staff.	2001	Important	Review outside LE and/or Government, particularly in IT – Check private sector and trends.

Appendix iv

Group 3
Information Technology Discussion

Goals	Cost Level	Implementation Target	Priority	Participating Agencies
Goal 1: Data Collection & Dissemination • Nationwide accessible criminal history database • Complete access to full criminal history • Statewide digital audio & image transceiver system, satellite supported. • GIS & Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) • Integrated Criminal Justice System Communications & Data • Access to real time shared data • Unified data & retrieval system statewide • Seamless electronic flow of information • Use of the Internet • Circular data system	Initial system development is high, however, reallocation of resources is medium.	Ongoing process	Extremely high; however, other systems need to be developed to collect data for dissemination	All law enforcement & criminal justice
Goal 2: Identification & Tracking • Auto tracking • DNA & other identification methods • DNA lab	High	Ongoing	High	Specialists such as forensics, medical community, psychologists, mental health, Dept of Corrections, computer specialists

Goal 3: Public & Officer Safety • Electronic vehicle disabling • Development of non-lethal weapons technology • GIS & GPS • Equipping officers	Medium in comparison to other issues	Ongoing	High	All law enforcement & criminal justice agencies & the community
Goal 4: Coordination • Unified, standardized systems for training • Real time data entry • Master system, statewide • Uniform reporting	Low; once people are in place, coordination should cost less	Ongoing	Extremely high	Everyone
Goal 5: Funding • Dedicated systems & support staff • Patch systems, not new systems • Industry resources • Funding mandate • Consistent resources	Extremely high	Ongoing	High	ACJC, JCLB, federal, legislative, local city councils, private industry & non-profit organizations
Goal 6: Security • Firewalls • Secure communication & data systems	High	Ongoing	High; criminal justice security must be maintained	Computer specialists
Goal 7: Change of Philosophies • Change of perspective • Sharing of resources	Medium	Ongoing	High	All law enforcement & criminal justice agencies

Goal 8: People • CJ system, private sector, mental health • Community leaders • Media	High; technical expertise costs	Ongoing, starting now`	High	Judicial, community, law enforcement, criminal justice, mental health
Goal 9: Facilitators • Intelligence task force • Executive steering • Hardware/ software stan-dardization	Low	Ongoing	High	Law enforcement & criminal justice leadership

Group 3
System Improvements Discussion

Goals	Cost Level	Implementation Target	Priority	Participating Agencies
Goal 1: Services • Seamless Services • Integrated Wireless Communications • Standardized Reporting • More Technology Oriented • Improved Information • Even distribution of Resources • System Trending • Quality dialog	High	On Going	High	Technical Experts/Users; specialists ; customers
Goal 2: Process & Outcome • Courts & Legislature can/can't do • Specialized investigations • Victims Rights • Intervention – Juveniles • Mandatory Sentencing	Medium	3 –5 years	Low	Judges; courts; law enforcement; school; community
Goal 3: Consequences • New Crimes/Challenges • Privacy vs. Security	Medium	1 –3 Years	Medium – will increase as technology increases	Criminal Justice / Law Enforcement

Goal 4: New Challenges • Faster Process of Offenders • Rehabilitation • More Crime Reported • Faster Info to the Public • Cybercrimes • Use of DNA Technology	High	On Going	High	Law Enforcement/ Criminal Justice System
Goal 5: Same Challenges in CJ • Drugs • Gangs • More Police;Prisons • Higher demand for services	High	On Going	High	Criminal Justice System
Goal 6: Training • Focused training	Medium	On Going	Medium now Low - until the product is developed; once system is in place is high	Law Enforcement/ Criminal Justice System
Goal 7: Information • Criminal History Info • ID Suspect	High	5 – 15 years	High	Criminal Justice System;private sector; specialists
Goal 8: Internal & External Process Improvements • Resources • Communications • Speedier Trials • Partnership w/ Private Sector • Bureaucy • Strategic Planning • Customer Service • Marketing • Public Education • Empathy	Medium	On Going	High	Criminal Justice/Public & Private Sector

Goal				
Goal 9: Geographic Issues • Change from Small town to Big City Mentality • Rural Areas Increase need for services	Medium	On Going	Medium	Citizens/ Communities; State & local government
Goal 10: Diversity Issues • Multi-Cultural • Language Issues • Immigration	Medium	On Going	High	Citizens/ Communities; State & local government
Goal 11: Senior Issues • Aging Population • Reallocation of Resources	Medium	On Going	Medium	Citizens/ Communities; State & local government
Goal 12: Offenders • Intelligent Criminal • Younger Prison Population • Female Offenders	High	On Going	High	Criminal Justice; Legislative; corrections
Goal 13: Global Neighborhood • Crime Reporting • International Cooperation • Jurisdictional Issues	Low	On Going	High	International Law Enforcement Agencies
Goal 14: Cyber Challenges • Apprehensions • More Criminal Behavior • Informed Criminal • Cybercrime	High	On Going	High	Criminal Justice; Law Enforcement ; Technical Specialists
Goal 15: Education • Training • Research	High	On Going	High	Criminal Justice System

Goal 16: Cyber Access • Customer Service • Community Policing • Public Access	Low	On Going	High	Criminal Justice System; Law Enforcement; local state government citizens
Goal 17: Privacy & Security Issues • Privacy • Security	High	On Going	High	Criminal Justice System/Technical Specialists; Law Enforcement; Private Sector - Technology

Appendix v

Group 4
Information Technology Discussion

Goals	Cost Level	Implementation Target	Priority	Participating Agencies
Goal 1: Policy & Resources • Research and evaluation • Criminal justice agency - statewide funding source for criminal justice system • Public/private partnership • Think tank from other sources • Technology changes faster than laws • Ethical/privacy issues • More I.D. info legally available generation changes to info sensitivity • Adequate dedicated funding • Can we overcome Turf?	High	1-5 years	High	All

Goal 2: Systems Integration	High	3-7 years	High	All
• Integration of hard-ware/software				
• Total system integration				
• Linked data systems				
• Criminal justice system wide integrated of data-bases				
• Centralized information network				
• Single point data entry				
• Ease of use and access to broad databases				
• Comprehensive data dictionary for common statistics				
• Internet based information system				
• Info links between schools, JOLTS-DOJC-DOC-DPS – treatment (data wo				
• Real time data sharing				
• Communication: Law enforcement/community corrections				
• Transparent data translation				
• Focus is not tech, it's knowledge sharing				
• Coordinated infrastructure build-out				
• Security of information access				
• Statewide intranet				
• Standard infrastructure architecture				
• "Programs" integration: corrections law enforcement				

Goal 3: Offender Based Identification	High	1-5 years	High	All
• Electronic tracking pa-rolees • Statewide DNA database • DNA portable test kits • Photo images • Continue use of GIS in criminal justice Victim alarm system • Existing databases • Single inmate tracking national/state • Unique I.D. Number from juvenile referral to adult (DPS-ACJIS) – DOL (SID) • Electronic chip tracking for sexual predators mi-cro-chip • Long range (15 feet) biometric identification integrated • National instant back-ground information • Criminal personal I.D. Electronic computerized tracking prohibited weapons • Satellite photographs of suspects in high crime areas • Central registry for sub-scribers (phones, pagers, cells)				

Goal 4: Field Information Links	High	3-10 years	High	Law Enforcement and Courts
• Video cameras in every police car • Paperless reporting system • Roadside criminal history info photos/pagers/cell • Access I.D. license status via swipe Portable computers ACIC/NCIC • Voice match ups, scanners for positive identification • Hands free communication • Confirm warrants via MDT/MTC PDA Voice recognition report writing • High-tech court rooms • Online electronic delivery of discovery info • Automatic transcription of LEA reports • Audio/video reports – supplements • Wireless communication • Print match-ups scanners for probation I.D. which would require identification for fingerprints • Fingerprint and scanners in patrol vehicles				

Group 4
System Improvements Discussion

Goals	Cost Level	Implementation Target	Priority	Participating Agencies
Goal 1: Coordination & Enhancement • Consolidate of services – no turf • Budgeting; try to eliminate duplication of efforts • Funding system united effort • Dedicated funding system • System wide planning and budgeting • Cross jurisdiction problem solving • Coordinate C.J. component mission/goals • Change jurisdictional boundaries • System wide management analysis • Have minimum standards statewide for equipment	High	1-3 years	High	All
Goal 2: Public Interaction • Increase public education of CJ system • Public/policy maker education re: current communication system • Community involvement • Advanced computerized	Low	1-3 years	High	Law Enforcement, ACJC, Legislature

community policing				
Goal 3: Improved Practices • Interdisciplinary pro-grams • Ongoing accurate evaluation of problems • Improved use of research models • Integrate research & practice • Coordinated law en-forcement Public/private • International partnerships • Employee exchange: "Rhodes Scholars" • Cross training/cross work collaboration	Low	1-5 years	Medium	All
Goal 4: Human Resources • Training academies computer based • Central hiring clearing house • Deployment requires training • Computerized applicant pool statewide • Statewide criminal jus-tice hiring standard • Equivalent pay • Continued positive rein-forcement of L.E. As ca-reer – not just job • High school programs geared toward law en-forcement and correc-tions • Hire adequate numbers of officers	High	1-5 years and ongoing	Medium	Law Enforcement, ACJC, Schools, Community, Col-leges, AZPOST

Goal 5: Court Reform	Medium	1-5 years	High	Courts
• Limit number of appeals • File charges less than 72 hours • Video court appearance • Entire police report on cd/dvd • Accountability of judges • Mandatory court sched-ule • Alternate court models • Network Video court proceedings • Term limits for judges • Professional juries • Initial appearance less than 8 hours				

Goal				
Goal 6: Legal Challenges • Statute review • Cyber crime • Impacts of cyber justice system • Divert migrants away from organized crime	Low	3-5 years	Low	Courts, Prosecutors, Legislature
Goal 7: Alternate Solutions • More emphasis of prevention by others • Consider prevention, restorative justice • More involvement by victims • Greater variety of sanctions • Offenders with mental illness • Improve cooperative sentencing; • Rehabilitation/disabilities • Parental accountability for incarcerated youths	Low	3-5 years	Medium	All