

FEATURE ARTICLES



Improving the Quality and Accuracy of Bias Crime Statistics

[This article was excerpted from the Executive Summary of "Improving the Quality and Accuracy of Bias Crime Statistics Nationally: An Assessment of the First Ten Years of Bias Crime Data Collection." The report was produced by The Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, and the Justice Research and Statistics Association, and funded by the Bureau of Justice Statistics.]

Over the past 15 years, increased awareness and discussion about the legacy and impact of bias crimes has prompted legislation that identifies them as distinct from similar non-bias crimes. The Federal Bureau of Investigation defines these crimes as follows:

A hate crime, also known as a bias crime, is a criminal offense committed against a person, property, or society which is motivated, in whole or part, by the offender's bias against a race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, or ethnicity/national origin (Crime in the United States, 1999).

Bias crimes are therefore not separate offenses, but acknowledge a specific motivation for a criminal event. This motivation is considered more pernicious and disruptive to the community, imposing "distinct emotional harm on victims."

Since the passage of the Hate Crime Statistics Act of 1990, the FBI has been collecting data on hate crimes as part of its Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. In order to identify ways in which Hate Crime Reports can be improved, the Bureau of Justice Statistics funded a project carried out by Northeastern Univer-

sity and JRSA. The project had several components: a survey of 2,657 law enforcement agencies, a survey of advocacy groups, a review of state hate crime training efforts, and interviews with experts around the country.

Sources of Hate Crime Data

The best source of national hate crime data continues to be the Uniform Crime Reports. Although incident-based systems (including NIBRS) provide more comprehensive data, these systems exist

in very few jurisdictions, precluding any cross-jurisdictional comparisons or national estimates. The FBI began collecting national data about hate crimes in 1991 and nearly 12,000 agencies now participate with the UCR Hate Crime Reporting Program. Participation, however, is a somewhat misleading term, as the vast majority (83%, in 1998) of agencies participate by submitting that their jurisdiction had zero hate crimes during the year. In the most recent Hate Crime

(See **IMPROVING STATISTICS**, p. 4)

"Technocorrections": The Promises, the Uncertain Threats in the New Century

[This article was written by Tony Fabelo, Executive Director, Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council, and former Texas SAC Director. It is excerpted from an article originally published by the National Institute of Justice as a Sentencing & Corrections Research in Brief (May 2000, No. 5, NCJ 181411). A full copy of this report is available on the NIJ Web site: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij>.]

In this new century, the technological forces that have made the use of cell phones ubiquitous will converge with the forces of law and order to create "technocorrections." The correctional establishment—the managers of the jail, prison, probation, and parole systems—and their sponsors in elected office are seeking more cost-effective ways to increase public safety as the number of people under correctional supervision continues to grow. A correctional establishment that takes advantage of all the

potential offered by the new technologies to reduce the costs of supervising criminal offenders and minimize the risk they pose to society will define the field of technocorrections.

The Technologies of Technocorrections

Emerging technologies in three areas—electronic tracking and location systems, pharmacological treatments, and genetic and neurobiologic risk assessments—may be used in technocorrections. While these technologies may significantly increase public safety, we must also anticipate the threats they pose to democracy. The technocorrectional apparatus may provide the infrastructure for increased intrusiveness by the state and its abusive control of both offenders and law-abiding citizens.

(See **TECHNOCORRECTIONS**, p. 5)

JRSA ACTIVITIES



SACs Receive Grants for Juvenile Justice Evaluation Partnerships

Over the past two years, the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) has been working with the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) to enhance juvenile justice evaluation capacity in the states through the Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center (JJEC) project. The JJEC aims to provide state and local juvenile justice professionals with tools and resources to improve evaluation, and, ultimately, programs and initiatives funded by the Title II, Part B State Formula Grants Program.

The Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) Evaluation Partnership Program, one of several activities carried out by the JJEC project, was designed to foster relationships among state agencies, local programs, and evaluators in an effort to develop and improve state infrastructure for supporting systematic evaluation. For the past two years, the JJEC project has awarded selected SACs with seed money to encourage partnerships

among the SACs, state juvenile justice agencies, local programs, and evaluators. The purpose of these projects is to build sustainable relationships that will, over time, enhance the juvenile justice evaluation capacity of the state. State SACs that apply for funding are encouraged, to the degree possible, to involve other juvenile justice professionals from a variety of state and local agencies, including the juvenile justice specialist from the state. Project award decisions are made based on the recommendations of external reviewers.

In late 1999, JRSA awarded SAC Juvenile Justice Evaluation Partnership grants to three states: Maine, Massachusetts, and New Mexico.

- The SAC in Maine worked with the state Juvenile Justice Advisory Group (JJAG) to design and deliver training on performance measurement, proposal writing, and evaluation, to create a reference manual on performance measures, and to develop an RFP protocol for juvenile justice agencies.
- The Massachusetts SAC conducted a process evaluation of programs administered under Title V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act for the fiscal years 1996 through 1998.
- The New Mexico SAC collaborated with the Juvenile Division of the New Mexico Children, Youth, and Families Department to complete a formative evaluation of the EQUIP program, a group-based treatment program specifically designed for youth with antisocial behavioral problems.

In September 2000, SAC awards were given to Maine, Illinois, and Iowa.

- The Maine SAC will provide three regional training conferences for local program administrators, law enforcement officials, and judiciary and corrections officials on evaluating juvenile justice programs. Conference proceedings will be published, as well as a Juvenile Justice Resource Guide.
- The Illinois SAC will produce a needs assessment guidebook and evaluation manual to strengthen the evaluation of

county juvenile justice system projects. SAC staff will meet with county councils to determine what guidance they would find most useful in assessing their juvenile justice system, starting new programs, and evaluating existing programs. In consultation with the Illinois Juvenile Justice Specialist, they will prepare a guidebook and manual, and work with the Illinois State Advisory Group (the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission) to make the evaluation manual available to all Title II, Part B grantees in Illinois.

- The Iowa Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and SAC will coordinate and organize localized youth planning initiatives. This will include conducting interviews with the National Center for Family Centered Practice (NCFCP) to review its training protocol and further understand its current evaluation process. In addition, the SAC will review each of the relevant state initiatives for the terms being used, domains, indicators, sources of information, and availability of information. They will also work with the relevant stakeholders to identify commonalities and work toward agreement among the various agencies and initiatives.

Reports summarizing the SAC partnership activities and findings from the first year will be posted on the JRSA Web site (www.jrsa.org). In the future, the reports will also be available on *JJEC Online* (www.jrsa.org/jjec), a Web-based juvenile justice evaluation resource center managed by JRSA. For 2001, the JJEC has proposed expanding the SAC Evaluation Partnership program by bringing together the juvenile justice specialists, the State Advisory Group members, and SAC directors from three states for an intensive work session to establish the partnerships and plan specific evaluation activities.

For more information about the SAC evaluation projects, please contact the SACs directly. For information about the Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center project, contact JRSA's Project Manager, Dr. Taj C. Carson, at tcarsen@jrsa.org.

(See **JRSA ACTIVITIES**, p. 7)

INSIDE

FEATURE ARTICLES

- Improving the Quality and Accuracy of Bias Crime Statistics . . . 1
 "Technocorrections": The Promises, the Uncertain Threats 1

JRSA ACTIVITIES

- SACs Receive Grants for Juvenile Justice Evaluation Partnerships 2
 JRSA Welcomes New SAC Director 7
 JRSA Staff Update 7

NATIONAL SCENE

- NCJA Conference Explores Incidents of Mass Victimization 3
 National Association of Sentencing Commissions—An Overview 3

JUSTICE BOOKSHELF

- Statistical Analysis Center Publications
 Publications from the Office of Justice Programs 8

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Upcoming Criminal Justice Meetings & Conferences 10



NCJA Conference Explores Incidents of Mass Victimization

[This article was submitted by the National Criminal Justice Association, a non-profit organization that represents state and local governments on criminal justice-related issues.]

At its annual membership meeting held in Kansas City, Mo., July 10-12, 2000, the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) examined the roles of local, state, and federal public safety officials in preparing for, responding to, and mitigating the effects of incidents of mass victimization. Using the theme *Community as Victim-Crisis Management for Public Safety*, a cadre of presenters from law enforcement, victim crisis services, public health, and the military shared their expertise and experiences in coping with devastating incidents affecting whole communities. The conference, co-hosted by the Missouri Department of Public Safety, also featured representatives of leading federal emergency response agencies, who highlighted the range of resources available for responding to national crises.

Topics covered in conference sessions and workshops included Collaborating for Public Safety; School Safety: Issues and Controversies; Healing the Hurt; and The Military Mission in Domestic Terrorism. Responses to recent national tragedies such as the 1995 bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, the shooting massacre at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, and the flooding in North Carolina that followed Hurricane Floyd were covered during conference sessions. Emerging themes included the need for collaboratively developed crisis management plans prepared *before* a disaster occurs; the importance of multi-agency, multijurisdictional coordination and communication; and the need for crisis mediation to be victim-focused, with treatment options matching the unique needs of the individual affected by the incident.

In the plenary session on Collaborating for Public Safety, representatives from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), and the Georgia Depart-

ment of Public Safety described federal and state resources available through their offices to help states support the victims of man-made and natural disasters. In this session, panelists also outlined the needs of victims and responsibilities of responders after a violent incident. These include identifying victims and notifying family members and the public of fatalities, as well as the need for victims to be informed about the services available to them, the identity of their offenders, and their right to attend trials.

The session *Healing the Hurt* addressed more specifically how victim service providers must meet the needs of individual survivors of mass destruction.

Experts stated that because of the variables associated with the event itself and with each person victimized, a range of treatment options should be made available. For example, with respect to the incident, crisis responders need to consider the length and speed of onset of the trauma as well as whether the incident was life threatening and involved losses (of family members, homes, limbs, etc.). Understanding that individuals can be affected differently by the same event, crisis responders also need to determine a victim's psychological, social, and physical situation at the time of the incident to determine the best course of treatment.

(See **CONFERENCE**, p. 8)

National Association of Sentencing Commissions – An Overview

[This article was written by Debra L. Dailley, Director, Minnesota Sentencing Guidelines Commission, and Former Chair, National Association of Sentencing Commissions.]

Over the past 20 years approximately half of the states in the nation have implemented or considered developing some type of structured sentencing system such as sentencing guidelines. Many states have established commissions and funded staff to carry out the work of developing and maintaining these broad-based, rational sentencing policies. These efforts typically involve a heavy focus on the importance of good criminal justice information and generally have resulted in significant improvements in the availability of data regarding sentencing practices. They often have common approaches to dealing with issues related to sentencing such as sentencing philosophy and process, political concerns, media relations, impact analysis, and prison population projections.

The National Association of Sentencing Commissions (NASC) is an organization created to help jurisdictions involved in

structured sentencing efforts benefit from the experiences and knowledge of others around the country. Specifically, the mission of NASC is to facilitate the exchange and sharing of information, ideas, data, expertise, and experiences, and to educate on issues related to sentencing policies, sentencing guidelines, and sentencing commissions.

NASC had its beginnings in 1993 when the University of Colorado School of Law invited representatives from 12 states to participate in a Symposium on Sentencing Reform. From this experience, it became clear that an annual conference that would offer the opportunity to share interests and concerns in the area of structured sentencing would be of enormous value. A national conference was held in Seattle, WA, in 1994 and in Boston, MA, in 1995, and from these conferences, NASC was formalized with a set of by-laws and incorporated as a nonprofit organization under the laws of the State of Delaware. Conferences have since been held in Madison, WI, Palm Beach, FL, Minneapolis, MN, Salt Lake City, UT, and this year in Pittsburgh, PA.

(See **OVERVIEW**, p. 8)

(IMPROVING STATISTICS, from p. 1)

Report issued by the FBI (1998), 15 states had 10 or fewer agencies submitting incidents of bias crime; one other state did not participate entirely.

The number of hate crime incidents submitted nationally has remained remarkably stable since reporting first began. In 1992, there were 7,466 incidents reported and in 1998, 7,755. In 1994, the number of reported hate crime incidents hit a low of 5,932, with the highest number of reported incidents occurring in 1996, 8,759. In addition to those departments which submit zeros, a significant percentage (about a third) do not participate in the UCR Hate Crime Reporting Program (zero or otherwise).

Reporting Process

Although there are some common factors that affect crime reporting overall, several caveats exist for hate crime reporting specifically. Barriers to accurate hate crime reporting generally fall into one or two broad categories: individual (victim) inhibitors and police

Key Decision Points in Hate Crime Reporting

1. Victim understands that a crime has been committed.
2. Victim recognizes that hate (of the victim's real or perceived minority status or attribute) may be a motivating factor.
3. Victim or another party solicits law enforcement about motivation of the crime.
4. Victim or another party communicates with law enforcement about motivation of the crime.
5. Law enforcement recognizes the element of hate.
6. Law Enforcement documents the element of hate and, as appropriate, charges suspect with civil rights or hate/bias offense.
7. Law enforcement records the incident and submits the information to the Uniform Crime Reports, Hate Crime Reporting Unit.

dis/incentives. The process of hate crime reporting (from the incident to the documentation in the UCR statistics) can be conceptualized as a series of seven key decision points (see box). These events generally occur in sequence, and if there is a breakdown at any one of these decision points, the likelihood of accurate reporting diminishes substantially.

Study Findings

Data from the law enforcement agencies surveyed indicate that 37.1% (n = 36) of the respondents from those agencies which did not submit to UCR in 1997 believed that their department had investigated and reported one or more incidents of hate crime. Surprisingly, of those agencies which reported zero hate crimes to UCR, 31% (n = 58) indicated that their department had investigated and reported one or more incidents of hate crime. *These data are substantial because they indicate a disconnect between what line officers believe and what is reported to the UCR.*

Through follow-up of interviews with survey respondents, researchers explored the reasons why such disparities occurred. A major reason cited for the disparity involved a break down in the two-step process of a local agency reporting to a state agency, which then compiles the hate crime reports. The second reason mentioned involved situations in which the investigating officers may note the element of bias within the narrative of the incidents report, but the report never gets to the person within their agency responsible for completing the UCR reports. Many respondents felt that the indication of bias was occasionally lost within the departmental bureaucracy.

Only a minority of police agencies from across the country (37.5%) stated that they had an official policy regarding hate crime (excluding 44 missing responses, total n = 661). In general, the smaller the agency, the less likely they are to have a hate crime policy. In particular, the southern and midwestern areas of the country are less likely to have implemented a policy. More than three quarters of officers responding to the survey indicated that the officers will "support departmental policy" regarding hate crimes. This majority indicates that maintaining a policy could positively affect an officer's decision whether or not to investigate bias.

While it appears most departments do provide some supervisory review of hate crimes (72.1%, total n=691), in general, only about one third (32.9%) of the time is the review outside of the normal supervision process. The level of supervisory review is important because it offers line officers additional support in identifying potential hate crimes.

Nationally, approximately one quarter of the police agencies (24.8%) stated that their department had a specialized officer or unit to deal with hate crimes. Of those that have a specialized officer(s), only very few, approximately 2%, of these officers work full time on hate crime offenses.

The mail survey respondents indicated that *more than two thirds of the departments presently do provide some training on hate crimes (67%).* In general, the larger the agency, the more likely it is to provide hate crime training. *However, most respondents indicated that this training is rather limited, generally under two hours in duration.* Results from the telephone survey of training academies indicate the smaller agencies with small budgets seem to be unaware of the training opportunities that exist at both federal and state levels.

Police Perceptions of Hate Crime

One of the most salient questions about hate crime currently is whether officers believe there is something "different" about these crimes. *Therefore, it is important to note that across America, a majority of those who deal with crime victims most frequently—the police—generally believe that hate-motivated crimes are more serious than similar crimes that are not motivated by bias.* Hate crime investigators noted that they believe a lack of understanding about hate crimes contributes more to under-reporting than more external issues such as extra work or fear of media reactions.

Police believe that the most salient factor in discouraging victims from reporting is the police/victim interaction. Further, this sentiment is expressed regardless of agency size. Therefore, it appears that by improving the community/law enforcement relationship, police will also improve the hate crime reporting processes.

Recommendations

Improving the national documentation of bias crimes requires a broad-based strategy that addresses four overarching areas. Highlights of the study's recommendations include the following:

- **Improve Police-Community Relationships** through enhancing victim-police relations; raising public awareness about bias crimes and services available at local law enforcement agencies; and adding a hate crimes emphasis to the COPS Office community policing initiatives.
- **Develop Infrastructure and Support** through FBI efforts to support the identification, investigation, and reporting of hate crimes, and through encouraging local agencies to develop procedures and policies for handling bias crimes as well as for dealing with vic-

tims and communities.

- **Provide Training** through national, state and local efforts, including identifying target jurisdictions in which the FBI can provide intensive follow-up; inviting advocacy groups to participate as consultants or trainers; and conducting research on the most effective hate crime training curricula and techniques.
- **Improve Data and Reporting** through eliminating the "information disconnect" between the investigating officer and UCR reporting; instituting data quality control methods; encouraging the use of NIBRS reporting; and analyzing local data to determine whether they can serve as an "early warning system" for jurisdictions.

The study recommendations also pointed to the need for research to identify the

correlates of hate crime; to identify the patterns of hate crime prosecutions as well as the sentencing of offenders; to understand the actions of offenders within the broader context of youth violence; and to examine the level and character of hate crimes in NIBRS jurisdictions. Finally, research should be conducted on the role of the Internet in promoting violence motivated by hate.

[Note: The report's executive summary was released on September 13, 2000, at a White House press conference on the federal hate crimes legislation. Printed copies are available from Northeastern University's Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research. To access the executive summary and report online, go to the Programs and Research section of the JRSA Web site: www.jrsa.org, where a link to the full document is provided.]

(TECHNOCORRECTIONS, from p. 1)

Because the application of technologies tends to move faster than the enactment of laws to manage them properly, we need to start debating immediately the ethical and legal questions that have to be answered if we are to understand how to prevent the state from using the technocorrectional establishment in ways inconsistent with constitutional or ethical standards. The critical challenge will be to learn how to take advantage of new technological opportunities while minimizing their threats.

Tracking and Location Systems

Electronic tracking and location systems are the technology perhaps most familiar to correctional practitioners today. Electronic monitoring—with either old-fashioned bracelets that communicate through a device connected to telephone lines or more modern versions based on cellular or satellite tracking—are in use in most states. With this technology, correctional officials can continuously track offenders' locations to supervise their movements. They can also define geographic areas from which offenders are prohibited and furnish tracking devices to potential victims (such as battered wives). The devices will set "safe zones" that trigger alarms or warning notices upon approach of the offender.

Tiny cameras could be integrated into tracking devices to provide live video of offenders' locations and circumstances. Miniature electronic devices implanted in the body to signal the location of offenders at all times, create unique identifiers that trigger alarms, and monitor key bodily functions that affect unwanted behaviors are under development and are close to becoming reality.¹

Pharmacological Treatment

Pharmacological breakthroughs—new "wonder" drugs—will also affect technocorrections. Correctional officials are already familiar with some of these drugs, as many are currently used to treat mentally ill offenders. Yet these drugs could be easily used to control mental conditions affecting behaviors considered undesirable even when the offenders are not mentally ill. Experiments are now being conducted with drugs that affect the levels of brain neurotransmitters (substances in the body that transmit nerve impulses) and can be used to help treat drug abuse.²

On another front, research into the relationship between levels of the neurotransmitter serotonin and violent behavior seem to indicate that people who have low levels of serotonin are more prone than others to impulsive, violent acts, especially when they abuse alcohol.³

The National Academy of Sciences has recommended a new emphasis in biomedical research on violence as a means to understand the biological roots of violent behavior.⁴ Neurobiologic processes are the complex electrical and chemical activities in specific brain regions that underlie observable human behavior. It is only a matter of time before research findings in this area lead to the development of drugs to control neurobiologic processes. These drugs could become correctional tools to manage violent offenders and perhaps even to prevent violence. Such advances are related to the third area of technology that will affect corrections: genetic and neurobiologic risk assessment technologies.

Risk Assessment Technologies

Correctional officials today are familiar with DNA profiling of offenders, particularly sex offenders. This is just the beginning of the application of gene-related technologies to corrections. The Human Genome Project, supported by the National Institutes of Health and Department of Energy, will be completed by 2003. A map of the 3 billion chemical bases that make up human DNA will be created, and high-powered "sequencer" machines will be able to analyze the map faster than any human researcher.⁵

(See **TECHNOCORRECTIONS**, p. 6)

(TECHNOCORRECTIONS, from p. 5)

Gene “management” technologies are already widely used in agriculture and are increasingly used in medicine. The progression is likely to continue, with applications in psychiatric and behavioral management. The genetic—or inherited—basis of behavior, including anti-social and criminal behavior, is being investigated by researchers. Eventually the genetic roots of human behavior could be profiled. An example of a step in that direction is scientists’ search for genetic explanations of variations among individuals in levels of the secretion of serotonin and dopamine (another neurotransmitter, this one playing a major role in addiction).

Is it possible that breakthroughs in these areas will lead to the development of risk assessment tools that use genetic or neurobiologic profiles to identify children who have a propensity toward addiction or violence? How about identifying males with a propensity for sex offending? The National Institutes of Health, working with psychologists at the University of Illinois, have conducted research on more than 8,600 children to identify those with high “aggressor” traits and to treat them, through social intervention, to prevent their involvement in violent behavior.⁶ What if these children could be more reliably identified with genetic or neurobiologic assessments?

We may be years away from linking genetic and neurobiologic traits with social and environmental factors to reliably predict who is at risk for addiction, sex offending, violent behavior, or crime in general. But when we are able to do it very well, attempts may be made to develop genetic or neurobiologic tests for assessing risks posed by individuals. Demand for risk assessments of individuals will come from correctional officials under pressure to prevent violent recidivism. Once under correctional control, specific offenders could be identified, on the basis of such testing and risk assessment, as likely violent recidivists, and incarceration could assume a more preventive role.

“Preventive incarceration” is already a reality for some convicted sex offenders. More than a dozen states commit certain sex offenders to special “civil commitment” facilities after they have served

their prison sentences because of a behavioral or mental abnormality that makes them dangerous. This happens today with no clear understanding of the nature of the abnormality. It is not difficult to imagine what might be done to justify preventive incarceration if this “abnormal” behavior or criminal behaviors could be explained and predicted by genetic or neurobiologic profiling.

Forces Converging to Escalate Technocorrections

At the same time that the three emerging technologies promise more effective control of recidivism, the country’s dominant social, political, and market forces appear to be converging to create conditions conducive to the rapid expansion of technocorrections. As social scientists Charles Edgley and Dennis Brisset recently suggested, American culture increasingly supports the conversion of every privilege, need, aspiration, and interest into a right that must be defended with governmental intervention.⁷ This “meddling” on the part of government is promoted, the authors argue, by bureaucrats, interest groups, advocacy groups, and voluntary associations and is supported by a risk-averse culture. The citizenry has lost the ability to “distinguish between major problems and minor vices,” they write, “for the latter are viewed as simply the inevitable first steps to the former.”⁸

Risk Aversion in Public Safety

This interventionist approach is clearly justified in the name of controlling crime and promoting public safety. The national “tough on crime” reforms increased penalties for many criminal offenses and closed loopholes that once allowed lenient correctional supervision of offenders. As a result of these reforms, the number of people under correctional supervision has continued to increase and, more significant, public demands on correctional officials have escalated. Reducing the risk of recidivism has always been part of the mission of corrections, but only in the technocorrectional world is it possible to reduce the risk of violent recidivism to almost zero. The promise of technology to supervise offenders more effectively will accelerate the impulse to expand technocorrections.

Market Culture Creates New Needs

The market culture that sells the tech-

nologies reflects the social context and the political culture. By exploiting the propensity toward risk aversion, market forces create new outlets for technology (for example, cell phones for emergency communications). At the same time, the technology creates perceived needs that then have to be satisfied (for example, the need for locational systems that pinpoint the whereabouts of cell phone users when they call for emergency service). As markets for these goods and services expand, the cost of the technology declines, creating even further expansion and spinoffs. In the correctional “marketplace,” as in the marketplace at large, corrections officials, along with their political sponsors, are not likely to be able to resist the pressure to use technologies that both reduce costs and greatly increase the odds of eliminating the threat of recidivism.

What Price Technological Effectiveness?

Should we be concerned about how new technologies are used as long as they curtail criminal behavior? Should they be used to increase treatment flexibility, reduce social regimentation, and restore the individual to a productive relationship with society? Should they be used to increase control and regimentation? To use traditional correctional parlance, do we care if the technologies are used mainly to enhance rehabilitation or mainly to enhance surveillance and incapacitation?

What other issues should we be concerned about as we implement an electronic, pharmacological, and genetic or neurobiologic infrastructure to identify, track, and control offenders more closely? Should we heed Edgley and Brisset’s warning, “The more we ask government to meddle into the lives of others, the closer we get to creating an apparatus that will in all likelihood eventually meddle into our own?”⁹

Controlling Technological Control

Technological innovations used to be years in the development stage before reaching the marketplace. Today, the interval between product development and the market can be almost instantaneous. Can we shape the way these technologies will be applied to corrections? It is possible, but first there needs to be a consensus about a values framework for promoting appropriate technocorrections. To arrive at that consensus

requires generating an understanding of the issues through research, symposiums held with private industry and policymakers, and input from related interest groups. The values framework developed through this process would then be widely circulated so as to create the necessary ethical awareness, at the policymaking level, of the direction technocorrections should take.

A Final Caveat

The main threat of technocorrections may be the incentives it offers to expand the net of state control in order to deal with social and behavioral problems in the name of public safety. As control by the state becomes less costly and more effective, less attention may be paid to the development of policies to assist institutions of informal social control or to the accumulation of human capital to prevent crime and increase public safety. There may also be a greater incentive to define a broader set of deviant, unpopular, or just plain unconventional behaviors (body piercing, for example) as criminal. As more people are labeled "criminal," the apparatus of technological control would continue to expand, invisibly intruding into the privacy of individuals and providing more tools and opportunities for the state to abuse its powers if it is corrupt enough to do so.

The potential for abuse of state power should never be dismissed as farfetched. In our democracy, the debate over how best to balance the use of correctional techniques to maintain public safety against the need to preserve essential freedoms must take on a new urgency as technocorrections develop. As "corrections" becomes "technocorrections," everyone would do well to address the issue of how to make optimal use of new technology to increase correctional effectiveness without increasing regimentation and without building an apparatus of control for the state to abuse.

Notes

1. Microchip implants closer to reality. (1999, October). *The Futurist* 33, (8), 9.
2. Leshner, A. I. (1999, November). We can conquer drug addiction. *The Futurist* 33, (9), 22-25.
3. Stolberg, S. (1994, January 16). Scientific studies are generating controversy. *Austin American-Statesman*.
4. Reiss, A. J., Jr., & Roth, J. A., Eds. (1993). *Understanding and preventing violence*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press. Reiss and Roth call for systematic searches for neurobiologic markers for persons with elevated potentials for violent behavior" (p. 24). See also p. 116.
5. Isaacson, W. (1999, January 11). The biotech century. *Time*, 42; and
6. Lemonick, M. D., & Thompson, D. (1999, January 11). Racing to map our DNA. *Time*, 44.
7. Stolberg, S. (1994, January 16). Project targets behavior of children. *Austin American-Statesman*.
8. Edgley, C. & Brisset D. *A nation of meddlers*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1999.
9. Ibid, 15.
10. Idem. ¶

(JRSA ACTIVITIES, from p. 2)

JRSA Welcomes New SAC Director

Laura Hutzel is the new director of the **West Virginia** SAC. She earned her bachelor's degree in interdisciplinary studies from Miami University and her master's degree in experimental psychology from Ohio University. After completing graduate school, Ms. Hutzel began working for the West Virginia Division of Criminal Justice Services (DCJS) evaluating programs funded under the Violence Against Women Act. When the West Virginia SAC moved to DCJS, she worked for the SAC as a research analyst. She was appointed SAC Director beginning September 1. The SAC is working on several long-term projects including: projections for the Division of Corrections, the juvenile justice database for the National Juvenile Court Data Archive, and summary reports for the WV Supreme Court of Appeals. They are also finishing projects on victims of sexual assault and violence in West Virginia schools.

New Staff Join JRSA

JRSA is pleased to announce the addition of three new employees to its staff. **Taj C. Carson** joins us as Project Director for the Juvenile Justice Evaluation Center. The JJEC is designed to provide state and local juvenile justice professionals with tools and resources to improve program evaluations and, ultimately, programs. Prior to her employment at JRSA, Dr. Carson was an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Northern Arizona University. She has served as a program evaluator for social service agencies, has done her own

research in an academic setting, and has participated in community work on a variety of issues. Working with agencies in Philadelphia, she developed and implemented program evaluations for social services in the community. She received her doctorate in sociology from the University of Delaware in 1999.

Marc Osman joined JRSA as its new Web Site Manager in September. After receiving his degree in operations management from Pennsylvania State University, Mr. Osman entered the non-profit field. He worked for various local and statewide nonprofit organizations in Pennsylvania, then came to Washington, DC to work for the Campus Outreach Opportunity League, becoming Webmaster in addition to assuming other responsibilities. He has done both volunteer and paid Web page consulting for various organizations and in 1999 launched his own Web site and small home business.

If you have called JRSA recently, you most likely have spoken with our new Secretary/Receptionist, **Lisa Wilson**. A native Washingtonian, Ms. Wilson has lived in the District of Columbia all of her life. She attended the University of the District of Columbia where she studied Computer Information Systems and Business Management. Before coming to JRSA, she did customer service and receptionist work at Crown Books, Sharper Image, Prudential Real Estate, and Borders Books, Music, & Cafe. Her experience includes multi-line telephone management, front desk management, employee training and supervising, scheduling, and payroll. In addition to "directing traffic" at the front desk, she will be assisting the JRSA staff on a wide variety of projects. ¶

(CONFERENCE, from p. 3)

Panelists in the session on school safety pointed to a changing trend in school violence that appears increasingly to involve planned attacks, mass victimization, and multiple weapons. They noted, however, that too many school officials are not prepared to deal with the effects of violence affecting their entire student body, and thus either underestimate the effects of the crisis or are overwhelmed by it. Panelists called for every school to develop crisis plans with clearly defined procedures and roles for staff members; update school policies to reflect zero tolerance for violence; strengthen student mediation and counseling services; and provide specialized staff training on safety issues. Community resources also should be identified to deal with mental health issues and technical assistance.

The rising threat of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) to national security, another area of increasing concern, was addressed by a public information staff officer from the Joint Task Force Civil Support (JTFCs) in Norfolk, Virginia. JTFCs was created under the Presidential Decision Directive 62, signed by the president in May 1998, as part of an effort to unify government agencies' responses to acts of terrorism. Its role is to direct efforts by the Department of Defense to support state and local civil authorities and leading federal agencies (mainly the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Federal

Emergency Management Agency) in restoring public safety after an incident of mass destruction. Military WMD teams have developed contingency plans and conducted training exercises with federal and civil authorities in preparation for a national crisis. The 27 teams are able to detect and mitigate the effects of chemical, biological, nuclear, and radiological weapons as well as large explosive devices. A permanent office was established in the Pentagon on October 1, 1999, to coordinate training efforts.

Other topics covered during the two-day conference included Creating Environments of Safety, Meeting the Needs of First Responders, Handling the Media, Assessing Your Community's Level of Risk, and several other legal, criminal and technical aspects of crisis response.

The NCJA is a private, nonprofit organization on Capitol Hill that represents state and local governments on crime control and public safety issues. Its 1,500 members represent all facets of the criminal justice community including law enforcement, corrections, prosecution, defense, victim-witness services, educational institutions, and federal, state, and local elected officials. While most of the NCJA's work is focused on helping to shape public policy in criminal justice matters, the organization also conducts research for the U.S. Department of Justice and serves as criminal justice adviser to the National Governors' Association. 

(OVERVIEW, from p. 3)

The annual conferences are critical to achieving the mission of NASC. In addition to offering the opportunity for attendees to meet and talk informally to people from around the country, these meetings offer sessions and workshops that address many of the common issues facing jurisdictions involved in structured sentencing. Workshops have included topics such as "Data Management and Integration," "Resources for New Commissions," "Correctional Projections and Forecasting," and "Politics, the Media, and Sentencing Data."

NASC also communicates with its members through a biannual newsletter and a Web site housed at the U.S. Sentencing Commission. In addition to publishing special feature articles, the newslet-

ter offers jurisdictions a forum for updating others on what's new. The Web site (www.uscc.gov/states) provides access to the association by-laws, state contacts with Web links, announcements, and other miscellaneous information.

Association membership is open to any individual who works or serves on a sentencing commission or similar governmental body charged with sentencing policy responsibilities, or anyone who works for any government agency directly involved in the development of state or federal policy. Any academic, public or private employee, student, or other individual interested in sentencing may also join. To find out more about NASC or to become a member, contact the current NASC Chair, Kim Hunt (Director of the Advisory Commission on Sentencing in Washington, DC), at: (202) 353-7794 or by email at: khunt@dcacs.com. 

JUSTICE BOOKSHELF

This column lists selected publications on criminal and juvenile justice issues that have recently arrived in the JRSA library. To obtain copies of Statistical Analysis Center publications, contact the appropriate SAC (log on to www.jrsa.org). Unless otherwise noted, contact the National Criminal Justice Reference Service for publications from the Office of Justice Programs (800-851-3420 or www.ncjrs.org).

Statistical Analysis Center Publications

Corrections

- **Compliance and Sanctions in the Community: Felony Probation in Hawaii, 1996-1999.** Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa, and Research & Statistics Branch, Crime Prevention & Justice Assistance Division, Department of the Attorney General. June 2000. 56 pp. Available at www.cpja.ag.state.hi.us.

This report describes the salient characteristics of the adult felony probation caseload in the state of Hawaii in an attempt to determine the proportion who do not succeed in complying with the conditions of probation, to identify predictors of that noncompliance, and to offer recommendations on this sentencing option.

- **Overview of Special Needs Parole Policy and Recommendations for Improvement.** Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council. May 2000. 13 pp. Available at www.cjpc.state.tx.us.

This report examines the utilization of the Special Needs Parole program and presents options for improving the policy for the state congressional committees reviewing the program.

- **West Virginia Adult Corrections, 1990-1999.** Division of Criminal Justice Services, Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center. March 2000. Information on Department of Correction facilities in West Virginia and statistics on the correctional popula-

tion in these facilities is provided in this report.

Domestic Violence

- **West Virginia Domestic Violence Incidents, 1989–1998.** Division of Criminal Justice Services, Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center. May 2000. 4pp.
This publication summarizes a 10-year history of domestic violence complaints in West Virginia.

Incident-Based Reporting

- **Linking Incident-Based Crime Data and Court Records: A Pilot Study of Domestic Relationship and Driving Under the Influence Incidents.** Vermont Center for Justice Research, Norwich University, Montpelier, VT. Spring 2000. 45 pp.
This report summarizes the findings from an analysis of domestic violence and driving under the influence (DUI) incidents using incident-based crime and court adjudication data in Vermont. The project was designed as a demonstration for combining incident-based law enforcement and court data.

Publications from the Office of Justice Programs

Corrections

- **Correcting Corrections: Missouri's Parallel Universe** by Dora Schriro. Sentencing and Corrections Issues for the 21st Century. National Institute of Justice. May 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 181414.
Missouri's parallel universe, a model of offender management, is described. Since 97% of Missouri's inmates will be released to the community at some point, the strategy is designed to make life inside prison resemble life outside prison. The goal is for inmates to acquire values, habits, and skills that will help them become productive, law-abiding citizens.

- **Drug Use, Testing, and Treatment in Jails** by Doris James Wilson. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. May 2000. 11 pp. NCJ 179999.
This report, the third in a series on prior drug use and treatment of offenders, focuses on local jail inmates and jail jurisdictions.

Crime

- **The Restorative Justice and Mediation Collection: Executive Summary.** Office for Victims of Crime, July 2000. 13 pp. NCJ 180301.
This bulletin summarizes the five documents in *The Restorative Justice and Mediation Collection*, which covers a number of issues related to restorative justice. Four of the documents focus on victim-offender mediation, a major programmatic intervention that fully embraces the concepts of restorative justice.
- **Creating Healthy Communities.** Weed & Seed In-sites, Vol. VIII, No. 3, August/September 2000. Executive Office for Weed and Seed. 24 pp.
This special conference edition highlights Weed and Seed initiatives that promote healthy communities, including initiatives in the areas of crime prevention, primary intervention, youth contributions, treatment, community well-being, and diversity.

- **What Can the Federal Government Do to Decrease Crime and Revitalize Communities?** Executive Office for Weed and Seed, National Institute of Justice. July 1998. 95 pp. NCJ 172210.
This volume is a collection of symposium presentations focusing on the needs of local communities related to crime, public safety, and revitalization.

Firearms

- **Background Check for Firearm Transfers, 1999** by Lea S. Gifford, Devon B. Adams, Gene Lauver, and Michael Bowling. Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. June 2000. 11 pp. NCJ 180882.
This bulletin presents findings from the Firearm Inquiry Statistics (FIST) program. Included are background

checks conducted by state and local points of contact (POCs), by other checking agencies (such as those that check backgrounds of permit applicants), and the FBI. Estimates of rejection rates and the basis for rejections are also provided.

Juveniles

- **Characteristics of Crimes Against Juveniles** by David Finkelhor and Richard Ormrod. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. June 2000. 12 pp. NCJ 179034.
This bulletin reviews data from the 1997 NIBRS data file that pertain to juvenile victims.
- **Race, Ethnicity, and Serious and Violent Juvenile Offending** by Darnell F. Hawkins, John H. Laub, Janet L. Lauritsen, and Lynn Cothorn. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. June 2000. 8 pp. NCJ 181202.
This bulletin describes the racial distribution of serious and violent offending among juveniles in the United States, and provides various explanations for the racial and ethnic differences observed.
- **Sexual Assault of Young Children as Reported to Law Enforcement: Victim, Incident, and Offender Characteristics** by Howard N. Snyder. Bureau of Justice Statistics. July 2000. 14 pp. NCJ 182990.
This bulletin reports on a study using National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) data on sexual assault that attempted to study the sexual assault of young children.

Law Enforcement

- **Police Attitudes Toward Abuse of Authority: Findings From a National Study** by David Weisburd et al. National Institute of Justice. Research in Brief. May 2000. 14 pp. NCJ 181312.
This national survey of 925 police officers from 121 departments assesses officers' views on a number of issues related to the abuse of police authority. ¶

Upcoming Criminal Justice Meetings & Conferences

November

- 1–5 American Evaluation Association, *Evaluation 2000: Increasing Evaluation Capacity*, Sheraton Waikiki, Honolulu HI (972/264-6428, www.aea.org)
- 2–3 Bureau of Justice Statistics and Justice Research and Statistics Association 2000 National Conference, *Transforming Data Into Informed Policy in the 21st Century*, Minneapolis, MN (Karen Maline, 202/842-9330, www.jrsa.org)
- 15–18 American Society of Criminology, *Crime and Criminology in the Year 2000*, San Francisco, CA (323/343-4613; Fax: 323/343-4646, www.asc41.com)

December

- 2–5 Police Executive Research Forum, *The 11th Annual International Problem-Oriented Policing Conference*, San Diego, CA (Eugenia Gratto Gravely, egratto@policeforum.org)
- 9–12 National Institute of Justice, *Fourth Annual International Crime Mapping Research Conference*, Professional Conference Series, San Diego, CA (703/684-5300, nijpcs@ilj.org)
- 12–14 Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Justice for Children: A Vision for the 21st Century*, Washington, DC (301/519-6387, www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/nconf2000.htm)
- 2001**
- April**
3–7 Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences 2001 Annual Meeting, *Questioning the Quality of Justice in Social and Political Contexts*, Washington, DC.

The JRSA Forum is supported by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. JRSA is a national nonprofit organization. For membership or other information, call (202) 842-9330, e-mail cjinfo@jrsa.org, or visit our Web site: <http://www.jrsa.org>.

Karen F. Maline, *Editor*
Nancy Michel, *Managing Editor*

JRSA Officers and Staff

Thomas Murphy, *President*
Robert McManus, *Vice President*
Michelle Johnson, *Secretary/Treasurer*
Douglas Yearwood, *Delegate*
Donald Faggiani, *Appointed Delegate*
Roger Przybylski, *Appointed Delegate*
Timothy S. Bynum, *Past President*

Joan C. Weiss, *Executive Director*
Ali Burnett, *Office Manager*
Taj C. Carson, *Project Manager*
Linda Carter, *Administrative Assistant*
Loyce Craft, *Assistant Director of Administration*
Sandra Dayton, *Director of Finance and Administration*
Francesca Garcia Lanier, *Research Associate*
Karen F. Maline, *Director of Information and Member Services*
Nancy Michel, *Director of Publications*
Stan Orchowosky, *Research Director*
Marc Osman, *Web Site Manager*
Cheri Peterson, *Research Assistant*
Marylinda Stawasz, *Program Coordinator*
Merideth Trahan, *Research Associate*
Jason Trask, *Information Specialist*
Lisa Walbolt, *Research Analyst*
Lisa Wilson, *Secretary/Receptionist*
Yuki Yamagishi, *Research Analyst*
James Zepp, *Director, Training and Technical Assistance Center*

Justice Research and Statistics Association

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Suite 801
Washington, DC 20002

First Class
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 5356
Washington, DC