Use of Data in Police Departments: A Survey of Police Chiefs and Data Analysts

May 2005

The Justice Research and Statistics Association
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Suite 801
Washington, D.C. 20002

Acknowledgments

The Justice Research and Statistics Association would like to thank the Statistical Analysis Center Directors who were instrumental in organizing the focus groups on which the surveys were based: Gerard Ramker, formerly of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and currently with the Bureau of Justice Statistics; David Wright, formerly of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center; and Doug Hoffman of the Center for Research and Evaluation in the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. Thank you to Michael Connelly, original Project Director for this project and current Executive Director of the Wisconsin Sentencing Commission, for all of his work in developing this project.

JRSA would also like to thank Dr. Robert Friedmann, Georgia State University, and Dr. Richard Rosenfeld, University of Missouri – St. Louis for their patience, guidance, and support of this effort.

This report was prepared by Lisa Walbolt Wagner, Project Manager, under the direction of JRSA Research Director Stan Orchowsky.

Joan C. Weiss
Executive Director

This document was prepared by the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA), under NIJ grant 2002-RG-CX-K005 awarded to Georgia State University, lead institution in the Urban Serving Universities (formerly Great Cities Universities) criminal justice initiative. The opinions, findings, and recommendations expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of Georgia State University or the Urban Serving Universities.

Table of Contents

Abstract

In order to determine the use of data in police departments, 1,379 police agencies serving populations of at least 25,000 were surveyed. Separate surveys were sent for completion by police chiefs and data analysts; the response rate was over 50% for both groups. Three types of analysis were completed: analysis of chief responses, analysis of analyst responses, and then a comparison of chiefs and analysts. Chief and analyst responses were broken into comparison groups by size of population served.

In general, responses followed the expected trend of agencies serving larger populations doing more analysis with more types of data than their smaller counterparts. Agencies serving over 100,000 people were much more likely than agencies serving smaller populations to use data to improve performance and for planning and to be involved in multiagency information sharing. Agencies receive frequent requests for information from community leaders, the media, and the public and most analysts provide information to their agencies in regular reports and bulletins.

Law enforcement agencies are using crime analysis tools to improve both their daily functions and for planning future initiatives. Although many departments do not use, or have access to, other criminal justice system data, most departments would benefit from having readily available data in a format that would allow analysis without additional hardware. Access to such data may finally provide criminal justice and law enforcement agencies the tools to build statistical indicators that would enable them to better predict and better respond to crime.

Introduction

As policymakers and taxpayers demand program effectiveness and policy accountability, government agencies and practitioners have become concerned about the creation of statistical indicators of performance. Most efforts have been concentrated on linking, sharing, and integrating agency and departmental data systems, which promises to improve performance at both the micro and macro levels.

At the micro level, service providers become better able to work with clients, patients, offenders, or other users because they are better able to access all of the data necessary to understand needs and develop appropriate responses. At the macro level, policymakers are able to address broad-scale problems more effectively because they have regularly reported indicators, either single measures or composite indices, that help them understand trends, new situations, and interconnections among variables and activities.

Practitioners in many policy areas, such as education, health care, the economy, and the environment, currently use indicators of performance. In those areas, effective indicators serve the same function as effective models in scientific study, i.e., they identify some or all of the key factors that should be known for hypothesizing and testing. In education, for example, the drop-out rate is usually considered an important indicator of a system's effectiveness, whereas average daily attendance, while also a statistic, usually is not. For the U.S. economy, the Index of Leading Economic Indicators is used to predict economic performance 6 to 12 months in the future. Armed with such statistics that can proxy for system performance or forecast future behavior with reasonable

success, service providers and policymakers are able, if willing, to chart courses more informed than otherwise, and hopefully more successfully.

With few exceptions, criminal justice has not provided policymakers with similar indicators. At the micro level, much is being done within states and regions to share and integrate data to ensure that officers and officials have all of the information necessary to deal with people apprehended, arrested, or imprisoned. At the macro level, however, the indicator best known and most widely used by policymakers is the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) Uniform Crime Report (UCR).

The UCR has well-known problems due to uneven agency reporting, definition interpretation, and failure to count certain classes of offenses reliably. Because the UCR system relies on the willingness and ability of victims to report crimes, it is held hostage to the vagaries of individual reporting. Paradoxically, more effective agencies may even find themselves with victims more willing to report crimes and thus appear to have more crime than their counterparts. As a guide to understanding the how's, what's, and why's of offending and offenders, the UCR has proven limited as a policy indicator.

As a response to these limitations, the U.S. Department of Justice and its Bureau of Justice Statistics have for many years promoted the adoption of incident-based reporting (IBR) by law enforcement agencies. In particular, they have encouraged participation in the National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS). This system requires far more extensive detail regarding the offense, offender, property involved, and victim than traditional reporting, which often includes only crime counts. With more detailed information compiled and recorded for statistical analysis, service providers and

criminal justice policymakers will, in theory, have more realistic portraits of crime and its environments, which will enable them to develop the means to better address crime.

In practice, use of these systems is still incomplete. According to the FBI, only 26 states were certified to report NIBRS data in 2004, while 12 are currently in the testing phase. The Association of State Uniform Crime Reporting Programs (ASUCRP) in a survey of its members found that a majority of states have IBR systems with limited or cumbersome query capabilities.

Similarly, efforts at sharing and integrating data within and among criminal justice agencies are also incomplete at this point. In fact, the development of these systems for creating indicators or data-driven policy planning has yet to begin. For example, the 2003 Conference on Justice Information Technology Integration Project, held jointly by the National Governors Association (NGA) and the U.S. Office of Justice Programs (OJP), reviewed current types and amounts of technical assistance and local and statewide data sharing efforts. The project found a multitude of problems being faced by states, most notably current budgeting and financing. None of the information provided by NGA and OJP indicated that states or local agencies are actively pursuing the development of integrated data into specific policy-enhancing capacity.

A recent report by the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) and the Police Foundation, *Problem Analysis in Policing*, discusses how these problems affect data-driven policy for law enforcement, particularly problem analysis in policing (Boba, 2003). The report states that "problem analysis represents a method of providing police agencies with the capability to conduct in-depth, practical research" (p. 2). Problem analysis, according to the report, is not

limited to crime analysis but is "action research in that it involves using formalized methods of study with a goal of arriving at practical solutions" (p. 3). The report asserts, however, that in practice, not all law enforcement agencies will have the capacity for such analysis. It is likely that smaller agencies may require the assistance of outside agencies.

This conclusion was affirmed by another COPS report, *Crime Analysis in America*, published in conjunction with the Police Foundation and the University of South Alabama (O'Shea & Nicholls, 2002). This national survey of U.S. law enforcement agencies studied crime analysts, their resources, and their uses. It divided responding agencies into those with at least 100 sworn personnel and those with fewer. The report found that the size of department did not predict crime analysis capabilities, but did find that larger agencies provided a wider range of analysis. The report also found that agencies with a specific crime analysis position provided more, and better, crime analysis.

To improve law enforcement access to data and analytical tools, the Urban Serving Universities, a coalition of 13 urban universities, instituted the Improving Crime Data (ICD) project. Funded by the National Institute of Justice, the project aims to develop and apply advanced methods of criminal justice data and analysis to improve local decisionmaking and anticrime efforts in urban communities with a possible goal of pairing crime incident data with other sources of data to create a better index of crime. The Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) is partnering with the Urban Serving Universities to gather information on current data sharing/integration efforts and their uses for policymaking. The following sections describe the study and its findings.

Methods

Surveys were used to gather information on current data sharing and integration efforts to identify the needs and capacities for data usage in local law enforcement agencies. The surveys allowed respondents to provide the information at their convenience in a cost-effective manner. To determine what information should be gathered via the surveys, JRSA convened focus groups of criminal justice professionals in Illinois, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania. (Please see Appendix A for a list of agencies participating in the focus groups.) As a result of the focus groups, two surveys were developed, one for police chiefs and one for data analysts. In agencies without data analysts, any person filling that role was encouraged to complete the survey.

The chief survey was one page, front and back, consisting of 15 questions and an open-ended recommendation section. The final analyst survey was longer, with two pages front and back containing 43 questions and an open-ended recommendation section. (Please see Appendix B for copies of the surveys.) The chief survey was designed with fewer questions to increase the likelihood of participation; as a result, the answers for some questions were restricted to fewer options than were given the analysts.

To encourage participation, two mailings were sent. The first round of surveys was mailed in January 2004; a second set of surveys was mailed to nonresponding agencies in March 2004. In order to increase the probability that agencies would return the surveys, letters were included explaining the study. Self-addressed, prestamped envelopes were also included in the mailing and respondents were given the option of completing the survey online at the JRSA Web site.

The online surveys were originally posted with online survey software called OmniForms. After posting, however, it was determined that the software did not allow multiple responses to be selected for one question in the analyst survey. The surveys were then reposted with software called SurveyMonkey. Since some responses using the original software had already been received, the question with the error was excluded from the analysis. In some cases, however, respondents included the multiple responses in the comments or recommendations sections; these surveys were edited and included in the analysis. Given that the percentage of responses coming in over the Web site was so small, this exclusion should have no effect on the analysis as presented.

Sample

The survey sample for this study was selected from the 2000 Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) survey. All police agencies serving populations of at least 25,000 were selected from the LEMAS database for inclusion. As a result, surveys were sent to 1,379 agencies.

Response

Chief surveys were received from 779 agencies (56% of the sample) and data analyst surveys were received from 741 agencies (54% of the sample). Most of the responses were received via mail (75% of chiefs, 73% of analysts). For 10 agencies, multiple analyst and chief responses were received. These multiples were not duplicates, but rather differing responses from the same agency. This is not surprising for data analysts, as the second mailing may have been given to a different analyst in agencies with multiple analysts and both were returned. It is more difficult to explain the multiple

chief responses, although it suggests that at least in some agencies, chiefs were not actually the individuals completing the surveys. The final total of chief surveys included in the analysis was 790, while 752 data analyst responses were included.

As can be seen in Table 1, response rates for both chiefs and analysts increased with size of population served. No surveys were received from Vermont, Delaware, and West Virginia; no analyst surveys were received from Maine. Since these states are small, however, only a few agencies fit the criteria for inclusion in our sample. In Vermont, for example, only one agency received the mailing.

Table 1. Response Rate for Chiefs and Analysts, by Size of Population Served

Population Size	Chief Response Rate	Data Analyst Response Rate
250,000 or more	76%	75%
100,000 – 249,999	61%	62%
50,000 – 99,999	57%	60%
25,000 – 49,999	53%	48%

Just under half of the participating agencies indicated that they are reporting NIBRS data to the FBI, which is higher than the national average of roughly 31%, according to SEARCH, the National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics. Agencies reporting NIBRS data may be more technologically advanced than their counterparts, simply due to the requirements of the program. As a result, the findings of this survey may be slightly skewed and may not adequately represent agencies on the lower end of the technology spectrum.

Results

Due to the large amount of information obtained through the surveys, only issues most relevant to the ICD project are presented here. For more detailed information, please see Appendix C for tabular chief survey results by question and Appendix D for tabular analyst survey results by question.

Three types of analysis were completed. First, chief responses were reviewed and responses were compared by the size of population served by the participating agencies. Second, analyst responses were reviewed and responses were again compared by the size of population served. Finally, chief and analyst responses were compared for similar questions. This final comparison also included a comparison of agencies by size of population served.

Four groups were used to compare agencies by size of population served: agencies serving populations of 250,000 or more; agencies serving between 100,000 and 249,999; between 50,000 and 99,999; and between 25,000 and 49,999. It was expected that results would trend across the groups; specifically, it was anticipated that agencies serving a larger population would have more access to data and use data more often than their counterparts serving smaller populations.

Chief Survey Responses

The chief surveys focused on five main areas of interest: use of data, personnel response to data collection, the collection and reporting of incident-based data, sharing data, and the providing of statistics to the community and media.

Use of Data

Most of the responding chiefs indicated that criminal justice data, particularly calls for service, arrest, incident report, traffic stop, clearance rates, and hot spots data, are useful in managing their agencies. For most of the data types, responses followed the predicted trend, with the agencies serving the largest populations being more likely to report the use of data than the agencies serving smaller populations. Since it was assumed that the group of agencies serving the largest populations would be more likely to use most of the data categories, it was surprising to find that agencies serving populations between 100,000 and 249,999 were more likely to report the use of hot spots, police pursuit, and disposition data. Also unexpected, the agencies serving the smallest population were most likely to report the use of arrest data.

The agencies serving the largest populations were least likely to report the use of state crime publications. This is not surprising, as these publications are published on an annual basis and are often not available until a year after the data were collected. These agencies most likely produce their own internal publications tailored to their needs and using much more recent data. Agencies serving smaller populations, however, may not have the resources or staff to produce their own reports, and may be more interested in comparing their data with other similarly sized agencies in the state. In these cases, the state publications would be more useful.

Few chiefs reported the use of non-criminal justice data, nor was there any indication that these types of data would be useful if available. The exception to this was the use of Census data, with most chiefs reporting the use of Census data in their

departments. This most likely reflects the continued emphasis on mapping by law enforcement and the use of Census tract and population data.

Currently chiefs are using the data they collect for a variety of functions. The functions most often reported include using data to:

- assess department performance,
- make budget decisions,
- make deployment and tactical decisions,
- respond to inquiries, and
- compare with other jurisdictions.

As seen in Figure 1, most agencies are using data to improve performance and for planning. Agencies serving large populations are more likely to use data to help agency performance, while smaller agencies are more likely to use the data for planning programs or policies.

Figure 1. Use of Data for Performance and Planning, as Reported by Chiefs



Personnel Response to Data Collection

Most of the chiefs felt that officers are supportive in their efforts to gather required information. Just under half of all chiefs, however, felt that officers would only be "somewhat thorough" if required to collect additional information (Figure 2).

Figure 2. Response of Personnel to Gathering Information



Collection and Reporting of Incident-Based Data

Just under half of the chiefs report that their agencies are currently collecting and reporting data to the FBI's NIBRS. NIBRS, unlike the system for reporting summary data, requires the gathering of information relating to the characteristics of the offense, victim(s), offender(s), arrestee(s), and property included in a reported incident. Due to the increased requirements for reporting NIBRS data, agencies have been relatively slow in converting to incident-based reporting. In this study, agencies serving smaller populations were more likely to be reporting NIBRS data; 44% of agencies serving populations from 25,000 to 49,999 report NIBRS data, compared to 27% of agencies serving populations of 250,000 and more.

As seen in Figure 3, agencies serving larger populations are slightly more likely to have a plan to implement NIBRS in the next 3 years. Most agencies not currently reporting incident-based data, however, have no plan to do so.

Figure 3. Plans to Implement NIBRS



When asked why agencies have no plan to implement NIBRS, agencies serving the largest populations were the least likely to report that NIBRS is not useful. Rather, financial matters seem to be the main reason agencies have not begun reporting incident-based data; most blamed the doubtful commitment of state and federal resources and the costs associated with changing systems. Figure 4 shows the differences among agencies serving different population sizes.

Figure 4. Why Agencies Are Not Implementing NIBRS



Although chiefs were asked about the amount budgeted for data analysis and collection, the wording of the question led to answers that are difficult to interpret. Because police officers are the ones actually collecting data, it is possible that police officer salaries, a large part of the department budget, could have been considered an element of data collection, whereas the purpose of the question actually was to find out more about the costs of data entry and analysis functions. Most chiefs reported that agencies budget between 1% and 5% for data collection and analysis functions. Over a quarter of chiefs responding said that they budget over a quarter of their total funds for collection and analysis, which may be a result of how they interpreted the question.

Sharing Data

While most chiefs responding to this survey reported involvement with multiagency information sharing, agencies serving populations over 100,000 are much more likely to be involved than those agencies serving smaller populations. Although chiefs were not asked why they were not participating, it seems likely that agencies serving larger populations have greater crime problems and potentially more mobile offenders. With large populations moving between urban centers and suburbs, agencies need a system to keep track of people offending in multiple but contiguous areas. Figure 5 shows the percentage of agencies involved in information sharing. Agencies currently involved in data sharing efforts find them valuable; between 65% and 75% of all groups of respondents reported that the effort was very valuable.

Figure 5. Percentage of Agencies Involved in Multiagency Information Sharing



Providing Statistics to the Community and Media

Police chiefs face a constant demand for information from community leaders, the media, and the public. Almost 75% of chiefs report that community leaders request statistics at least once a month; 30% of these report requests at least once a week. As can be seen in Figure 6, agencies serving larger populations receive more frequent requests, often at least three a week.

Figure 6. Frequency of Information Requests Received by Agencies from Community Leaders



Only about half of the chiefs rate the media's understanding of data provided them as good. Chiefs of agencies serving the largest populations, 250,000 and more, rated the media's understanding poorer than did chiefs in the other three groups.

Analyst Survey Responses

Like the chief surveys, the analyst surveys focused on five main areas of interest: use of data, agency structures and resources, data for strategies, data sharing and outside assistance, and incident-based data. Since the analyst survey was twice as long as the chief survey, analysts were able to provide much more detail about the use and analysis of data in their agencies.

Use of Data

Analysts use calls for service and incident report data most often in their jobs. Few analysts report the use of any non-criminal justice data, with the exception of Census data. There were few differences among agencies in regard to the types of data used. One notable difference, however, was in the use of medical examiner data; agencies serving populations of 250,000 and more were more likely to use such data than agencies serving smaller populations.

The trends for the types of data used were as expected; agencies were more likely to use data as the size of the population they served increased. The largest difference among agencies was for the use of drug and/or gun seizure data, with agencies serving large populations being much more likely to have and use the data. Agencies serving populations over 100,000 would be more likely to use any additional data if made available than agencies serving populations under 100,000. This is most likely due to the

size of the crime analysis units; agencies serving smaller populations may not be able to handle any additional analysis.

As expected, agencies serving larger populations are more likely to use the data for evaluating performance and for planning future initiatives. Analysts in all agencies agree that data are used more often for performance than for planning (Figure 7).

Figure 7. Use of Data for Performance and Planning, as Reported by Analysts



Agency Structures and Resources

Although most agencies serving populations over 100,000 report having a crime analysis unit, agencies serving under 50,000 are much less likely to have a separate unit (Figure 8).

On average, crime analysis units tend to have only a single analyst. Agencies serving larger populations have more analysts; about 13% of agencies serving more than 250,000 people report having more than 10 analysts on staff.

Figure 8. Percentage of Agencies with a Crime Analysis Unit



Analysts across agencies are similar; most analysts have an undergraduate degree. Analysts in agencies serving 100,000 people or more are more likely to receive training for their jobs; only 70% of analysts in smaller agencies report receiving any analysis-specific training. Most analysts receive training from outside agencies, but almost half report that their training is not up-to-date.

With the demand for increased information sharing and improvements in technology, it is not surprising that most of the agencies responding to this survey have automated records management systems (RMS). With over 80% reporting automated systems, the number seems higher than expected. The high number of automated agencies in our sample may actually reflect our selection method and a self-selected response set. In fact, agencies reporting NIBRS were more likely to respond to this survey. Since NIBRS requires the collection of a large number of incident characteristics and must be reported electronically, by default that means that most of these agencies are automated. Surprisingly, there was little difference among agencies serving the different population groups.

Despite the automation, many analysts would like to improve their ability to extract data from their record management systems, especially analysts in agencies serving populations under 100,000. Analysts would also like to see increased analysis capacity and improved data quality. When asked how analysts could improve their technical capacities, most in agencies serving 250,000 or more reported that they would increase the number of staff performing analysis functions. Analysts in agencies serving fewer than 250,000 instead reported that they would improve the software used for analysis and reporting.

Although the push toward technology has in essence led business to the Internet, it was surprising to find that almost 93% of the responding agencies reported having a Web site. It seems likely, however, that as city and county governments move to providing instant access to information to their citizens, law enforcement information, and therefore law enforcement agencies, are included on these community Web sites. These sites, however, may provide little more than contact information. In fact, fewer than half of the agencies serving populations under 100,000 provide crime statistics via the Web. Agencies serving populations of 250,000 or more are much more likely, with 83% of analysts in these agencies reporting that crime statistics are provided on an agency Web site.

Data for Strategies

Roughly half of the respondents report that their agency is able to track offenders over time. In most cases, this system tracks offender arrest history; jail, court, and probation/parole data are included in only about half of the agencies.

Over half of the analysts reported that information is regularly distributed in the agency, most often in memos and bulletins or upon request. Fewer than half of the analysts in agencies serving fewer than 50,000 provide the information in regular reports, compared with almost 80% of the analysts in agencies serving 250,000 or more (Figure 9).

Figure 9. Dissemination of Data in Agencies



Data Sharing and Outside Assistance

Analysts in agencies serving large populations are much more likely to use data systems that are integrated with systems of other departments or agencies; 76% of analysts in agencies serving populations over 250,000 use integrated systems, compared with 60% of agencies serving populations under 50,000. These systems tend to be maintained by the county, and in most cases these integrated systems allow agencies to share criminal incident and person information with other law enforcement agencies. Just under half of the analysts report that their agency shares automated data with courts, and few share with corrections or probation offices. The likelihood of sharing data

increases with increased population. Only half of the analysts, however, rate data sharing efforts as successful.

Few analysts seek analytic assistance from outside agencies, but most report that they would be receptive to assistance if offered. For most, maintaining confidentiality of the information would be the largest concern, followed by issues surrounding the maintenance of data integrity.

Incident-Based Data

Only 40% of the analysts report that their agency is collecting and reporting incident-based data, and most have no definite plan to implement a NIBRS-compatible system. Most blame their current records management systems and the need to update to support incident-based reporting, as well as the need to redesign collection processes and reporting forms.

Comparison of Chief and Analyst Survey Responses

Since the chief and analyst surveys were different lengths and were designed for different purposes, the wording differed slightly for several of the questions. Chiefs, for example, were asked about data useful in managing their agency, while analysts were simply asked what data are used in their agency. In total, 14 of the questions are similar enough in their content to compare responses. As a result of phrasing, however, responses can't always be compared without explanation. In the following sections, only agencies with both chiefs and analysts responding are included in the analysis. Multiple responses from single agencies are excluded.

Use of Data

While most of the responses can be compared, answer options for one of the questions differed in the analyst and chief surveys. As a result, these data are not included in the following comparisons.

Chiefs are more likely than analysts to report the use of some categories of criminal justice data. The differences between chiefs and analysts are most apparent in agencies serving populations between 100,000 and 249,999. In these agencies, chiefs and analysts differed by at least 5% in 10 of the possible 15 categories of data types.

Figure 10. Reported Use of Data by Chiefs and Analysts



It is not surprising that chiefs would be more likely to report the use of cost data; for the other categories, however, it appears that either chiefs may be overestimating the use of data in their agencies, or analysts are underestimating. Figure 10 lists the largest discrepancies found for all agencies.

Chiefs and analysts also differed in their perceptions of how the data are used (Figure 11). Again, the wording for these questions differed slightly, with chiefs being

asked how they use data in their agencies, while analysts were asked how data are used in the agency. Analysts seemed to underestimate how data are used for making deployment decisions and for comparisons to other agencies; chiefs seemed to underestimate the number of inquiries for information received by the agency.

Figure 11. Use of Data as Reported by Chiefs and Analysts



Chiefs and analysts tend to agree that data often affect performance and are used for planning. The only difference across agency size occurred for agencies serving populations between 50,000 and 99,999. In these agencies, chiefs were much more likely to report that data affect planning (91% of chiefs vs. 80% of analysts).

Personnel Response to Data Collection

There was little difference between chiefs and analysts in regard to the support received from officers in gathering data. Most agree that officers are supportive but would only be somewhat thorough if required to collect any additional information. The discrepancy between chiefs and analysts was most evident in agencies serving 100,000

people or more; in these agencies, chiefs indicated that they felt officers would be more thorough than analysts did.

Collection and Reporting of Incident-Based Data

Chiefs in agencies serving populations over 50,000 are more likely to indicate that their agencies are collecting and reporting NIBRS data (Figure 12). The difference may simply be an issue regarding familiarity with the term NIBRS; analysts may only know that they are collecting data for use in their agency and may not know that their data collection specifications define the data as NIBRS data. Analysts in agencies not currently reporting NIBRS, however, are more likely than chiefs to report plans to report NIBRS data in the next three years.

Figure 12. Agencies Reporting NIBRS Data, Comparison of Chiefs and Analysts



Although both surveys asked why agencies are not currently reporting NIBRS data, the analyst survey provided more answer options (23) than the chief survey (6). Five of the six options on the chief survey can be directly compared with answer options on the analyst survey; the sixth corresponds to a category of cost-related options that are further broken down for the analysts. For this sixth question, a response to any of the

answer options corresponds to a "yes" response. As can be seen in Figure 13, analysts reported more issues with reporting NIBRS data than did chiefs.

Figure 13. Chief and Analysts Reasons for Not Reporting NIBRS Data



*Cost comparison includes a category offering more response options for analysts, which may account for their higher response rate.

Sharing Data

Both chiefs and analysts were asked about sharing agency data, but the questions were worded slightly differently and can only be compared with caution. The wording on the chief survey specifically asked if the department is currently involved in sharing data, while analysts were asked whether the department is currently *or is planning on* participating in an information sharing project. As expected, the numbers are much higher for analysts, with 97% responding that their agencies are or will be sharing data, compared with 67% of chiefs responding that their departments are currently sharing data.

In the survey, chiefs were asked to rate the value of multiagency efforts to share data. A similar question was posed to the analysts, but instead asked whether analysts

find data sharing efforts to be successful. In agencies that are currently sharing data with outside agencies, chiefs report the project to be more valuable than analysts do. As can be seen in Figure 14, this finding is consistent across agency size.

Figure 14. Percentage of Chiefs and Analysts Reporting Information Sharing Projects are Valuable / Successful



Providing Statistics to the Community and Media

Chiefs report more weekly requests for information from external sources than do analysts. It is possible that chiefs actually receive more requests for information, and these requests are not filtered down to the analysts. It is just as likely that either chiefs overestimate the number of requests received by an agency, or that analysts underestimate the number that are handled outside the crime analysis units.

In general, roughly only half of chiefs and analysts agree that the media have a good understanding of the information that the agency provides them (Figure 15). Chiefs of agencies serving populations between 100,000 and 250,000 rate the media slightly better than the other agency categories.

Figure 15. Percentage of Chiefs and Analysts Rating Media Understanding as Good



Discussion

Police departments across the country are indeed using criminal justice data. As expected, most agencies are using the data to help performance and for planning programs and policies. Using reports, memos, and bulletins, analysts are sharing data within their agencies. Information is also shared on a regular basis with community leaders, the media, and the public. Over half of the police agencies are involved in an information sharing project with outside agencies and report that such projects are valuable.

Although law enforcement agencies are sharing data, most are only sharing limited data with other law enforcement agencies. According to the survey results, agencies are not sharing data with local courts, corrections, or probation offices. Agencies may therefore not know when arrestees are currently active in their or in a surrounding jurisdiction's criminal justice system.

Agencies tend to be automated and to have a Web site. Most agencies serving populations of over 50,000 people have a crime analysis unit, which is generally staffed by at least one full-time analyst. Even though most analysts have an undergraduate

degree and receive some kind of job-specific training, it is evident that more up-to-date training is needed, especially for agencies serving populations under 100,000.

While agencies find that their officers tend to be supportive in their data collection efforts, it is unclear whether officers would be thorough if required to collect additional information.

Just under half of the surveyed agencies are currently reporting NIBRS data to the state. Despite the fact that most of the agencies are automated, most of the agencies not currently reporting have no plan to implement a NIBRS collection system. Most agencies cite cost as the most important factor that keeps them from reporting incident-based data.

At the start of this project, it was expected that trends would follow a consistent pattern across the categories based on the size of the population served by the agencies responding to the surveys. Although the trend was as expected for most of the survey data, at several points the responses of agencies serving populations of 100,000 to 249,999 were not as expected. Since most of these agencies are likely to be in large suburbs outside of large urban areas, it is likely that these agencies have a larger tax base and therefore more resources at their disposal. With the additional resources, they can spend more money on data analysts and analysis, unlike their possibly cash-strapped urban counterparts.

In summary, it seems clear that law enforcement agencies are using crime analysis tools to improve both their daily functions and for planning future initiatives. Although many departments do not use or have access to other criminal justice system data, it seems clear most departments would benefit from having readily available data in

a format that would allow analysis without additional hardware. Access to such data may finally allow criminal justice and law enforcement agencies the tools to build statistical indicators that would enable them to better predict and better respond to crime.

References

Association of State Uniform Crime Reporting Programs. (2003). State Survey 2003. Published online at http://www.asucrp.org/pdfs/surveys/2003-ASUCRP-Survey.pdf.

Boba, R. (2003). Problem Analysis In Policing. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation.

O'Shea, T.C. and Nicholls, K. (2002). Crime Analysis in America. Washington, D.C.: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Appendix A. Focus Group Participants

Illinois

- Chicago Police Department
- Crime Analysts of Illinois Association
- Hanover Park Police Department
- Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
- Illinois State Police
- Integrated Justice Information System
- Office of the Cook County State's Attorney
- Sangamon County Sheriff's Department
- Streamwood Police Department

Oklahoma

- Beaver Sheriff's Office
- Dewey Police Department
- Duncan Police Department
- Eufaula Police Department
- Jackson Sheriff's Office
- Lexington Police Department
- Marlow Police Department
- Oklahoma Criminal Justice Resource Center
- Oklahoma Department of Corrections Research and Evaluation Unit
- Oklahoma Sentencing Commission
- Roger Mills Sheriff's Office
- Wagoner Police Department

Pennsylvania

- Berks County Adult Probation and Parole
- Governor's Policy Office
- JNET
- Justice HUB
- Lower Allen Township Police Department
- Mercyhurst College Civic Institute
- Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency
- Pennsylvania Sentencing Commission
- Pennsylvania State Police
- Philadelphia Police Department

Appendix B: Surveys

Survey ID:

JUSTICE RESEARCH AND STATISTICS ASSOCIATION

IMPROVING CRIME DATA

POLICE CHIEF SURVEY

This survey can also be completed online. Please visit www.jrsa.org/survey.

PLEASE CHECK ONE OR MORE RESPONSES AS INDICATED.

1. Which of the following criminal justice data do you find useful in managing your agency? *(check all that apply)*

❍ calls for service	❍ incident report data	❍ traffic stop data
❍ clearance rates	❍ drug/gun seizure data	❍ state crime publications
❍ arrest data	❍ "hot spots" data	❍ police pursuits
❍ disposition data	❍ court caseloads	❍ corrections data
❍ cost data	❍ drug use surveys	❍ victimization survey rates
❍ recidivism rates	❍ other: (*please specify)*_____	

2. Which of the following non-criminal justice data do you find useful in managing your agency? *(check all that apply)*

❍ emergency room data	❍ medical examiner data	❍ census data
❍ treatment program data	❍ education data	❍ health data
❍ other (*please specify)* _____		

3. How do you use the data? (*check all that apply)*

❍ assessment of overall department performance	❍ deployment and other tactical decisions
❍ budget decisions	❍ responses to inquiries
❍ comparisons with other jurisdictions	❍ COMPSTAT-type processes
❍ promotion decisions and performance reviews	
❍ other (*please specify)*_____	

4. If not currently used, which of the following criminal justice data would you find useful if they were accessible to you? *(check all that apply)*

❍ calls for service	❍ incident report data	❍ traffic stop data
❍ clearance rates	❍ drug/gun seizure data	❍ state crime publications
❍ arrest data	❍ "hot spots" data	❍ police pursuits
❍ disposition data	❍ court caseload	❍ corrections data
❍ costs data	❍ drug use surveys	❍ victimization survey rates
❍ recidivism rates	❍ other: (*please specify)*_____	

5. If not currently used, which of the following non-criminal justice data would you find useful if they were accessible to you? *(check all that apply)*

❍ emergency room data	❍ medical examiner data	❍ census data
❍ treatment program data	❍ education data	❍ health data
❍ other (*please specify)* _____		

6. How often do data and statistics help the performance of your agency?

❍ very often ❍ often ❍ seldom ❍ rarely ❍ never

7. How often do data and statistics affect the planning of programs or policies in your agency?

❍ very often ❍ often ❍ seldom ❍ rarely ❍ never

PLEASE COMPLETE REVERSE

8. Which best describes the response of your agency's officers when they are required to gather data for records and reports?
   ❍ very supportive ❍ supportive ❍ indifferent ❍ unsupportive ❍ very unsupportive

9. How thorough would your agency's officers be if required to record/report more data about incidents than they currently are?
   ❍ very thorough ❍ thorough ❍ somewhat thorough ❍ not very thorough ❍ not at all thorough

10. Does your agency collect and report incident-based (NIBRS) data? ❍ yes ❍ no
    - ♦ If no, has your agency ever reported NIBRS-compatible data? ❍ yes ❍ no
    - ♦ Does your agency plan to report NIBRS-compatible data?
      ❍ within the next year ❍ within next 3 years ❍ no definite plan ❍ never

11. If your agency does not report NIBRS data and has no plan to do so, what are the reason(s) for this? (*check all that apply)*

❍ costs associated with meeting reporting requirements
❍ NIBRS more useful for national or macro-level analyses than for local strategic analysis and planning
❍ possible "increases" in local crime statistics due to shift from UCR Summary to NIBRS and related changes in how/what data are collected
❍ doubtful commitment of state/federal resources to local agencies for continued implementation
❍ strict, rigid guideline requirements for certification and reporting data
❍ conflicting definitions of statutes and offenses on different government levels
❍ other (*specify:)* _____

12. Is your department currently involved in a multi-agency effort to share/integrate data?
    ❍ yes ❍ no
    - ♦ If yes, how valuable would you say this effort is?
      ❍ very valuable ❍ somewhat valuable ❍ not very valuable
    - ♦ If yes, what is the position/job title of the person who represents your department in this multi-agency effort? _____

13. What proportion of your agency's overall budget would you estimate goes to support data collection and analysis functions? _____ %

14. How often do community leaders (mayor's office, city council, community groups) ask for data or statistics from your department?
    ❍ 3 or more times a week ❍ 1 –2 times a week ❍ 1 –2 times a month ❍ 1 –2 times a year ❍ never

15. How would you rate the media's understanding and reporting of data and statistics that you provide them?
    ❍ excellent ❍ very good ❍ good ❍ fair ❍ poor

RECOMMENDATION

If you could make one change in your current system of data sharing and integration to improve its role in developing programs and policies, what would it be?

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for your time!

SURVEY ID:

JUSTICE RESEARCH AND STATISTICS ASSOCIATION

IMPROVING CRIME DATA SURVEY

DATA ANALYST SURVEY

THIS SURVEY CAN ALSO BE COMPLETED ONLINE. PLEASE VISIT WWW.JRSA.ORG/SURVEY.

PLEASE CHECK ONE OR MORE RESPONSES AS INDICATED.

DATA USE

1. Which of the following criminal justice data are used in your agency? (check all that apply)

‘ calls for service ‘ incident report data
‘ traffic stop data ‘ clearance rates
‘ drug/gun seizures ‘ arrest data
‘ police pursuits ‘ “hot spots” data
‘ state UCR data ‘ victimization survey rates
‘ recidivism rates ‘ disposition data
‘ court caseloads ‘ corrections data
‘ cost data ‘ drug use surveys
‘ other *(specify:* _____*)*

2. Which of the following non-criminal justice data are used in your agency? (check all that apply)

‘ emergency room data ‘ medical examiner data
‘ census data ‘ treatment program data
‘ education data ‘ health data
‘ other *(specify:* _____*)*

3. How does your agency use the data? (check all that apply)

‘ training ‘ budget decisionmaking
‘ deployment ‘ responses to inquiries
‘ daily reports ‘ program planning
‘ evaluation ‘ policy development
‘ crime patterns ‘ mapping
‘ crime trends ‘ COMPSTAT
‘ comparisons with other jurisdictions
‘ other (*specify:*_____*)*

4. If not currently used, which of the following criminal justice data would be useful, if available? (check all that apply)

‘ calls for service ‘ incident report data
‘ traffic stop data ‘ clearance rates
‘ drug/gun seizures ‘ arrest data
‘ police pursuits ‘ “hot spots” data
‘ state UCR data ‘ victimization survey rates
‘ recidivism rates ‘ disposition data
‘ court caseloads ‘ corrections data
‘ cost data ‘ drug use surveys
‘ other *(specify:* _____*)*

5. If not currently used, which of the following non-criminal justice data would be useful, if available? (check all that apply)

‘ emergency room data ‘ medical examiner data
‘ census data ‘ treatment program data
‘ education data ‘ health data
‘ other *(specify:* _____*)*

6. How often do data and statistics help the performance of your agency in its functions?

‘ very often ‘ often ‘ seldom ‘ rarely ‘ never

7. How often do data and statistics affect the planning of programs or policies in your agency?

‘ very often ‘ often ‘ seldom ‘ rarely ‘ never

8. Which best describes the response of your agency’s officers when they are required to gather data for records and reports?

‘ very supportive ‘ supportive ‘ indifferent
‘ unsupportive ‘ very unsupportive

9. How thorough would your agency’s officers be if required to record/report more data about incidents than they currently are?

‘ very thorough ‘ thorough
‘ somewhat thorough ‘ not very thorough
‘ not at all thorough

10. Of the following possible changes, rank the top three that you think would be most helpful in increasing the use of data and statistics for decisionmaking in your agency (1 = most important).

___ Improved data entry
___ Improved data quality
___ Improved ability to extract data from RMS
___ Increased analysis capacity (e.g., more analysts, improved hardware and software)
___ Greater support from management for analysis
___ Increased cooperation of other agencies
___ Increased systems integration among local agencies
___ Other (*specify*:_____)

AGENCY DATA STRUCTURES

11. Does your agency have a crime analysis unit?

‘ yes ‘ no

If “yes,” how would you characterize your unit? (check all that apply)

‘ single person unit
‘ formal, authorized
‘ embedded in another unit
‘ informal, ad hoc
‘ distinct unit ‘ other (specify_____)

12. How many analysts are in your unit? _____

13. What is the average educational level achieved by analysts in your agency/jurisdiction?

‘ high school ‘ some college
‘ undergraduate degree ‘ master's degree
‘ doctorate ‘ other *(specify:_____)*

14. Do analysts in your agency/jurisdiction receive special training, workshops, etc., to develop skills?

‘ yes ‘ no

If "yes," how are those efforts paid for?

‘ by the agency/jurisdiction ‘ grants
‘ by the analyst ‘ other *(specify:_____)*

15. Who provides crime analysis training for your agency? (check all that apply)

‘ agency (in-house) ‘ outside contractor
‘ professional associations ‘ no training provided
‘ other (*specify*:_____)

16. How up-to-date do you consider your training for data collection and reporting?

‘ very up-to-date ‘ up-to-date
‘ somewhat up-to-date ‘ somewhat outdated
‘ very outdated

17. How is crime analysis information disseminated within your agency? (check all that apply)

‘ upon request
‘ formal reports
‘ periodic memos/bulletins/short reports
‘ other *(specify:_____)*

18. Within your agency, how useful is the work of analysts as seen by:

Patrol officers: ‘ very useful ‘ useful ‘ somewhat useful ‘ rarely useful ‘ never useful
Supervisors: ‘ very useful ‘ useful ‘ somewhat useful ‘ rarely useful ‘ never useful
Detectives: ‘ very useful ‘ useful ‘ somewhat useful ‘ rarely useful ‘ never useful

19. Does your unit seek assistance in data analysis from outside agencies? (check all that apply)

‘ universities/colleges ‘ Statistical Analysis Centers
‘ private consultants ‘ vendors/suppliers
‘ state Uniform Crime Reporting Unit
‘ other law enforcement agencies
‘ other *(specify:_____)*

20. How receptive is your agency to assistance in data analysis from outside agencies?

‘ very receptive ‘ receptive ‘ indifferent ‘ not very receptive ‘ not at all receptive

21. What would concern analysts in your agency about assistance from external sources? (check all that apply)

‘ maintenance of appropriate confidentiality of records and data
‘ high integrity and professionalism in the collection and use of records and data
‘ manageable costs
‘ loss of control over process
‘ other *(specify:_____)*

22. How up-to-date do you consider the technology used in your agency for data collection and reporting?

‘ very up-to-date ‘ up-to-date
‘ somewhat up-to-date ‘ somewhat outdated
‘ very outdated

23. How often does your agency update the technology used for data collection and reporting?

‘ always ‘ frequently ‘ sometimes ‘ seldom ‘ never

24. What has been your experience with vendors of data collection/reporting products in the following areas:

Quality of product:
‘ excellent ‘ very good ‘ good ‘ fair ‘ poor
Cost-effectiveness of product:
‘ excellent ‘ very good ‘ good ‘ fair ‘ poor
Quality of technical assistance:
‘ excellent ‘ very good ‘ good ‘ fair ‘ poor
Cost-effectiveness of technical assistance:
‘ excellent ‘ very good ‘ good ‘ fair ‘ poor

25. If you had more money for your technical capacities for data collection and reporting, on which area would you first spend it?

‘ hardware ‘ software
‘ personnel salaries ‘ additional staff
‘ personnel training ‘ other *(specify:_____)*

Data for Programming and Policy Strategies

26. How often are data and statistical indicators used in your agency for:

Budgeting decisions:
‘ always ‘ frequently ‘ sometimes ‘ seldom ‘ never
Personnel evaluations:
‘ always ‘ frequently ‘ sometimes ‘ seldom ‘ never
Promotion decisions:
‘ always ‘ frequently ‘ sometimes ‘ seldom ‘ never
Policy decisions:
‘ always ‘ frequently ‘ sometimes ‘ seldom ‘ never
Policy evaluations:
‘ always ‘ frequently ‘ sometimes ‘ seldom ‘ never

27. How often does your agency provide data to policymakers and/or community stakeholders for developing programs and policies?

‘ 3 or more times a week ‘ 1-2 times a week
‘ 1-2 times a month ‘ 1-2 times a year ‘ never

28. Does your agency have representation on a local, regional, or state criminal justice coordinating council, advisory board, or task force?

‘ yes ‘ no

If "yes," how receptive are the members of those bodies to using data to develop programs and policies?

‘ very receptive ‘ receptive ‘ indifferent
‘ seldom receptive ‘ never receptive

29. How would you rate the media's understanding and reporting of data and statistics that you provide them?

‘ excellent ‘ very good ‘ good ‘ fair ‘ poor

30. Does your agency provide a mechanism for data users to provide feedback?

‘ yes ‘ no

If "yes," do you receive feedback regarding:

Data availability:
‘ positive feedback ‘ negative feedback ‘ both ‘ none

Data quality:
‘ positive feedback ‘ negative feedback ‘ both ‘ none

Data utility:
‘ positive feedback ‘ negative feedback ‘ both ‘ none

Possible data improvements:
‘ positive feedback ‘ negative feedback ‘ both ‘ none

Interjurisdictional Data Sharing and Integration

31. Is there currently a citywide or countywide integrated information systems project underway?

‘ yes ‘ no

If "yes," is your agency currently (or planning on) participating?

‘ yes ‘ no

If "yes," what data are shared?

‘ crime incident information ‘ GIS data
‘ person information ‘ auto information
‘ other *(specify:*_____*)*

32. Does your agency use data systems that are integrated with systems of other departments/agencies?

‘ yes ‘ no

If "yes," which of the following departments/agencies participate? (check all that apply)

Criminal Justice/Public Safety Agencies

‘ other law enforcement agency ‘ court
‘ corrections ‘ probation
‘ public defender ‘ juvenile services
‘ department of motor vehicles ‘ fire department
‘ parole ‘ prosecution
‘ other *(specify:*_____*)*

Non-Criminal Justice/Non-Public Safety Agencies

‘ child support agency ‘ social services
‘ health department ‘ education
‘ public utilities ‘ planning/zoning
‘ transportation ‘ victim support groups
‘ public works
‘ other *(specify:*_____*)*

33. If your agency uses a data system that is integrated with the systems of other departments/agencies, does your agency maintain it?

‘ yes ‘ no

If "no," who does? _____

34. Does your agency have access to a data system that allows the tracking of offenders over time?

‘ yes ‘ no

If "yes," does this system include: (check all that apply)

‘ arrest history ‘ jail data
‘ court data ‘ probation/parole data
‘ other *(specify:*_____*)*

35. For each agency listed below, indicate whether your department: (S) sends data to the agency, (R) receives data from the agency, or (B) both sends data to and receives data from the agency.

Criminal Justice/Public Safety Agencies

___ other law enforcement agency ___ court
___ corrections ___ probation
___ public defender ___ juvenile services
___ department of motor vehicles ___ fire department
___ prosecution ___ parole
___ other *(specify:*_____*)*

Non-Criminal Justice/Non-Public Safety Agencies

___ child support agency ___ social services
___ health department ___ education
___ public utilities ___ planning/zoning
___ transportation ___ public works
___ victim support groups
___ other *(specify:*_____*)*

36. How successful are the data sharing efforts that you participate in?

‘ very successful ‘ successful ‘ somewhat successful
‘ not very successful ‘ unsuccessful

37. How do the technical capacities of your agency compare with neighboring jurisdictions?

‘ better than others ‘ the same as others
‘ worse than others ‘ don’t know

38. What would concern your agency about sharing data with other criminal justice agencies? (check all that apply)

‘ maintenance of appropriate confidentiality of records and data
‘ high integrity and professionalism in the collection and use of records and data
‘ manageable costs
‘ available manpower
‘ loss of control over process
‘ other (*specify:*_____)

Incident-Based Data

39. Does your agency collect and report incident-based (NIBRS) data?

‘ yes ‘ no

If “no,” has your agency ever collected and reported NIBRS data?

‘ yes ‘ no

Does your agency plan to report NIBRS data?

‘ within the next year ‘ within the next 3 years
‘ no definite plan ‘ never

40. If you are collecting NIBRS data, which of the following obstacles to collecting and reporting NIBRS has your agency experienced? If your agency is not currently collecting NIBRS data, which of the following issues have been issues for your agency? (check all that apply)

Increased Costs

‘ Redesigning collection processes and reporting forms
‘ Updating record management systems
‘ Upgrading software/hardware
‘ Rewriting software programs
‘ Implementing process at street level
‘ Upgrading communications infrastructure to support reporting
‘ Hiring additional support/data entry staff
‘ Training existing and new personnel
‘ Exercising more quality control on data entry
‘ Increasing volume and complexity of data and effect on personnel costs
‘ Other *(specify:* _____)

Ambiguous Use and Benefits

‘ NIBRS not a priority to policymakers because benefits not immediate or clear
‘ Perception of NIBRS as “research”-related rather than “operations”-related
‘ NIBRS more useful for national or macro-level analyses than for local strategic analysis and planning
‘ Possible “increases” in local crime statistics due to shift from UCR to NIBRS and related changes in how/what data collected
‘ No definitive guidelines for NIBRS data sharing or comparisons
‘ Other *(specify:* _____)

Administration

‘ Loss of patrol time due to increased detail in reporting
‘ Slow turnaround to local agencies of data reported to state/federal agencies
‘ Doubtful commitment of state/federal resources to local agencies for continued implementation
‘ Inadequate marketing of NIBRS benefits
‘ Inadequate training of local agency personnel
‘ Strict, rigid guideline requirements for certification and reporting data
‘ Lack of utility or relevance on local level of data elements, definitions, structures
‘ Conflicting definitions of statutes and offenses on different government levels
‘ Other *(specify:*_____)

Recommendations

If you could make one change to the current system of data sharing and integration within your agency to improve its role in program planning and policy development, what would it be? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Demographics

41. Describe your jurisdiction.

Region: ‘ urban ‘ rural ‘ suburb
Level: ‘ city ‘ county ‘ city/county

42. Does your agency have a Web site?

‘ yes ‘ no

If “yes,” are crime statistics provided on the Web site?

‘ yes ‘ no

43. Does your agency have an automated RMS?

‘ yes ‘ no

Thank you for your time!

Appendix C: Chief Survey Results

Improving Crime Data Survey Chief Responses

Question 1: Which of the following criminal justice data do you find useful in managing your agency? (check all that apply)

Use calls for service * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use calls for service	Yes	Count	54	105	220	402	781
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.8%	98.9%
	No	Count	0	0	0	9	9
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.2%	1.1%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use incident report data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use incident report data	Yes	Count	51	91	197	350	689
		% within Population Category	94.4%	86.7%	89.5%	85.2%	87.2%
	No	Count	3	14	23	61	101
		% within Population Category	5.6%	13.3%	10.5%	14.8%	12.8%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use traffic stop data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use traffic stop data	Yes	Count	42	83	170	334	629
		% within Population Category	77.8%	79.0%	77.3%	81.3%	79.6%
	No	Count	12	22	50	77	161
		% within Population Category	22.2%	21.0%	22.7%	18.7%	20.4%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use clearance rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use clearance rates	Yes	Count	48	87	163	311	609
		% within Population Category	88.9%	82.9%	74.1%	75.7%	77.1%
	No	Count	6	18	57	100	181
		% within Population Category	11.1%	17.1%	25.9%	24.3%	22.9%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use drug/gun seizure data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use drug/gun seizure data	Yes	Count	39	71	94	191	395
		% within Population Category	72.2%	67.6%	42.7%	46.5%	50.0%
	No	Count	15	34	126	220	395
		% within Population Category	27.8%	32.4%	57.3%	53.5%	50.0%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use state crime publications * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use state crime publications	Yes	Count	15	51	111	173	350
		% within Population Category	27.8%	48.6%	50.5%	42.1%	44.3%
	No	Count	39	54	109	238	440
		% within Population Category	72.2%	51.4%	49.5%	57.9%	55.7%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use arrest data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use arrest data	Yes	Count	53	97	197	389	736
		% within Population Category	98.1%	92.4%	89.5%	94.6%	93.2%
	No	Count	1	8	23	22	54
		% within Population Category	1.9%	7.6%	10.5%	5.4%	6.8%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use "hot spots" data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use "hot spots" data	Yes	Count	47	94	159	288	588
		% within Population Category	87.0%	89.5%	72.3%	70.1%	74.4%
	No	Count	7	11	61	123	202
		% within Population Category	13.0%	10.5%	27.7%	29.9%	25.6%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use police pursuits * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use police pursuits	Yes	Count	32	68	117	221	438
		% within Population Category	59.3%	64.8%	53.2%	53.8%	55.4%
	No	Count	22	37	103	190	352
		% within Population Category	40.7%	35.2%	46.8%	46.2%	44.6%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use disposition data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use disposition data	Yes	Count	29	60	103	217	409
		% within Population Category	53.7%	57.1%	46.8%	52.8%	51.8%
	No	Count	25	45	117	194	381
		% within Population Category	46.3%	42.9%	53.2%	47.2%	48.2%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use court caseloads * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use court caseloads	Yes	Count	6	12	25	55	98
		% within Population Category	11.1%	11.4%	11.4%	13.4%	12.4%
	No	Count	48	93	195	356	692
		% within Population Category	88.9%	88.6%	88.6%	86.6%	87.6%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use corrections data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use corrections data	Yes	Count	12	15	26	37	90
		% within Population Category	22.2%	14.3%	11.8%	9.0%	11.4%
	No	Count	42	90	194	374	700
		% within Population Category	77.8%	85.7%	88.2%	91.0%	88.6%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use cost data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use cost data	Yes	Count	36	67	117	206	426
		% within Population Category	66.7%	63.8%	53.2%	50.1%	53.9%
	No	Count	18	38	103	205	364
		% within Population Category	33.3%	36.2%	46.8%	49.9%	46.1%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use drug surveys * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use drug surveys	Yes	Count	14	23	47	96	180
		% within Population Category	25.9%	21.9%	21.4%	23.4%	22.8%
	No	Count	40	82	173	315	610
		% within Population Category	74.1%	78.1%	78.6%	76.6%	77.2%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use victimization survey rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use victimization survey rates	Yes	Count	22	32	65	120	239
		% within Population Category	40.7%	30.5%	29.5%	29.2%	30.3%
	No	Count	32	73	155	291	551
		% within Population Category	59.3%	69.5%	70.5%	70.8%	69.7%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use recidivism rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use recidivism rates	Yes	Count	18	28	54	89	189
		% within Population Category	33.3%	26.7%	24.5%	21.7%	23.9%
	No	Count	36	77	166	322	601
		% within Population Category	66.7%	73.3%	75.5%	78.3%	76.1%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use other cj data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use other cj data	Yes	Count	2	7	10	19	38
		% within Population Category	3.7%	6.7%	4.5%	4.6%	4.8%
	No	Count	52	98	210	392	752
		% within Population Category	96.3%	93.3%	95.5%	95.4%	95.2%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 2: Which of the following non-criminal justice data do you find useful in managing your agency? (check all that apply)

Use emergency room data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use emergency room data	Yes	Count	8	10	21	44	83
		% within Population Category	14.8%	9.5%	9.5%	10.7%	10.5%
	No	Count	46	95	199	367	707
		% within Population Category	85.2%	90.5%	90.5%	89.3%	89.5%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use medical examiner data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use medical examiner data	Yes	Count	19	22	55	110	206
		% within Population Category	35.2%	21.0%	25.0%	26.8%	26.1%
	No	Count	35	83	165	301	584
		% within Population Category	64.8%	79.0%	75.0%	73.2%	73.9%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use census data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use census data	Yes	Count	46	93	179	317	635
		% within Population Category	85.2%	88.6%	81.4%	77.1%	80.4%
	No	Count	8	12	41	94	155
		% within Population Category	14.8%	11.4%	18.6%	22.9%	19.6%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use treatment program data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use treatment program data	Yes	Count	10	16	21	48	95
		% within Population Category	18.5%	15.2%	9.5%	11.7%	12.0%
	No	Count	44	89	199	363	695
		% within Population Category	81.5%	84.8%	90.5%	88.3%	88.0%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use education data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use education data	Yes	Count	13	41	74	147	275
		% within Population Category	24.1%	39.0%	33.6%	35.8%	34.8%
	No	Count	41	64	146	264	515
		% within Population Category	75.9%	61.0%	66.4%	64.2%	65.2%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use health data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use health data	Yes	Count	4	13	20	38	75
		% within Population Category	7.4%	12.4%	9.1%	9.2%	9.5%
	No	Count	50	92	200	373	715
		% within Population Category	92.6%	87.6%	90.9%	90.8%	90.5%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use other cj data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use other cj data	Yes	Count	4	6	9	7	26
		% within Population Category	7.4%	5.7%	4.1%	1.7%	3.3%
	No	Count	50	99	211	404	764
		% within Population Category	92.6%	94.3%	95.9%	98.3%	96.7%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 3: How do you use the data? (check all that apply)

Used for assessment of department performance * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Used for assessment of department performance	Yes	Count	47	99	205	376	727
		% within Population Category	87.0%	94.3%	93.2%	91.5%	92.0%
	No	Count	7	6	15	35	63
		% within Population Category	13.0%	5.7%	6.8%	8.5%	8.0%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Used for deployment and tactical decisions * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Used for deployment and tactical decisions	Yes	Count	49	97	188	332	666
		% within Population Category	90.7%	92.4%	85.5%	80.8%	84.3%
	No	Count	5	8	32	79	124
		% within Population Category	9.3%	7.6%	14.5%	19.2%	15.7%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Used for budget decisions * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Used for budget decisions	Yes	Count	45	94	180	378	697
		% within Population Category	83.3%	89.5%	81.8%	92.0%	88.2%
	No	Count	9	11	40	33	93
		% within Population Category	16.7%	10.5%	18.2%	8.0%	11.8%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Used for responses to inquiries * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Used for responses to inquiries	Yes	Count	40	91	154	284	569
		% within Population Category	74.1%	86.7%	70.0%	69.1%	72.0%
	No	Count	14	14	66	127	221
		% within Population Category	25.9%	13.3%	30.0%	30.9%	28.0%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Used for comparisons * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Used for comparisons	Yes	Count	35	75	155	284	549
		% within Population Category	64.8%	71.4%	70.5%	69.1%	69.5%
	No	Count	19	30	65	127	241
		% within Population Category	35.2%	28.6%	29.5%	30.9%	30.5%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Used for COMPSTAT-type process * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Used for COMPSTAT-type process	Yes	Count	40	61	76	111	288
		% within Population Category	74.1%	58.1%	34.5%	27.0%	36.5%
	No	Count	14	44	144	300	502
		% within Population Category	25.9%	41.9%	65.5%	73.0%	63.5%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Used for promotion/performance reviews * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Used for promotion/performance reviews	Yes	Count	10	26	69	146	251
		% within Population Category	18.5%	24.8%	31.4%	35.5%	31.8%
	No	Count	44	79	151	265	539
		% within Population Category	81.5%	75.2%	68.6%	64.5%	68.2%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Used for other purposes * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Used for other purposes	Yes	Count	1	3	7	11	22
		% within Population Category	1.9%	2.9%	3.2%	2.7%	2.8%
	No	Count	53	102	213	400	768
		% within Population Category	98.1%	97.1%	96.8%	97.3%	97.2%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 4: If not currently used, which of the following criminal justice data would you find useful if they were accessible to you? (check all that apply)

Would use calls for service * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category	
			25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use calls for service	Yes	Count	2	2
		% within Population Category	22.2%	22.2%
	No	Count	7	7
		% within Population Category	77.8%	77.8%
Total		Count	9	9
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%

Would use local incident * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use local incident	Yes	Count	0	1	1	5	7
		% within Population Category	.0%	7.1%	4.3%	8.2%	6.9%
	No	Count	3	13	22	56	94
		% within Population Category	100.0%	92.9%	95.7%	91.8%	93.1%
Total		Count	3	14	23	61	101
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use traffic stop data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Would use traffic stop data	Yes	Count	0	4	9	9	22
		% within Population Category	.0%	18.2%	17.6%	11.7%	13.6%
	No	Count	12	18	42	68	140
		% within Population Category	100.0%	81.8%	82.4%	88.3%	86.4%
Total		Count	12	22	51	77	162
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use clearance rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Would use clearance rates	Yes	Count	0	5	8	18	31
		% within Population Category	.0%	27.8%	14.3%	18.0%	17.2%
	No	Count	6	13	48	82	149
		% within Population Category	100.0%	72.2%	85.7%	82.0%	82.8%
Total		Count	6	18	56	100	180
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use drug/gun seizure data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use drug/gun seizure data	Yes	Count	2	1	14	26	43
		% within Population Category	13.3%	2.9%	11.2%	11.8%	10.9%
	No	Count	13	33	111	194	351
		% within Population Category	86.7%	97.1%	88.8%	88.2%	89.1%
Total		Count	15	34	125	220	394
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use UCR crime data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use UCR crime data	Yes	Count	6	0	11	29	46
		% within Population Category	15.4%	.0%	10.1%	12.2%	10.5%
	No	Count	33	54	98	209	394
		% within Population Category	84.6%	100.0%	89.9%	87.8%	89.5%
Total		Count	39	54	109	238	440
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use arrest data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use arrest data	Yes	Count	1	0	3	3	7
		% within Population Category	100.0%	.0%	13.0%	13.6%	13.0%
	No	Count	0	8	20	19	47
		% within Population Category	.0%	100.0%	87.0%	86.4%	87.0%
Total		Count	1	8	23	22	54
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use "hot spots" data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use "hot spots" data	Yes	Count	2	1	19	32	54
		% within Population Category	28.6%	9.1%	31.1%	26.0%	26.7%
	No	Count	5	10	42	91	148
		% within Population Category	71.4%	90.9%	68.9%	74.0%	73.3%
Total		Count	7	11	61	123	202
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use police pursuits * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use police pursuits	Yes	Count	2	0	9	10	21
		% within Population Category	9.1%	.0%	8.8%	5.3%	6.0%
	No	Count	20	37	93	180	330
		% within Population Category	90.9%	100.0%	91.2%	94.7%	94.0%
Total		Count	22	37	102	190	351
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use disposition data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use disposition data	Yes	Count	8	11	23	20	62
		% within Population Category	32.0%	24.4%	19.8%	10.3%	16.3%
	No	Count	17	34	93	174	318
		% within Population Category	68.0%	75.6%	80.2%	89.7%	83.7%
Total		Count	25	45	116	194	380
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use court caseload * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use court caseload	Yes	Count	4	9	17	41	71
		% within Population Category	8.3%	9.7%	8.8%	11.5%	10.3%
	No	Count	44	84	177	315	620
		% within Population Category	91.7%	90.3%	91.2%	88.5%	89.7%
Total		Count	48	93	194	356	691
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use corrections data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use corrections data	Yes	Count	9	12	12	19	52
		% within Population Category	21.4%	13.3%	6.2%	5.1%	7.4%
	No	Count	33	78	182	355	648
		% within Population Category	78.6%	86.7%	93.8%	94.9%	92.6%
Total		Count	42	90	194	374	700
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use costs data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use costs data	Yes	Count	5	7	21	51	84
		% within Population Category	27.8%	18.4%	20.6%	24.9%	23.1%
	No	Count	13	31	81	154	279
		% within Population Category	72.2%	81.6%	79.4%	75.1%	76.9%
Total		Count	18	38	102	205	363
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use drug surveys * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use drug surveys	Yes	Count	7	24	31	72	134
		% within Population Category	17.5%	29.3%	18.0%	22.9%	22.0%
	No	Count	33	58	141	243	475
		% within Population Category	82.5%	70.7%	82.0%	77.1%	78.0%
Total		Count	40	82	172	315	609
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use victimization survey rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use victimization survey rates	Yes	Count	9	25	38	83	155
		% within Population Category	28.1%	34.2%	24.5%	28.5%	28.1%
	No	Count	23	48	117	208	396
		% within Population Category	71.9%	65.8%	75.5%	71.5%	71.9%
Total		Count	32	73	155	291	551
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use recidivism rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use recidivism rates	Yes	Count	7	22	36	75	140
		% within Population Category	19.4%	28.6%	21.7%	23.3%	23.3%
	No	Count	29	55	130	247	461
		% within Population Category	80.6%	71.4%	78.3%	76.7%	76.7%
Total		Count	36	77	166	322	601
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use other data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use other data	Yes	Count	1	0	7	4	12
		% within Population Category	1.9%	.0%	3.2%	1.0%	1.5%
	No	Count	53	105	212	406	776
		% within Population Category	98.1%	100.0%	96.8%	99.0%	98.5%
Total		Count	54	105	219	410	788
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 5: If not currently used, which of the following non-criminal justice data would you find useful if they were accessible to you? (check all that apply)

Would use emergency room data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use emergency room data	Yes	Count	10	21	46	59	136
		% within Population Category	21.7%	22.1%	23.1%	16.1%	19.2%
	No	Count	36	74	153	308	571
		% within Population Category	78.3%	77.9%	76.9%	83.9%	80.8%
Total		Count	46	95	199	367	707
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use medical examiner data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use medical examiner data	Yes	Count	5	11	14	22	52
		% within Population Category	14.3%	13.3%	8.5%	7.3%	8.9%
	No	Count	30	72	150	279	531
		% within Population Category	85.7%	86.7%	91.5%	92.7%	91.1%
Total		Count	35	83	164	301	583
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use census data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use census data	Yes	Count	0	1	8	18	27
		% within Population Category	.0%	8.3%	20.0%	19.1%	17.5%
	No	Count	8	11	32	76	127
		% within Population Category	100.0%	91.7%	80.0%	80.9%	82.5%
Total		Count	8	12	40	94	154
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use treatment program data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use treatment program data	Yes	Count	5	17	35	61	118
		% within Population Category	11.4%	19.1%	17.6%	16.8%	17.0%
	No	Count	39	72	164	302	577
		% within Population Category	88.6%	80.9%	82.4%	83.2%	83.0%
Total		Count	44	89	199	363	695
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use education data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use education data	Yes	Count	4	7	18	39	68
		% within Population Category	9.8%	10.9%	12.3%	14.8%	13.2%
	No	Count	37	57	128	225	447
		% within Population Category	90.2%	89.1%	87.7%	85.2%	86.8%
Total		Count	41	64	146	264	515
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use health data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use health data	Yes	Count	4	15	26	37	82
		% within Population Category	8.0%	16.3%	13.0%	9.9%	11.5%
	No	Count	46	77	174	336	633
		% within Population Category	92.0%	83.7%	87.0%	90.1%	88.5%
Total		Count	50	92	200	373	715
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use other data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use other data	Yes	Count	0	0	6	0	6
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	2.8%	.0%	.8%
	No	Count	50	99	205	404	758
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	97.2%	100.0%	99.2%
Total		Count	50	99	211	404	764
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 6: How often do data and statistics help the performance of your agency?

How often use data to help performance * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How often use data to help performance	Very often	Count	32	51	60	91	234
		% within Population Category	59.3%	48.6%	27.3%	22.1%	29.6%
	Often	Count	20	48	133	255	456
		% within Population Category	37.0%	45.7%	60.5%	62.0%	57.7%
	Often/ Seldom	Count	0	0	1	1	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.2%	.3%
	Seldom	Count	2	5	24	58	89
		% within Population Category	3.7%	4.8%	10.9%	14.1%	11.3%
	Rarely	Count	0	1	2	6	9
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.0%	.9%	1.5%	1.1%
Total		Count	54	105	220	411	790
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 7: How often do data and statistics affect the planning of programs or policies in your agency?

How often do data affect planning * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How often do data affect planning	Very often	Count	31	45	65	88	229
		% within Population Category	57.4%	42.9%	29.7%	21.4%	29.0%
	Often	Count	21	52	133	264	470
		% within Population Category	38.9%	49.5%	60.7%	64.2%	59.6%
	Often/ Seldom	Count	0	0	2	1	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.9%	.2%	.4%
	Seldom	Count	2	8	18	55	83
		% within Population Category	3.7%	7.6%	8.2%	13.4%	10.5%
	Rarely	Count	0	0	1	3	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.7%	.5%
Total		Count	54	105	219	411	789
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 8: Which best describes the response of your agency's officers when they are required to gather data for records and reports?

Response of officers to gather data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Response of officers to gather data	Very supportive	Count	9	13	16	24	62
		% within Population Category	16.7%	12.5%	7.3%	5.9%	7.9%
	Supportive	Count	31	57	132	220	440
		% within Population Category	57.4%	54.8%	60.0%	53.7%	55.8%
	Indifferent	Count	14	27	56	141	238
		% within Population Category	25.9%	26.0%	25.5%	34.4%	30.2%
	Indifferent/ Unsupportive	Count	0	0	3	1	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.2%	.5%
	Unsupportive	Count	0	7	13	21	41
		% within Population Category	.0%	6.7%	5.9%	5.1%	5.2%
	Very unsupportive	Count	0	0	0	3	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.4%
Total		Count	54	104	220	410	788
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 9: How thorough would your agency's officers be if required to record/report more data about incidents than they currently are?

How thorough would officers be * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How thorough would officers be	Very thorough	Count	7	9	12	19	47
		% within Population Category	13.2%	8.7%	5.5%	4.7%	6.0%
	Thorough	Count	25	36	98	148	307
		% within Population Category	47.2%	34.6%	44.7%	36.3%	39.2%
	Thorough/Somewhat thorough	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Somewhat thorough	Count	18	51	92	207	368
		% within Population Category	34.0%	49.0%	42.0%	50.7%	46.9%
	Somewhat/Not very thorough	Count	0	0	2	1	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.9%	.2%	.4%
	Not very thorough	Count	3	8	13	32	56
		% within Population Category	5.7%	7.7%	5.9%	7.8%	7.1%
	Not at all thorough	Count	0	0	1	1	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.2%	.3%
Total		Count	53	104	219	408	784
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 10: Does your agency collect and report incident-based (NIBRS) data?

Reporting NIBRS Recode * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Reporting NIBRS Recode	Yes	Count	14	38	83	176	311
		% within Population Category	26.9%	37.6%	39.5%	43.7%	40.6%
	No	Count	38	63	127	227	455
		% within Population Category	73.1%	62.4%	60.5%	56.3%	59.4%
Total		Count	52	101	210	403	766
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If no, has your agency ever reported NIBRS-compatible data?

If no, ever reported NIBRS-compatible data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
If no, ever reported NIBRS-compatible data	Yes	Count	3	3	10	20	36
		% within Population Category	9.4%	5.6%	9.7%	11.9%	10.1%
	No	Count	29	51	93	148	321
		% within Population Category	90.6%	94.4%	90.3%	88.1%	89.9%
Total		Count	32	54	103	168	357
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Does your agency plan to report NIBRS-compatible data?

Plan to report NIBRS-compatible data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Plan to report NIBRS-compatible data	Within the next year	Count	6	10	21	32	69
		% within Population Category	17.1%	16.7%	18.8%	16.1%	17.0%
	Within next 3 years	Count	9	12	22	34	77
		% within Population Category	25.7%	20.0%	19.6%	17.1%	19.0%
	No definite plan	Count	20	37	65	125	247
		% within Population Category	57.1%	61.7%	58.0%	62.8%	60.8%
	Never	Count	0	1	4	8	13
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.7%	3.6%	4.0%	3.2%
Total		Count	35	60	112	199	406
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 11: If your agency does not report NIBRS data and has no plan to do so, what are the reason(s) for this? (check all that apply)

Costs associated with reporting requirements * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Costs associated with reporting requirements	Yes	Count	10	14	28	49	101
		% within Population Category	50.0%	38.9%	40.6%	37.7%	39.6%
	No	Count	10	22	41	81	154
		% within Population Category	50.0%	61.1%	59.4%	62.3%	60.4%
Total		Count	20	36	69	130	255
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

NIBRS more useful for national analyses * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
NIBRS more useful for national analyses	Yes	Count	1	10	19	35	65
		% within Population Category	5.0%	27.8%	27.5%	27.3%	25.7%
	No	Count	19	26	50	93	188
		% within Population Category	95.0%	72.2%	72.5%	72.7%	74.3%
Total		Count	20	36	69	128	253
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Possible "increases" in crime due to shift from UCR data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Possible "increases" in crime due to shift from UCR data	Yes	Count	0	9	7	9	25
		% within Population Category	.0%	25.7%	10.1%	7.0%	9.9%
	No	Count	20	26	62	119	227
		% within Population Category	100.0%	74.3%	89.9%	93.0%	90.1%
Total		Count	20	35	69	128	252
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Doubtful commitment of state/federal resources * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Doubtful commitment of state/federal resources	Yes	Count	5	16	25	52	98
		% within Population Category	25.0%	44.4%	36.2%	40.3%	38.6%
	No	Count	15	20	44	77	156
		% within Population Category	75.0%	55.6%	63.8%	59.7%	61.4%
Total		Count	20	36	69	129	254
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Strict guideline requirements * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Strict guideline requirements	Yes	Count	1	5	8	22	36
		% within Population Category	5.0%	14.3%	11.6%	17.2%	14.3%
	No	Count	19	30	61	106	216
		% within Population Category	95.0%	85.7%	88.4%	82.8%	85.7%
Total		Count	20	35	69	128	252
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Conflicting definitions of statutes and offenses * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Conflicting definitions of statutes and offenses	Yes	Count	4	7	14	31	56
		% within Population Category	20.0%	20.0%	20.3%	24.2%	22.2%
	No	Count	16	28	55	97	196
		% within Population Category	80.0%	80.0%	79.7%	75.8%	77.8%
Total		Count	20	35	69	128	252
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Other reasons * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Other reasons	Yes	Count	3	13	15	31	62
		% within Population Category	15.0%	36.1%	21.7%	24.0%	24.4%
	No	Count	17	23	54	98	192
		% within Population Category	85.0%	63.9%	78.3%	76.0%	75.6%
Total		Count	20	36	69	129	254
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 12: Is your department currently involved in a multi-agency effort to share/integrate data?

Currently involved in data integration effort * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Currently involved in data integration effort	Yes	Count	42	84	146	251	523
		% within Population Category	79.2%	81.6%	67.0%	61.4%	66.8%
	No	Count	11	19	72	158	260
		% within Population Category	20.8%	18.4%	33.0%	38.6%	33.2%
Total		Count	53	103	218	409	783
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, how valuable would you say this effort is?

If yes, how valuable * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
If yes, how valuable	Very valuable	Count	28	53	92	150	323
		% within Population Category	71.8%	68.8%	69.2%	64.4%	67.0%
	Somewhat valuable	Count	11	24	39	77	151
		% within Population Category	28.2%	31.2%	29.3%	33.0%	31.3%
	Not very valuable	Count	0	0	2	6	8
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.5%	2.6%	1.7%
Total		Count	39	77	133	233	482
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 13: What proportion of your agency's overall budget would you estimate goes to support data collection and analysis functions? (responses grouped into categories)

budget_cat * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
budget_cat	Under 1%	Count	5	9	25	31	70
		% within Population Category	15.6%	10.5%	14.2%	9.1%	11.0%
	Between 1% and 5%	Count	14	39	68	135	256
		% within Population Category	43.8%	45.3%	38.6%	39.5%	40.3%
	Between 6% and 10%	Count	3	15	44	73	135
		% within Population Category	9.4%	17.4%	25.0%	21.3%	21.2%
	Over 10%	Count	10	23	39	103	175
		% within Population Category	31.3%	26.7%	22.2%	30.1%	27.5%
Total		Count	32	86	176	342	636
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 14: How often do community leaders (mayor's office, city council, community groups) ask for data or statistics from your department?

How often do leaders ask for data/statistics * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How often do leaders ask for data/statistics	3 or more times per week	Count	24	22	34	14	94
		% within Population Category	45.3%	21.4%	15.7%	3.4%	12.0%
	1-2 times per week	Count	21	30	34	57	142
		% within Population Category	39.6%	29.1%	15.7%	14.0%	18.2%
	1-2 times per month	Count	7	37	95	204	343
		% within Population Category	13.2%	35.9%	43.8%	50.0%	43.9%
	1-2 times per year	Count	1	14	52	125	192
		% within Population Category	1.9%	13.6%	24.0%	30.6%	24.6%
	Never	Count	0	0	2	8	10
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.9%	2.0%	1.3%
Total		Count	53	103	217	408	781
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 15: How would you rate the media's understanding and reporting of data and statistics that you provide them?

Rate media's understanding of data/statistics * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rate media's understanding of data/statistics	Excellent	Count	4	2	10	9	25
		% within Population Category	7.4%	1.9%	4.6%	2.2%	3.2%
	Very good	Count	10	19	46	68	143
		% within Population Category	18.5%	18.4%	21.2%	16.7%	18.3%
	Good	Count	15	47	81	161	304
		% within Population Category	27.8%	45.6%	37.3%	39.7%	39.0%
	Fair	Count	17	28	65	124	234
		% within Population Category	31.5%	27.2%	30.0%	30.5%	30.0%
	Poor/Fair	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Poor	Count	8	7	14	44	73
		% within Population Category	14.8%	6.8%	6.5%	10.8%	9.4%
Total		Count	54	103	217	406	780
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Appendix D: Analyst Survey Results

Improving Crime Data Survey Analyst Responses

Question 1: Which of the following criminal justice data are used in your agency? (check all that apply)

Use calls for service * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use calls for service	Yes	Count	54	105	216	358	733
		% within Population Category	100.0%	97.2%	97.7%	97.0%	97.5%
	No	Count	0	3	5	11	19
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.8%	2.3%	3.0%	2.5%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use incident report data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use incident report data	Yes	Count	49	106	207	335	697
		% within Population Category	90.7%	98.1%	93.7%	90.8%	92.7%
	No	Count	5	2	14	34	55
		% within Population Category	9.3%	1.9%	6.3%	9.2%	7.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use traffic stop data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use traffic stop data	Yes	Count	41	83	174	299	597
		% within Population Category	75.9%	76.9%	78.7%	81.0%	79.4%
	No	Count	13	25	47	70	155
		% within Population Category	24.1%	23.1%	21.3%	19.0%	20.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use clearance rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use clearance rates	Yes	Count	45	89	149	256	539
		% within Population Category	83.3%	82.4%	67.4%	69.4%	71.7%
	No	Count	9	19	72	113	213
		% within Population Category	16.7%	17.6%	32.6%	30.6%	28.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use drug/gun seizures * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use drug/gun seizures	Yes	Count	45	64	85	164	358
		% within Population Category	83.3%	59.3%	38.5%	44.4%	47.6%
	No	Count	9	44	136	205	394
		% within Population Category	16.7%	40.7%	61.5%	55.6%	52.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use arrest data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use arrest data	Yes	Count	52	100	199	328	679
		% within Population Category	96.3%	92.6%	90.0%	88.9%	90.3%
	No	Count	2	8	22	41	73
		% within Population Category	3.7%	7.4%	10.0%	11.1%	9.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use police pursuits * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use police pursuits	Yes	Count	35	51	115	184	385
		% within Population Category	64.8%	47.2%	52.0%	49.9%	51.2%
	No	Count	19	57	106	185	367
		% within Population Category	35.2%	52.8%	48.0%	50.1%	48.8%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use hot spots data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use hot spots data	Yes	Count	47	88	150	193	478
		% within Population Category	87.0%	81.5%	67.9%	52.3%	63.6%
	No	Count	7	20	71	176	274
		% within Population Category	13.0%	18.5%	32.1%	47.7%	36.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use state UCR data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use state UCR data	Yes	Count	42	98	179	306	625
		% within Population Category	77.8%	90.7%	81.0%	82.9%	83.1%
	No	Count	12	10	42	63	127
		% within Population Category	22.2%	9.3%	19.0%	17.1%	16.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use victimization survey rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use victimization survey rates	Yes	Count	13	22	27	41	103
		% within Population Category	24.1%	20.4%	12.2%	11.1%	13.7%
	No	Count	41	86	194	328	649
		% within Population Category	75.9%	79.6%	87.8%	88.9%	86.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use recidivism rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use recidivism rates	Yes	Count	13	12	24	23	72
		% within Population Category	24.1%	11.1%	10.9%	6.2%	9.6%
	No	Count	41	96	197	346	680
		% within Population Category	75.9%	88.9%	89.1%	93.8%	90.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use disposition data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use disposition data	Yes	Count	28	54	93	173	348
		% within Population Category	51.9%	50.0%	42.1%	46.9%	46.3%
	No	Count	26	54	128	196	404
		% within Population Category	48.1%	50.0%	57.9%	53.1%	53.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use court caseloads * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use court caseloads	Yes	Count	5	15	18	47	85
		% within Population Category	9.3%	13.9%	8.1%	12.7%	11.3%
	No	Count	49	93	203	322	667
		% within Population Category	90.7%	86.1%	91.9%	87.3%	88.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use corrections data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use corrections data	Yes	Count	12	23	27	24	86
		% within Population Category	22.2%	21.3%	12.2%	6.5%	11.4%
	No	Count	42	85	194	345	666
		% within Population Category	77.8%	78.7%	87.8%	93.5%	88.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use cost data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use cost data	Yes	Count	24	37	51	110	222
		% within Population Category	44.4%	34.3%	23.1%	29.8%	29.5%
	No	Count	30	71	170	259	530
		% within Population Category	55.6%	65.7%	76.9%	70.2%	70.5%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use drug use surveys * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use drug use surveys	Yes	Count	6	8	13	34	61
		% within Population Category	11.1%	7.4%	5.9%	9.2%	8.1%
	No	Count	48	100	208	335	691
		% within Population Category	88.9%	92.6%	94.1%	90.8%	91.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use other cj data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use other cj data	Yes	Count	4	5	10	10	29
		% within Population Category	7.4%	4.6%	4.5%	2.7%	3.9%
	No	Count	50	103	211	359	723
		% within Population Category	92.6%	95.4%	95.5%	97.3%	96.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 2: Which of the following non-criminal justice data are used in your agency? (check all that apply)

Use emergency room data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use emergency room data	Yes	Count	7	4	5	14	30
		% within Population Category	13.0%	3.7%	2.3%	3.8%	4.0%
	No	Count	47	104	216	355	722
		% within Population Category	87.0%	96.3%	97.7%	96.2%	96.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use medical examiner data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use medical examiner data	Yes	Count	20	17	33	70	140
		% within Population Category	37.0%	15.7%	14.9%	19.0%	18.6%
	No	Count	34	91	188	299	612
		% within Population Category	63.0%	84.3%	85.1%	81.0%	81.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use census data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use census data	Yes	Count	47	79	149	221	496
		% within Population Category	87.0%	73.1%	67.4%	59.9%	66.0%
	No	Count	7	29	72	148	256
		% within Population Category	13.0%	26.9%	32.6%	40.1%	34.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use treatment program data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use treatment program data	Yes	Count	7	3	8	11	29
		% within Population Category	13.0%	2.8%	3.6%	3.0%	3.9%
	No	Count	47	105	213	358	723
		% within Population Category	87.0%	97.2%	96.4%	97.0%	96.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use education data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use education data	Yes	Count	11	24	45	68	148
		% within Population Category	20.4%	22.2%	20.4%	18.4%	19.7%
	No	Count	43	84	176	301	604
		% within Population Category	79.6%	77.8%	79.6%	81.6%	80.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use health data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use health data	Yes	Count	2	4	9	14	29
		% within Population Category	3.7%	3.7%	4.1%	3.8%	3.9%
	No	Count	52	104	212	355	723
		% within Population Category	96.3%	96.3%	95.9%	96.2%	96.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use other non-cj data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use other non-cj data	Yes	Count	3	2	6	4	15
		% within Population Category	5.6%	1.9%	2.7%	1.1%	2.0%
	No	Count	51	106	215	365	737
		% within Population Category	94.4%	98.1%	97.3%	98.9%	98.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 3: How does your agency use the data? (check all that apply)

Use for training * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for training	Yes	Count	34	72	141	252	499
		% within Population Category	63.0%	66.7%	63.8%	68.3%	66.4%
	No	Count	20	36	80	117	253
		% within Population Category	37.0%	33.3%	36.2%	31.7%	33.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for budget decisionmaking * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for budget decisionmaking	Yes	Count	39	81	141	281	542
		% within Population Category	72.2%	75.0%	63.8%	76.2%	72.1%
	No	Count	15	27	80	88	210
		% within Population Category	27.8%	25.0%	36.2%	23.8%	27.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for deployment * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for deployment	Yes	Count	46	96	181	294	617
		% within Population Category	85.2%	88.9%	81.9%	79.7%	82.0%
	No	Count	8	12	40	75	135
		% within Population Category	14.8%	11.1%	18.1%	20.3%	18.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for responses to inquiries * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for responses to inquiries	Yes	Count	50	99	174	293	616
		% within Population Category	92.6%	91.7%	78.7%	79.4%	81.9%
	No	Count	4	9	47	76	136
		% within Population Category	7.4%	8.3%	21.3%	20.6%	18.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for daily reports * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for daily reports	Yes	Count	39	74	124	235	472
		% within Population Category	72.2%	68.5%	56.1%	63.7%	62.8%
	No	Count	15	34	97	134	280
		% within Population Category	27.8%	31.5%	43.9%	36.3%	37.2%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for program planning * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for program planning	Yes	Count	39	73	121	193	426
		% within Population Category	72.2%	67.6%	54.8%	52.3%	56.6%
	No	Count	15	35	100	176	326
		% within Population Category	27.8%	32.4%	45.2%	47.7%	43.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for evaluation * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for evaluation	Yes	Count	37	65	110	201	413
		% within Population Category	68.5%	60.2%	49.8%	54.5%	54.9%
	No	Count	17	43	111	168	339
		% within Population Category	31.5%	39.8%	50.2%	45.5%	45.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for policy development * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for policy development	Yes	Count	37	66	112	212	427
		% within Population Category	68.5%	61.1%	50.7%	57.5%	56.8%
	No	Count	17	42	109	157	325
		% within Population Category	31.5%	38.9%	49.3%	42.5%	43.2%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for crime patterns * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for crime patterns	Yes	Count	52	105	189	291	637
		% within Population Category	96.3%	97.2%	85.5%	78.9%	84.7%
	No	Count	2	3	32	78	115
		% within Population Category	3.7%	2.8%	14.5%	21.1%	15.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for mapping * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for mapping	Yes	Count	50	88	136	167	441
		% within Population Category	92.6%	81.5%	61.5%	45.3%	58.6%
	No	Count	4	20	85	202	311
		% within Population Category	7.4%	18.5%	38.5%	54.7%	41.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for crime trends * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for crime trends	Yes	Count	53	104	176	272	605
		% within Population Category	98.1%	96.3%	79.6%	73.7%	80.5%
	No	Count	1	4	45	97	147
		% within Population Category	1.9%	3.7%	20.4%	26.3%	19.5%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for Compstat * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for Compstat	Yes	Count	36	49	53	58	196
		% within Population Category	66.7%	45.4%	24.0%	15.7%	26.1%
	No	Count	18	59	168	311	556
		% within Population Category	33.3%	54.6%	76.0%	84.3%	73.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for comparisons to others * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for comparisons to others	Yes	Count	38	79	127	195	439
		% within Population Category	70.4%	73.1%	57.5%	52.8%	58.4%
	No	Count	16	29	94	174	313
		% within Population Category	29.6%	26.9%	42.5%	47.2%	41.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Use for Other * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use for Other	Yes	Count	1	3	5	2	11
		% within Population Category	1.9%	2.8%	2.3%	.5%	1.5%
	No	Count	53	105	216	367	741
		% within Population Category	98.1%	97.2%	97.7%	99.5%	98.5%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 4: If not currently used, which of the following criminal justice data would be useful, if available? (check all that apply)

Would use calls for service * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category			
			100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use calls for service	Yes	Count	1	1	5	7
		% within Population Category	33.3%	20.0%	45.5%	36.8%
	No	Count	2	4	6	12
		% within Population Category	66.7%	80.0%	54.5%	63.2%
Total		Count	3	5	11	19
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use incident report data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use incident report data	Yes	Count	1	0	0	1	2
		% within Population Category	20.0%	.0%	.0%	2.9%	3.6%
	No	Count	4	2	14	33	53
		% within Population Category	80.0%	100.0%	100.0%	97.1%	96.4%
Total		Count	5	2	14	34	55
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use traffic stop data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Would use traffic stop data	Yes	Count	3	8	12	13	36
		% within Population Category	23.1%	32.0%	25.5%	18.6%	23.2%
	No	Count	10	17	35	57	119
		% within Population Category	76.9%	68.0%	74.5%	81.4%	76.8%
Total		Count	13	25	47	70	155
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use clearance rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Would use clearance rates	Yes	Count	1	8	7	22	38
		% within Population Category	11.1%	42.1%	9.7%	19.5%	17.8%
	No	Count	8	11	65	91	175
		% within Population Category	88.9%	57.9%	90.3%	80.5%	82.2%
Total		Count	9	19	72	113	213
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use drug/gun seizures * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use drug/gun seizures	Yes	Count	3	9	15	30	57
		% within Population Category	33.3%	20.5%	11.0%	14.6%	14.5%
	No	Count	6	35	121	175	337
		% within Population Category	66.7%	79.5%	89.0%	85.4%	85.5%
Total		Count	9	44	136	205	394
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use arrest data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use arrest data	Yes	Count	0	3	4	4	11
		% within Population Category	.0%	37.5%	18.2%	9.8%	15.1%
	No	Count	2	5	18	37	62
		% within Population Category	100.0%	62.5%	81.8%	90.2%	84.9%
Total		Count	2	8	22	41	73
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use police pursuits * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use police pursuits	Yes	Count	0	7	7	14	28
		% within Population Category	.0%	12.3%	6.6%	7.6%	7.6%
	No	Count	19	50	99	171	339
		% within Population Category	100.0%	87.7%	93.4%	92.4%	92.4%
Total		Count	19	57	106	185	367
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use hot spots data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use hot spots data	Yes	Count	1	11	26	53	91
		% within Population Category	14.3%	55.0%	36.6%	30.1%	33.2%
	No	Count	6	9	45	123	183
		% within Population Category	85.7%	45.0%	63.4%	69.9%	66.8%
Total		Count	7	20	71	176	274
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use state UCR data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use state UCR data	Yes	Count	0	0	2	3	5
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	4.8%	4.8%	3.9%
	No	Count	12	10	40	60	122
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	95.2%	95.2%	96.1%
Total		Count	12	10	42	63	127
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use victimization survey rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use victimization survey rates	Yes	Count	14	37	66	81	198
		% within Population Category	34.1%	43.0%	34.0%	24.7%	30.5%
	No	Count	27	49	128	247	451
		% within Population Category	65.9%	57.0%	66.0%	75.3%	69.5%
Total		Count	41	86	194	328	649
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use recidivism rates * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use recidivism rates	Yes	Count	14	41	51	74	180
		% within Population Category	34.1%	42.7%	25.9%	21.4%	26.5%
	No	Count	27	55	146	272	500
		% within Population Category	65.9%	57.3%	74.1%	78.6%	73.5%
Total		Count	41	96	197	346	680
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use disposition data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use disposition data	Yes	Count	9	18	34	33	94
		% within Population Category	34.6%	33.3%	26.6%	16.8%	23.3%
	No	Count	17	36	94	163	310
		% within Population Category	65.4%	66.7%	73.4%	83.2%	76.7%
Total		Count	26	54	128	196	404
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use court caseloads * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use court caseloads	Yes	Count	9	19	20	30	78
		% within Population Category	18.4%	20.4%	9.9%	9.3%	11.7%
	No	Count	40	74	183	292	589
		% within Population Category	81.6%	79.6%	90.1%	90.7%	88.3%
Total		Count	49	93	203	322	667
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use corrections data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use corrections data	Yes	Count	13	17	32	44	106
		% within Population Category	31.0%	20.0%	16.5%	12.8%	15.9%
	No	Count	29	68	162	301	560
		% within Population Category	69.0%	80.0%	83.5%	87.2%	84.1%
Total		Count	42	85	194	345	666
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use cost data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use cost data	Yes	Count	8	17	31	56	112
		% within Population Category	26.7%	23.9%	18.2%	21.6%	21.1%
	No	Count	22	54	139	203	418
		% within Population Category	73.3%	76.1%	81.8%	78.4%	78.9%
Total		Count	30	71	170	259	530
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use drug use surveys * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use drug use surveys	Yes	Count	10	27	43	64	144
		% within Population Category	20.8%	27.0%	20.7%	19.1%	20.8%
	No	Count	38	73	165	271	547
		% within Population Category	79.2%	73.0%	79.3%	80.9%	79.2%
Total		Count	48	100	208	335	691
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use other cj data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use other cj data	Yes	Count	2	4	4	2	12
		% within Population Category	4.0%	3.9%	1.9%	.6%	1.7%
	No	Count	48	99	207	357	711
		% within Population Category	96.0%	96.1%	98.1%	99.4%	98.3%
Total		Count	50	103	211	359	723
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 5: If not currently used, which of the following non-criminal justice data would be useful, if available? (check all that apply)

Would use emergency room data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use emergency room data	Yes	Count	15	23	46	61	145
		% within Population Category	31.9%	22.1%	21.3%	17.2%	20.1%
	No	Count	32	81	170	294	577
		% within Population Category	68.1%	77.9%	78.7%	82.8%	79.9%
Total		Count	47	104	216	355	722
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use medical examiner data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use medical examiner data	Yes	Count	6	13	25	26	70
		% within Population Category	17.6%	14.3%	13.3%	8.7%	11.4%
	No	Count	28	78	163	273	542
		% within Population Category	82.4%	85.7%	86.7%	91.3%	88.6%
Total		Count	34	91	188	299	612
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use census data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use census data	Yes	Count	4	10	22	32	68
		% within Population Category	57.1%	34.5%	30.6%	21.6%	26.6%
	No	Count	3	19	50	116	188
		% within Population Category	42.9%	65.5%	69.4%	78.4%	73.4%
Total		Count	7	29	72	148	256
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use treatment program data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use treatment program data	Yes	Count	11	36	44	49	140
		% within Population Category	23.4%	34.3%	20.7%	13.7%	19.4%
	No	Count	36	69	169	309	583
		% within Population Category	76.6%	65.7%	79.3%	86.3%	80.6%
Total		Count	47	105	213	358	723
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use education data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use education data	Yes	Count	12	24	23	49	108
		% within Population Category	27.9%	28.6%	13.1%	16.3%	17.9%
	No	Count	31	60	153	252	496
		% within Population Category	72.1%	71.4%	86.9%	83.7%	82.1%
Total		Count	43	84	176	301	604
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use health data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use health data	Yes	Count	7	20	20	30	77
		% within Population Category	13.5%	19.2%	9.4%	8.5%	10.7%
	No	Count	45	84	192	325	646
		% within Population Category	86.5%	80.8%	90.6%	91.5%	89.3%
Total		Count	52	104	212	355	723
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Would use other non-cj data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Would use other non-cj data	Yes	Count	0	0	2	3	5
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.9%	.8%	.7%
	No	Count	51	106	213	362	732
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	99.1%	99.2%	99.3%
Total		Count	51	106	215	365	737
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 6: How often do data and statistics help the performance of your agency in its functions?

How often use data to help performance * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How often use data to help performance	Very Often	Count	34	55	61	76	226
		% within Population Category	63.0%	50.9%	28.0%	20.8%	30.3%
	Often	Count	19	43	122	230	414
		% within Population Category	35.2%	39.8%	56.0%	63.0%	55.6%
	Seldom	Count	1	8	33	52	94
		% within Population Category	1.9%	7.4%	15.1%	14.2%	12.6%
	Rarely	Count	0	2	2	6	10
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.9%	.9%	1.6%	1.3%
	Never	Count	0	0	0	1	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%	.1%
Total		Count	54	108	218	365	745
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 7: How often do data and statistics affect the planning of programs or policies in your agency?

How often do data affect planning * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How often do data affect planning	Very Often	Count	24	41	40	62	167
		% within Population Category	44.4%	38.0%	18.5%	17.3%	22.7%
	Often	Count	27	56	133	238	454
		% within Population Category	50.0%	51.9%	61.6%	66.3%	61.6%
	Seldom	Count	2	8	40	55	105
		% within Population Category	3.7%	7.4%	18.5%	15.3%	14.2%
	Rarely	Count	1	3	3	3	10
		% within Population Category	1.9%	2.8%	1.4%	.8%	1.4%
	Never	Count	0	0	0	1	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	.3%	.1%
Total		Count	54	108	216	359	737
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 8: Which best describes the response of your agency's officers when they are required to gather data for records and reports?

Response of officers to gather data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Response of officers to gather data	Very Supportive	Count	5	7	12	27	51
		% within Population Category	9.4%	6.5%	5.5%	7.4%	6.9%
	Supportive	Count	34	66	135	206	441
		% within Population Category	64.2%	61.1%	61.9%	56.6%	59.4%
	Supportive/ Indifferent	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Indifferent	Count	13	26	55	107	201
		% within Population Category	24.5%	24.1%	25.2%	29.4%	27.1%
	Indifferent/ Unsupportive	Count	1	0	1	0	2
		% within Population Category	1.9%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.3%
	Unsupportive	Count	0	6	13	20	39
		% within Population Category	.0%	5.6%	6.0%	5.5%	5.2%
	Very Unsupportive	Count	0	3	1	4	8
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.8%	.5%	1.1%	1.1%
Total		Count	53	108	218	364	743
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 9: How thorough would your agency's officers be if required to record/report more data about incidents than they currently are?

How thorough would officers be * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How thorough would officers be	Very Thorough	Count	4	12	18	25	59
		% within Population Category	7.5%	11.1%	8.2%	6.9%	7.9%
	Very Thorough/Thorough	Count	0	1	0	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.9%	.0%	.0%	.1%
	Thorough	Count	23	28	95	139	285
		% within Population Category	43.4%	25.9%	43.4%	38.2%	38.3%
	Somewhat Thorough	Count	20	54	89	175	338
		% within Population Category	37.7%	50.0%	40.6%	48.1%	45.4%
	Not Very Thorough	Count	4	9	17	23	53
		% within Population Category	7.5%	8.3%	7.8%	6.3%	7.1%
	Not at all Thorough	Count	2	4	0	2	8
		% within Population Category	3.8%	3.7%	.0%	.5%	1.1%
Total		Count	53	108	219	364	744
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 10: Of the following possible changes, rank the top three that you think would be most helpful in increasing the use of data and statistics for decisionmaking in your agency. (1 = most important)

Rank of improved data entry * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rank of improved data entry	1	Count	17	20	43	69	149
		% within Population Category	53.1%	40.8%	42.6%	43.4%	43.7%
	2	Count	10	16	30	47	103
		% within Population Category	31.3%	32.7%	29.7%	29.6%	30.2%
	3	Count	5	13	28	43	89
		% within Population Category	15.6%	26.5%	27.7%	27.0%	26.1%
Total		Count	32	49	101	159	341
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rank of improved data quality * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rank of improved data quality	1	Count	18	37	44	70	169
		% within Population Category	51.4%	55.2%	39.6%	36.3%	41.6%
	2	Count	10	14	29	72	125
		% within Population Category	28.6%	20.9%	26.1%	37.3%	30.8%
	3	Count	7	16	38	51	112
		% within Population Category	20.0%	23.9%	34.2%	26.4%	27.6%
Total		Count	35	67	111	193	406
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rank of improved ability to extract from RMS * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rank of improved ability to extract from RMS	1	Count	16	26	63	110	215
		% within Population Category	45.7%	52.0%	44.7%	52.1%	49.2%
	2	Count	11	8	44	49	112
		% within Population Category	31.4%	16.0%	31.2%	23.2%	25.6%
	3	Count	8	16	34	52	110
		% within Population Category	22.9%	32.0%	24.1%	24.6%	25.2%
Total		Count	35	50	141	211	437
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rank of increased analysis capacity * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rank of increased analysis capacity	1	Count	5	14	57	78	154
		% within Population Category	17.9%	24.6%	43.8%	38.8%	37.0%
	2	Count	10	23	44	64	141
		% within Population Category	35.7%	40.4%	33.8%	31.8%	33.9%
	3	Count	13	20	29	59	121
		% within Population Category	46.4%	35.1%	22.3%	29.4%	29.1%
Total		Count	28	57	130	201	416
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rank of greater support from management * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rank of greater support from management	1	Count	3	6	14	12	35
		% within Population Category	33.3%	33.3%	48.3%	25.5%	34.0%
	2	Count	2	7	4	16	29
		% within Population Category	22.2%	38.9%	13.8%	34.0%	28.2%
	3	Count	4	5	11	19	39
		% within Population Category	44.4%	27.8%	37.9%	40.4%	37.9%
Total		Count	9	18	29	47	103
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rank of increased cooperation of other agencies * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rank of increased cooperation of other agencies	1	Count	1	3	10	13	27
		% within Population Category	16.7%	14.3%	23.8%	16.9%	18.5%
	2	Count	2	10	19	40	71
		% within Population Category	33.3%	47.6%	45.2%	51.9%	48.6%
	3	Count	3	8	13	24	48
		% within Population Category	50.0%	38.1%	31.0%	31.2%	32.9%
Total		Count	6	21	42	77	146
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rank of increased systems integration among agencies * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rank of increased systems integration among agencies	1	Count	4	17	28	60	109
		% within Population Category	22.2%	38.6%	29.8%	34.1%	32.8%
	2	Count	5	15	31	44	95
		% within Population Category	27.8%	34.1%	33.0%	25.0%	28.6%
	3	Count	9	12	35	72	128
		% within Population Category	50.0%	27.3%	37.2%	40.9%	38.6%
Total		Count	18	44	94	176	332
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Rank of other * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rank of other	1	Count	0	1	1	2	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	50.0%	14.3%	40.0%	26.7%
	3	Count	1	1	6	3	11
		% within Population Category	100.0%	50.0%	85.7%	60.0%	73.3%
Total		Count	1	2	7	5	15
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 11: Does your agency have a crime analysis unit?

Crime analysis unit * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Crime analysis unit	Yes	Count	50	103	154	161	468
		% within Population Category	94.3%	95.4%	71.0%	44.4%	63.2%
	No	Count	3	5	63	202	273
		% within Population Category	5.7%	4.6%	29.0%	55.6%	36.8%
Total		Count	53	108	217	363	741
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, how would you characterized your unit? (check all that apply)

Single, Recoded Based on S12 * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Single, Recoded Based on S12	Yes	Count	5	39	104	127	275
		% within Population Category	10.0%	37.9%	67.5%	78.9%	58.8%
	No	Count	45	64	50	34	193
		% within Population Category	90.0%	62.1%	32.5%	21.1%	41.2%
Total		Count	50	103	154	161	468
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Formal, authorized * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Formal, authorized	Yes	Count	26	48	33	19	126
		% within Population Category	52.0%	46.6%	21.7%	11.9%	27.2%
	No	Count	24	55	119	140	338
		% within Population Category	48.0%	53.4%	78.3%	88.1%	72.8%
Total		Count	50	103	152	159	464
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Embedded in another unit * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Embedded in another unit	Yes	Count	13	21	27	30	91
		% within Population Category	26.0%	20.4%	17.8%	19.0%	19.7%
	No	Count	37	82	125	128	372
		% within Population Category	74.0%	79.6%	82.2%	81.0%	80.3%
Total		Count	50	103	152	158	463
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Informal, ad hoc * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Informal, ad hoc	Yes	Count	4	2	10	26	42
		% within Population Category	8.0%	1.9%	6.6%	16.5%	9.1%
	No	Count	46	101	142	132	421
		% within Population Category	92.0%	98.1%	93.4%	83.5%	90.9%
Total		Count	50	103	152	158	463
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Distinct unit * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Distinct unit	Yes	Count	16	27	26	7	76
		% within Population Category	32.0%	26.2%	17.1%	4.4%	16.4%
	No	Count	34	76	126	151	387
		% within Population Category	68.0%	73.8%	82.9%	95.6%	83.6%
Total		Count	50	103	152	158	463
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Other type of unit * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Other type of unit	Yes	Count	4	3	6	4	17
		% within Population Category	8.0%	2.9%	3.9%	2.5%	3.7%
	No	Count	46	100	146	154	446
		% within Population Category	92.0%	97.1%	96.1%	97.5%	96.3%
Total		Count	50	103	152	158	463
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 12: How many analysts are in your unit?

Number of analysts * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Number of analysts	.00	Count	0	1	1	2	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.0%	.7%	1.3%	.9%
	.25	Count	0	0	0	1	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.2%
	.50	Count	0	0	2	0	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.0%	.5%
	1.00	Count	5	39	105	129	278
		% within Population Category	10.9%	40.2%	71.4%	84.3%	62.8%
	1.50	Count	0	2	3	0	5
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.1%	2.0%	.0%	1.1%
	2.00	Count	7	24	30	14	75
		% within Population Category	15.2%	24.7%	20.4%	9.2%	16.9%

Number of analysts * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Number of analysts	2.50	Count	0	2	0	0	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.1%	.0%	.0%	.5%
	3.00	Count	1	16	5	2	24
		% within Population Category	2.2%	16.5%	3.4%	1.3%	5.4%
	3.50	Count	0	0	0	1	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.2%
	4.00	Count	6	7	1	3	17
		% within Population Category	13.0%	7.2%	.7%	2.0%	3.8%
	5.00	Count	8	4	0	1	13
		% within Population Category	17.4%	4.1%	.0%	.7%	2.9%
	6.00	Count	2	2	0	0	4
		% within Population Category	4.3%	2.1%	.0%	.0%	.9%
	7.00	Count	2	0	0	0	2
		% within Population Category	4.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%
	8.00	Count	5	0	0	0	5
		% within Population Category	10.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.1%
	9.00	Count	1	0	0	0	1
		% within Population Category	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.2%
	10.00	Count	3	0	0	0	3
		% within Population Category	6.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%
	12.00	Count	3	0	0	0	3
		% within Population Category	6.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%
	13.00	Count	2	0	0	0	2
		% within Population Category	4.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.5%

Number of analysts * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Number of analysts	20.00	Count	1	0	0	0	1
		% within Population Category	2.2%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.2%
Total		Count	46	97	147	153	443
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Number of analyst categories * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Number of analyst categories	No Analysts	Count	0	1	1	2	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.0%	.7%	1.3%	.9%
	No Full-time Analysts	Count	0	0	2	1	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.4%	.7%	.7%
	1 Analyst	Count	5	39	105	129	278
		% within Population Category	10.9%	40.2%	71.4%	84.3%	62.8%
	2 - 5 Analysts	Count	22	55	39	21	137
		% within Population Category	47.8%	56.7%	26.5%	13.7%	30.9%
	6 - 10 Analysts	Count	13	2	0	0	15
		% within Population Category	28.3%	2.1%	.0%	.0%	3.4%
	More than 10 Analysts	Count	6	0	0	0	6
		% within Population Category	13.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.4%
Total		Count	46	97	147	153	443
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 13: What is the average educational level achieved by analysts in your agency/jurisdiction?

Average educational level * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Average educational level	High School	Count	2	7	10	24	43
		% within Population Category	4.2%	6.9%	5.9%	11.4%	8.1%
	Some College	Count	16	15	61	79	171
		% within Population Category	33.3%	14.9%	35.9%	37.4%	32.3%
	Undergraduate Degree	Count	25	63	63	78	229
		% within Population Category	52.1%	62.4%	37.1%	37.0%	43.2%
	Master's Degree	Count	4	13	29	21	67
		% within Population Category	8.3%	12.9%	17.1%	10.0%	12.6%
	Doctorate	Count	1	3	4	7	15
		% within Population Category	2.1%	3.0%	2.4%	3.3%	2.8%
	Other	Count	0	0	3	2	5
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.8%	.9%	.9%
Total		Count	48	101	170	211	530
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 14: Do analysts in your agency/jurisdiction receive special training, workshops, etc., to develop skills?

Do analysts receive training * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Do analysts receive training	Yes	Count	46	96	140	155	437
		% within Population Category	90.2%	93.2%	83.3%	69.5%	80.2%
	No	Count	5	7	28	68	108
		% within Population Category	9.8%	6.8%	16.7%	30.5%	19.8%
Total		Count	51	103	168	223	545
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, how are those efforts paid for?

How is training paid for * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How is training paid for	Agency	Count	25	61	106	112	304
		% within Population Category	58.1%	66.3%	79.1%	74.7%	72.6%
	Grants	Count	2	3	3	5	13
		% within Population Category	4.7%	3.3%	2.2%	3.3%	3.1%
	Analyst	Count	0	3	4	5	12
		% within Population Category	.0%	3.3%	3.0%	3.3%	2.9%
	Other	Count	1	0	3	2	6
		% within Population Category	2.3%	.0%	2.2%	1.3%	1.4%
	Multiple Sources	Count	15	25	18	26	84
		% within Population Category	34.9%	27.2%	13.4%	17.3%	20.0%
Total		Count	43	92	134	150	419
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Who provides crime analysis training for your agency? (check all that apply)

Training provided by agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Training provided by agency	Yes	Count	33	39	51	84	207
		% within Population Category	61.1%	36.1%	23.1%	22.8%	27.5%
	No	Count	21	69	170	285	545
		% within Population Category	38.9%	63.9%	76.9%	77.2%	72.5%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Training provided by outside contractor * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Training provided by outside contractor	Yes	Count	24	32	65	68	189
		% within Population Category	44.4%	29.6%	29.4%	18.4%	25.1%
	No	Count	30	76	156	301	563
		% within Population Category	55.6%	70.4%	70.6%	81.6%	74.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Training provided by professional associations * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Training provided by professional associations	Yes	Count	29	75	100	96	300
		% within Population Category	53.7%	69.4%	45.2%	26.0%	39.9%
	No	Count	25	33	121	273	452
		% within Population Category	46.3%	30.6%	54.8%	74.0%	60.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

No training provided * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
No training provided	Yes	Count	2	6	21	63	92
		% within Population Category	3.7%	5.6%	9.5%	17.1%	12.2%
	No	Count	52	102	200	306	660
		% within Population Category	96.3%	94.4%	90.5%	82.9%	87.8%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Training provided by other * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Training provided by other	Yes	Count	3	8	20	14	45
		% within Population Category	5.6%	7.4%	9.0%	3.8%	6.0%
	No	Count	51	100	201	355	707
		% within Population Category	94.4%	92.6%	91.0%	96.2%	94.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 16: How up-to-date do you consider your training for data collection and reporting?

How up-to-date is training * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How up-to-date is training	Very Up-to-date	Count	9	26	32	56	123
		% within Population Category	17.3%	24.3%	16.1%	17.7%	18.2%
	Up-to-date	Count	18	26	70	86	200
		% within Population Category	34.6%	24.3%	35.2%	27.1%	29.6%
	Up-to-data/Somewhat up-to-date	Count	0	1	0	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.9%	.0%	.0%	.1%
	Somewhat Up-to-date	Count	17	41	65	105	228
		% within Population Category	32.7%	38.3%	32.7%	33.1%	33.8%
	Somewhat Outdated	Count	8	11	20	48	87
		% within Population Category	15.4%	10.3%	10.1%	15.1%	12.9%
	Very Outdated	Count	0	2	12	22	36
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.9%	6.0%	6.9%	5.3%
Total		Count	52	107	199	317	675
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 17: How is crime analysis information disseminated within your agency? (check all that apply)

Data disseminated upon request * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Data disseminated upon request	Yes	Count	41	94	145	230	510
		% within Population Category	75.9%	87.0%	65.6%	62.3%	67.8%
	No	Count	13	14	76	139	242
		% within Population Category	24.1%	13.0%	34.4%	37.7%	32.2%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Data disseminated in formal reports * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Data disseminated in formal reports	Yes	Count	42	78	120	138	378
		% within Population Category	77.8%	72.2%	54.3%	37.4%	50.3%
	No	Count	12	30	101	231	374
		% within Population Category	22.2%	27.8%	45.7%	62.6%	49.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Data disseminated in memos/bulletins * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Data disseminated in memos/bulletins	Yes	Count	43	92	158	208	501
		% within Population Category	79.6%	85.2%	71.5%	56.4%	66.6%
	No	Count	11	16	63	161	251
		% within Population Category	20.4%	14.8%	28.5%	43.6%	33.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Data disseminated in other fashion * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Data disseminated in other fashion	Yes	Count	15	15	33	24	87
		% within Population Category	27.8%	13.9%	14.9%	6.5%	11.6%
	No	Count	39	93	188	345	665
		% within Population Category	72.2%	86.1%	85.1%	93.5%	88.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 18: Within your agency, how useful is the work of analysts as seen by:

Work seen by patrol officers * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Work seen by patrol officers	Very Useful	Count	13	25	25	24	87
		% within Population Category	25.5%	24.5%	13.5%	8.9%	14.3%
	Useful	Count	16	36	89	104	245
		% within Population Category	31.4%	35.3%	48.1%	38.5%	40.3%
	Somewhat Useful	Count	19	30	57	89	195
		% within Population Category	37.3%	29.4%	30.8%	33.0%	32.1%
	Rarely Useful	Count	3	11	13	43	70
		% within Population Category	5.9%	10.8%	7.0%	15.9%	11.5%
	Never Useful	Count	0	0	1	10	11
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	3.7%	1.8%
Total		Count	51	102	185	270	608
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Work seen by supervisors * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Work seen by supervisors	Very Useful	Count	23	42	65	74	204
		% within Population Category	46.9%	42.0%	36.5%	27.7%	34.3%
	Useful	Count	17	41	76	125	259
		% within Population Category	34.7%	41.0%	42.7%	46.8%	43.6%
	Somewhat Useful	Count	9	15	30	53	107
		% within Population Category	18.4%	15.0%	16.9%	19.9%	18.0%
	Rarely Useful	Count	0	2	6	12	20
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.0%	3.4%	4.5%	3.4%
	Never Useful	Count	0	0	1	3	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.6%	1.1%	.7%
Total		Count	49	100	178	267	594
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Work seen by detectives * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Work seen by detectives	Very Useful	Count	22	42	52	85	201
		% within Population Category	44.9%	41.6%	29.1%	31.8%	33.7%
	Useful	Count	17	37	85	118	257
		% within Population Category	34.7%	36.6%	47.5%	44.2%	43.1%
	Somewhat Useful	Count	9	19	34	48	110
		% within Population Category	18.4%	18.8%	19.0%	18.0%	18.5%
	Rarely Useful	Count	1	3	6	13	23
		% within Population Category	2.0%	3.0%	3.4%	4.9%	3.9%
	Never Useful	Count	0	0	2	3	5
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.1%	1.1%	.8%
Total		Count	49	101	179	267	596
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 19: Does your unit seek assistance in data analysis from outside agencies? (check all that apply)

Seek assistance from universities * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Seek assistance from universities	Yes	Count	20	24	28	26	98
		% within Population Category	37.0%	22.2%	12.7%	7.0%	13.0%
	No	Count	34	84	193	343	654
		% within Population Category	63.0%	77.8%	87.3%	93.0%	87.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Seek assistance from SACs * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Seek assistance from SACs	Yes	Count	3	9	13	10	35
		% within Population Category	5.6%	8.3%	5.9%	2.7%	4.7%
	No	Count	51	99	208	359	717
		% within Population Category	94.4%	91.7%	94.1%	97.3%	95.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Seek assistance from private consultants * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Seek assistance from private consultants	Yes	Count	5	13	12	13	43
		% within Population Category	9.3%	12.0%	5.4%	3.5%	5.7%
	No	Count	49	95	209	356	709
		% within Population Category	90.7%	88.0%	94.6%	96.5%	94.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Seek assistance from vendors * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Seek assistance from vendors	Yes	Count	7	13	24	32	76
		% within Population Category	13.0%	12.0%	10.9%	8.7%	10.1%
	No	Count	47	95	197	337	676
		% within Population Category	87.0%	88.0%	89.1%	91.3%	89.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Seek assistance from state UCR * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Seek assistance from state UCR	Yes	Count	15	31	61	106	213
		% within Population Category	27.8%	28.7%	27.6%	28.7%	28.3%
	No	Count	39	77	160	263	539
		% within Population Category	72.2%	71.3%	72.4%	71.3%	71.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Seek assistance from other law enforcement agencies * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Seek assistance from other law enforcement agencies	Yes	Count	14	41	90	106	251
		% within Population Category	25.9%	38.0%	40.7%	28.7%	33.4%
	No	Count	40	67	131	263	501
		% within Population Category	74.1%	62.0%	59.3%	71.3%	66.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Seek assistance from other * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Seek assistance from other	Yes	Count	1	2	16	11	30
		% within Population Category	1.9%	1.9%	7.2%	3.0%	4.0%
	No	Count	53	106	205	358	722
		% within Population Category	98.1%	98.1%	92.8%	97.0%	96.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 20: How receptive is your agency to assistance in data analysis from outside agencies?

Receptive to outside assistance * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Receptive to outside assistance	Very Receptive	Count	5	22	51	80	158
		% within Population Category	9.8%	20.6%	25.8%	24.4%	23.1%
	Receptive	Count	27	61	114	183	385
		% within Population Category	52.9%	57.0%	57.6%	55.8%	56.3%
	Indifferent	Count	15	19	23	47	104
		% within Population Category	29.4%	17.8%	11.6%	14.3%	15.2%
	Not Very Receptive	Count	4	5	8	14	31
		% within Population Category	7.8%	4.7%	4.0%	4.3%	4.5%
	Not at all Receptive	Count	0	0	2	4	6
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.0%	1.2%	.9%
Total		Count	51	107	198	328	684
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 21: What would concern analysts in your agency about assistance from external sources? (check all that apply)

Concern about confidentiality * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concern about confidentiality	Yes	Count	38	76	136	180	430
		% within Population Category	70.4%	70.4%	61.5%	48.8%	57.2%
	No	Count	16	32	85	189	322
		% within Population Category	29.6%	29.6%	38.5%	51.2%	42.8%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about integrity * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concern about integrity	Yes	Count	28	62	103	126	319
		% within Population Category	51.9%	57.4%	46.6%	34.1%	42.4%
	No	Count	26	46	118	243	433
		% within Population Category	48.1%	42.6%	53.4%	65.9%	57.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about manageable costs * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Concern about manageable costs	Yes	Count	27	58	99	153	337
		% within Population Category	50.0%	53.7%	44.8%	41.5%	44.8%
	No	Count	27	50	122	216	415
		% within Population Category	50.0%	46.3%	55.2%	58.5%	55.2%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about control of process * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Concern about control of process	Yes	Count	22	40	78	83	223
		% within Population Category	40.7%	37.0%	35.3%	22.5%	29.7%
	No	Count	32	68	143	286	529
		% within Population Category	59.3%	63.0%	64.7%	77.5%	70.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about other * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concer about other	Yes	Count	5	8	8	5	26
		% within Population Category	9.3%	7.4%	3.6%	1.4%	3.5%
	No	Count	49	100	213	364	726
		% within Population Category	90.7%	92.6%	96.4%	98.6%	96.5%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 22: How up-to-date do you consider the technology used in your agency for data collection and reporting?

How up-to-date is the technology * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How up-to-date is the technology	Very Up-to-date	Count	7	27	51	69	154
		% within Population Category	13.0%	25.2%	23.8%	19.6%	21.2%
	Up-to-date	Count	19	38	59	102	218
		% within Population Category	35.2%	35.5%	27.6%	29.0%	30.0%
	Somewhat Up-to-date	Count	16	29	64	119	228
		% within Population Category	29.6%	27.1%	29.9%	33.8%	31.4%
	Somewhat Outdated	Count	10	7	28	49	94
		% within Population Category	18.5%	6.5%	13.1%	13.9%	12.9%
	Very Outdated	Count	2	6	12	13	33
		% within Population Category	3.7%	5.6%	5.6%	3.7%	4.5%
Total		Count	54	107	214	352	727
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 23: How often does your agency update the technology used for data collection and reporting?

How often is technology updated * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How often is technology updated	Always	Count	3	5	12	12	32
		% within Population Category	5.6%	4.7%	5.7%	3.4%	4.4%
	Frequently	Count	16	43	72	124	255
		% within Population Category	29.6%	40.2%	34.0%	35.5%	35.3%
	Sometimes	Count	30	42	85	149	306
		% within Population Category	55.6%	39.3%	40.1%	42.7%	42.4%
	Seldom	Count	5	15	38	58	116
		% within Population Category	9.3%	14.0%	17.9%	16.6%	16.1%
	Never	Count	0	2	5	6	13
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.9%	2.4%	1.7%	1.8%
Total		Count	54	107	212	349	722
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 24: What has been your experience with vendors of data collection/reporting products in the following areas:

Experience with quality of product * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Experience with quality of product	Excellent	Count	1	7	5	13	26
		% within Population Category	2.0%	7.2%	2.8%	4.2%	4.1%
	Very Good	Count	11	29	48	66	154
		% within Population Category	22.4%	29.9%	26.5%	21.5%	24.3%
	Very Good/ Good	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.6%	.0%	.2%
	Good	Count	21	40	87	146	294
		% within Population Category	42.9%	41.2%	48.1%	47.6%	46.4%
	Fair	Count	14	17	29	68	128
		% within Population Category	28.6%	17.5%	16.0%	22.1%	20.2%
	Poor	Count	2	4	11	14	31
		% within Population Category	4.1%	4.1%	6.1%	4.6%	4.9%
Total		Count	49	97	181	307	634
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Experience with cost-effectiveness of product * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Experience with cost-effectiveness of product	Excellent	Count	0	0	5	7	12
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	2.8%	2.3%	1.9%
	Very Good	Count	5	15	22	41	83
		% within Population Category	10.4%	15.6%	12.4%	13.7%	13.3%
	Good	Count	22	32	68	111	233
		% within Population Category	45.8%	33.3%	38.2%	37.0%	37.5%
	Fair	Count	16	40	59	106	221
		% within Population Category	33.3%	41.7%	33.1%	35.3%	35.5%
	Poor	Count	5	9	24	35	73
		% within Population Category	10.4%	9.4%	13.5%	11.7%	11.7%
Total		Count	48	96	178	300	622
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Experience with quality of TA * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Experience with quality of TA	Excellent	Count	0	3	5	12	20
		% within Population Category	.0%	3.1%	2.8%	4.0%	3.2%
	Very Good	Count	11	19	27	59	116
		% within Population Category	22.9%	19.6%	15.1%	19.5%	18.5%
	Good	Count	15	31	71	99	216
		% within Population Category	31.3%	32.0%	39.7%	32.8%	34.5%
	Fair	Count	17	35	55	86	193
		% within Population Category	35.4%	36.1%	30.7%	28.5%	30.8%
	Poor	Count	5	9	21	46	81
		% within Population Category	10.4%	9.3%	11.7%	15.2%	12.9%
Total		Count	48	97	179	302	626
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Experience with cost-effectiveness of TA * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Experience with cost-effectiveness of TA	Excellent	Count	0	2	2	8	12
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.1%	1.1%	2.7%	1.9%
	Very Good	Count	6	12	25	41	84
		% within Population Category	13.0%	12.6%	14.1%	13.8%	13.6%
	Good	Count	13	28	71	98	210
		% within Population Category	28.3%	29.5%	40.1%	32.9%	34.1%
	Fair	Count	19	40	48	106	213
		% within Population Category	41.3%	42.1%	27.1%	35.6%	34.6%
	Poor	Count	8	13	31	45	97
		% within Population Category	17.4%	13.7%	17.5%	15.1%	15.7%
Total		Count	46	95	177	298	616
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 25: If you had more money for your technical capacities for data collection and reporting, on which area would you first spend it?

How would first spend additional funds * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How would first spend additional funds	Hardware	Count	4	9	20	38	71
		% within Population Category	7.5%	8.5%	9.5%	10.9%	9.9%
	Software	Count	11	32	73	128	244
		% within Population Category	20.8%	30.2%	34.6%	36.6%	33.9%
	Personnel Salaries	Count	7	10	13	20	50
		% within Population Category	13.2%	9.4%	6.2%	5.7%	6.9%
	Additional Staff	Count	21	18	47	61	147
		% within Population Category	39.6%	17.0%	22.3%	17.4%	20.4%
	Personnel Training	Count	8	14	29	38	89
		% within Population Category	15.1%	13.2%	13.7%	10.9%	12.4%
	Other	Count	1	1	3	3	8
		% within Population Category	1.9%	.9%	1.4%	.9%	1.1%
	Mixed Response	Count	1	22	26	62	111
		% within Population Category	1.9%	20.8%	12.3%	17.7%	15.4%
Total		Count	53	106	211	350	720
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 26: How often are data and statistical indicators used in your agency for:

Data used for budgeting decisions * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Data used for budgeting decisions	Always	Count	13	17	26	51	107
		% within Population Category	24.5%	16.5%	12.3%	14.2%	14.7%
	Frequently	Count	19	46	84	160	309
		% within Population Category	35.8%	44.7%	39.6%	44.7%	42.6%
	Sometimes	Count	15	35	84	121	255
		% within Population Category	28.3%	34.0%	39.6%	33.8%	35.1%
	Seldom	Count	5	5	17	22	49
		% within Population Category	9.4%	4.9%	8.0%	6.1%	6.7%
	Seldom/ Never	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Never	Count	1	0	0	4	5
		% within Population Category	1.9%	.0%	.0%	1.1%	.7%
Total		Count	53	103	212	358	726
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Data used fo personnel evaluations * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Data used fo personnel evaluations	Always	Count	5	5	23	45	78
		% within Population Category	10.2%	4.8%	11.0%	12.8%	10.9%
	Always/ Frequently	Count	0	0	0	2	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.3%
	Frequently	Count	17	39	67	115	238
		% within Population Category	34.7%	37.5%	32.1%	32.8%	33.4%
	Frequently/ Sometimes	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Sometimes	Count	16	37	67	112	232
		% within Population Category	32.7%	35.6%	32.1%	31.9%	32.5%
	Seldom	Count	9	13	32	56	110
		% within Population Category	18.4%	12.5%	15.3%	16.0%	15.4%
	Seldom/ Never	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Never	Count	2	10	18	21	51
		% within Population Category	4.1%	9.6%	8.6%	6.0%	7.2%
Total		Count	49	104	209	351	713
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Data used for promotion decisions * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Data used for promotion decisions	Always	Count	2	3	9	18	32
		% within Population Category	3.8%	2.9%	4.5%	5.2%	4.5%
	Frequently	Count	7	14	35	84	140
		% within Population Category	13.5%	13.6%	17.3%	24.1%	19.8%
	Sometimes	Count	18	34	78	124	254
		% within Population Category	34.6%	33.0%	38.6%	35.5%	36.0%
	Seldom	Count	11	31	42	67	151
		% within Population Category	21.2%	30.1%	20.8%	19.2%	21.4%
	Seldom/ Never	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Never	Count	14	21	37	56	128
		% within Population Category	26.9%	20.4%	18.3%	16.0%	18.1%
Total		Count	52	103	202	349	706
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Data used for policy decisions * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Data used for policy decisions	Always	Count	5	8	17	17	47
		% within Population Category	9.6%	7.8%	8.3%	4.9%	6.6%
	Frequently	Count	25	37	69	154	285
		% within Population Category	48.1%	35.9%	33.8%	44.0%	40.2%
	Sometimes	Count	17	49	89	146	301
		% within Population Category	32.7%	47.6%	43.6%	41.7%	42.5%
	Seldom	Count	4	6	25	28	63
		% within Population Category	7.7%	5.8%	12.3%	8.0%	8.9%
	Seldom/ Never	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Never	Count	1	3	3	5	12
		% within Population Category	1.9%	2.9%	1.5%	1.4%	1.7%
Total		Count	52	103	204	350	709
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Data used for policy evaluations * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Data used for policy evaluations	Always	Count	7	8	17	15	47
		% within Population Category	14.6%	7.5%	8.5%	4.3%	6.7%
	Frequently	Count	22	33	63	131	249
		% within Population Category	45.8%	31.1%	31.3%	37.6%	35.4%
	Sometimes	Count	14	50	89	153	306
		% within Population Category	29.2%	47.2%	44.3%	44.0%	43.5%
	Seldom	Count	4	11	27	42	84
		% within Population Category	8.3%	10.4%	13.4%	12.1%	11.9%
	Seldom/ Never	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Never	Count	1	4	4	7	16
		% within Population Category	2.1%	3.8%	2.0%	2.0%	2.3%
Total		Count	48	106	201	348	703
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 27: How often does your agency provide data to policymakers and/or community stakeholders for developing programs and policies?

How often provide data to community leaders * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
How often provide data to community leaders	3 or more times a week	Count	17	12	19	7	55
		% within Population Category	32.1%	11.3%	8.8%	2.0%	7.5%
	1-2 times a week	Count	18	23	34	47	122
		% within Population Category	34.0%	21.7%	15.7%	13.2%	16.7%
	1-2 times a month	Count	14	50	85	133	282
		% within Population Category	26.4%	47.2%	39.4%	37.3%	38.5%
	1-2 times a month/year	Count	0	0	0	2	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	.6%	.3%
	1-2 times a year	Count	4	19	71	142	236
		% within Population Category	7.5%	17.9%	32.9%	39.8%	32.2%
	1-2 times a year/Never	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.5%	.0%	.1%
	Never	Count	0	2	6	26	34
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.9%	2.8%	7.3%	4.6%
Total		Count	53	106	216	357	732
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 28: Does your agency have representation on a local, regional, or state criminal justice coordinating council, advisory board, or task force?

Representation on board or task force * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Representation on board or task force	Yes	Count	42	69	124	151	386
		% within Population Category	84.0%	69.0%	59.0%	43.1%	54.4%
	No	Count	8	31	86	199	324
		% within Population Category	16.0%	31.0%	41.0%	56.9%	45.6%
Total		Count	50	100	210	350	710
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, how receptive are the members of those bodies to using data to develop programs and policies?

Receptive of members to using data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Receptive of members to using data	Very Receptive	Count	12	17	22	34	85
		% within Population Category	30.0%	25.0%	18.8%	23.3%	22.9%
	Receptive	Count	25	42	76	104	247
		% within Population Category	62.5%	61.8%	65.0%	71.2%	66.6%
	Indifferent	Count	3	7	18	7	35
		% within Population Category	7.5%	10.3%	15.4%	4.8%	9.4%
	Not Very Receptive	Count	0	2	1	0	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.9%	.9%	.0%	.8%
	Not at all Receptive	Count	0	0	0	1	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	.7%	.3%
Total		Count	40	68	117	146	371
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 29: How would you rate the media's understanding and reporting of data and statistics that you provide them?

Rate of media's understanding of data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Rate of media's understanding of data	Excellent	Count	2	2	5	6	15
		% within Population Category	3.8%	1.9%	2.3%	1.7%	2.0%
	Very Good	Count	5	20	47	59	131
		% within Population Category	9.4%	18.5%	21.8%	16.5%	17.8%
	Good	Count	25	42	96	151	314
		% within Population Category	47.2%	38.9%	44.4%	42.3%	42.8%
	Good/Fair	Count	1	0	0	0	1
		% within Population Category	1.9%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
	Fair	Count	19	39	56	112	226
		% within Population Category	35.8%	36.1%	25.9%	31.4%	30.8%
	Poor	Count	1	5	12	29	47
		% within Population Category	1.9%	4.6%	5.6%	8.1%	6.4%
Total		Count	53	108	216	357	734
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 30: Does your agency provide a mechanism for data users to provide feedback?

Provide a feedback mechanism * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Provide a feedback mechanism	Yes	Count	30	58	82	119	289
		% within Population Category	56.6%	55.2%	38.3%	34.1%	40.1%
	No	Count	23	47	132	230	432
		% within Population Category	43.4%	44.8%	61.7%	65.9%	59.9%
Total		Count	53	105	214	349	721
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, do you receive feedback regarding:

Feedback received on data availability * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Feedback received on data availability	Positive Feedback	Count	10	16	27	34	87
		% within Population Category	34.5%	28.1%	35.1%	29.1%	31.1%
	Negative Feedback	Count	0	1	3	4	8
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.8%	3.9%	3.4%	2.9%
	Both	Count	19	35	44	72	170
		% within Population Category	65.5%	61.4%	57.1%	61.5%	60.7%
	None	Count	0	5	3	7	15
		% within Population Category	.0%	8.8%	3.9%	6.0%	5.4%
Total		Count	29	57	77	117	280
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Feedback received on data quality * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Feedback received on data quality	Positive Feedback	Count	9	17	25	32	83
		% within Population Category	34.6%	30.9%	32.9%	27.6%	30.4%
	Negative Feedback	Count	1	1	2	1	5
		% within Population Category	3.8%	1.8%	2.6%	.9%	1.8%
	Both	Count	16	31	44	74	165
		% within Population Category	61.5%	56.4%	57.9%	63.8%	60.4%
	None	Count	0	6	5	9	20
		% within Population Category	.0%	10.9%	6.6%	7.8%	7.3%
Total		Count	26	55	76	116	273
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Feedback received on data utility * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Feedback received on data utility	Positive Feedback	Count	8	14	23	27	72
		% within Population Category	29.6%	25.9%	30.7%	23.7%	26.7%
	Negative Feedback	Count	0	1	0	3	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.9%	.0%	2.6%	1.5%
	Both	Count	18	33	46	64	161
		% within Population Category	66.7%	61.1%	61.3%	56.1%	59.6%
	None	Count	1	6	6	20	33
		% within Population Category	3.7%	11.1%	8.0%	17.5%	12.2%
Total		Count	27	54	75	114	270
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Feedback received on improvements * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Feedback received on improvements	Positive Feedback	Count	11	14	22	26	73
		% within Population Category	40.7%	25.5%	28.2%	22.6%	26.5%
	Negative Feedback	Count	0	1	0	3	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.8%	.0%	2.6%	1.5%
	Both	Count	15	32	49	64	160
		% within Population Category	55.6%	58.2%	62.8%	55.7%	58.2%
	None	Count	1	8	7	22	38
		% within Population Category	3.7%	14.5%	9.0%	19.1%	13.8%
Total		Count	27	55	78	115	275
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 31: Is there currently a citywide or countywide integrated information systems project underway?

Integrated info system currently underway * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Integrated info system currently underway	Yes	Count	42	73	127	174	416
		% within Population Category	77.8%	68.9%	59.6%	48.6%	56.9%
	No	Count	12	33	86	184	315
		% within Population Category	22.2%	31.1%	40.4%	51.4%	43.1%
Total		Count	54	106	213	358	731
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, is your agency currently (or planning on) participating?

Agency participating * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Agency participating	Yes	Count	40	69	119	161	389
		% within Population Category	100.0%	97.2%	97.5%	95.3%	96.8%
	No	Count	0	2	3	8	13
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.8%	2.5%	4.7%	3.2%
Total		Count	40	71	122	169	402
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, what data are shared?

Sharing crime incident information * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Sharing crime incident information	Yes	Count	26	52	95	136	309
		% within Population Category	63.4%	75.4%	77.9%	82.9%	78.0%
	No	Count	15	17	27	28	87
		% within Population Category	36.6%	24.6%	22.1%	17.1%	22.0%
Total		Count	41	69	122	164	396
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sharing GIS data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Sharing GIS data	Yes	Count	17	27	61	61	166
		% within Population Category	41.5%	39.1%	50.4%	37.9%	42.3%
	No	Count	24	42	60	100	226
		% within Population Category	58.5%	60.9%	49.6%	62.1%	57.7%
Total		Count	41	69	121	161	392
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sharing person information * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Sharing person information	Yes	Count	19	48	77	104	248
		% within Population Category	46.3%	69.6%	63.6%	62.7%	62.5%
	No	Count	22	21	44	62	149
		% within Population Category	53.7%	30.4%	36.4%	37.3%	37.5%
Total		Count	41	69	121	166	397
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sharing auto information * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Sharing auto information	Yes	Count	11	29	54	59	153
		% within Population Category	27.5%	42.0%	44.3%	36.2%	38.8%
	No	Count	29	40	68	104	241
		% within Population Category	72.5%	58.0%	55.7%	63.8%	61.2%
Total		Count	40	69	122	163	394
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Sharing other information * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Sharing other information	Yes	Count	6	14	17	8	45
		% within Population Category	15.0%	19.7%	14.3%	5.0%	11.5%
	No	Count	34	57	102	153	346
		% within Population Category	85.0%	80.3%	85.7%	95.0%	88.5%
Total		Count	40	71	119	161	391
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 32: Does your agency use data systems that are integrated with systems of other departments/agencies?

Use systems integrated with other agencies * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Use systems integrated with other agencies	Yes	Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	75.9%	65.7%	61.9%	56.9%	61.0%
	No	Count	13	37	82	154	286
		% within Population Category	24.1%	34.3%	38.1%	43.1%	39.0%
Total		Count	54	108	215	357	734
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, which of the following departments/agencies participate? (check all that apply)

Share with other law enforcement agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with other law enforcement agency	Yes	Count	37	55	112	171	375
		% within Population Category	90.2%	77.5%	84.2%	84.2%	83.7%
	No	Count	4	16	21	32	73
		% within Population Category	9.8%	22.5%	15.8%	15.8%	16.3%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with court * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with court	Yes	Count	24	29	55	72	180
		% within Population Category	58.5%	40.8%	41.4%	35.5%	40.2%
	No	Count	17	42	78	131	268
		% within Population Category	41.5%	59.2%	58.6%	64.5%	59.8%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with corrections * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with corrections	Yes	Count	16	16	27	46	105
		% within Population Category	39.0%	22.5%	20.3%	22.7%	23.4%
	No	Count	25	55	106	157	343
		% within Population Category	61.0%	77.5%	79.7%	77.3%	76.6%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with probation * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with probation	Yes	Count	13	19	27	36	95
		% within Population Category	31.7%	26.8%	20.3%	17.7%	21.2%
	No	Count	28	52	106	167	353
		% within Population Category	68.3%	73.2%	79.7%	82.3%	78.8%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with public defender * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with public defender	Yes	Count	4	7	7	9	27
		% within Population Category	9.8%	9.9%	5.3%	4.4%	6.0%
	No	Count	37	64	126	194	421
		% within Population Category	90.2%	90.1%	94.7%	95.6%	94.0%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with juvenile services * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with juvenile services	Yes	Count	7	9	19	28	63
		% within Population Category	17.1%	12.7%	14.3%	13.8%	14.1%
	No	Count	34	62	114	175	385
		% within Population Category	82.9%	87.3%	85.7%	86.2%	85.9%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with dmv * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with dmv	Yes	Count	21	20	45	77	163
		% within Population Category	51.2%	28.2%	33.8%	37.9%	36.4%
	No	Count	20	51	88	126	285
		% within Population Category	48.8%	71.8%	66.2%	62.1%	63.6%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with fire department * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with fire department	Yes	Count	10	14	24	46	94
		% within Population Category	24.4%	19.7%	18.0%	22.7%	21.0%
	No	Count	31	57	109	157	354
		% within Population Category	75.6%	80.3%	82.0%	77.3%	79.0%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with parole * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with parole	Yes	Count	11	16	27	25	79
		% within Population Category	26.8%	22.5%	20.3%	12.3%	17.6%
	No	Count	30	55	106	178	369
		% within Population Category	73.2%	77.5%	79.7%	87.7%	82.4%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with prosecution * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with prosecution	Yes	Count	12	17	25	39	93
		% within Population Category	29.3%	23.9%	18.8%	19.2%	20.8%
	No	Count	29	54	108	164	355
		% within Population Category	70.7%	76.1%	81.2%	80.8%	79.2%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with other cj agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with other cj agency	Yes	Count	7	13	13	22	55
		% within Population Category	17.1%	18.3%	9.8%	10.8%	12.3%
	No	Count	34	58	120	181	393
		% within Population Category	82.9%	81.7%	90.2%	89.2%	87.7%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with child support agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with child support agency	Yes	Count	3	3	6	10	22
		% within Population Category	7.3%	4.2%	4.5%	4.9%	4.9%
	No	Count	38	68	127	193	426
		% within Population Category	92.7%	95.8%	95.5%	95.1%	95.1%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with social services * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with social services	Yes	Count	5	5	8	12	30
		% within Population Category	12.2%	7.0%	6.0%	5.9%	6.7%
	No	Count	36	66	125	191	418
		% within Population Category	87.8%	93.0%	94.0%	94.1%	93.3%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with health department * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with health department	Yes	Count	1	3	4	5	13
		% within Population Category	2.4%	4.2%	3.0%	2.5%	2.9%
	No	Count	40	68	129	198	435
		% within Population Category	97.6%	95.8%	97.0%	97.5%	97.1%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with education * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with education	Yes	Count	4	2	5	6	17
		% within Population Category	9.8%	2.8%	3.8%	3.0%	3.8%
	No	Count	37	69	128	197	431
		% within Population Category	90.2%	97.2%	96.2%	97.0%	96.2%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with public utilities * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with public utilities	Yes	Count	10	6	9	12	37
		% within Population Category	24.4%	8.5%	6.8%	5.9%	8.3%
	No	Count	31	65	124	191	411
		% within Population Category	75.6%	91.5%	93.2%	94.1%	91.7%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with planning/zoning * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with planning/zoning	Yes	Count	6	9	18	14	47
		% within Population Category	14.6%	12.7%	13.5%	6.9%	10.5%
	No	Count	35	62	115	189	401
		% within Population Category	85.4%	87.3%	86.5%	93.1%	89.5%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with transportation * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with transportation	Yes	Count	7	3	3	5	18
		% within Population Category	17.1%	4.2%	2.3%	2.5%	4.0%
	No	Count	34	68	130	198	430
		% within Population Category	82.9%	95.8%	97.7%	97.5%	96.0%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with victim support groups * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with victim support groups	Yes	Count	3	3	7	8	21
		% within Population Category	7.3%	4.2%	5.3%	3.9%	4.7%
	No	Count	38	68	126	195	427
		% within Population Category	92.7%	95.8%	94.7%	96.1%	95.3%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with public works * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with public works	Yes	Count	6	7	17	15	45
		% within Population Category	14.6%	9.9%	12.8%	7.4%	10.0%
	No	Count	35	64	116	188	403
		% within Population Category	85.4%	90.1%	87.2%	92.6%	90.0%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with other non-cj agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with other non-cj agency	Yes	Count	4	0	6	3	13
		% within Population Category	9.8%	.0%	4.5%	1.5%	2.9%
	No	Count	37	71	127	200	435
		% within Population Category	90.2%	100.0%	95.5%	98.5%	97.1%
Total		Count	41	71	133	203	448
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 33: If your agency uses a data system that is integrated with the systems of other departments/agencies, does your agency maintain it?

Maintains integrated data system * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Maintains integrated data system	Yes	Count	22	25	46	66	159
		% within Population Category	56.4%	37.3%	35.7%	33.3%	36.7%
	No	Count	17	42	81	132	272
		% within Population Category	43.6%	62.7%	62.8%	66.7%	62.8%
	Shared Responsibility	Count	0	0	2	0	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.6%	.0%	.5%
Total		Count	39	67	129	198	433
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If no, who does? (recoded into categories)

Who maintains integrated data system * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Who maintains integrated data system	State	Count	1	2	6	21	30
		% within Population Category	7.1%	5.7%	10.2%	17.9%	13.3%
	County	Count	4	17	23	40	84
		% within Population Category	28.6%	48.6%	39.0%	34.2%	37.3%
	Other LE Agency	Count	2	3	11	12	28
		% within Population Category	14.3%	8.6%	18.6%	10.3%	12.4%
	Regional	Count	1	2	1	6	10
		% within Population Category	7.1%	5.7%	1.7%	5.1%	4.4%
	City	Count	1	6	8	11	26
		% within Population Category	7.1%	17.1%	13.6%	9.4%	11.6%
	Other	Count	5	5	10	27	47
		% within Population Category	35.7%	14.3%	16.9%	23.1%	20.9%
Total		Count	14	35	59	117	225
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 34: Does your agency have access to a data system that allows the tracking of offenders over time?

System to track offenders over time * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
System to track offenders over time	Yes	Count	33	72	119	178	402
		% within Population Category	67.3%	67.3%	55.6%	50.4%	55.6%
	No	Count	16	35	95	175	321
		% within Population Category	32.7%	32.7%	44.4%	49.6%	44.4%
Total		Count	49	107	214	353	723
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, does this sytem include: (check all that apply)

System includes arrest history * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
System includes arrest history	Yes	Count	33	68	115	171	387
		% within Population Category	100.0%	94.4%	96.6%	96.1%	96.3%
	No	Count	0	4	4	7	15
		% within Population Category	.0%	5.6%	3.4%	3.9%	3.7%
Total		Count	33	72	119	178	402
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

System includes jail data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
System includes jail data	Yes	Count	19	42	64	102	227
		% within Population Category	57.6%	58.3%	53.8%	57.3%	56.5%
	No	Count	14	30	55	76	175
		% within Population Category	42.4%	41.7%	46.2%	42.7%	43.5%
Total		Count	33	72	119	178	402
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

System includes court data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
System includes court data	Yes	Count	23	41	65	100	229
		% within Population Category	69.7%	56.9%	54.6%	56.2%	57.0%
	No	Count	10	31	54	78	173
		% within Population Category	30.3%	43.1%	45.4%	43.8%	43.0%
Total		Count	33	72	119	178	402
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

System includes probation/parole data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
System includes probation/parole data	Yes	Count	18	40	49	66	173
		% within Population Category	54.5%	55.6%	41.2%	37.1%	43.0%
	No	Count	15	32	70	112	229
		% within Population Category	45.5%	44.4%	58.8%	62.9%	57.0%
Total		Count	33	72	119	178	402
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

System includes other data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
System includes other data	Yes	Count	1	4	1	14	20
		% within Population Category	3.0%	5.6%	.8%	7.9%	5.0%
	No	Count	32	68	118	164	382
		% within Population Category	97.0%	94.4%	99.2%	92.1%	95.0%
Total		Count	33	72	119	178	402
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 35: For each agency listed below, indicate whether your department: sends data to thae agency, receives data from the agency, or both sends data to and receives data from the agency.

Share with other law enforcement agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with other law enforcement agency	Sends data	Count	5	9	14	18	46
		% within Population Category	10.9%	9.3%	7.8%	6.3%	7.6%
	Receives data	Count	3	1	5	8	17
		% within Population Category	6.5%	1.0%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	38	85	156	246	525
		% within Population Category	82.6%	87.6%	86.7%	86.6%	86.5%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	2	5	12	19
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.1%	2.8%	4.2%	3.1%
Total		Count	46	97	180	284	607
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with court * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with court	Sends data	Count	7	14	38	59	118
		% within Population Category	16.7%	20.6%	25.5%	25.4%	24.0%
	Receives data	Count	9	15	15	28	67
		% within Population Category	21.4%	22.1%	10.1%	12.1%	13.6%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	26	38	93	141	298
		% within Population Category	61.9%	55.9%	62.4%	60.8%	60.7%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	3	4	8
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.5%	2.0%	1.7%	1.6%
Total		Count	42	68	149	232	491
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with corrections * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with corrections	Sends data	Count	1	3	16	22	42
		% within Population Category	2.9%	5.9%	15.5%	14.4%	12.3%
	Receives data	Count	21	23	41	69	154
		% within Population Category	61.8%	45.1%	39.8%	45.1%	45.2%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	12	25	44	61	142
		% within Population Category	35.3%	49.0%	42.7%	39.9%	41.6%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	0	2	1	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.9%	.7%	.9%
Total		Count	34	51	103	153	341
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with probation * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with probation	Sends data	Count	0	9	19	32	60
		% within Population Category	.0%	15.3%	17.6%	19.2%	16.6%
	Receives data	Count	11	20	28	40	99
		% within Population Category	40.7%	33.9%	25.9%	24.0%	27.4%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	16	30	60	90	196
		% within Population Category	59.3%	50.8%	55.6%	53.9%	54.3%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	0	1	5	6
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.9%	3.0%	1.7%
Total		Count	27	59	108	167	361
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with public defender * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with public defender	Sends data	Count	7	12	35	47	101
		% within Population Category	50.0%	60.0%	62.5%	64.4%	62.0%
	Receives data	Count	1	3	5	5	14
		% within Population Category	7.1%	15.0%	8.9%	6.8%	8.6%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	6	5	16	21	48
		% within Population Category	42.9%	25.0%	28.6%	28.8%	29.4%
Total		Count	14	20	56	73	163
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with juvenile services * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with juvenile services	Sends data	Count	4	14	30	41	89
		% within Population Category	16.0%	27.5%	27.8%	22.9%	24.5%
	Receives data	Count	6	5	9	13	33
		% within Population Category	24.0%	9.8%	8.3%	7.3%	9.1%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	15	31	68	120	234
		% within Population Category	60.0%	60.8%	63.0%	67.0%	64.5%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	1	5	7
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.0%	.9%	2.8%	1.9%
Total		Count	25	51	108	179	363
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with dmv * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with dmv	Sends data	Count	1	5	15	13	34
		% within Population Category	2.9%	7.8%	10.9%	5.8%	7.4%
	Receives data	Count	22	34	61	91	208
		% within Population Category	62.9%	53.1%	44.5%	40.3%	45.0%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	12	24	60	116	212
		% within Population Category	34.3%	37.5%	43.8%	51.3%	45.9%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	1	6	8
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.6%	.7%	2.7%	1.7%
Total		Count	35	64	137	226	462
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with fire department * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with fire department	Sends data	Count	2	2	7	24	35
		% within Population Category	9.5%	4.8%	8.1%	17.6%	12.3%
	Receives data	Count	3	4	5	9	21
		% within Population Category	14.3%	9.5%	5.8%	6.6%	7.4%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	16	36	73	99	224
		% within Population Category	76.2%	85.7%	84.9%	72.8%	78.6%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	0	1	4	5
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.2%	2.9%	1.8%
Total		Count	21	42	86	136	285
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with prosecution * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with prosecution	Sends data	Count	6	20	33	43	102
		% within Population Category	18.8%	28.2%	27.7%	21.4%	24.1%
	Receives data	Count	9	7	14	27	57
		% within Population Category	28.1%	9.9%	11.8%	13.4%	13.5%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	17	42	70	124	253
		% within Population Category	53.1%	59.2%	58.8%	61.7%	59.8%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	2	2	7	11
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.8%	1.7%	3.5%	2.6%
Total		Count	32	71	119	201	423
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with parole * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with parole	Sends data	Count	5	7	21	29	62
		% within Population Category	16.7%	11.9%	21.2%	19.3%	18.3%
	Receives data	Count	11	16	25	30	82
		% within Population Category	36.7%	27.1%	25.3%	20.0%	24.3%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	14	35	51	90	190
		% within Population Category	46.7%	59.3%	51.5%	60.0%	56.2%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	2	1	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	1.7%	2.0%	.7%	1.2%
Total		Count	30	59	99	150	338
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with other cj agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category			
			100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with other cj agency	Sends data	Count	0	2	2	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	100.0%	18.2%	25.0%
	Receives data	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	9.1%	6.3%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	3	0	6	9
		% within Population Category	100.0%	.0%	54.5%	56.3%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	0	2	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	18.2%	12.5%
Total		Count	3	2	11	16
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with child support agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with child support agency	Sends data	Count	4	9	17	37	67
		% within Population Category	36.4%	39.1%	36.2%	39.8%	38.5%
	Receives data	Count	4	3	6	12	25
		% within Population Category	36.4%	13.0%	12.8%	12.9%	14.4%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	3	11	24	41	79
		% within Population Category	27.3%	47.8%	51.1%	44.1%	45.4%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	0	0	3	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	3.2%	1.7%
Total		Count	11	23	47	93	174
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with social services * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with social services	Sends data	Count	6	12	28	33	79
		% within Population Category	35.3%	33.3%	36.8%	28.0%	32.0%
	Receives data	Count	4	2	7	12	25
		% within Population Category	23.5%	5.6%	9.2%	10.2%	10.1%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	7	21	40	68	136
		% within Population Category	41.2%	58.3%	52.6%	57.6%	55.1%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	1	5	7
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.8%	1.3%	4.2%	2.8%
Total		Count	17	36	76	118	247
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with health department * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with health department	Sends data	Count	4	9	14	25	52
		% within Population Category	36.4%	45.0%	34.1%	33.3%	35.4%
	Receives data	Count	3	3	6	16	28
		% within Population Category	27.3%	15.0%	14.6%	21.3%	19.0%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	4	8	21	32	65
		% within Population Category	36.4%	40.0%	51.2%	42.7%	44.2%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	0	0	2	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.7%	1.4%
Total		Count	11	20	41	75	147
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with education * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with education	Sends data	Count	5	7	19	14	45
		% within Population Category	35.7%	25.0%	38.8%	17.9%	26.6%
	Receives data	Count	4	2	5	11	22
		% within Population Category	28.6%	7.1%	10.2%	14.1%	13.0%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	5	19	24	51	99
		% within Population Category	35.7%	67.9%	49.0%	65.4%	58.6%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	0	1	2	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	2.0%	2.6%	1.8%
Total		Count	14	28	49	78	169
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with public utilities * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with public utilities	Sends data	Count	2	2	7	17	28
		% within Population Category	11.8%	10.0%	14.3%	24.6%	18.1%
	Receives data	Count	14	11	28	28	81
		% within Population Category	82.4%	55.0%	57.1%	40.6%	52.3%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	1	6	14	22	43
		% within Population Category	5.9%	30.0%	28.6%	31.9%	27.7%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	0	2	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	5.0%	.0%	2.9%	1.9%
Total		Count	17	20	49	69	155
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with planning/zoning * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with planning/zoning	Sends data	Count	4	7	16	16	43
		% within Population Category	19.0%	15.9%	24.2%	16.5%	18.9%
	Receives data	Count	6	9	9	21	45
		% within Population Category	28.6%	20.5%	13.6%	21.6%	19.7%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	11	27	40	57	135
		% within Population Category	52.4%	61.4%	60.6%	58.8%	59.2%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	1	3	5
		% within Population Category	.0%	2.3%	1.5%	3.1%	2.2%
Total		Count	21	44	66	97	228
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with transportation * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Share with transportation	Sends data	Count	3	6	10	13	32
		% within Population Category	20.0%	30.0%	27.8%	30.2%	28.1%
	Receives data	Count	6	4	11	8	29
		% within Population Category	40.0%	20.0%	30.6%	18.6%	25.4%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	6	9	15	20	50
		% within Population Category	40.0%	45.0%	41.7%	46.5%	43.9%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	0	2	3
		% within Population Category	.0%	5.0%	.0%	4.7%	2.6%
Total		Count	15	20	36	43	114
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with victim support groups * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Share with victim support groups	Sends data	Count	2	8	15	22	47
		% within Population Category	15.4%	25.8%	21.4%	20.8%	21.4%
	Receives data	Count	3	3	5	13	24
		% within Population Category	23.1%	9.7%	7.1%	12.3%	10.9%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	8	19	49	68	144
		% within Population Category	61.5%	61.3%	70.0%	64.2%	65.5%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	1	3	5
		% within Population Category	.0%	3.2%	1.4%	2.8%	2.3%
Total		Count	13	31	70	106	220
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with public works * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with public works	Sends data	Count	6	12	26	40	84
		% within Population Category	42.9%	36.4%	38.8%	38.1%	38.4%
	Receives data	Count	4	5	9	10	28
		% within Population Category	28.6%	15.2%	13.4%	9.5%	12.8%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	4	16	31	52	103
		% within Population Category	28.6%	48.5%	46.3%	49.5%	47.0%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	0	1	3	4
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	1.5%	2.9%	1.8%
Total		Count	14	33	67	105	219
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Share with other non-cj agency * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Share with other non-cj agency	Sends data	Count	2	2	2	0	6
		% within Population Category	100.0%	66.7%	66.7%	.0%	60.0%
	Receives data	Count	0	0	0	1	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	10.0%
	Both sends and receives data	Count	0	0	1	0	1
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	10.0%
	Checked but not specified	Count	0	1	0	1	2
		% within Population Category	.0%	33.3%	.0%	50.0%	20.0%
Total		Count	2	3	3	2	10
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 36: How successful are the data sharing efforts that you participate in?

Success of data sharing efforts * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Success of data sharing efforts	Very Successful	Count	3	7	17	22	49
		% within Population Category	5.8%	6.7%	8.5%	6.7%	7.1%
	Successful	Count	24	42	100	139	305
		% within Population Category	46.2%	40.0%	49.8%	42.1%	44.3%
	Somewhat Successful	Count	22	53	67	132	274
		% within Population Category	42.3%	50.5%	33.3%	40.0%	39.8%
	Not Very Successful	Count	3	3	12	31	49
		% within Population Category	5.8%	2.9%	6.0%	9.4%	7.1%
	Unsuccessful	Count	0	0	5	6	11
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	2.5%	1.8%	1.6%
Total		Count	52	105	201	330	688
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 37: How do the technical capacities of your agency compare with neighboring jurisdictions?

Comparison of technical capacities * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Comparison of technical capacities	Better Than Others	Count	35	53	107	166	361
		% within Population Category	67.3%	50.0%	50.0%	46.8%	49.7%
	Same as Others	Count	8	31	62	127	228
		% within Population Category	15.4%	29.2%	29.0%	35.8%	31.4%
	Worse than Others	Count	2	6	24	26	58
		% within Population Category	3.8%	5.7%	11.2%	7.3%	8.0%
	Don't Know	Count	5	15	21	34	75
		% within Population Category	9.6%	14.2%	9.8%	9.6%	10.3%
	Depends/Mixed Response	Count	2	1	0	2	5
		% within Population Category	3.8%	.9%	.0%	.6%	.7%
Total		Count	52	106	214	355	727
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 38: What would concern your agency about sharing data with other criminal justice agencies? (check all that apply)

Concern about confidentiality * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concern about confidentiality	Yes	Count	38	83	144	241	506
		% within Population Category	70.4%	76.9%	65.2%	65.3%	67.3%
	No	Count	16	25	77	128	246
		% within Population Category	29.6%	23.1%	34.8%	34.7%	32.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about integrity * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concern about integrity	Yes	Count	36	58	121	171	386
		% within Population Category	66.7%	53.7%	54.8%	46.3%	51.3%
	No	Count	18	50	100	198	366
		% within Population Category	33.3%	46.3%	45.2%	53.7%	48.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about costs * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concern about costs	Yes	Count	35	57	112	188	392
		% within Population Category	64.8%	52.8%	50.7%	50.9%	52.1%
	No	Count	19	51	109	181	360
		% within Population Category	35.2%	47.2%	49.3%	49.1%	47.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about manpower * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concern about manpower	Yes	Count	15	39	76	106	236
		% within Population Category	27.8%	36.1%	34.4%	28.7%	31.4%
	No	Count	39	69	145	263	516
		% within Population Category	72.2%	63.9%	65.6%	71.3%	68.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about control over process * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concern about control over process	Yes	Count	22	38	63	95	218
		% within Population Category	40.7%	35.2%	28.5%	25.7%	29.0%
	No	Count	32	70	158	274	534
		% within Population Category	59.3%	64.8%	71.5%	74.3%	71.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Concern about other * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Concern about other	Yes	Count	4	2	6	4	16
		% within Population Category	7.4%	1.9%	2.7%	1.1%	2.1%
	No	Count	50	106	215	365	736
		% within Population Category	92.6%	98.1%	97.3%	98.9%	97.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 39: Does your agency collect and report incident-based (NIBRS) data?

NIBRS Recode * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
NIBRS Recode	Yes	Count	10	34	73	157	274
		% within Population Category	18.5%	32.4%	34.1%	44.7%	37.8%
	No	Count	44	71	141	194	450
		% within Population Category	81.5%	67.6%	65.9%	55.3%	62.2%
Total		Count	54	105	214	351	724
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If no, has your agency ever collected and reported NIBRS data?

Ever collected and reported incident-based data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Ever collected and reported incident-based data	Yes	Count	5	3	11	11	30
		% within Population Category	12.8%	4.9%	8.7%	7.0%	7.8%
	No	Count	34	58	116	146	354
		% within Population Category	87.2%	95.1%	91.3%	93.0%	92.2%
Total		Count	39	61	127	157	384
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Does your agency plan to report NIBRS data?

Plan to report NIBRS data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Plan to report NIBRS data	Within the next year	Count	10	11	20	22	63
		% within Population Category	25.0%	16.7%	15.0%	12.5%	15.2%
	With the next 3 years	Count	11	17	15	37	80
		% within Population Category	27.5%	25.8%	11.3%	21.0%	19.3%
	No definite plan	Count	18	37	89	103	247
		% within Population Category	45.0%	56.1%	66.9%	58.5%	59.5%
	Never	Count	1	1	9	14	25
		% within Population Category	2.5%	1.5%	6.8%	8.0%	6.0%
Total		Count	40	66	133	176	415
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 40: If you are collecting NIBRS data, which of the following obstacles to collecting and reporting NIBRS has your agency experienced?
If your agency is not currently collecting NIBRS data, which of the following issues have been issues for your agency? (check all that apply)

Issue with redesign and forms * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with redesign and forms	Yes	Count	28	51	80	130	289
		% within Population Category	51.9%	47.2%	36.2%	35.2%	38.4%
	No	Count	26	57	141	239	463
		% within Population Category	48.1%	52.8%	63.8%	64.8%	61.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with updating RMS * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with updating RMS	Yes	Count	28	53	97	158	336
		% within Population Category	51.9%	49.1%	43.9%	42.8%	44.7%
	No	Count	26	55	124	211	416
		% within Population Category	48.1%	50.9%	56.1%	57.2%	55.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with upgrading software/hardware * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with upgrading software/hardware	Yes	Count	23	52	90	158	323
		% within Population Category	42.6%	48.1%	40.7%	42.8%	43.0%
	No	Count	31	56	131	211	429
		% within Population Category	57.4%	51.9%	59.3%	57.2%	57.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with rewriting software programs * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with rewriting software programs	Yes	Count	26	39	62	83	210
		% within Population Category	48.1%	36.1%	28.1%	22.5%	27.9%
	No	Count	28	69	159	286	542
		% within Population Category	51.9%	63.9%	71.9%	77.5%	72.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with implementing at street level * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with implementing at street level	Yes	Count	20	43	71	104	238
		% within Population Category	37.0%	39.8%	32.1%	28.2%	31.6%
	No	Count	34	65	150	265	514
		% within Population Category	63.0%	60.2%	67.9%	71.8%	68.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with upgrading infrastructure * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with upgrading infrastructure	Yes	Count	17	28	44	72	161
		% within Population Category	31.5%	25.9%	19.9%	19.5%	21.4%
	No	Count	37	80	177	297	591
		% within Population Category	68.5%	74.1%	80.1%	80.5%	78.6%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with hiring additional staff * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with hiring additional staff	Yes	Count	20	35	63	95	213
		% within Population Category	37.0%	32.4%	28.5%	25.7%	28.3%
	No	Count	34	73	158	274	539
		% within Population Category	63.0%	67.6%	71.5%	74.3%	71.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with training personnel * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with training personnel	Yes	Count	26	52	92	184	354
		% within Population Category	48.1%	48.1%	41.6%	49.9%	47.1%
	No	Count	28	56	129	185	398
		% within Population Category	51.9%	51.9%	58.4%	50.1%	52.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with quality ocntrol * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Issue with quality ocntrol	Yes	Count	20	51	61	109	241
		% within Population Category	37.0%	47.2%	27.6%	29.5%	32.0%
	No	Count	34	57	160	260	511
		% within Population Category	63.0%	52.8%	72.4%	70.5%	68.0%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with increasing volume and complexity of data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				Total
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	
Issue with increasing volume and complexity of data	Yes	Count	24	49	60	99	232
		% within Population Category	44.4%	45.4%	27.1%	26.8%	30.9%
	No	Count	30	59	161	270	520
		% within Population Category	55.6%	54.6%	72.9%	73.2%	69.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with other cost obstacle * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with other cost obstacle	Yes	Count	1	4	9	14	28
		% within Population Category	1.9%	3.7%	4.1%	3.8%	3.7%
	No	Count	53	104	212	355	724
		% within Population Category	98.1%	96.3%	95.9%	96.2%	96.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with lack of priority of policymakers * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with lack of priority of policymakers	Yes	Count	15	23	40	70	148
		% within Population Category	27.8%	21.3%	18.1%	19.0%	19.7%
	No	Count	39	85	181	299	604
		% within Population Category	72.2%	78.7%	81.9%	81.0%	80.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with research perception of NIBRS * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with research perception of NIBRS	Yes	Count	11	24	34	71	140
		% within Population Category	20.4%	22.2%	15.4%	19.2%	18.6%
	No	Count	43	84	187	298	612
		% within Population Category	79.6%	77.8%	84.6%	80.8%	81.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with lack of strategic analysis capabilities * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with lack of strategic analysis capabilities	Yes	Count	10	19	41	71	141
		% within Population Category	18.5%	17.6%	18.6%	19.2%	18.8%
	No	Count	44	89	180	298	611
		% within Population Category	81.5%	82.4%	81.4%	80.8%	81.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with apparent increase in crime statistics * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with apparent increase in crime statistics	Yes	Count	18	32	45	68	163
		% within Population Category	33.3%	29.6%	20.4%	18.4%	21.7%
	No	Count	36	76	176	301	589
		% within Population Category	66.7%	70.4%	79.6%	81.6%	78.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with lack of guidelines for data sharing * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with lack of guidelines for data sharing	Yes	Count	10	25	36	69	140
		% within Population Category	18.5%	23.1%	16.3%	18.7%	18.6%
	No	Count	44	83	185	300	612
		% within Population Category	81.5%	76.9%	83.7%	81.3%	81.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with other use and benefit obstacle * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with other use and benefit obstacle	Yes	Count	3	5	1	10	19
		% within Population Category	5.6%	4.6%	.5%	2.7%	2.5%
	No	Count	51	103	220	359	733
		% within Population Category	94.4%	95.4%	99.5%	97.3%	97.5%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with loss of patrol time * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with loss of patrol time	Yes	Count	22	36	56	108	222
		% within Population Category	40.7%	33.3%	25.3%	29.3%	29.5%
	No	Count	32	72	165	261	530
		% within Population Category	59.3%	66.7%	74.7%	70.7%	70.5%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with slow turnaround of data * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with slow turnaround of data	Yes	Count	5	22	27	71	125
		% within Population Category	9.3%	20.4%	12.2%	19.2%	16.6%
	No	Count	49	86	194	298	627
		% within Population Category	90.7%	79.6%	87.8%	80.8%	83.4%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with commitment of resources * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with commitment of resources	Yes	Count	15	25	38	87	165
		% within Population Category	27.8%	23.1%	17.2%	23.6%	21.9%
	No	Count	39	83	183	282	587
		% within Population Category	72.2%	76.9%	82.8%	76.4%	78.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with lack of marketing of benefits * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with lack of marketing of benefits	Yes	Count	11	23	46	95	175
		% within Population Category	20.4%	21.3%	20.8%	25.7%	23.3%
	No	Count	43	85	175	274	577
		% within Population Category	79.6%	78.7%	79.2%	74.3%	76.7%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with inadequate training * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with inadequate training	Yes	Count	10	19	44	90	163
		% within Population Category	18.5%	17.6%	19.9%	24.4%	21.7%
	No	Count	44	89	177	279	589
		% within Population Category	81.5%	82.4%	80.1%	75.6%	78.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with rigid guidelines for certification * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with rigid guidelines for certification	Yes	Count	9	18	34	60	121
		% within Population Category	16.7%	16.7%	15.4%	16.3%	16.1%
	No	Count	45	90	187	309	631
		% within Population Category	83.3%	83.3%	84.6%	83.7%	83.9%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with lack of utility at local level * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with lack of utility at local level	Yes	Count	7	15	28	57	107
		% within Population Category	13.0%	13.9%	12.7%	15.4%	14.2%
	No	Count	47	93	193	312	645
		% within Population Category	87.0%	86.1%	87.3%	84.6%	85.8%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with conflicting definitions * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with conflicting definitions	Yes	Count	14	24	50	90	178
		% within Population Category	25.9%	22.2%	22.6%	24.4%	23.7%
	No	Count	40	84	171	279	574
		% within Population Category	74.1%	77.8%	77.4%	75.6%	76.3%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Issue with other administration obstacle * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Issue with other administration obstacle	Yes	Count	1	4	2	7	14
		% within Population Category	1.9%	3.7%	.9%	1.9%	1.9%
	No	Count	53	104	219	362	738
		% within Population Category	98.1%	96.3%	99.1%	98.1%	98.1%
Total		Count	54	108	221	369	752
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 41: Describe your jurisdiction.

Region * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Region	Urban	Count	39	59	94	98	290
		% within Population Category	92.9%	72.8%	55.0%	33.2%	49.2%
	Rural	Count	0	0	9	36	45
		% within Population Category	.0%	.0%	5.3%	12.2%	7.6%
	Suburban	Count	3	22	68	161	254
		% within Population Category	7.1%	27.2%	39.8%	54.6%	43.1%
Total		Count	42	81	171	295	589
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Level * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Level	City	Count	32	88	165	230	515
		% within Population Category	71.1%	96.7%	94.3%	89.8%	90.8%
	County	Count	1	0	0	7	8
		% within Population Category	2.2%	.0%	.0%	2.7%	1.4%
	City/County	Count	12	3	10	19	44
		% within Population Category	26.7%	3.3%	5.7%	7.4%	7.8%
Total		Count	45	91	175	256	567
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 42: Does your agency have a Web site?

Web site * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Web site	Yes	Count	52	106	198	322	678
		% within Population Category	98.1%	98.1%	92.1%	89.9%	92.4%
	No	Count	1	2	17	36	56
		% within Population Category	1.9%	1.9%	7.9%	10.1%	7.6%
Total		Count	53	108	215	358	734
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

If yes, are crime statistics provided on the Web site?

Crime statistics provided on Web site * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Crime statistics provided on Web site	Yes	Count	43	59	92	105	299
		% within Population Category	84.3%	56.7%	46.7%	33.3%	44.8%
	No	Count	8	45	105	210	368
		% within Population Category	15.7%	43.3%	53.3%	66.7%	55.2%
Total		Count	51	104	197	315	667
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Question 43: Does your agency have an automated RMS?

Automated RMS * Population Category Crosstabulation

			Population Category				
			250,000 and greater	100,000 through 249,999	50,000 through 99,999	25,000 through 49,999	Total
Automated RMS	Yes	Count	41	91	166	277	575
		% within Population Category	80.4%	89.2%	81.8%	82.2%	83.0%
	No	Count	9	11	37	60	117
		% within Population Category	17.6%	10.8%	18.2%	17.8%	16.9%
	Partial	Count	1	0	0	0	1
		% within Population Category	2.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.1%
Total		Count	51	102	203	337	693
		% within Population Category	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%