

The Fall 2003 Police Information Technology Adoption Survey

Community Policing Project Paper No. 28

by

Wesley G. Skogan and Susan M. Hartnett

Institute for Policy Research
Northwestern University
625 Haven Street
Evanston IL 60208 USA

This project was supported by Cooperative Agreement #2002-CK-WX-K003, awarded by the Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS) in Washington, D.C. Points of view or opinions contained within this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services.

January 2004

This and other evaluation reports are also available at: www.northwestern.edu/publications/policing.html

The Fall 2003 Police Information Technology Adoption Survey

by

Wesley G. Skogan and Susan M. Hartnett

In May 2001, the Chicago Police Department began development of a suite of software modules and sophisticated databases. The goal of the project is to help Chicago “police smarter” using information technology. The project was dubbed “CLEAR,” for Citizen and Law Enforcement Assessment and Reporting. In addition to its internal benefits, CLEAR envisions linking the Chicago police with criminal justice agencies elsewhere in the state and region. By extending the department’s analytic capacity to a network of agency partners, Chicago hopes (in their words) to “enable unified strategies to reduce crime, eliminate criminal justice system ‘bottlenecks,’ increase accountability among criminal justice agencies and provide a complete picture of offender activity.” In practice, this partnership is being formed by opening access to the CLEAR data warehouse to other agencies. This involves ensuring that they have the technical capacity to access the system and training representatives of newly participating agencies. Behind the scenes, Chicago had to create mechanisms to audit use of the system by outsiders and put in place procedures to ensure responsible use.

With the support of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, Northwestern University’s Institute for Policy Research conducted an evaluation of many aspects of CLEAR. This report documents an agency survey that was collected as part of the evaluation of the criminal justice integration component of this effort. It describes the scope of the study and the data collection process. It includes the two survey instruments utilized in the study. The complete evaluation report can be found at our web site:
www.northwestern.edu/IPR/policing.html

The Study

Chicago’s data warehouse is an information repository that can produce a variety of relational reports using modern, flexible database query software. The data warehouse includes a list of data elements that expands almost daily. There is data on the criminal history of arrestees, outstanding warrants, the arrest status of juveniles, mug shots, and digitized fingerprints. Participating agencies also have access to Chicago Police Department directives, streaming digital training videos, email addresses, and directories, to name a few early offerings. After a pilot test in six suburban police departments, the next outside users of the data warehouse were trained to use the system in October 2002. This report traces use of the system by outside agencies of all types over a 13-month period ending in October 2003.

The study had two purposes. The first was to describe the scope of agency utilization of the data warehouse. This included an examination of the number of agencies involved and how agency representatives were initially trained. By October 2003, users included the Illinois State Police, the FBI, county prosecutors and sheriffs, probation and parole agencies, high school security offices, university police departments, and 159 suburban municipal police departments. The final report describes trends in use of the system over time. The user survey gathered reports

of the obstacles that agencies had to overcome to get involved, and measures of their satisfaction with the system and its administration by the city.

The second purpose of the study was to explain variations in the timing and extent of data warehouse use. This part of the study focused exclusively on municipal police departments in Cook County, and they were the subject of the user survey. They were all offered access to the system, and the study investigated the factors associated with the extent to which they did so in the first year. This study of the use of the data warehouse falls into a body of research examining the adoption of innovation.

One significant source of agency data was collected by a survey of users and potential users of the data warehouse. The survey was conducted to assess why agencies decided to get involved, to describe how they are using the data warehouse and to identify the obstacles that participating agencies faced. Agencies that had not signed up to use the system responded only to the first part of the questionnaire, which focused on their organizational capabilities and technological savvy. Those who had sent representatives for training answered additional questions that focused on use of the data warehouse. The first targeted respondent was the police chief. During their interview chiefs were asked to identify another agency member with more hands-on familiarity with using the data warehouse, and those nominees were also surveyed using essentially the same questionnaire. All of the interviews were conducted by telephone during autumn 2003. An advance letter to each chief described the project, and it included a list of some specific questions we were going to ask about agency staffing and budgets so they could prepare in advance.

Questionnaire Development

The questionnaire was designed to handle both of the studies described above. General questions that were to be asked of all agencies were grouped in the first half of the questionnaire. These questions focused on their organizational and technological capabilities, factors that were hypothesized to have contributed to their decisions regarding participation in the data warehouse. Midway through the interview respondents skipped to the end of the questionnaire if they were not a participating agency. Participating agencies were presented with questions about their decision to get involved; who was sent for training; obstacles they had to overcome to become users of the data warehouse; and their experiences using the system.

The questionnaire development process began with interviews with agency representatives and Chicago Police Department personnel involved in the data warehouse. Even before the survey was planned, our technology evaluation had included meetings and one-on-one sessions with senior police executives, project managers, and technical personnel working on data warehouse projects. The survey development process then added personal interviews with selected suburban police chiefs and technical personnel, to gather impressions of their experiences with the data warehouse. These interviews were conducted in the northern and northwestern suburbs, and represented municipal agencies that had been using the system for at least several months. Later in the process, a draft questionnaire was administered by telephone to

an experienced retired police chief. One of our staff members conducted the interview, while another sat behind him and took notes during the process. They then held a de-briefing session that examined each item in the questionnaire. The pilot test gave us a final check on the length of the interview and identified questions that could be eliminated or changed.

Our discussion with the former chief also led to the inclusion of additional materials in our advance letter. The letter ultimately included more detail about what the survey would cover, so that respondents could think in advance about the many organization-specific questions we would be asking. We also included a list of 17 specific operational statistics or budget figures that would be covered, and asked respondents to have the figures compiled in advance of our call. This was the first time that some agencies that share dispatching with other suburbs had tried to put together operational statistics for their own department, and several found it quite difficult to do.

The literature on adoption of innovation and experts in the field were tapped for suggestions for questionnaire content. The questionnaire included several questions about information technology in the department, including whether the department was NIBRS compliant. We asked about a list of specific equipment, as well as about who uses it. There was a section on budgets, grants, number of personnel, types and characteristics of personnel, as well as crime and arrest figures that are not available from the Illinois State Police. The questionnaire also asked about interagency contact and policy.

The second section focused on use of the data warehouse by agencies that had sent their staff to Chicago police headquarters for training. This section probed about who had been to training, who had been trained at their department, what features of the warehouse were being used, problems they might be experiencing, and their most important reasons for deciding to get involved with the data warehouse. A short section of the questionnaire addressed those who had not signed on to the data-sharing project, asking why they chose not to participate. The secondary questionnaire was identical to the primary questionnaire, except for the questions on budgets and operational statistics, and on the chief's participation in professional conferences.

Interviewer Recruitment, Training and Supervision

Five experienced interviewers were hired to conduct the study. Their efforts were supplemented by three full-time members of the evaluation staff, who also served as supervisors. The survey was conducted in the building where the project is housed. Interviewers worked at desks which were in close proximity to the staff members serving as supervisors. Two of the interviewers had worked with us on earlier surveys projects, and three had telephone interviewing experience in other professional settings. Training took place in late September 2003. At training, all materials were explained, pilot-test experiences shared, and role playing conducted. Supervisors were able to work one-on-one with the interviewers during the role playing session. Materials handed out included introduction respondent selection sheets, responses to frequently asked questions, sample call sheets and questionnaires, and a copy of the letter sent out in advance of the interviewing. Interviewers were monitored each time they

worked to insure thorough and consistent data collection. Supervisors were always on hand to handle questions as they came up.

Our survey methodology involved sending an advance letter to the chief of police for each agency in our sample. The letter explained the nature of the survey, underscored its importance in law enforcement, cited the support by the Chicago Police Department for our evaluation efforts, and gave a name and number for any questions the police chief might have. Also included was a page of questions that we believed would take some amount of checking or research on the part of the agency. The questions included items like the agency's budget, the number of officers with college degrees, and a number of inquiries about crime statistics for the prior year. The letter was sent one week prior to the start of our interviewing. Interviewing began on October 1, 2003 and ended on November 7, 2003. After interviewing for several weeks we found a number of agencies for whom we had not been able to speak with the designated primary respondent. We sent out a second letter and the additional page of questions to that 20 percent to stress the importance of their participation and timely response. This yielded many completions from those agencies. One thing we did not anticipate was the number of times we would need to fax the additional page of questions to these agencies. Often the respondent had not seen this page and could not answer the items off the top of his or her head. Thus, we had many questionnaires in various stages of completion, waiting for answers to the budgetary and crime-statistic questions. This became a very task-intensive part of the survey process, for each agency had slightly different ways in which they would handle how the information got to us. While many promised they would fax it, we often found ourselves following up via the telephone after a fax did not arrive. Another task-intensive activity was the fielding of calls themselves. While we had a staff of interviewers that were in both mornings and afternoons, interviews still needed to be scheduled for times when interviewers did not work, which were handled by the supervisory staff. These calls were often conducted in the late evenings or early mornings to accommodate the 24-hour nature of police schedules.

As the sample was dwindling and fewer interviewer hours were required to work through it, we still had a core of agencies for whom we had not contacted the designated respondent. Our last effort involved sending a third letter and the full questionnaire via overnight courier to that 6 (six) percent of the agencies in our sample. This time we also gave out a telephone number respondents could call to reach us and be interviewed at their convenience. A stamped self-addressed envelope was provided to them to return our questionnaire. Again this proved to be somewhat task intensive on the supervisory staff because interviewer hours were not as extensive at this point and the phone had to be monitored during working hours. For off-hour calls, the telephone was equipped with voice mail. This again proved to be successful in that it "jump started" many of those agencies to either call in to our office or mail in the completed questionnaire.

The Sample and Survey Completion Rates

The survey had two purposes. One was to gather descriptive information concerning the use of the data warehouse by police departments. For this study the universe was the 129

municipal police departments that were registered to use the system on September 1, 2003, regardless of their location. This was a sufficiently small enough number that we included all of them in the survey sample. The second purpose of the survey was to gather data to explain the extent of use of the system and why some agencies had chosen not to participate at all. To examine non-use requires a sample that includes both users and non-users. For this study the universe was all 122 suburban municipal police departments in Cook County, Illinois. Again, this was a small enough number that we included all of them in the survey sample. The two studies overlapped, so a total of 145 municipal police agencies were included in the sample.

To represent these agencies, our primary respondent was the chief of police. The primary respondent was asked to identify another agency member with more hands-on familiarity with using the data warehouse, and they were also interviewed using essentially the same questionnaire. All of the interviews were conducted by telephone.

Field work was conducted from October 1 until November 7, 2003. The primary questionnaire took approximately 17 minutes to administer, while the secondary took approximately 12 minutes. At the end, two completion rates are appropriate for the study: the percentage of sample agencies who were represented by at least one interview, and the percentage of all designated primary and secondary respondents who were successfully interviewed. We began with a list of 146 agencies, but found during interviewing that one was ineligible for inclusion in the study universe because all of their operations are handled by the Cook County Sheriff. This reduced our agency sample by one and the total number of possible interviews by two. During the course of interviewing, two agencies refused participation, one because they were moving the location of their office and the other simply stated that they “declined” to get involved. We were unable to conduct interviews with anyone at three more agencies, despite never getting a clear refusal. The primary respondents for eight agencies denied that there was anyone else who was suitable for a second interview. One agency is represented by a secondary respondent nominated by the chief, but we were unable to complete the chief’s interview.

Table 1 summarizes the calculation of response rates for the survey. Of the 145 sample agencies eligible for interviewing, we completed one or more interviews with 142, for a 98 percent completion rate. Of the 145 potential primary interviews, we conducted 141, a 97 percent response rate. The 134 secondary respondent interviews yielded a response rate of 92 percent.

Table 1
Survey Response Rates

	Agency Rate*	Personal Interview Rate	
	agency level	primary interviews	secondary interviews
a. eligible sample list	145	145	145
b. Minus non-completions			
denied other respondents	0	0	8
refused to participate	2	2	2
never completed interview	1	2	1
c. Completed cases	142	141	134
d. Response rate (c/a)	98	97	92

* One or more interviews in an agency.

Data Organization and Reliability

An important feature of the survey was that many agencies were represented by two respondents rather than one. The data was collected in order to characterize agencies. To turn the survey findings into agency-level data, survey responses for two-respondent agencies (94 percent of the agencies) were combined. For many questions, the responses of the primary respondent – almost always the chief of police – were used to represent the agency. This was especially true for the first part of the questionnaire, which focused on policy issues and agency-level matters. For these questions, answers from the secondary respondent were used if the chief did not know the answer but the follow-up respondent did. The responses of many other questions could be combined directly, for they were designed to use each of two respondents as independent reporters. Because the two respondents saw their department from different vantage points, they each had unique information to supply. A good example was presented earlier. Each respondent was asked about the uses their officers were making of the data warehouse. The list included such uses as “checking fingerprints” and “checking mug shots.” For this question, information from either respondent that officers were using the data warehouse for a particular purpose was recorded. In the end, 142 agencies were represented by at least one survey respondent, and the data are used here to describe agency reactions to the CLEAR data warehouse.

In addition to minimizing missing data at the agency level and maximizing the information that can be gleaned from respondents who are somewhat differentially positioned in the organization, the paired character of responses to the survey enables us to evaluate the reliability of the survey. Data reliability can be examined by comparing the stories provided by pairs of respondents who are describing the same organization. If they generally agree when they describe their organization’s features and activities, we have confidence that the survey accurately represents reality. Technically, this is an “inter-observer agreement” approach to reliability estimation.

Table 2 presents estimates of the reliability of responses to 17 questions that were included in the first half of the questionnaire. Figures given there are the percentage of responses to each group of questions that were in agreement. These questions were presented to all respondents, regardless of their involvement in CLEAR. Respondents who reported they did not know the answer to a question were omitted from each paired comparison. For the two questions regarding how frequently agencies were in contact with one another seeking information, five-category responses were dichotomized into once a month or less often versus more often than monthly.

Table 2
Survey Reliability: Agency Characteristics

Paired survey questions; all agencies (133 agencies)	Percent Agreement
Availability of computer equipment, computerized dispatching, and crime mapping (4 questions, 523 responses)	82
NIBRS compliance, Internet, e-mail, training and systems management (5 questions, 710 responses)	80
Agency newsletters, advisory boards, written policies, dispatching analysis, voice mail for officers (6 questions, 759 responses)	82
Frequency (dichotomized) with which agency contacts other agencies for information, and frequency with which agency is contacted by other agencies (2 questions, 250 responses)	83

Levels of agreement between pairs of respondents were acceptably high. In the computer equipment category there was less agreement about the availability of “handheld or portable computers” than about whether agencies had computer terminals in their cars, a computer aided-dispatch system and computerized crime mapping capabilities. There was a great deal of agreement on whether agencies had access to a skilled systems manager (85 percent) and e-mail (81 percent), but not over whether their agency was NIBRS compliant (67 percent). Agreement was very high about having written policies for vehicle pursuits and firearms use (96 percent), but not over whether their department has a newsletter for community members (64 percent).

Table 3 presents a comparable table that tracks agreement between respondents concerning data warehouse issues. These were asked only of participating agencies, 117 of which were represented by two respondents. In the case of the check list of 10 questions regarding the reasons agencies chose to participate in CLEAR, the three-category responses were dichotomized into “no influence” versus “somewhat or very influential.”

Levels of agreement were not as high for these issues as they were for general agency characteristics. They were lowest for the uses that officers were making of the data warehouse. This is perhaps expected in agencies in which chiefs are fairly removed from day-to-day operations. There was more disagreement over whether officers were checking warrants (58 percent) than there was over mug shots (96 percent) or name checks (92 percent). In terms of the reasons for participating in the data warehouse, there was most agreement over the importance of identifying Chicago offenders, cost issues, and its impact on officer skills (all over 90 percent agreement). There was less over the importance of professional meetings and reading about technology in publications (both in the 50 percent range). Among the questions about problems in making use of the system, there was the most disagreement over whether agency policies and procedures had to be changed as a result (69 percent), and the least disagreement over hardware and internet access issues (all over 80 percent).

Table 3
Survey Reliability: Data Warehouse Issues

Paired survey questions; participating agencies (117 agencies)	Percent Agreement
Potential problems in accessing and using the data warehouse (5 questions, 410 responses)	76
Uses officers are making of the data warehouse (8 questions, 622 responses)	72
Factors influencing (dichotomized) the decision to participate in CLEAR (10 questions, 891 responses)	75
Local interest in the data warehouse (4 questions, 319 responses)	76

Experiences in the Field

There are several considerations when conducting an in-house survey of this nature. The interviewing staff must have experience with interviewing professional respondents. Many of the chiefs in our sample had an army of gatekeepers to protect them from unwanted calls, and ours often were in that category. Our interviewers often faced frustrating and unusual circumstances, and they needed to maintain a professional demeanor and accommodate many different respondent styles. One respondent yelled out to others in the office for help during the interview. Other respondents insisted upon looking up the answers to many questions while we waited on the telephone.

A dose of persistence and creativity was also necessary when dealing with those who were resistant to responding to the survey. Our interviewers had to be flexible as they approached each agency, for they had many unique ways of handling non-emergency incoming calls. One example was when interviewers were confronted with the “nobody knows anything about this issue” response when requesting an interview. With careful coaxing and probing, we were almost always able to conduct interviews, and we found respondents in fact had ample

knowledge of the subject matter. While their initial response may have been an attempt to avoid the survey, most respondents reacted positively to the questionnaire once they were engaged in the process. That said, in eight agencies where we did complete an interview, the chief indicated that there was no one else in the organization who could answer our questions and refused to nominate a secondary respondent. Some respondents were called back as many as 20 times. However, our experience was that once we did get the respondent on the telephone, they were highly cooperative and pleasant; they were often just very difficult to nail down. This was true of secondary respondents as well, because many of them worked as street supervisors. They sometimes had to be called at odd hours, and they frequently were not in the office. We interviewed respondents as early as 5 (five) a.m. and as late as 11:30 p.m. Some were helpful and provided cell phone numbers, allowing us to contact them even while they were out of the office. In a few instances we tried to interview officers who had attended training at Chicago Police headquarters as substitutes for unavailable secondary respondents suggested by the chief. However, they proved to know little about the organizational and policy issues that were the focus of the survey. In two cases we were unable to carry out an interview by telephone, but we did receive completed questionnaires after we express mailed them to the agency.

Flexibility and team work was of the utmost importance due to the individualized treatment required to handle each responding agency. And because this was an in-house project, our regular project staff had to allow for ample time for the survey, which intruded on their other duties. We found ourselves faxing specific questions to agencies multiple times, because the paperwork got lost or was passed on to people who had no knowledge about our project. Calling one person did not necessarily get us to the person that was compiling the information that we requested in advance. We needed to make adjustments when speaking with agencies that were small and structured quite differently than the larger agencies. In those, one person often takes on many roles, such as when the chief is also the chief computer technician, or when outside consultants serve as the agencies' computer "expert." In those cases we needed to make calls outside the department to get some of our technical questions answered.

Appendices attached:

- primary respondent questionnaire
- secondary respondent questionnaire

Primary Respondent Questionnaire

First I have a few questions about information technology in your department.

Q01. This year, approximately how much funding do you have for computers, software and computer training? _____

DON'T KNOW -1

Q02. Is this typical, or it is more or less than in recent years?

TYPICAL 2
MORE 3
LESS 1
DON'T KNOW 9

Q03. Does your department participate in PIMS, [POLICE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM] to submit data through the state system?

YES 1
NO 0 [SKIP TO Q07]
DON'T KNOW 9 [SKIP TO Q07]

Q04. How helpful is PIMS for accessing information that is useful for your department? Would you say very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not at all helpful?

VERY HELPFUL 3
SOMEWHAT HELPFUL 2
NOT AT ALL HELPFUL 1
DON'T KNOW 9
[VOL] VERY/SOMEWHAT 7
[VOL] SOMEWHAT/NOT 8

Q05. Is adequate information available in PIMS, or are there important things missing?

ADEQUATE INFORMATION 2
THINGS MISSING 1
DON'T KNOW 9

Q06. Do you feel that the effort put into accessing information through PIMS is worth the output that you receive?

YES	1
SOMETIMES	2
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q07. Is your department NIBRS compliant? [NATIONAL INCIDENT BASED RECORDS SYSTEM]

YES	1
PARTIALLY	2
NO	0
[VOL] planning to	3 [ASK WHEN] _____ / _____
	MM YYYY
DON'T KNOW	9

Q08. Does your department have Internet access?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q09. Do individual officers have e-mail addresses through the department?

YES	1 [INCLUDES "SOME"]
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q10. Do you have someone on your staff who is a systems manager or a real computer "whiz?"

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9
[VOL] CITY DATA CENTER	2
[VOL] CONSULTANT	3

Q11. Do you have any internal training for your officers in computer use?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q12. I'm going to read a short list of equipment. For each one, please tell me whether your department currently has any in operation.

Does your department have....	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>
A. Computer terminals in cars?	1	0	9
B. Other handheld or portable computers?	1	0	9
C. A computer aided dispatch system?	1	0	9
D. A computerized crime mapping system?	1	0	9

We sent you an advance copy of the next several sets of questions to help us gather the data that we need. First, I have some questions about your budget and departmental funding.

Q13. For this fiscal year, what is your current total budget? This would include funds from all sources. _____

DON'T KNOW -1

Q14. Has your department applied for officer hiring grants from the COPS Office in Washington?

YES	1	
NO	0	[SKIP TO Q16]
DON'T KNOW	9	[SKIP TO Q16]

Q15. In total, how many positions to date have been paid in part with COPS grant funds? This was on the list of the questions we sent in advance. _____ **[ENTER ZERO IF NONE ARE BEING PAID WITH COPS FUNDS]**

DON'T KNOW -1

Q16. Has your agency applied for funding for computers from the COPS Office, through their COPS-MORE program?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q17. Currently, how many full-time sworn personnel are in your department? _____

DON'T KNOW -1

Q18. Currently, how many part-time sworn personnel are in your department? _____

DON'T KNOW -1

Q19. Does your department use uniformed volunteers or auxiliary officers?

YES 1
NO 0 [SKIP TO Q21]

Q20. How many uniformed volunteers do you have? _____

DON'T KNOW -1

Q21. How many civilian staff members do you employ, excluding crossing guards and parking meter readers? _____

DON'T KNOW -1

Q22. How many officers serve as detectives or specialized crime investigators? _____
[FTE EQUIVALENT]

DON'T KNOW -1

Q23. How many personnel whose primary job is planning, research or crime analysis are in your department? _____ [EXCLUDES LIGHT DUTY OFFICERS]
[FTE EQUIVALENT]

DON'T KNOW -1

Q24. How many of your full-time officers have a 4-year college degree? _____ [CAN ACCEPT PERCENTAGE]

DON'T KNOW -1

Q25. For **2002**, what were your totals for **[IF DON'T KNOW, ENTER - 1]**

- A. Physical arrests for all crimes, not counting motor vehicle infractions? _____
- B. Arrests specifically for drug violations? (part of the above total) _____
- C. Moving violation citations? _____
- D. Calls through 911? _____
- E. Dispatches? _____

Q26. Does your department participate in any multijurisdiction investigation task forces. This would include NORTAF, on the North Shore, and other “MEGs”. [Multijurisdictional Enforcement Groups]

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q27. How frequently does your department contact other agencies for information? Would you say,

almost daily	5
once a week	4
once a month	3
every six months	2
once a year, or	1
some other amount?	7 [SPECIFY] _____

Q28. Which police departments does your department contact most frequently when you are looking for information for operational planning or making policy.

1. _____	5. _____
2. _____	6. _____
3. _____	7. _____
4. _____	8. _____

Q29. Which do you talk to most?

_____ [RECORD AGENCY NUMBER 1-8 FROM ABOVE]

Q30. Do other police departments contact your department?

YES	1
NO	0 [SKIP TO Q33]
DON'T KNOW	9 [SKIP TO Q33]

Q31. Which police departments contact you?

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 5. _____ |
| 2. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 7. _____ |
| 4. _____ | 8. _____ |

Q32. About how often are you contacted by these other police departments? Would you say it happens

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| almost daily | 5 |
| once a week | 4 |
| once a month | 3 |
| every six months | 2 |
| once a year, or | 1 |
| some other amount of time? | 7 [SPECIFY] _____ |

Q33. Does your department have....	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>
A. Voice mail for individual officers or units?	1	0	9
B. A newsletter for community members or groups?	1	0	9
C. A citizen advisory board for the department?	1	0	9
D. A dispatching system that can provide reports for planning and evaluation?	1	0	9
E. Your own written policy for pursuit of vehicles?	1	0	9
F. Your own written policy for firing at fleeing vehicles?	1	0	9

Q34. Has your department been in contact with a representative of the Chicago Police Department about participating in their new CLEAR Data Warehouse System?

- | | |
|------------|---|
| YES | 1 |
| NO | 0 |
| DON'T KNOW | 9 |
- [SKIP TO PURPLE 'RESPONDENT INFORMATION' PAGE]**

Q35. Did you first hear about the Data Warehouse from the Chicago Police Department, or from some other department, or did you reach out to the CPD?

- HEARD FROM CPD 1
- ANOTHER DEPARTMENT 2 [SKIP TO Q37]
- OWN OUTREACH 3 [SKIP TO Q37]
- NEVER HEARD OF DW 4 [SKIP TO Q37]
- DON'T KNOW 9 [SKIP TO Q37]

Q36. Even though you initially heard about the Data Warehouse from the CPD, did you also hear about it through other police departments?

- YES 1
- NO 0
- DON'T KNOW 9

Q37. Has your department sent anyone to the Chicago Police Department's headquarters for CLEAR Data Warehouse training?

- YES 1 [SKIP TO GREEN 'PARTICIPATING AGENCIES' PAGE]
- NO 0
- DON'T KNOW 9

Q38. I'm going to list some reasons why police departments may not have attended training. Please tell me which are applicable to your department. [CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY]

- A. You plan on sending officers to training in the future. 1
- B. Your officers don't have the time to attend Data Warehouse training. 1
- C. You don't have the resources to send people to training. 1
- D. Training for the Data Warehouse is not a priority for you at this time. 1
- E. At this time, you're simply not interested. 1
- F. OTHER [SPECIFY] _____ 1
- G. DON'T KNOW 1

[SKIP TO PURPLE 'RESPONDENT INFORMATION' PAGE]

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

Q39. What are their usual assignments? **[CIRCLE “1” FOR ALL MENTIONED]**

- 1 PATROL
- 1 DETECTIVE/INVESTIGATIONS
- 1 GANG
- 1 TACTICAL
- 1 CRIME ANALYSTS AND PLANNERS
- 1 COMPUTER PERSON
- 1 COMMUNITY POLICING/NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONS
- 1 NARCOTICS
- 1 OTHER **[SPECIFY]** _____
- 1 DON'T KNOW

Q40. Have officers who attended CPD training given any training to others in your department since they attended?

- YES 1
- NO 0
- DON'T KNOW 9

Q41. Who will be trained to use the Data Warehouse system? **[CIRCLE “1” FOR ALL THAT APPLY]**

- 1 DETECTIVES/INVESTIGATORS
- 1 CRIME ANALYSTS AND PLANNERS
- 1 COMPUTER PERSON
- 1 SUPERVISORS
- 1 PATROL UNITS
- 1 EVERYONE SWORN IN THE DEPARTMENT
- 1 **[VOL]** EVERYONE WHO NEEDS IT
- 1 **[VOL]** EVERYONE WHO WANTS IT, OR
- 1 OTHER? **[SPECIFY]** _____
- 1 DON'T KNOW

Q42. Has anyone contacted the Chicago Police Department “Help Desk” for questions or problems with the Data Warehouse?

YES	1
NO	0 [SKIP TO Q44]
DON'T KNOW	9 [SKIP TO Q44]

Q43. Did the Help Desk solve the problem?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q44. Here is a list of ways that departments might use the Data Warehouse. As far as you know, which of them are your officers currently using? [“HOPING” THAT THEY USE IT OR THINKING THAT THEY “OUGHT TO” = NO]

Are they using the system for. . . .	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>
A. Checking names or addresses?	1	0	9
B. Checking for outstanding warrants?	1	0	9
C. Checking penitentiary releases?	1	0	9
D. Checking juvenile arrest status?	1	0	9
E. Checking the criminal history of an arrestee or suspect?	1	0	9
F. Checking mug shots?	1	0	9
G. Checking finger prints?	1	0	9
H. Analyzing a crime pattern?	1	0	9

Q45. Has your department had any problems with your connection to the CPD’s network?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q46. Did you have to make any substantial changes to your internal networks or internet connection to access the CPD network?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q47. Did you have to purchase any new hardware or software to access the CPD network?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q48. Did you have to change any of your agency's policies or procedures in order to start using the Data Warehouse?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9
[VOL] "will be"	8

Q49. Do you have any concerns about mis-use of the system by your personnel?

YES	1
NO	0 [SKIP TO Q51]
DON'T KNOW	9 [SKIP TO Q51]

Q50. What are those concerns?

Q51. Here is a list of reasons that departments might have for gaining access to the CLEAR Data Warehouse. Could you tell me for each reason mentioned how influential it was for your agency getting involved. Was is very influential, somewhat influential, or not at all influential when deciding whether to get involved.

How influential is it that....	<u>Very</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not</u>
A. It was available with little or no extra cost.	3	2	1
B. Your agency heard favorable things about it from other suburban agencies.	3	2	1

	<u>Very</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not</u>
C. Your agency expected to make fewer calls or visits to other jurisdictions in order to get information.	3	2	1
D. Your agency expected to identify offenders from Chicago committing crimes in your community.	3	2	1
E. Someone at your agency had read about this kind of technology in professional publications.	3	2	1
F. There was enthusiasm among your staff about participating.	3	2	1
G. Someone at your agency had heard about it at a professional meeting.	3	2	1
H. Using technology seemed to be the thing to do these days.	3	2	1
I. It was an opportunity to improve your officers' skills.	3	2	1
J. It was an opportunity to improve your department's standing among other agencies.	3	2	1

Q52. Prior to getting involved with the Data Warehouse, what was it like to get information from the Chicago Police Department? Would you say it was

very difficult	3
somewhat difficult, or	2
not very difficult	1
DON'T KNOW/NEVER REQUESTED	9

Q53. Are you comfortable with the Chicago Police Department spearheading this integrated criminal justice information project, rather than the County or the State of Illinois?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q54. Since you began using the Data Warehouse, have you

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
A. Brought it to the attention of your mayor, city manager or city council?	1	0
B. Issued a press release or described it to a local community newspaper?	1	0

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
C. Brought it to the attention of any citizen committees or advisory boards?	1	0
D. Reported about it in a newsletter for the public?	1	0

Q55. We're looking for examples of the successful use of the Data Warehouse to solve a particular crime pattern or make important arrests. Does your department have a specific "success story" that we could follow up on?

YES	1	
NO	0	[SKIP TO Q57]
DON'T KNOW	9	[SKIP TO Q57]

Q56. Will you please give me a brief description of the success story, the name of someone to call for details, and their number.

Q57. Do you personally use the Data Warehouse?

YES	1
NO	0
OTHER	9

Q58. In the past year, [have you] [has the chief] had a chance to attend the Illinois Chiefs Association meeting?

YES	1
NO	0

Q59. In the past year, [have you] [has the chief] had a chance to attend the International Association of Police Chiefs meeting?

YES	1
NO	0

Q60. What is your specific job title? **[JOB TITLE, NOT RANK; ASK ONLY IF YOU DO NOT KNOW]**

CHIEF	1
ASST/DEPUTY CHIEF	2
TECHNICAL MANAGER	3
DETECTIVE/INVESTIGATOR	4
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF	5
COMPUTER STAFF	6
OTHER [SPECIFY]	7 _____

Q61. Are you civilian or sworn? **[ASK ONLY IF YOU DO NOT KNOW]**

CIVILIAN	1
SWORN	2

Q62. Gender **[DON'T ASK]**

FEMALE	1
MALE	2

Q63. [PARTICIPATING AGENCIES] Can you give me the name of another contact person within your department who knows about the Data Warehouse system and could provide us with detailed information about the use of the Data Warehouse in your agency?

[NON-PARTICIPATING AGENCIES] Can you give me the name of another contact person within your department who knows about your equipment and computer technology?

Name _____

Position _____

Contact phone _____

Best time to contact _____

Q64. Would you like to receive a summary of our report findings?

YES	1
NO	0

That completes our survey! Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Secondary Respondent Questionnaire

First I have a few questions about information technology in your department.

Q01. This year, approximately how much funding do you have for computers, software and computer training? _____

DON'T KNOW -1

Q02. Is this typical, or it is more or less than in recent years?

TYPICAL 2

MORE 3

LESS 1

DON'T KNOW 9

Q03. Does your department participate in PIMS, [POLICE INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM] to submit data through the state system?

YES 1

NO 0 [SKIP TO Q07]

DON'T KNOW 9 [SKIP TO Q07]

Q04. How helpful is PIMS for accessing information that is useful for your department? Would you say very helpful, somewhat helpful, or not at all helpful?

VERY HELPFUL 3

SOMEWHAT HELPFUL 2

NOT AT ALL HELPFUL 1

DON'T KNOW 9

[VOL] VERY/SOMEWHAT 7

[VOL] SOMEWHAT/NOT 8

Q05. Is adequate information available in PIMS, or are important things missing?

ADEQUATE INFORMATION 2

THINGS MISSING 1

DON'T KNOW 9

Q06. Do you feel the effort put into accessing information through PIMS is worth the output you get?

YES 1

SOMETIMES 2

NO 0

DON'T KNOW 9

Q07. Is your department NIBRS compliant? [NATIONAL INCIDENT BASED RECORDS SYSTEM]

YES	1		
PARTIALLY	2		
NO	0		
[VOL] planning to	3	[ASK WHEN]	____ / ____ MM YYYY
DON'T KNOW	9		

Q08. Does your department have Internet access?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q09. Do individual officers have e-mail addresses through the department?

YES	1 [INCLUDES "SOME"]
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q10. Do you have someone on your staff who is a computer "whiz"?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9
[VOL] CITY DATA CENTER	2
[VOL] CONSULTANT	3

Q11. Is any internal computer-related training offered on an ongoing basis for your officers?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q12. I'm going to read a short list of equipment. For each one, please tell me whether your department currently has any in operation.

Does your department have....	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>
A. Computer terminals in cars?	1	0	9
B. Other handheld or portable computers?	1	0	9
C. A computer aided dispatch system?	1	0	9
D. A computerized crime mapping system?	1	0	9

[Q13 THROUGH Q26 = BLANK]

Q27. How frequently does your department contact other agencies for information? Would you say,

almost daily	5
once a week	4
once a month	3
every six months	2
once a year, or	1
some other amount?	7

[SPECIFY] _____

Q28. Which police departments does your department contact most frequently when you are looking for information for operational planning or making policy.

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 5. _____ |
| 2. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 7. _____ |
| 4. _____ | 8. _____ |

Q29. Which do you talk to most?

_____ **[RECORD DEPARTMENT NUMBER 1-8 FROM ABOVE]**

Q30. Do other police departments contact your department?

YES	1
NO	0 [SKIP TO Q33]
DON'T KNOW	9 [SKIP TO Q33]

Q31. Which police departments contact you?

- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 1. _____ | 5. _____ |
| 2. _____ | 6. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 7. _____ |
| 4. _____ | 8. _____ |

Q32. About how often are you contacted by these other police departments? Would you say it happens

almost daily	5
once a week	4
once a month	3
every six months	2
once a year, or	1
some other amount of time?	7 [SPECIFY] _____

Q33. Does your department have....	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>
A. Voice mail for individual officers or units?	1	0	9
B. A newsletter for community members or groups?	1	0	9
C. A citizen advisory board for the department?	1	0	9
D. A dispatching system that can provide reports for planning and evaluation?	1	0	9
E. Your own written policy for pursuit of vehicles?	1	0	9
F. Your own written policy for firing at fleeing vehicles?	1	0	9

Q34. Has your department been in contact with a representative of the Chicago Police Department about participating in their new CLEAR Data Warehouse System?

YES	1
NO	0 [SKIP TO PURPLE 'RESPONDENT INFORMATION PAGE']
DON'T KNOW	9

Q35. Did you first hear about the Data Warehouse from the Chicago Police Department, or from some other department, or did you reach out to the CPD?

HEARD FROM CPD	1
ANOTHER DEPARTMENT	2 [SKIP TO Q37]
OWN OUTREACH	3 [SKIP TO Q37]
NEVER HEARD OF DW	4 [SKIP TO Q37]
DON'T KNOW	9 [SKIP TO Q37]

Q36. Even though you initially heard about the Data Warehouse from the CPD, did you also hear about it through other police departments?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q37. Has your department sent anyone to CPD headquarters for CLEAR Data Warehouse training?

YES	1	[SKIP TO GREEN ‘PARTICIPATING AGENCIES’ PAGE]
NO	0	
DON’T KNOW	9	

Q38. I’m going to list some reasons why police departments may not have attended training. Please tell me which are applicable to your department. **[CIRCLE “1” FOR ALL THAT APPLY]**

- A. You plan on sending officers to training in the future. 1
- B. Your officers don’t have the time to attend Data Warehouse training. 1
- C. You don’t have the resources to send people to training. 1
- D. Training for the Data Warehouse is not a priority for you at this time. 1
- E. At this time, you are simply not interested. 1
- F. OTHER **[SPECIFY]** _____ 1
- G. DON’T KNOW 1

[SKIP TO PURPLE ‘RESPONDENT INFORMATION PAGE’]

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

Q39. What are their usual assignments? **[CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL MENTIONED]**

- 1 PATROL
- 1 DETECTIVE/INVESTIGATOR
- 1 GANG
- 1 TACTICAL
- 1 CRIME ANALYSTS AND PLANNERS
- 1 COMPUTER PERSON
- 1 COMMUNITY POLICING/NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONS
- 1 NARCOTICS
- 1 OTHER **[SPECIFY]** _____
- 1 DON'T KNOW

Q40. Have officers who attended CPD training given any training to others in your department since they attended?

- | | |
|------------|---|
| YES | 1 |
| NO | 0 |
| DON'T KNOW | 9 |

Q41. Who will be trained to use the Data Warehouse system? Will you be training... **[CIRCLE "1" FOR ALL THAT APPLY]**

- 1 DETECTIVES/INVESTIGATORS
- 1 CRIME ANALYSTS AND PLANNERS
- 1 SUPERVISORS
- 1 PATROL UNITS
- 1 EVERYONE IN THE DEPARTMENT
- 1 VOL "EVERYONE WHO NEEDS IT"
- 1 VOL "EVERYONE WHO WANTS IT", OR
- 1 OTHER? **[SPECIFY]** _____
- 1 DON'T KNOW

Q42. Has anyone contacted the Chicago Police Department “Help Desk” for questions or problems with the Data Warehouse?

YES	1
NO	0 [SKIP TO Q44]
DON'T KNOW	9 [SKIP TO Q44]

Q43. Did the Help Desk solve the problem?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q44. Here is a list of ways that departments might use the Data Warehouse. As far as you know, which of them are your officers currently using? [“HOPING” THAT THEY USE IT OR THINKING THAT THEY “OUGHT TO” = NO]

Are they using the system for.	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>DK</u>
A. Checking names or addresses?	1	0	9
B. Checking for outstanding warrants?	1	0	9
C. Checking penitentiary release?	1	0	9
D. Checking juvenile arrest status?	1	0	9
E. Checking the criminal history of an arrestee or suspect?	1	0	9
F. Checking mug shots?	1	0	9
G. Checking finger prints?	1	0	9
H. Analyzing a crime pattern?	1	0	9

Q45. Has your department had any problems with your connection to the CPD’s network?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q46. Did you have to make any substantial changes to your internal networks or internet connection to access the CPD network?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q47. Did you have to purchase any new hardware or software to access the CPD network?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q48. Did you have to change any of your agency's policies or procedures in order to start using the Data Warehouse?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9
[VOL] "will be"	8

Q49. Do you have any concerns about mis-use of the system by your personnel?

YES	1
NO	0 [SKIP TO Q51]
DON'T KNOW	9 [SKIP TO Q51]

Q50. What are those concerns?

Q51. Here is a list of reasons that departments might have for gaining access to the CLEAR Data Warehouse. Could you tell me for each reason mentioned how influential it was for getting involved. Was is very influential, somewhat influential, or not at all influential to your agency when deciding whether to get involved.

How influential is it that....	<u>Very</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not</u>
A. It was available with little or no extra cost.	3	2	1
B. Your agency heard favorable things about it from other suburban agencies.	3	2	1

	<u>Very</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Not</u>
C. Your agency expected to make fewer calls or visits to other jurisdictions in order to get information.	3	2	1
D. Your agency expected to identify offenders from Chicago committing crimes in your community.	3	2	1
E. Someone in your agency had read about this kind of technology in professional publications.	3	2	1
F. There was enthusiasm among your staff about participating.	3	2	1
G. We had heard about it at a professional meeting.	3	2	1
H. Using technology seemed to be the thing to do these days.	3	2	1
I. It was an opportunity to improve your officers' skills.	3	2	1
J. It was an opportunity to improve your department's standing among other agencies.	3	2	1

Q52. Prior to getting involved with the Data Warehouse, what was it like to get information from the Chicago Police Department? Would you say it was

very difficult	3
somewhat difficult, or	2
not very difficult	1
DON'T KNOW/NEVER REQUESTED	9

Q53. Are you comfortable with the Chicago Police Department spearheading this integrated criminal justice information project, rather than the County or the State of Illinois?

YES	1
NO	0
DON'T KNOW	9

Q54. Since you began using the Data Warehouse, have you

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
A. Brought it to the attention of your mayor, city manager or city council?	1	0
B. Issued a press release or described it to a local community newspaper?	1	0

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
C. Brought it to the attention of any citizen committees or advisory boards?	1	0
D. Reported about it in a newsletter for the public?	1	0

Q55. We're looking for examples of the successful use of the Data Warehouse to solve crime patterns or make important arrests. Does your department have a "success story" that we could follow up on?

YES	1
NO	0 [SKIP TO Q57]
DON'T KNOW	9 [SKIP TO Q57]

Q56. Will you please give me a brief description of the success story, the name of someone to call about it and their number.

Q57. Do you personally use the Data Warehouse?

YES	1
NO	0
OTHER	9

[Q58 THROUGH Q59 = BLANK]

Q60. What is your position/title? [JOB TITLE, NOT RANK; ASK ONLY IF YOU DO NOT KNOW]

- CHIEF 1
- ASST/DEPUTY CHIEF 2
- TECHNICAL MANAGER 3
- DETECTIVE/INVESTIGATOR 4
- ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF 5
- COMPUTER STAFF 6
- OTHER [SPECIFY] 7 _____

Q61. Are you civilian or sworn? [ASK ONLY IF YOU DO NOT KNOW]

- CIVILIAN 1
- SWORN 2

Q62. Gender [DON'T ASK]

- FEMALE 1
- MALE 2

Q63. [PARTICIPATING AGENCIES] Can you give me the name of another contact person within your department who knows about the Data Warehouse system and could provide us with detailed information about the use of the Data Warehouse in your agency?

[NON-PARTICIPATING AGENCIES] Can you give me the name of another contact person within your department who knows about your equipment and computer technology?

Name _____

Position _____

Contact phone _____

Best time to contact _____

Q64. Would you like to receive a summary of our report findings?

- YES 1
- NO 0

That completes our survey! Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.