EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM

2005 State Annual Report

Ohio Department of Public Safety (ODPS)
Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS)
1970 W. Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio   43223
Toll-free: (800) 448-4842
Telephone: (614) 466-7782
Fax: (614) 466-0308
http://www.ocjs.state.oh.us

Bob Taft, Governor
Bruce Johnson, Lt. Governor
Kenneth L. Morkel, Director, ODPS
Karhlton F. Moore, Executive Director, OCJS

OHIO OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES
Edward J. Byrne Memorial
State Annual Report
TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS) implemented the fiscal year (FY) 2003 Edward Byrne Memorial Program with the goal of assisting local and state government in preventing and controlling illegal drugs, reducing incidents of violent crime and improving the overall functioning of the criminal justice system. The table "Ohio Programs and Byrne Goals" notes which calendar year (CY) 2004 programs are relevant to the Byrne Formula Grant Program Goals.

Ohio Programs and Byrne Goals

Program Area	Prevent and Control Illegal Drugs	Reduce Violent Crime	Improve Overall Operations
Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces	X	X	
Community Crime Prevention and Community Oriented Policing	X	X	
Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison for Non-Violent Offenders	X	X	
Non-Compensation Assistance to Jurors, Witnesses and Victims		X	X
Innovative Programs Demonstrating New and Different Approaches to Enforcement, Prosecution and Adjudication	X	X	
Treatment Programs for Drug- and Alcohol-Dependent Offenders	X	X	
Criminal Justice Information Systems		X	X
Homeland Security and Anti-Terrorism		X	X

Bold *denotes programs with independent evaluations during Calendar Year 2004.*

Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces
While the number of task forces declined during the period 2001 through 2004 and the average amount of funding per task force decreased six percent from 2003, most measures of project effectiveness during 2004 increased. The increase is especially true for: (1) the number of investigations and arrests, (2) the amounts of cocaine, heroin and methamphetamine removed, and (3) the value of criminal asset seizures and forfeitures. In terms of the demographics of those arrested, there was a decline in the percent of African-American arrests and an increase in the percent of Caucasians arrested.

Community Crime Prevention and Community Oriented Policing (COP)
During 2004, the Ohio Crime Prevention/COP program accomplished its objectives of increased inter-agency collaboration and citizen-police cooperation by providing services for more than 33,000 people, including more than 14,000 youth and 2,600 parents. These services were provided by a variety of agencies throughout Ohio, including 22 projects implemented by law enforcement agencies, 23 by non-law enforcement local service

providers, nine by courts or prosecution, eight by statewide associations, six by local schools, four by colleges, three by faith-based agencies, three by state agencies, and two other types of agencies. In addition to these direct service projects, funding was provided for two university research studies on crime prevention.

Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison for Non-Violent Offenders
During CY 2004, the Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison Programs accomplished its goal of providing community correction alternatives that serve the offenders' treatment needs. The projects reported serving 4,134 offenders, resulting in saving 191,295 bed days in Ohio's jails and prisons. The programs provided services for both juvenile and adult offenders. These services focused on substance abuse, mental health, family services and employment needs. Of the 2,744 offenders terminated from these programs during 2004, 74 percent (2,029) were terminated successfully. Unexcused absences and lack of cooperation were the most common reasons for unsuccessful termination. Three percent were terminated for failed urinalysis.

Non-Compensation Assistance to Jurors, Witnesses and Victims
During CY 2004, the Non-Compensation Assistance to Jurors, Witnesses and Victims program was very successful in providing increased services to African-American and Hispanic youth in Ohio's urban areas. African-American and Hispanic juvenile males increased from five percent of clients during CY 2002 to 17 percent during CY 2004. While doing so, the program was able to continue its emphasis on services to victims of domestic violence. These victims accounted for 62 percent of all clients served by the Ohio program during CY 2004.

Innovative Programs Demonstrating New and Different Approaches to Enforcement, Prosecution and Adjudication
During CY 2004, Ohio's Innovative Programs category was successful in increasing the number of individuals receiving advanced training, the number of criminal cases initiated and completed, and the number of specialized court dockets.

Treatment Programs for Drug- and Alcohol-Dependent Offenders
Program Area F accomplished its objective of providing drug and alcohol treatment to offenders through the establishment or expansion of six drug courts, one mental health court, one re-entry court, two institutional projects, and seven other projects. During CY 2004, these projects treated 831 offenders and provided an average 19.6 hours of service per week. Overall, of those terminated from Area F projects during CY 2004, 57 percent successfully completed the programming after participating in the program an average of 129 days. The three juvenile projects averaged 87 percent successful completion, with these juveniles participating in the programs an average of 197 days.

Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS)
Progress was made on all eight tasks identified for the Ohio Criminal Justice Information Systems Program during 2004. The greatest improvement was with juvenile justice. The CJIS Policy Board determined that a juvenile justice information system needs assessment should be conducted. The recommendations from the needs assessment led to the creation of the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Steering Committee. The goal is to electronically connect the 88 Ohio juvenile courts to share information and enable electronic report transmission to the Ohio Department of Youth Services.

Progress on the eight tasks resulted in achieving the objectives of increasing the quantity and quality of justice information in the state, as well as improving the exchange of information between justice information systems within the state.

Homeland Security and Anti-Terrorism
During CY 2004, Ohio's Homeland Security and Anti-Terrorism Program improved the state's capacity to respond to terrorist threats and actions through training, equipment and enforcement activities. One enforcement activity involved collaboration with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and other federal agencies in gaining indictments against a multi-state theft and fraud ring that was sending proceeds to the Middle East. As in CY 2003, an area of much activity was Lake Erie. Training and improved collaboration resulted in increased interdictions on the lake. Equipment purchased was primarily communications and hazmat related. More than 1,100 officers received training on equipment, hazmat response and maritime interdiction.

FUND DISTRIBUTION AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

In three of Ohio's six metropolitan counties, regional planning units (RPUs) conduct comprehensive criminal and juvenile justice planning and administer grant funds locally. Local priorities are established within the parameters of the state strategy, based on the identification of local needs. Each of the three RPUs has its own unique way of identifying local needs. For example:
> - Franklin County conducts a needs assessment. The results are reviewed and presented to the justice planning committee. The committee determines the funding priorities based on the needs assessment.
> - Lucas County holds public hearings, out of which comes information and concerns that form the foundation for funding priorities for the coming year.
> - Cuyahoga County has a supervisory board made up of several standing committees. It is the responsibility of the various committees to identify local problems and concerns and to then make recommendations to the supervisory board. The board then reviews the identified issues and authorizes priorities. Those priorities are weighted for the review process and impact on the funding decisions.

SECTION I:
INTRODUCTION

I. A.   OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMS

A comprehensive Needs Assessment conducted by OCJS in 2000 identified the following priorities:

- Promoting the philosophy of community oriented policing (COP).
- Reducing violent crime, making available effective treatment/correctional programming for adjudicated/convicted offenders.
- Promoting the collection and use of justice-related data.
- Promoting restoration for crime victims.
- Sustaining and expanding coordination of multi-jurisdictional enforcement agencies.
- Promoting equity and efficiency in the administration of criminal justice.

To meet these priorities, OCJS offered eight program areas in which local constituents could apply during CY 2004.

Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces
This program contributes to the goal of controlling illegal drugs by identifying, investigating and arresting drug traffickers operating multi-jurisdictional areas. Many of these drug traffickers also traffic in guns and other contraband. By arresting these individuals, the task forces also contribute to the reduction of violent crime.

Community Crime Prevention and Community Oriented Policing
Effective community oriented policing (COP) is essential to controlling drugs and violent crime. In addition to COP, projects funded through this program focus on crime prevention activities with youth and young adults as well as specialized community sub-groups (businesses, seniors).

Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison for Non-Violent Offenders
One of the greatest needs was treatment services for offenders, especially for mentally ill offenders and substance abusing offenders. This program supported effective treatment services during 2004 with special emphasis on substance abuse treatment. By intervening in the drug-crime cycle, this program contributes to both the goals of controlling illegal drugs and reducing violent crime.

Non-Compensation Assistance for Jurors, Witnesses and Victim Services
The importance of victim services found in the 2000 Byrne Needs Assessment was later reinforced in OCJS's 2001 Family Violence Needs Assessment. There is notable variation in needs and resources throughout the state, especially the great need and limited resources in the Appalachian counties. Effective victim services contribute to the long-term overall operations of the justice system. Effective intervention can also contribute to a reduction in violent crime.

Treatment Programs for Drug- and Alcohol-Dependent Offenders
One of the greatest needs discovered in the 2000 Needs Assessment was treatment services for offenders. This is especially true for mentally ill offenders and substance

abusing offenders. This program supports effective treatment services with special emphasis on substance abuse treatment. By intervening in the drug-crime calendar year, this program contributes to both the goals of controlling illegal drugs and reducing violent crime.

Innovative Programs Demonstrating New and Different Approaches to Enforcement, Prosecution and Adjudication
It is a common refrain among justice professionals that if we want to improve our communities we cannot continue to just do more of the same. This program supports innovative enforcement, prosecution and adjudication programs that contribute to controlling drugs and reducing violent crime.

Criminal Justice Information Systems
Accurate information is essential to improving overall operations of the justice system. Improvement of information systems was also one of the highest priorities discovered by the Ohio Needs Assessment.

Homeland Security and Anti-Terrorism
Ohio has several mission-critical areas. It has one international border and a complex transportation system that includes: nine ports on Lake Erie and 16 terminals on the Ohio River; 33,000 trucking companies and 36 railroads; the 4th largest interstate system in the U.S.; three air cargo hubs and more than 180 private airports.

I. B.   COORDINATION EFFORTS

Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)
OCJS worked with the Ohio Family Violence Advisory Council and the OCJS Criminal Justice Advisory Policy Board to develop recommendations for the VAWA program. Consistent with those recommendations, during CY 2004 Ohio awarded funds to law enforcement, prosecutors and direct victim service providers.

The STOP Program (Services Training Officers Prosecution) awarded approximately $3,047,607 to 80 projects that support statewide efforts to improve the criminal justice system's response to violence against women, and enhance the services to female victims of violent crime in Ohio. While some projects receive both VAWA and JAG/Byrne funds, the money is distributed to most effectively meet a variety of needs within those agencies.

Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners (RSAT)
The RSAT program funds residential substance abuse programming at both the state and local levels. The RSAT program has more restrictive guidelines (separation from general population, length of time in treatment), so Byrne funds are used for promising projects that do not fit the RSAT guidelines.

JAG/Law Enforcement
Proposed to streamline justice funding and grant administration, the JAG program allows states, tribes and local governments to support a broad range of activities to prevent and control crime based on their own local needs and conditions. JAG blends the previous

Byrne Formula and Local Law Enforcement Block Grant programs to provide agencies with the flexibility to prioritize and place justice funds where they are needed most.

Family Violence Prevention and Services (FVPS)
The purpose of the FVPS program is to prevent incidents of family violence and to provide immediate shelter and related assistance for victims of family violence and their dependents. Funding for this program went to applicants who provided or helped provide temporary refuge and shelter to victims of family violence and their dependents in an effort to prevent future violence. Much like the situation with the VAWA program, some projects receive both FVPS and and JAG/Byrne funds. The two grant programs are coordinated so they most effectively meet a variety of needs within those agencies.

SECTION II:
EVALUATION PLAN AND ACTIVITIES

II. A.   Rationale for Evaluation Plan

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) guidelines document, titled "Evaluating Drug Control and System Improvement Projects," provides the conceptual framework for organizing the evaluation of all OCJS-administered grant programs. The NIJ document distinguishes three types of evaluation: implementation, results and outcomes/impact.   The OCJS Evaluation Plan complies with this three-part distinction in the following ways:

1.   Implementation – OCJS staff assess how well each project is organized and carried out through project monitoring. Staff from the Grants Planning and Evaluation (GP&E) Section conduct the monitoring. Annual phone interviews are conducted with all projects and on-site monitoring of 10 percent of all projects from each fiscal year of funding. The exception to this protocol is research projects — OCJS researchers conduct the monitoring of every research project.

2.   Results – Monitoring is supplemented by information collected through the OCJS semi-annual performance reports. Results-level data are collected through these reports. These forms encompass questions identified by the State Reporting and Evaluation Program as well as questions of interest to policymakers in Ohio. GP&E staff periodically update the performance reports to better meet the information needs of BJA, OCJS, and the subgrantees. Performance reports are required for all funded projects.

3.   Outcomes – Each grant calendar year, OCJS funds outcome evaluations of selected programs. Selection of programs for outcome evaluations is based on their strategic interest to the state and their implications for justice in Ohio. Outcome evaluations are conducted one of three ways: by OCJS researchers, by academic institutions or through collaborative agreements between OCJS and academic institutions or other state agencies. Independent evaluators are used for outcome evaluation for two primary reasons: (a) technical expertise in evaluation methodologies, and (b) their independence lends credibility to their findings.

OCJS integrates the three types of evaluation, with semi-annual performance reports providing the link between monitoring and outcome evaluations. Semi-annual reports and monitoring together form the basis for awarding funds to continuation programs. Outcome evaluations are used in developing the Ohio Byrne Strategy and in amending program areas during intervening years.

II. B.   Staffing and Financial Resources Devoted to the Evaluation Effort

In 2004, Ohio funded seven independent research projects totaling $598,296. The research projects included program evaluations of local preparedness, victim services, crime prevention, residential substance abuse treatment, violent offenders and drug courts, as well as research using NIBRS and other data necessary for program planning. The research projects are described as part of their respective "program area" performance summaries.

SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER THE BYRNE FORMULA GRANT
PROGRAM

Program Area A:
Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces

III. A. 1.   PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area A is open only to law enforcement agencies, and is meant to supplement, rather than replace local enforcement activities. Task forces focus attention on the trafficking of illicit drugs, but also investigate firearms and stolen goods as well as gangs and other organized forms of criminal activity. During CY 2004, OCJS funded 27 task forces in the amount of $3,816,339.

III. A. 2.   GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area A Goals:
The task forces strive to lessen the impact of drug and firearm traffickers, pharmaceutical diversion, gangs and other organized criminal activity on the health and safety of Ohio citizens through multi-jurisdictional collaboration.

Program Area A Objectives:
- To identify, investigate and arrest multi-jurisdictional mid- and upper-level drug traffickers and/or pharmaceutical diverters in Ohio.

- To identify, investigate, arrest and prosecute offenders illegally diverting pharmaceutical drugs.

Program Area A Activities and Requirements:
All task forces supported through the Ohio program are required to have met the following specifications:
- All task forces must be multi-jurisdictional and may be multi-disciplinary.
- Must include prosecutors from each county represented by a participating law enforcement agency.
- Must include at least one state or federal law enforcement agency as a participating agency.
- Must establish a collaboration board to develop policies; allocate financial, personnel and programmatic resources; and approve investigatory and prosecutorial plans for the task force. The collaboration board must be composed of representatives of all participating agencies that are responsible for developing policies allocating resources, and approving investigatory and prosecutorial plans.
- Projects with a pharmaceutical diversion component must include the Ohio State Pharmacy Board in their collaboration memo.
- All task force commanders or a designee are required to attend OCJS-sponsored task force commander meetings.

The Drug Enforcement Administration, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are participating agencies in more than half of Ohio's task forces. Other federal agencies participating in at least one Ohio task force include U.S. Coast Guard, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Attorney and U.S. Marshal.

III. A. 3.   PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

Program performance measures and evaluation methods focus on the number of investigations of drug traffickers, the number of people arrested and prosecuted for drug trafficking and the amount of illicit drugs, stolen goods and/or firearms confiscated.

III. A. 4.   PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2004 Program Accomplishments
While the number of task forces declined during the period 2001 through 2004 and the average amount of funding per task force decreased six percent from 2003, most measures of project effectiveness during 2004 increased. The increase is especially true for: (1) the number of investigations and arrests, (2) the amounts of cocaine, heroin and methamphetamine (meth) removed, and (3) the value of criminal asset seizures and forfeitures. In terms of the demographics of those arrested, there was a decline in the percent of African-American arrests and an increase in the percent of Caucasians arrested.

Overview of Project Performance
Twenty-six task forces submitted performance data during calendar year 2004. Forty-eight semi-annual reports were received, a 92 percent reporting rate.

Ohio Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2004

Activity	CY 2004 Total	Average per Task Force per Year
Investigations Initiated	7,039	271
Arrests	5,158	196
Cocaine Seized	184,029 grams	7,078 grams
Crack Seized	5,722 grams	220 grams
Marijuana Plants Seized	9,214 plants	354 plants
Heroin Seized	11,288 grams	434 grams
Amphetamines/ Methamphetamines	4,949 grams	190 grams
Criminal Assets Seized	$7,075,142	$272,121
Criminal Assets Forfeited	$1,681,938	$64,690

Ohio's law enforcement task forces are designed to identify, investigate and arrest mid- to upper-level drug traffickers and violent offenders. The goal is not to supplant, but to supplement regular law enforcement by addressing offenders operating in a multi-jurisdictional region. These offenders are often difficult, if not impossible, to identify by an agency working only within one jurisdiction.

In order to make arrests, Ohio's task forces must first identify and investigate offenders operating across jurisdictional boundaries. During 2004, the task forces reported initiating 7,039 investigations, an average of 271 per task force per year. This is an increase of 16 percent from new investigations during CY 2003. The average number of new investigations per task force steadily increased during the four years, producing a 66-percent increase from 2001 to 2004.

New Task Force Investigations

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Number of Task Forces Reporting	35	32	25	26
Number of New Investigations Reported	5,713	5,529	6,066	7,039
Average Number of New Investigations per Task Force per Year	163	173	243	271

The investigations resulted in a reported 5,158 arrests during CY 2004. This is an average of 198 arrests per task force per year, an increase of 11 percent from CY 2003. The average number of arrests per task force was substantially higher in 2004 than in 2001, increasing 64 percent over the four-year period. There were 18,060 arrests during 2001 through 2004, an average of 153 arrests per task force per year for the whole of the four-year period.

Average Arrests per Task Force

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Number of Task Forces Reporting	35	32	25	26
Number of Arrests Reported	4,248	3,995	4,659	5,158
Average Number of Arrests per Task Force per Year	121	125	186	198

The following six tables present demographic data on those arrested. For the most part, those arrested by the task forces from 2001 through 2004 were consistent with the demographic profile of arrestees from the beginning of the Ohio task force program. This is especially true regarding gender and age. The most notable demographic change was the increase in the percent of Caucasians from 2001 to 2004. Increases in the percentage of arrests occurred with both Caucasian males and Caucasian females. Further, all of the increases in the percentage of Caucasians occurred with adult offenders. There have been corresponding decreases in the percentage of African-American arrestees. There has been speculation that some of the increase in the percentage of Caucasians reflects greater involvement of Caucasians in the manufacture and distribution of meth in Ohio, although meth does not explain all of this trend.

Over the years, males have consistently been the vast majority (about 80 percent) of those arrested by Ohio's task forces. This was true for the 2001 through 2004 period as well. It is too soon to tell if the slightly lower percent of males arrested in 2004 is the beginning of a trend.

10

Percent of Arrestees by Gender

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Female	19%	19%	19%	21%
Male	81%	81%	81%	79%

As with males, adults have consistently been the vast majority of task force arrestees, comprising about 95 percent of all arrestees.

Percent of Arrestees by Age

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
17 years or less	4%	5%	5%	4%
18 years or more	96%	95%	95%	96%

Repeat offenders were the majority of arrestees in each of the last four years. The year 2003 was notably higher in the percentage of repeat offenders.

Percent of Arrestees by Criminal History

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
First time offender	48%	49%	42%	46%
Repeat offender	52%	51%	58%	54%

From 2001 through 2004, there was a decrease of African-Americans arrested (from 49 percent to 34 percent) and an increase in Caucasians arrested (46 percent to 61 percent). This is the most notable change in the demographics of those arrested by Ohio task forces during the period.

Percent of Arrestees by Race and Ethnicity

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
African-American	49%	49%	41%	34%
Caucasian	46%	47%	56%	61%
Hispanic	3%	4%	3%	4%
Other	2%	< 1%	< 1%	1%

The shift to a higher percentage of Caucasian arrestees occurred for both males (+10 percent) and females (+five percent). As has been true throughout the history of this program, females were a larger percentage of Caucasian arrestees as a whole than females were for African-American arrestees or for Hispanic arrestees.

Percent of Arrestees by Gender and Race/Ethnicity*

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
African-American				
% male	42%	42%	36%	30%
% female	7%	7%	5%	4%
Caucasian				
% male	35%	35%	42%	45%
% female	11%	11%	13%	16%
Hispanic				
% male	2%	3%	3%	3%
% female	1%	< 1%	< 1%	1%
Other				
% male	1%	< 1%	< 1%	1%
% female	< 1%	< 1%	< 1%	< 1%

* *Percents are the percentage each group comprises of all arrestees where gender is known.*

The changes in the percent of African-American and Caucasian arrestees were the result of changes in the percentage of adult arrests. The percentages of juveniles were stable over the four years.

Percent of Arrestees by Age and Race/Ethnicity*

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
African-American				
% juvenile	1%	2%	2%	2%
% adult	48%	48%	39%	33%
Caucasian				
% juvenile	2%	3%	3%	2%
% adult	44%	44%	52%	60%
Hispanic				
% juvenile	< 1%	< 1%	< 1%	< 1%
% adult	3%	3%	3%	3%
Other				
% juvenile	< 1%	0%	< 1%	< 1%
% adult	1%	< 1%	< 1%	1%

* *Percents are the percentage each group comprises of all arrestees where age is known.*

A higher percent of African-Americans was reported to be repeat offenders than first-time offenders. For Caucasians the reverse is true. Hispanic and "Other" are split equally between first-time offenders and repeat offenders. However, use caution in viewing these data. Criminal history can be difficult to obtain and there are far more missing data on criminal history – about 40 percent over the four-year period – than with the other demographic categories.

Percent of Arrestees by Criminal History and Race and Ethnicity*

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
African-American				
% first time offenders	13%	14%	14%	9%
% repeat offenders	28%	29%	30%	26%
Caucasian				
% first time offenders	32%	33%	32%	36%
% repeat offenders	22%	20%	20%	26%
Hispanic				
% first time offenders	1%	2%	2%	2%
% repeat offenders	2%	2%	2%	2%
Other				
% first time offenders	1%	< 1%	< 1%	< 1%
% repeat offenders	1%	< 1%	< 1%	< 1%

* *Percents are the percentage each group comprises of all arrestees where criminal history is known.*

The average amount of drugs removed per task force substantially increased for cocaine, heroin and methamphetamines from 2001 to 2004. The amount of LSD and crack declined while the number of marijuana plants removed fluctuated. Use caution in assessing these data for several reasons:

- Illicit drug use can vary substantially over time as drugs gain and lose popularity.
- A few exceptionally large busts can produce spikes in the reported drugs removed.
- The way the data are reported is not always consistent across task forces or within a single task force. This is especially true with the drugs that have been reported as both grams and dosage units or grams and pounds (i.e. marijuana).

The table below focuses on the non-pharmaceutical drugs that are of most current interest except for pharmaceutical drugs that will be covered separately. Other than the steady decline in the total amount of crack removed, none of the drugs had a trend that was consistent through all four years. In general, the amount of cocaine and heroin increased substantially, the number of marijuana plants fluctuated and the amount of LSD decreased.

Type and Amount of Drugs Removed * *

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Cocaine	46,930 grams	192,633 grams	41,803 grams	184,029 grams
Crack	14,972 grams	10,207 grams	8,651 grams	5,722 grams
Marijuana	9,455 pounds	497 pounds	16,877 pounds	265,959 pounds***
	6,209 plants	30,388 plants	11,501 plants	9,214 plants
Heroin	3,471 grams	948 grams	2,440 grams	11,288 grams
LSD	1,606 DUs	5,693 DUs	524 DUs	929 DUs

In this and succeeding tables, "DUs" are the number of dosage units.

** When drugs were reported as DUs when the preferred unity was grams, the DUs were converted to grams at the rate of 1 DU = 0.2 grams.*

*** This figure is likely incorrect. The online performance reporting requests that the unit of measure for marijuana be pounds. However, it is known that some reports present marijuana in terms of grams. It is not possible with the online submissions to identify all the reports that were actually grams; thus, it is not possible to accurately convert all the reports to the common unit of pounds .*

Trends in drug removal per task force are a better way to assess task force performance because it corrects for changes in the number of Byrne-funded task forces. Reported this way, none of the drugs had a consistent direction of change through the whole of the four years. This may reflect, in part, fluctuations in the popularity of a drug over time. In general, the amount of cocaine and heroin increased over the four years, marijuana plants removed fluctuated and crack and LSD declined.

Type and Average Amount of Drugs Removed * **

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Number of Reporting Task Forces	35	32	25	26
Cocaine	1,340 grams	6,020 grams	1,672 grams	7,078 grams
Crack	428 grams	319 grams	346 grams	220 grams
Marijuana	270 pounds 177 plants	16 pounds 950 plants	675 pounds 460 plants	10,229 pounds*** 354 plants
Heroin	99 grams	30 grams	98 grams	434 grams
LSD	46 DUs	178 DUs	21 DUs	36 DUs

* *Data in this table are the average amounts of drugs removed per task force. This corrects for the number of task forces reporting performance data each year.*

** *When drugs were reported as DUs when the preferred unity was grams, the DUs were converted to grams at the rate of 1 DU = 0.2 grams.*

*** *This figure is likely incorrect. The online performance reporting requests that the unit of measure for marijuana be pounds. However, in the past some reports have presented marijuana in terms of grams. Given the 1,700 percent increase over 2003, it probably is the case that at least some of the reported pounds were actually grams. It is not possible with the online submissions to determine the amount that were actually grams.*

The largest percent increase of drugs removed over the four years was for cocaine and heroin. The amount of crack and LSD removed both declined. The 125-percent increase in the number of marijuana plants is misleading in that the amounts taken in the intervening years were substantially greater than for 2001 and 2004.

Average Amounts of Drugs Removed Over the Four-Year Period * **

Year	2001	2004	Percent Change 2001 to 2004
Cocaine	1,340 grams	7,078 grams	+ 428%
Crack	428 grams	220 grams	- 49%
Marijuana	270 pounds 177 plants	10,229 pounds*** 399 plants	+ 3,689% + 125%
Heroin	99 grams	434 grams	+ 338%
LSD	46 DUs	36 DUs	- 22%

* *Data in this table are the average amounts of drugs removed per task force. This corrects for the number of task forces reporting performance data.each year.*

** *When drugs were reported as DUs when the preferred unity was grams, the DUs were converted to grams at the rate of 1 DU = 0.2 grams.*

*** *This figure is likely incorrect. The online performance reporting requests that the unit of measure for marijuana be pounds. However, in the past some reports have presented marijuana in terms of grams. Given the 1,700 percent increase over 2003, it probably is the case that at least some of the reported pounds were actually grams. It is not possible with the online submissions to determine the amount that were actually grams.*

During the whole of the 2001 through 2004 period, Ohio's task forces removed large amounts of drugs, as seen in the table below.

Drug Removals: 2001 through 2004

Type of Drug	Total Drugs Removed 2001 through 2004	Average Amount per Task Force per Year CY 2001 through 2004
Cocaine	465,395 grams	3,944 grams
Crack	39,552 grams	335 grams
Marijuana	292,788 pounds*	2,481 pounds*
	57,312 plants	486 plants
Heroin	18,147 grams	154 grams
LSD	8,752 DUs	74 DUs

* The number of pounds reported for 2004 is questionable.

Due to changes in the performance reporting form, removals of pharmaceutical drugs are more specific for 2004 than for preceding years. Thus, data on pharmaceutical diversion will focus only on 2004 data. Amphetamine/methamphetamine was the drug for which the largest amount was removed. Xanax is also notable, as more than twice as many dosage units were diverted than for the next most common drug (Vicodin/Loritab).

Pharmaceutical Diversion During 2004

Type of Drug	Amount Dosage Units	Measured Amount
Acetaminophen with Codeine (Tylenol with Codeine)	1,502	
Alprazolam (Xanax)	13,715	
Amphetamine/methamphetamine*		4,949 gm
Carisoprodol (Soma)	2,132	
Citalopram Hydrobromide (Klonopin)	13	
Demoral		80 ml
Depressants	1,241	
Diazepam	88	
Diphenoxylate		13 ml
Durgestic Patch	1	
Hydrocodone (Vicodin/Loritab)	6,255	
Klonopin	36	
Oxycodone (Percocet/OxyContin)	2,089	
Tramadol	300	
Other	7,748	

* Because the reporting form in use during 2004 listed amphetamines and methamphetamines as one reporting category, task force commanders decided to report the combined category as pharmaceutical drugs.

The one group of pharmaceutical drugs for which trend data exists is amphetamines/methamphetamines. Based on monthly summaries from the task force commanders, there is reason to believe that most of these drugs removed were methamphetamine. There has been year-to-year fluctuation, but in general the amount of methamphetamines increased substantially.

Average Amount of Amphetamines/Methamphetamines Removed*

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Number of Reporting Task Forces	35	32	25	26
Methamphetamine or Amphetamine	17 grams	256 grams	65 grams	190 grams

* Data in this table are the average amounts of drugs removed per task force. This corrects for the number of task forces reporting each year.

The percent increase for amphetamines/methamphetamines was much greater than the percent increase in any other drug.

Average Amounts of Drugs Removed Over the Four-Year Period*

Year	2001	2004	Percent Change 2001 to 2004
Methamphetamine or amphetamine	17 grams	190 grams	+ 1,018%

* Data in this table are the average amounts of drugs removed per task force. This corrects for the number of task forces reporting performance data each year.

During the whole of the 2001 through 2004 period, Ohio's task forces removed more than 15,000 grams of methamphetamine or amphetamine.

Drug Removals: 2001 through 2004

Year	Total Drugs Removed 2001 through 2004	Average Amount per Task Force per Year 2001 through 2004
Methamphetamine or amphetamine	15,349 grams	130 grams

The total amount and average per task force for asset seizures and forfeitures increased over the period 2001 through 2004. The pattern for criminal asset seizures/forfeitures is similar to drugs removed – a consistent level of activity punctuated by occasional large busts. This increase in criminal assets is the third major indicator of increased task force effectiveness during the 2001 through 2004 period, along with the increase in investigations and arrests and the increase in the amount of cocaine, heroin and methamphetamine removed.

The greater amounts of seizures and forfeitures in 2002 and 2004 reflect a few exceptionally large seizures/forfeitures during those years.

Criminal Asset Seizures and Forfeitures

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Criminal Assets Seized	$3,349,665	$7,500,805	$4,546,633	$7,075,142
Criminal Assets Forfeited	$887,965	$2,006,350	$751,910	$1,681,938

The average value of criminal asset forfeitures per task force was higher in 2004 than for the other three years.

Average Criminal Asset Seizures and Forfeitures per Task Force per Year

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Number of Reporting Task Forces	35	32	25	26
Average Criminal Assets **Seized** per Task Force per Year	$95,705	$234,400	$181,865	$272,121
Average Criminal Assets **Forfeited** per Task Force per Year	$25,370	$62,698	$30,076	$64,690

In both cases, the percent change from 2001 to 2004 in the estimated value of criminal asset seizures and actual value of criminal asset forfeitures was substantial.

Change in Average Criminal Assets per Task Force During the Four-Year Period

Year	2001	2004	Percent Change 2001 to 2004
Average Estimated Criminal Assets **Seized** per Task Force per Year	$95,705	$272,121	+ 184%
Average Criminal Assets **Forfeited** per Task Force per Year	$25,370	$64,690	+ 155%

Currency accounted for the largest portions of criminal asset seizures during three of the four years. Motor vehicles and real property also accounted for substantial amounts. The pattern of currency being the largest category, and motor vehicles or real property being the next largest has held since the beginning of the Byrne Formula Grant Program in Ohio.

Average Criminal Asset Seizures by Type*

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Motor Vehicles	25%	10%	25%	26%
Currency	29%	47%	55%	58%
Financial Instruments	5%	< 1%	< 1%	< 1%
Real Property	38%	16%	16%	13%
Other	2%	27%	4%	1%

* Totals do not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Currency was also the largest category for criminal asset forfeitures all four years. Indeed, currency accounted for more than half of forfeitures each year and more than 70 percent for the whole four-year period.

Average Criminal Asset Forfeitures by Type

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
Motor Vehicles	11%	9%	22%	13%
Currency	80%	65%	57%	83%
Financial Instruments	0%	0%	0%	0%
Real Property	6%	25%	19%	3%
Other	3%	1%	2%	< 1%

Criminal assets seized totaled $22,472,245, an average of $761,771 criminal assets seized per task force for all four years. Criminal assets forfeited to the task forces totaled $5,328,163, an average of $180,616 per task force 2001 through 2004.

Total Criminal Asset Seizures and Forfeitures

Measure	Criminal Assets 2001 through 2004	Average Criminal Assets per Task Force 2001 through 2004
Criminal Assets Seized	$22,472,245	$761,771
Criminal Assets Forfeited	$5,328,163	$180,616

Program Area B:
Community Crime Prevention and Community Oriented Policing

III. B. 1.   PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area B is open to all eligible units of local government. Applicants are encouraged to develop crime prevention projects aimed at stopping criminal victimization before it happens. Such activities can be directed toward potential victims, potential offenders or areas that give rise to crime. During CY 2004, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded 82 Community Crime Prevention/COP projects in the amount of $1,740,802.

III. B. 2.   GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area B Goals:
To prevent and reduce crime and the fear it brings to communities through collaborative crime prevention in order to maintain order, solve problems and improve the quality of life for Ohio citizens.

Program Area B Objectives:
- ➢ To prevent and reduce the fear of crime through a collaborative crime prevention project that promotes partnership among law enforcement, community groups and individuals.

- ➢ To promote police-citizen cooperation to address the problems of crime and social disorder, while improving the quality of life in the community.

Program Area B Activities and Requirements:
- ➢ The project may have collaboration boards, consisting of organizations actively participating with the project.
- ➢ Gang prevention projects must include law enforcement representation in the collaboration.
- ➢ Community Oriented Policing applicants must describe a plan of action for the implementation of community policing within all levels of the law enforcement agency. The plan must reflect the participation and cooperation of law enforcement, community members and public and private agencies.

III. B. 3.   PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

The number of increased community members with crime prevention knowledge is a program performance measure.

Conducting a community survey measuring fear of crime and knowledge of crime prevention techniques before and after collaboration with law enforcement is an evaluation method.

III. B. 4.   Program Accomplishments and Evaluation Results

Summary of CY 2004 Program Accomplishments
During 2004, the Ohio Crime Prevention/COP program accomplished its objectives of increased inter-agency collaboration and citizen-police cooperation by providing services for more than 33,000 people, including more than 14,000 youth and 2,600 parents. These services were provided by a variety of agencies throughout Ohio, including 22 projects implemented by law enforcement agencies, 23 by non-law enforcement local service providers, nine by courts or prosecution, eight by statewide associations, six by local schools, four by colleges, three by faith-based agencies, three by state agencies, and two other types of agencies. In addition to these direct service projects, funding was provided for two university research studies on crime prevention.

Overview of Project Performance
Ohio's Community Crime Prevention/COP Program provides funding for a variety of projects that address the prevention of crime. The 82 projects submitted 128 semi-annual reports, a reporting rate of 78 percent.   The table below summarizes their accomplishments.

Ohio Community Crime Prevention/COP At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2004

Activity	*CY 2004 Total*
Number of Persons Served	33,031
Number of Youth	14,108
Number of Parents	2,658
Number of Senior Citizens	432
Number in Specialized Women's Programs	1,960
Number in Private Business	13
Number of Local Service Providers	2,347
General Public	11,513

Thirty-four percent of the projects were located in the metropolitan areas of Cleveland, Columbus and Toledo. The remaining 66 percent of projects were located in other metropolitan areas (Cincinnati, Dayton and Akron) or in rural counties. Not only were there a variety of agencies providing services, each type of agency covered a variety of services.

Of the 18 local law enforcement projects:
- 28 percent were located in schools (mostly school resource officers)
- 17 percent provided officer training
- 6 percent focused on prevention with the mentally ill
- 50 percent provided general crime prevention services

Of the 23 non-law enforcement local service providers:
- 43 percent involved schools or other youth programs
- 4 percent provided officer training

20

- 9 percent focused on prevention with the mentally ill
- 43 percent provided general crime prevention services

Of the eight statewide association projects:
- 38 percent involved schools or other youth programs
- 50 percent provided officer training
- 12 percent focused on prevention with the mentally ill

Of the three state agency projects:
- 33 percent involved officer training
- 67 percent provided general crime prevention services

Most of the Ohio crime prevention projects provide more than one program. Statewide in 2004, there were 384 crime prevention programs funded through Byrne, an average of 4.7 per project. Sixty-four percent of the programs served schools or other youth programs. Together they served 14,108 youth, 47 percent of all persons served by Ohio crime prevention programs.

Types of Ohio Crime Prevention Programs
and Number of People Served
CY 2004

Type of Program	Number of Programs	Percent of All Programs	Number of People Served	Percent of All People Served
Schools and Other Youth Programs	246	64.1%	14,108	42.7%
Parents	4	1.0%	2,658	8.0%
Women	3	0.8%	1,960	5.9%
Seniors	18	4.7%	432	1.3%
Law Enforcement/General Crime Prevention	108	28.1%	11,526	34.9%
Other	5	1.3%	2,347	7.1%

<u>Summary of Evaluations</u>

Development of Evaluation Methodologies for Criminal Justice Programs –
Ohio State University
OCJS has built its evaluation of corrections programs on the work of Paul Gendreau and Don Andrews, including their Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) instrument. OCJS has long hoped for an equivalent instrument for some of the other Byrne program areas, especially those concerned with crime prevention and victims. A problem has been that neither prevention programs nor victim programs have many empirical evaluation studies, the basis of the CPAI that are available for corrections. The Ohio State project is based on the belief that if the empirical basis does not exist, the next best basis is to ask practitioners what they believe works or does not work. CY 2004 activities involved interviewing practitioners on what constitutes best practices in their field. Best practices identified will be the basis for development of assessment instruments for prevention programs and for victims programs.

Program Area C:
Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison for Non-Violent Offenders

III. C. 1.   PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area C is open to all eligible units of local government. Applicants are to develop projects aimed at reducing detention, jail and prison populations. During CY 2004, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded 26 Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison projects in the amount of $754,654.

III. C. 2.   GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area C Goals:
To decrease criminal behavior in Ohio by providing effective non-residential correctional programs.

Program Area C Objectives:
➢ To provide community correction alternatives that focus on providing services to offenders in a least restrictive setting, given the offense and offender behavior; and to provide treatment services to offenders or broker community treatment services that meet offender needs.

Program Area C Activities and Requirements:
➢ The collaboration must include probation and/or parole representatives.
➢ Applicants for substance abuse projects must include either certification from the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, or a statement of review from the local alcohol and drug addiction services board.
➢ The intake process must be summarized from the point the offender is considered for the program through admission and participation. The applicant must define the criteria for rejecting an offender from the program.
➢ The applicant must summarize a system designed to assess offenders, refer them to services, monitor offenders' progress in the project and define successful completion and sanctions for offenders' non-compliance.

III. C. 3.   PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

Program performance measures and evaluation methods focus on the number of offenders successfully completing the non-residential substance abuse program.

III. C. 4.   PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2004 Program Accomplishments
During CY 2004, the Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison programs accomplished its goal of providing community correction alternatives that serve the offenders' treatment needs. The projects reported serving 4,134 offenders, resulting in saving 191,295 bed days in Ohio's jails and prisons. The programs provided services for both juvenile and adult offenders. These services focused on substance abuse, mental health,

family services and employment needs. Of the 2,744 offenders terminated from these programs during 2004, 74 percent (2,029) were terminated successfully. Unexcused absences and lack of cooperation were the most common reasons for unsuccessful termination. Three percent were terminated for failed urinalysis.

Overview of Project Performance
Twenty-six projects were funded during CY 2004, 25 of which were direct service projects (one was an independent program evaluation). The projects submitted 44 semi-annual performance reports, a reporting rate of 85 percent.

Ohio Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison for Non-Violent Offenders
At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2004

Activity	CY 2004 Total
Total number of offenders served	4,134
Average number of bed days saved per offender	44 days*
Percent of offenders successfully completing program	74%
Percent of offenders not successfully completing program	26%

* The mean number saved when both the average number of bed days and the number of offenders were reported.

Forty-eight percent of the projects served pre-adjudication offenders, 64 percent served post-adjudication offenders and 32 percent served prison re-entry clients (some projects served more than one type of offender). The direct service projects reported serving 4,134 offenders, an average of 165 per project per year. The projects reported an average of 44 bed days saved per offender.

The Ohio projects provided a variety of treatment programs. Substance abuse treatment, family services, employment and mental health services were the most common types of services provided. These services also were the four areas of primary emphasis, in that the remaining three types of services (basic education/GED, vocational training and work release) are all oriented toward employment.

Programs with Services Provided

Service	Percent of Programs with Service*
Substance Abuse	48%
Family Services	44%
Employment	44%
Mental Health	40%
Basic Education/GED	28%
Vocational Training	16%
Work Release	4%
Other**	56%

* All of the projects provided more than one type of service.
**Other services included life skills, mediation and a re-entry court.

The most commonly used sanction was community service. About one-third of the projects used victim restitution and about 20 percent used electronic monitoring or fines.

Sanctions that Programs Used

Sanction	Percent of Programs with Sanction*
Community Service	52%
Victim Restitution	32%
Electronic Monitoring	19%
Fines	19%

All of the projects used more than one type of sanction.

Of the clients terminated from the Ohio projects during CY 2004, the average number of days in the program prior to termination was nearly as long for those terminated unsuccessfully as for those terminated successfully. Those who absconded were in the program only about 70 percent as long as those successfully terminated.

Ohio Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison Successfully Completed
CY 2004

Types of Termination from Project	Percent of All Clients Terminated	Average Number of Days in the Program*
Percent Successfully Completed	74%	78 days
Percent Terminated from the Program Unsuccessfully	13%	74 days
Percent Abscond from Their Program	1%	55 days
Percent Reported as "Other"	12%	**

The mean number saved when both the average number of bed days and the number of offenders was reported.
** *The average number of days in the program was reported for only a few of the clients reported as "other."*

Unexcused absences and lack of cooperation each accounted for about one-third of those unsuccessfully terminated from the programs. Only three percent were terminated for failed urinalysis; however, 26 percent were terminated for some other indication of drug use.

Ohio Alternatives to Detention, Jail and Prison
Reason for Unsuccessful Termination
CY 2004

Reason for Unsuccessful Termination	Clients
Unexcused Absences	36%
Lack of Cooperation	33%
Failed Urinalysis	3%
Other Indication of Drug Use	26%
Other	2%*

Percents do not total 100 due to rounding.

For those offenders unsuccessfully terminated from their program, the most common reason for termination of juvenile offenders was lack of cooperation, while for adult offenders, the most common reason was for indication of drug use other than by urinalysis.

Consequences of Mental Health Court – Kent State University
Kent State University conducted the first phase of its outcome evaluation of the Akron Mental Health Court during CY 2004. Recidivism was measured along with other outcomes in the perceptions and behavior of those served by the court. This evaluation is an important contribution to establishing evidence-based practices, a cornerstone of Ohio's Clinical Quality Agenda. This contribution is enhanced by the fact that the Akron Mental Health Court has served as the model for other mental health courts in Ohio.

The Kent State study is designed to address what type of clients respond best to mental health court intervention. Further, the study is assessing if the court affects community-wide practice by breaking the cycle of arrest, release and re-arrest of those served.

During CY 2004, the project completed 281 initial interviews and 170 six-month follow-up interviews. The researchers then began the comparison between the Akron Mental Health Court and other courts in the state.

GRAD Project/Consortium for Family Research – Ohio State University
Attention to "extra-legal" factors (family context, peer relationships, educational concerns, mental health issues, etc.) that surround adolescent problem behaviors have increasingly impacted juvenile courts and treatment providers. The use of assessment instruments for classifying juveniles into appropriate treatment groups is needed to provide greater validity, structure and consistency to the intake process. However, the large numbers of youth and families with which court personnel must interact, as well as ever-present time and fiscal pressures, present a significant challenge to timely acquisition of information needed to make effective decisions regarding placement and/or treatment. In addition, while several local and state jurisdictions have developed risk assessment measures, the domains of inquiry vary appreciably from instrument to instrument.

This is a nine-month project within the 2004-2005 academic year that involves Ohio State University and OCJS. The graduate student selected to participate as Graduate Research Associate and the honors undergraduate student selected to participate as a Research Associate will conduct empirical research on the Global Risk Assessment Device (GRAD). The student will create a final report on their research project. A copy of this report will be delivered to OCJS, and will be placed on the GRAD web site.

During CY 2004, the students started their projects in the fall. This grant runs on a college academic year, so it runs from September through June. The projects being investigated include one on juvenile mental health courts and one on juvenile drug courts.

Returning Home: Prisoner Reentry in Ohio – Urban Institute (with collaboration from the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction and the Office of Criminal Justice Services)
One of the most pressing challenges facing the American justice system is the reintegration of the more than 600,000 individuals who leave state and federal prisons

and return home each year. Over the past quarter century, the size of Ohio's prison population has more than tripled, mirroring the national trend. Ohio prisons house more than 45,000 inmates, and release around 20,000 prisoners each year. Almost half of all prisoners in Ohio return to three counties — Cuyahoga County (Cleveland), Hamilton County (Cincinnati), and Franklin County (Columbus). As in many communities across the country, a large share of released prisoners in these counties return to a few neighborhoods. These neighborhoods experience high rates of prisoner removal and return.

Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry is a multi-year, multi-state study of returning prisoners, their families and the communities in which they live. The study is being implemented in Maryland, Illinois, Ohio and Texas. The research assesses five domains: individual characteristics describing the returning prisoner; the risks and assets of his or her family; the relationship of the returning prisoner to his or her peers; the strengths and weaknesses of his or her local community; and state corrections programs, policies and social and economic climate. The overall intent of the project is to inform state and local policy regarding prisoner reentry. This proposal involves interviews with prisoners before and after their release, interviews with family members of released prisoners and a series of focus groups and interviews with residents and stakeholders in Cleveland communities that are experiencing the largest concentrations of returning prisoners.

This project did not start until October 2004. Interviews began during the fall of 2004. The funding allowed Ohio to have two additional interviewers to obtain information from more parolees. The research will not be completed until 2006.

Program Area D:
Non-Compensation Assistance to Jurors, Witnesses and Victims

III. D. 1.   PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area D is for programs that assist prosecutors, law enforcement officers, courts and community-based agencies in providing supportive services to victims of crime. The program area is designed to establish victim services programs in areas of Ohio with the greatest needs and fewest resources. Funds assisted communities in effectively filling gaps in existing services and encouraging programs that can be replicated in other areas of the state. Multi-county projects are encouraged in areas where single county efforts are not feasible.

Victim assistance programs that are eligible include, but are not limited to, prosecutor, court or police-based victim assistance programs, rape crisis centers, domestic violence programs and other independent victim assistance programs. During this reporting period, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded 31 victim/witness projects in the amount of $675,159.

III. D. 2.   GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area D Goals:
To provide crime victims with needed services so that they may overcome the trauma of victimization, participate at all critical states of the criminal justice process and return to full, active lives.

Program Area D Objectives:
> To increase services for jurors and witnesses who have received threats related to a court appearance.
> Provide victims with needed services and information about the criminal justice system.

Program Area D Activities and Requirements:
The collaboration must include law enforcement, prosecution and victim service providers. If developing a visitation center, the court and children services must also be collaborating.
> Applicants must describe how the victim will be notified of his/her rights, the Ohio Victims of Crime Compensation Program (administered by the Ohio Attorney General's Office) and the Office of Victims Services (housed in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction).
> Applicant must describe the process the project will take to assure victim/juror/witness safety.
> Applicant must indicate that the services proposed in the application are not a duplication of existing services within the community. The applicant must identify the existing services being provided along with the funding source and clearly indicate what gap this project will fill.

- ➢ OCJS encourages projects to include a community education component. The applicant must indicate what steps are being taken by the project to improve awareness in the community.
- ➢ If the applicant applied for VOCA or VAWA funding, a copy of the application must be submitted along with the Byrne application.

III. D. 3.   PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

Program performance measures and evaluation methods focus on the number of victims receiving additional services, as well as the number of victims participating in a particular stage of the criminal justice process.

III. D. 4.   PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2004 Program Accomplishments
During CY 2004, the Ohio Victim/Witness Program was particularly effective in achieving its objective of providing victims with needed services and information. The program served 15,472 victims of crime in Ohio. The increase in services to African-Americans in Ohio's urban areas noted in 2003 continued in 2004. African-Americans increased from 18 percent of clients during CY 2003 to 26 percent during CY 2004. Nearly all of this increase resulted from increased services to African-American females. This reflects Ohio's Victim/Witness Program's continued emphasis on services to victims of domestic violence. These victims accounted for 66 percent of all clients served by the Ohio program during CY 2004.

Overview of Project Performance
Ohio's Victim/Witness Program provides funding for projects that support crime victims and witnesses. Thirty one victim/witness projects submitted performance data during calendar year 2003. A total of 54 semi-annual reports were received, an 87 percent reporting rate.

Ohio Victim/Witness At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2004

Activity	CY 2004 Total
Victims Reported Served	15,472
Percent Female Victims	80%
Increase in Percent Female Victims	2%
Increase in Percent African-American Female Victims	5%
Percent of Clients Who were Victims of Violent Crime	94%
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Education	77%
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Crisis Intervention	74%
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Court Advocacy	74%

During calendar year 2004, projects funded through Ohio's Victim/Witness Program report serving 15,472 clients. This is an increase of 3.5 percent more than the number served in 2003. The projects served an average of 360 clients during 2004.

The increase in services to African-Americans in Ohio's urban areas noted in 2003 continued to rise in 2004. Services to African-Americans increased from 18 percent of clients during CY 2003 to 26 percent during CY 2004. Most of this rise resulted from increased services to African-American females. This reflects Ohio's Victim/Witness Program's continued emphasis on services to victims of domestic violence. These victims accounted for 66 percent of all clients served by the Ohio program during CY 2004.

Ohio Victim/Witness Clients by Race/Ethnicity
CY 2004

Race/Ethnicity	Percent Male	Percent Female	Total
African-American	4%*	21%	26%
Caucasian	13%	49%	62%
Hispanic	1%	1%	2%
Other Race/Ethnicity	< 1%	1%	2%
Race/Ethnicity Unknown	2%	7%	9%
Total	20%	80%	100%

The percent in each cell is the percent that race/ethnicity and gender comprise of all victims served. For example, African-American males were four percent of all victims served by the Ohio projects.

Seventy-five percent of those reported to be special needs populations were Appalachians or mentally challenged. However, note that the semi-annual report form asks projects to indicate all clients who fit the respective special needs groups. Because clients can be counted more than once for this question, it is not possible to determine what percentage the special needs population comprises of all clients served. Juveniles were reported as 14 percent of victims served by Ohio's program. All other groups comprised less than five percent of the special needs populations.

Ohio Victim/Witness Special Needs Populations
CY 2004

Special Needs Group	Percent
Appalachians	36%
Mentally/Emotionally Challenged	39%
Juveniles	14%
Medically Challenged	4%
Older People	3%
Lesbian/Gay/Bi-sexual/Transgender	3%
English Second Language	2%
Migrant Farm Workers	< 1%

During CY 2004, victims of violent crimes accounted for 91 percent of all clients served by Ohio's program. Four percent were victims of property offenses and five percent were victims of other offenses. As in the past, domestic violence was the single largest offense category, accounting for 66 percent of victims served by Ohio's Victim/Witness Program. No other offense category accounts for more than 6 percent of the victims.

Note that the response category on the reporting form is "domestic violence," but it appears that some projects are reporting all types of family violence in this category.

Crimes Victimizing Clients Served by Ohio Victim/Witness
CY 2004

Offense	Number	Percent
Attempted Murder	440	3%
Rape	944	6%
Other Sexual Assault	468	3%
Domestic Violence	10,625	66%
Assault	868	5%
Other Violent Offenses	865	5%
Property Offenses	617	4%
Elder Abuse/Neglect	66	< 1%
Child Abuse/Neglect	291	2%
Other Offenses	813	5%

Services provided by Ohio's victim/witness projects can be grouped as services the projects provide directly to victims and services to which they refer victims. During CY 2004, the projects reported an average of 4.6 services provided directly, up from 4.2 during CY 2003. The projects reported an average of 5.3 services to which they referred victims, a drop from 5.5 in CY 2003. It is too early to tell from the OCJS performance reports if a trend is beginning to provide more services directly and consequently referring out fewer services. The percent of Ohio victim projects providing specific services directly or by referral is presented in the table below. Note that the rows can total more than 100 percent since a project may both *provide* and *make referrals* for a service.

Ohio Victim/Witness Services Provided
CY 2004

Type of Service	Percent of Projects Providing the Service Directly	Percent of Projects Providing Referrals for the Service
Education	77%	56%
Court Advocacy	74%	65%
Crisis Intervention	74%	56%
Training for Courts	53%	30%
Transportation	44%	40%
Counseling	33%	70%
Life Skills	26%	53%
Shelter	26%	67%
Medical Services	12%	72%
Other	44%	23%

Roughly three quarters of Ohio's victim/witness projects provided education, court advocacy and crisis intervention during CY 2004. Medical services are least likely to be provided directly, but are the type of service most likely to be referred. The Ohio projects are also more likely to refer out counseling services rather to provide counseling directly. In general, the Ohio victim/witness projects are inclined toward providing crisis intervention, education and court-related services. The projects are more likely to refer victims to other agencies for medical care, shelter and recovery services.

Summary of Evaluations

See "***Development of Evaluation Methodologies for Criminal Justice Programs***" in Area B.

Program Area E:
Innovative Programs Demonstrating New and Different Approaches to Enforcement, Prosecution and Adjudication

III. E. 1.   P<small>ROGRAM</small> O<small>VERVIEW</small>

Program Area E project eligibility is for law enforcement, prosecutors and courts. Law enforcement, prosecution and adjudication of drug offenses and other serious crimes have historically received funding support from OCJS. The FY 2000 Byrne Three-Year Strategy identified a need to provide funding opportunities for innovative approaches that do not fit under previously approved program areas. The intent of this program area is to promote the best and most efficient use of resources by supporting innovative programs that target drug offenses and other serious crimes having the potential to be model programs worthy of replication. During CY 2004, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded 11 Innovative Projects in the amount of $529,749.

III. E. 2.   G<small>OALS</small>, O<small>BJECTIVES AND</small> A<small>CTIVITIES</small>

Program Area E Goal:
To keep Ohio programs current in their knowledge and response to drug and other serious crime trends through the development and implementation of new and innovative approaches to law enforcement, prosecution and adjudication.

Program Area E Objectives:
 ➢ To develop and implement new approaches to *enforcement* of laws governing drugs and other serious crimes.
 ➢ To develop and implement new approaches to *prosecution* of drug offenses and other serious crimes.
 ➢ To develop and implement new approaches to *adjudication* of drug offenses and other serious crimes.

Program Area E Activities and Requirements:
 ➢ Applicants must provide a statement of the project's anticipated contribution to criminal justice policy and practice. It is important that applicants briefly cite those particular issues and concerns of present-day criminal justice policy that stimulate the proposed project. Applicants must clearly indicate if this project targets courts, prosecution or enforcement.
 ➢ Applicants must provide evidence to support how the project is innovative. This should include a literature review in the substantive area of this project. Applicants must provide information relevant to the community this project will serve.

III. E. 3.   P<small>ROGRAM</small> P<small>ERFORMANCE</small> M<small>EASURES AND</small> E<small>VALUATION</small> M<small>ETHODS</small>

Program performance and evaluation methods focus on the number of new approaches developed for enforcement of drugs and other serious crimes, and the number of potential projects developed that will be model programs worthy of replication.

Summary of CY 2004 Program Accomplishments
During CY 2004, Ohio's Innovative Programs category was successful in increasing the number of individuals receiving advanced training, the number of criminal cases initiated and completed, and the number of specialized court dockets.

Overview of Project Performance
Because these projects are so innovative and unique, open-ended questions are the best way to assess them. The reporting form for Innovative Programs consists of a series of open-ended questions assessing the project's success in meeting goals and best practices.

Despite the diversity among the projects, there is one common element during CY 2004 – all of the projects report improved inter-agency collaboration. More than half of the projects report improved collaboration among law enforcement agencies. Other areas of improved collaboration were: prosecution and law enforcement, correctional institutions and law enforcement and agencies involved in specialized court dockets (law enforcement, courts and corrections). Successes among innovative projects in Ohio came in three areas:

1. Increased number of <u>people trained.</u>
    a. Forensic investigation related to computer crime, including training 45-60 officers per month on data recovery.
    b. Sixty-five police agencies trained on critical incident stress management for first responders.
    c. Law enforcement and prosecution staff trained on dealing with reluctant witnesses (number trained was not provided).

2. Increased number of criminal <u>cases initiated and completed.</u>
    a. Investigations of computer crime.
    b. Drug enforcement.
    c. Financial investigation by special agents, mostly related to drug trafficking.
    d. Interception of drug conveyance into Ohio's prisons, as well as investigation of staff misconduct (e.g., staff-inmate relationships).

3. Increased number of <u>specialized court dockets.</u>
    a. Implementation of a mental health court.
    b. Implementation of a re-entry court.

Innovative Projects Highlights

Telecommunications Harassment Investigative Unit
The Telecommunications Harassment Investigative Unit consists of specialized personnel who investigate and assist in prosecuting misdemeanor crimes of harassment, stalking

and identity theft, which occur through computers, telephones and other telecommunication devices. In 2004, this unit reported the following:

- A 33-percent increase in the number of cases processed during 2004 (vs. 2003).
- A 13-percent increase in the number of misdemeanor charges filed and a 25-percent increase in the number of felony charges filed during 2004 (vs. 2003).
- They directly serviced 2,356 new clients during 2004, and were successful in maintaining pace with the caseload.
- They offered consultation to all clients concerning the technical aspects of their case during case processing. The number of consultations that were provided to clients increased 305 percent compared to the previous year.
- They continued to maintain and develop professional relationships with 25 local, state and federal government and law enforcement organizations as well as 26 central Ohio corporations.
- They are a participating member in seven community outreach associations and organizations.

Franklin County Mental Health Court
The Franklin County Mental Health Court was established in 2004. It was designed to allow for treatment of nonviolent offenders via a court that refers eligible offenders to treatment under court supervision instead of sending them to jail. Highlights of the project include the following:

- The Mental Health Program Docket (MHPD) was created within five months, and the program was implemented thereafter. A significant percentage of 2004 was devoted to achieving the following implementation goals:
  - Establishing goals and objectives for the program, including identifying eligibility criteria.
  - Identifying and contracting with treatment providers.
  - Developing the sanction and reward components of the court.
  - Establishing treatment phases and graduation criteria.
  - Developing and implementing referral and assessment processes.
  - Designing an Access database for housing client data.
  - Developing a policy and procedure manual.
  - Developing cross training for involved agencies.
  - Continuing the Mental Health Court Task Force meetings.
- In the eight months since the court opened its doors, it has assessed 61 individuals. At the end of 2004, there were 33 clients in the Mental Health Program Docket.

Information Sharing Initiative
The Hilliard Police Department's Information Sharing Initiative allows law enforcement to enter, access and share information from their cars through the installation of reliable mobile data computing devices and the connection of these devices via a secure wireless network. During the seven-month period in which the devices were first installed, the police department has noted the following:

- Timely and accurate LEADS information has resulted in several misdemeanor arrests and a recovered stolen vehicle.
- Dispatcher workload has decreased.
- Officers have begun to receive timely information from alerts from other cities.
- Photo images have verified identities of suspects.

- Access to mapping has resulted in timely responses to calls.
- There have been no increases in OJIN requests, nor in field interviews.
- LEADS requests decreased, but this is not yet quantifiable.

Digital Video Protection and Prosecution Enhancement
The Grandview Heights Police Department acquired equipment that allows them to video and audiotape interviews with suspects, victims and witnesses. This recording equipment assists in the prosecution of cases. Highlights of the program include the use of the equipment in 20 cases thus far.

Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System (OIBRS) Project
The village of Groveport acquired a computerized records management system to allow for OIBRS reporting capability and to provide for an efficient information database for crime analysis and information sharing. As a result, the software has been placed on office computers and is set to be placed on portable laptop computers for OIBRS reporting in the field. Officer training ensued and live data entry began in January 2005.

Enforcement Unit
The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction sought funding to bring together a parole officer and an institution investigator into an Enforcement Unit designed to gather intelligence and to investigate illegal drugs and gang/security threat group activity as connected to DRC. The unit also provided assistance to outside law enforcement agencies regarding investigations where links exist with DRC. The unit documented its success by the following:
- Seizure of 92.5 oz. of cocaine and 8 oz. of marijuana.
- Identification of seven instances of staff conveying and one instance of non-staff conveying.
- Identification of eight instances of staff inappropriate relationship cases.
- Seizure of 21 guns.
- 35 parolee and three felony arrests.

The unit was also asked to collaborate with a federal agency to reduce guns and drugs at a target area of Columbus. This investigation led to multiple seizures of drugs, guns and stolen property, and will bring multiple federal indictments at the conclusion of the investigation.

Northern Ohio Computer Crimes Initiative
The Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation (BCI) and the Ohio Peace Officer Training Academy (OPOTA) received funding to collaboratively train local law enforcement and prosecutors on combating computer crimes and investigating such crimes through the Computer Crimes Unit (CCU). In a six-month period, 181 individuals were trained by the computer crimes section of OPOTA. The current workload of the CCU increased by 33 percent over the previous year. Additionally, through the use of CCU, Ohio has experienced constant growth in the number of criminal investigations submitted and convictions obtained throughout the time period.

Critical Incident Response Service
The Fraternal Order of Police of Ohio (FOP), Inc. Critical Incident Response Service provides three kinds of services to law enforcement personnel and their families: 1) a no-cost comprehensive stress education program to police departments in Ohio, 2) on-scene

support, and 3) critical incident follow-up in the days, weeks and months following a critical incident. The program responded to 100 percent of the requests for formal critical incident stress management interventions involving approximately 65 different police agencies. The program's web site was used to disseminate important information to officers and agencies. Training opportunities were developed to create law enforcement peers that broadened the availability of services. Additionally, the FOP developed contacts with the Ohio Police Officer Training Academy to create and implement a core curriculum for critical incident response to be incorporated into the basic and continuing education classes provided to police officers.

Allen County Court Watch Program
The Allen Count Court Watch (ACCW) program was designed to ensure that the judicial system is effective, responsive and consistent in handling domestic violence cases. The goal of the program was to gather data on domestic violence cases, identify trends in the handling of these cases and issue a report to the judiciary, law enforcement, victim services and citizens documenting the court's effectiveness and identifying potential problems. ACCW was successful in developing an excellent relationship with the court as well as local victim services organizations. The end result was a detailed report of the findings, including relevant statistics, recommendations and limitations of the project. This report was administered to all justice system stakeholders and concerned community members and a round-table discussion of the findings resulted.

FINVEST
The Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation's Financial Investigations (FINVEST) Unit was funded to assist local law enforcement and drug task forces in pursuing charges related to money laundering, including completing net worth analysis on suspects, lending technical support and training for local officials and at times acting as lead financial investigators. BCI also provided Ohio's drug task forces with trained agents to work undercover assignments, "buy money" and high-tech electronic surveillance equipment. The financial special agents continue to have successes in forgery, theft and financial-related crime investigations. Victims of these investigations included private citizens, government groups and public corporations.

Domestic Violence Unit
The Stark County Prosecutor's Office developed a Domestic Violence Unit to provide services to victims of domestic violence and to promote the effective prosecution of domestic violence offenders. Funding was provided to employ a full-time assistant prosecutor to specialize in adult felony domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking cases, and a part-time, in-house victim advocate to work as a liaison between the prosecutor and the victim. Both the prosecutor and the victim advocate attended an in-service training. Information dissemination was a priority, as evidenced by the following creations: a relevant web site was created, which included a section to provide feedback and comments to the unit; a booklet was distributed, which compiled emergency assistance programs for referral purposes, thus allowing better communication with other agencies; a brochure was in development, which describes services for the community; a safety plan pocket card continued to be distributed in high volume; and plans were in the works for the 6th Annual Domestic Violence Seminar in September 2004.

Program Area F:
Treatment Programs for Drug and Alcohol Dependent Offenders

III. F. 1.   PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area F is for residential and non-residential projects that provide substance abuse treatment for offenders and alleged offenders. Treating inmate's substance abuse is a particular area of need in breaking the cycle of crime. During this reporting period, the Drug and Alcohol Treatment Program supported 17 projects in the amount of $656,832.

III. F. 2.   GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area F Goals:
To increase the availability and quality of services for substance abusing offenders such as residential and non-residential treatment programs and drug courts.

Program Area F Objectives:
- ➢ To provide drug and alcohol treatment that is most appropriate to the offender, and that reduces recidivism.

Program Area F Activities and Requirements:
- ➢ Treatment projects must have a Collaboration Board that includes community representation. If available, local level projects must use the local Community Corrections Act Board; if not, the Collaborative Board must reflect the participation and cooperation of law enforcement, common pleas judges, probation departments, the community and public and private agencies.
- ➢ Include either certification from the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services or a statement of review from their local alcohol and drug addiction services board.

Participants in substance abuse treatment programs in state institutions must have housing and program areas separate from the general population of the institution.

III. F. 3.   PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

Program performance measures and evaluation methods focus on the number of offenders successfully completing the drug and alcohol abuse treatment programs.

III. F. 4.   PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2004 Program Accomplishments
Program Area F accomplished its objective of providing drug and alcohol treatment to offenders through the establishment or expansion of six drug courts, one mental health court, one re-entry court, two institutional projects and seven other projects. During CY 2004, these projects treated 831 offenders and provided an average of 19.6 hours of

service per week. Overall, of those terminated from Area F projects during CY 2004, 57 percent successfully completed the programming after participating in the program an average of 129 days. The three juvenile projects averaged 87 percent successful completion, with these juveniles participating in the programs an average 197 days.

Overview of Project Performance
During CY 2004, 17 projects submitted 31 semi-annual performance reports, a 91 percent reporting rate. The projects reported serving 831 offenders, an average of 59 clients per project per year. Eight of the projects were specialized court dockets, including six drug courts, one mental health court and one re-entry court. Two projects provided substance abuse treatment for institutionalized offenders. Seven projects provided community-based services, often in collaboration with probation or parole. Fourteen of the projects served adult offenders, three served juveniles.

Ohio Treatment Programs for Drug and Alcohol Dependent Offenders
At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2004

Activity	CY 2004 Total
Total Number of Offenders Served	831
Average Clients Served per Project	59
Percent Successfully Completing Their Program	57%
Average Hours of Treatment Services per Week	19.6 Hours
Average Number of Services in the Treatment Program	5.7
Most Common Types of Substance Abuse Treatment	Individual Counseling, Cognitive-Behavioral, 12 Step

Cocaine, alcohol and marijuana remained the most common drugs of choice for offenders served by Ohio's program. However, projects commented on the increase in the percentage of offenders for whom heroin, opiates and pharmaceuticals were the drug of choice. The table below presents the percents for drugs of choice where a single drug of choice was reported.

Drug of Choice for Offenders in Ohio's Drug and Alcohol Treatment Projects
CY 2004

Cocaine	Alcohol	Marijuana	Heroin	Opiates	Pharmaceutical
33%	28%	23%	8%	2%	6%

The projects reported an average number of 59 offenders served during CY 2004. The projects reported providing an average of 19.6 hours of service per week. The types of services most often provided were individual counseling, cognitive-behavioral interventions and 12 Step. However, all of the programs provided more than one type of service in their treatment program. The average for all the projects was 5.7 types of service programs. When educational/vocational, substance abuse education or the therapeutic community were part of the treatment program, those services averaged more hours per week than other types of services.

Services Provided by Ohio's Drug and Alcohol Treatment Projects
CY 2004

Type of Service	Percent of Projects Offering the Service	Average Number of Hours per Week when the Service is Provided
Individual Counseling	85%	2.4
Peer Counseling	23%	3.0
12 Step	77%	3.5
Assessment	69%	2.1
Cognitive Behavioral	77%	4.1
Problem Solving	54%	2.9
Educational/Vocational	54%	6.2
Substance Abuse Education	69%	5.3
Therapeutic Community	38%	5.2
Other	46%	4.1

The programs reported for juvenile offenders were less intense in terms of number of types of services provided (4.7 per project) and the average number of hours per week (16.3). These programs offered less substance abuse education, 12 Step and cognitive-behavioral interventions and much more educational/vocational and "other" services than the programs overall.

Services Provided by Juvenile Drug and Alcohol Treatment Projects
CY 2004

Type of Service	Percent of Projects Offering the Service	Average Number of Hours per Week when the Service is Provided
Individual Counseling	67%	3.5
Peer Counseling	33%	1.5
12 Step	33%	2.0
Assessment	67%	3.5
Cognitive Behavioral	33%	1.0
Problem Solving	33%	1.0
Educational/Vocational	67%	15.0
Substance Abuse Education	33%	1.0
Therapeutic Community	33%	2.0
Other	67%	7.2

More than half (57 percent) of the offenders terminated from Ohio's Drug and Alcohol Treatment projects during CY 2004 successfully completed their treatment program. Those who successfully completed the programming averaged 129 days in the program. Twenty percent were terminated unsuccessfully with most either absconding or failing to appear at the project.

Successful Completion in Ohio's Drug and Alcohol Treatment Projects
CY 2004

Termination Status	Percent of Offenders Treated	Average Number of Days in Treatment
Successful	57%	129
Unsuccessful	20%	85
Abscond	13%	58
Other	10%	38

The juvenile programs reported a higher percent (87 percent) of participants successfully completing programming than the projects overall. The juveniles successfully completing programming were reported to have averaged 197 days in programming.

Lack of cooperation and unexcused absences were the two most common reasons for offenders not successfully completing programming during CY 2004. About three-fourths of the "other" category were offenders who failed to appear at the project. New incarcerations and juveniles whose families moved each comprised about 10 percent of the "other" category. The one remaining case was an adult who was medically discharged from the program.

- lack of cooperation   36%
- unexcused absences   30%
- failed urinalysis   4%
- other indicator of drug use   6%
- other   25%

Summary of Evaluations

Ohio Drug Court Cost-Benefit Study – University of Cincinnati
Late in CY 2003, the University of Cincinnati began its OCJS-funded cost-benefit study of Ohio's drug courts. The study builds on the CY 2001 Ohio Drug Court Evaluation, a collaboration between the University of Cincinnati, Ohio State University and OCJS. The cost/benefit study will collect longer-term outcome data than the CY 2001 study. The study will also collect cost information, both court expenses and costs avoided, that has not previously been collected from Ohio's drug courts. Extended outcome and cost data will permit analysis of both short-term and longer-term costs and costs avoided.

The study is using the cost-benefit model developed by the state of Washington. This model results in a statement of the dollars saved for every dollar invested in drug courts. It also generates data on the treatment effect size necessary for drug courts to have positive cost/benefit effects.

An interim report will be produced by the University of Cincinnati in the spring of CY 2005. This report will present the longer-term outcome data. It will also assess whether there are significant sub-groups within the drug court population that do better or worse in drug courts. The final report will be produced by the end of CY 2005. The final report will present the cost and costs avoided data and make recommendations for improving the cost/benefit effects of drug courts.

"Consequences of Mental Health Court - Kent State University;" OCJS
See "***Consequences of Mental Health Court***" in Area C.

Program Area G:
Criminal Justice Information Systems

III. G. 1.   PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The lack of adequate and timely criminal justice information has a profound impact on the ability of Ohio's criminal justice system to respond to crime in the state. This is felt in two basic ways. One is the lack of complete and timely information regarding individuals arrested or convicted for criminal offenses. For example, incomplete conviction records have resulted in much more lenient sentences for specific individuals than would have occurred if the judge had a complete conviction history available. Secondly, the ability of the state and local government to allocate criminal justice resources is limited by insufficient information regarding persons involved in the criminal justice system.

III. G. 2.   GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND ACTIVITIES

Program Area G Goal:
The purpose of this program area is to meet the criminal justice information needs of the state and local officials. Funding will support the development of statewide systems designed to generate information on criminal arrests, or sentences. Furthermore, funding will support efforts to coordinate the exchange of information among these criminal justice information systems. Prominent in the development of these statewide systems will be their responsiveness to the policies developed by the Ohio Criminal Justice Information Systems Policy Board.

Program Area G Objectives:
All projects funded through this program must be designed to achieve at least one of the following objectives:
  ➢ To improve the quantity and quality of crime and arrest information reported to the Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System.
  ➢ To increase the quantity and quality of dispositional information reported to the Ohio Computerized Criminal Histories program.
  ➢ To improve the exchange of information among the criminal justice information systems within the state.

Program Area G Activities and Requirements:
  ➢ Projects must show that they have achieved compliance with or are working to achieve compliance with federal standards and auditing procedures appropriate to that information system.
  ➢ Projects must show that they have achieved compliance with or are working to achieve compliance with standards and auditing procedures adopted by the Ohio Criminal Justice Information System Policy Board.

III. G. 3.   PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

Program performance measures and evaluation methods examine the number of Ohio agencies participating in CJIS-related programs, as well as the number of times Ohio criminal justice agencies access data through CJIS-related programs.

III. G. 4.   PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2004 Program Accomplishments
Progress was made on all eight tasks identified for the Ohio Criminal Justice Systems program during 2004. The greatest improvement was with juvenile justice. The CJIS Policy Board determined that a Juvenile Justice Information System needs assessment should be conducted. The recommendations from the needs assessment led to the creation of the Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) Steering Committee. The goal is to electronically connect the 88 Ohio juvenile courts to share information and enable electronic report transmission to the Ohio Department of Youth Services.

Progress on the eight tasks resulted in achieving the objectives of increasing the quantity and quality of justice information in the state as well as improving the exchange of information between justice information systems within the state.

Overview of Project Performance
The criminal justice system contains information about suspects, crimes, victims, property, cases and offenders. There is a need to manage this mass of data. Many of the applications developed to manage the data have historically been implemented agency-by-agency and function-by-function. While agencies realized sound benefits from these applications, the individual applications did not totally meet their needs because of their inability to share data with one another. Realizing the need to share information, then-Governor George Voinovich, along with then-Attorney General Betty Montgomery and Chief Justice Thomas Moyer, convened the Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) Policy Board in 1994. The board was tasked with: advising on the improvement of the quantity, timeliness and completeness of criminal justice information data; reviewing and developing policies and procedures for the state's criminal justice information systems; monitoring the development of criminal justice information systems to ensure compatibility; and determining how to improve accessibility to criminal justice data.

The CJIS Policy Board continues to meet on a regular basis and includes representatives of key Ohio CJIS stakeholders. This group consists of state-level executives who manage criminal justice information systems, as well as representatives from state criminal justice associations and the state's regional reporting centers. The role of the CJIS Policy Board is to monitor progress of the tasks within the CJIS Improvement Plan and to provide management and technical expertise for the strategic initiatives within the CJIS Plan.

The CJIS Improvement Plan was completed in December 1996. The plan consisted of 63 projects outlined by the CJIS Policy Board deemed necessary for improving the quality, completeness and timeliness of Ohio's criminal justice information systems. The CJIS Plan was updated in 2002 and contains 68 projects in various stages of completion. OCJS has received federal grant funds for the CJIS initiative since 1994. These funds have come from the following sources: the Edward Byrne/JAG Memorial 10 percent set-aside

program, the National Criminal History Improvement Program, the National Sex Offender Registry Program and the State Identification System Grant Program. Additionally, General Revenue funds were allocated to assist with court disposition interfaces and other CJIS initiatives beginning in 1997.

Some of the 68 tasks were subdivided to differentiate between multiple stages and functions within the same task. Seventy-nine tasks and subtasks resulted from the separation. Of the 79 tasks and subtasks, 48 are complete, 10 are closed, seven are ongoing, five are active and nine have not yet been initiated. The following section summarizes the progress of some of the most significant Ohio CJIS projects.

Implement NCIC 2000 Services (CJIS Tasks 13 and 14)
The Ohio Department of Public Safety (ODPS) is upgrading the current LEADS system to have its connected devices National Crime Information Center 2000 Services compliant. ODPS converted the state message switch to NCIC 2000. All direct connect agencies were on NCIC 2000 at the end of 2004. The deadline for the entire state being NCIC 2000 compliant is December 3, 2006.

Multi-Agency Radio Communications Service (MARCS) (CJIS Task 15)
MARCS is a statewide voice and data communications system to serve public safety and emergency management agencies within the state. The technical design phase of the project began in 1998, and is now operational. Ohio obtained full coverage in 2004.

Ohio Law Enforcement Officer's Toolkit software (OIBRS) (CJIS Task 36)
The Ohio Law Enforcement Officer's Toolkit (LEOT) is an OIBRS/NIBRS compliant records management system developed by OCJS. By the end of 2004 there were 165 Ohio law enforcement agencies using the existing system. This software is used 24-hours-a-day by patrol officers throughout the state. OCJS is responsible for developing, maintaining and marketing this product. The LEOT also reached Ohio Local Law Enforcement Information Sharing Network (OLLEISN) Level I certification at the end of 2004.

Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System Repository (CJIS Task 59)
OCJS currently administers the OIBRS Repository for Ohio crime data collection. More than 245 Ohio law enforcement agencies contributed data to the OIBRS Repository in 2004 that was then electronically forwarded to the FBI in the NIBRS format. OCJS received NIBRS certification from the FBI in 1999. OCJS continues to heavily promote the incident-based reporting standard to automate crime reporting in Ohio. An OIBRS Portal was unveiled in 2004 enabling Ohio law enforcement agencies to view their crime statistics, search the OIBRS database and view street-level crime maps statewide through a secure web-based application.

Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS) (CJIS Tasks 9, 33 and 66)
When completing the original CJIS Plan, the Policy Board's focus was primarily on the adult system. Due to increasing demands for information regarding juvenile offenders, requirements for submission of juvenile fingerprints and the need to track juveniles placed in detention centers, the Policy Board determined that a Juvenile Justice Information System needs assessment should be conducted. The recommendations from the needs assessment have led to the creation of the Juvenile Justice Information System Steering Committee. The goal is to electronically connect the 88 Ohio juvenile courts to share information and enable electronic report transmission to the Ohio Department of Youth Services. JJIS began to build momentum in 2004 and anticipates progress in coming years.

Program Area H:
Homeland Security and Anti-Terrorism

<u>III. H. 1.</u>   Program Overview

Program Area H is designed to develop and implement anti-terrorism training programs and to procure equipment for use by local law enforcement authorities. The nine projects in operation during CY 2004 received $271,899 in funding.

<u>III. H. 2.</u>   Goals, Objectives and Activities

Program Area H Goal:
The goal of this program area is to support projects that develop plans to facilitate data collection, analysis and information-sharing among agencies; review equipment and technology needs; and ensure the thoroughness of local emergency response plans.

Program Area H Objectives:
All projects funded through this program must be designed to achieve at least one of the following objectives:
  - To promote law enforcement officer training in anti-terrorism.
  - To enhance enforcement capabilities for responding to terrorist acts.

Program Area H Activities and Requirements:
  - Homeland Security/Anti-Terrorism projects must have a collaboration board, including representation from law enforcement, first responders and the criminal justice system.
  - Program Area H applicants may include in their project description:
    - *Operations and Support:* funding for functional expenses from a result or outcome directly related to anti-terrorism efforts.
    - *Equipment:* funding to obtain materials that directly contribute to anti-terrorism operations.
    - *Planning:* funding to develop proposed scenarios or methods for emergency operations performed in response to terrorist acts or threats.
    - *Training:* funding for initial or advanced anti-terrorism training for individuals and teams, including education directly related to anti-terrorism operations.
    - *Technical Assistance:* funding for technical support and training directly related to a jurisdiction's ability to plan, organize, coordinate and execute specific anti-terrorism operations.

<u>III. H. 3.</u>   Program Performance Measures and Evaluation Methods

Program performance measures and evaluation methods examine: the number of homeland security training sessions *attended* and the number of people trained; the number of homeland security training sessions *provided* and the number of people trained; the number of agencies collaborating on, planning for and responding to

homeland security threats; and the number and type of homeland security equipment purchased and successfully utilized.

III. H. 4.   PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2004 Program Accomplishments
During CY 2004, Ohio's Homeland Security and Anti-Terrorism Program improved the state's capacity to respond to terrorist threats and actions through training, equipment and enforcement activities. One enforcement activity involved collaboration with the FBI and other federal agencies in gaining indictments against a multi-state theft and fraud ring that was sending proceeds to the Middle East. As in CY 2003, an area of much activity was Lake Erie. Training and improved collaboration resulted in increased interdictions on the lake. Equipment purchased was primarily communications-, hazmat- or weapons of mass destruction (WMD)-related. More than 1,100 officers received training on equipment, hazmat response and maritime interdiction.

Overview of Project Performance
During CY 2004, OCJS funded nine homeland security projects.   These projects submitted 15 semi-annual performance reports, an 83 percent reporting rate. The projects reported achieving improved capacity to respond to terrorist threats and actions through training, equipment and enforcement activities. Summarizing achievements in each of these areas:

Enforcement activities.
• Increased maritime interdictions on Lake Erie.
• Collaboration with the FBI and other federal agencies resulted in indictments against a multi-state theft and fraud ring that was sending proceeds to the Middle East.

Equipment.
• Four projects purchased and implemented communications equipment.
• Four projects purchased and implemented hazmat equipment.
• Three projects purchased and implemented other types of equipment, most of which was related to WMD.

Training.
• Not all projects reported the number of officers receiving training, but those who did reported 1,108 officers received training.
• Seven projects secured equipment training, primarily communications or hazmat equipment.
• Two projects secured training on handling hazmat and WMD situations.
• One project secured training on maritime interdiction.

Seven projects reported on problems encountered during CY 2004. Six projects reported problems in purchasing or implementing equipment, all but one of which involved communications equipment.   One project reported difficulties related to being short staffed while officers are receiving training.

45

The homeland security projects report on activities during the year that they think were particularly successful. Successful activities reported for CY 2004 were:
- Four projects reported success in improved working relationships with other agencies.
- Three projects reported success in improved communications.
- One project reported success in improvements resulting from training received.

Summary of Evaluations

Statewide Homeland Security Survey - Ohio State University
This survey is designed to generate views and beliefs held by Ohio's citizens regarding the threat of terrorism and how to respond to that threat. There have been several such surveys nationally. However, OCJS and Ohio Homeland Security thought it necessary to generate Ohio-specific data. Activities during CY 2004 consisted of generating the survey instrument, planning the sampling scheme to be used and developing memorandums of understanding for the implementation of the survey.

SECTION IV:
SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION

IV. A. Crime in Ohio: Analyses of Ohio Incident-Based Crime Data

In 2002, researchers at Ohio State University were given a grant to conduct descriptive studies of crime in various Ohio jurisdictions using Ohio incident-based crime data. Work on this study continued into CY 2004. There were three purposes for this project. One was to provide a foundation of knowledge for criminal justice agency planning. The second was to inform local agencies about what crimes are most pronounced, and whether these crimes are stable, growing or declining. The third purpose was to demonstrate to non-reporting agencies the types of knowledge that can be gained from incident-based reporting, and thus, to encourage greater participation. Analyses of more than 20 local Ohio law enforcement jurisdictions were conducted, and their reports can be obtained at http://www.sociology.ohio-state.edu/cjrc/oibrs/.

IV. B. County Profile Assessment Project

There are two parts to this research project. The first part has been conducted by Kent State University. This study is designed to generate information that can be used by state and local agencies for planning. During CY 2004, this study worked with a pilot county to develop justice data appropriate to the project. This included assessment both of what data was available and what information was desired by local agencies.

The companion to the Kent State study is being conducted by Ohio State University. This project will conduct a citizen attitude survey of the pilot county. Questions asked will be informed by topics identified by the Kent State study, resulting in this part of the study lagging behind the first part. Activity during CY 2004 mostly consisted of meetings with OCJS and Kent State staff to coordinate the two studies and to keep the Ohio State staff aware of findings by the Kent State study.

IV. C. Crime Opportunity Prevention Service

The idea behind this project is to establish a system modeled on the agricultural extension service, except that the service would be criminal justice. The extension offices would provide information, technical assistance and perhaps even conduct research to support local justice agencies. The University of Cincinnati, Division of Criminal Justice is providing this service.

IV. D. Statewide Crime Survey

This is a statewide citizen attitude survey. The survey builds on the several citizen attitude surveys conducted by OCJS in the past. By using some of the same questions, trends can be assessed. This survey also includes questions directed to newly emerging issues, including a couple of questions on homeland security. Survey results will assist OCJS in planning the Byrne Strategy and with addressing other justice issues.