



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

**2006 State Annual Report
Pre-FY 2004 Projects**

**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. Morckel, 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 SUMMARY1

INTRODUCTION5

EVALUATION PLAN AND ACTIVITIES7

SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS FUNDED UNDER THE BYRNE
FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM, PRE-FFY 2004 8

 Program Area A – Law Enforcement Task Forces..... 8

 Program Area B – Crime Prevention and Community Policing.....8

 Program Area C – Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment12

 Program Area D –Non-Compensation Assistance to Jurors, Witnesses and Victims17

 Program Area E – Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS).....21

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS) implemented the fiscal year (FY) 2004 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 programs are relevant to the Byrne Formula Grant Program Goals.

Ohio Programs and Byrne Goals

<i>Program Area</i>	<i>Prevent and Control Illegal Drugs</i>	<i>Reduce Violent Crime</i>	<i>Improve Overall Operations</i>
Law Enforcement Task Forces	X	X	X
Crime Prevention and Community Policing	X	X	
Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment	X	X	
Victim Services		X	X
Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS)		X	X

Bold denotes programs with independent evaluations during Calendar Year 2005.

The performance of each program based on all Byrne-funded projects active during CY 2005 is summarized below.

Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces

Ohio’s law enforcement task forces accomplished their CY 2005 goals, posting increases for virtually all performance measures. During the year, the task forces arrested 6,544 offenders, with 4,686 of these offenders being charged with felony offenses. Ohio’s drug markets were impacted by the task forces, seizing 231,735 grams of cocaine and 78,726 grams of crack, 173,389 pounds of processed marijuana and 12,176 marijuana plants. Ohio’s task forces also hit criminal enterprise by seizing \$14,221,218 in criminal assets. In addition to the quantities of arrests, drugs, and assets, the task forces took numerous steps to improve Ohio’s justice system. Most notable is the improved coordination attained through implementation of the Ohio Task Force Commanders Association’s Task Force Information System (TFIS).

Crime Prevention and Community Policing

During FY 2005, the Ohio Crime Prevention/COP program accomplished its objectives by providing services for 13,799 people. This total includes 2,799 youth. Projects funded through Crime Prevention/COP provided 309 programs, 190 of which served adults (61 percent) and 119 that served juveniles (39 percent). Programs serving juveniles included substance abuse prevention, youth violence prevention, school-related programs working with at-risk youth, school resource officers, workforce development programs, life skills development, and general delinquency reduction. Most of the programs for adults involved crime reduction/prevention through increased law enforcement efforts. Training was a component of more than one-third of the adult

programs. A total of 179 trainings were held, with 1,583 people trained. Forty-two percent of those trained were law enforcement and 51 percent were service agencies.

In addition to these direct service projects, funding was provided for five university research studies on crime prevention. Study topics included: crime opportunity prevention services, the use of local justice data for planning purposes, analysis of NIBRS data for reporting law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve, juvenile risk assessment, and citizen attitudes towards disaster preparedness and homeland security.

Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment

During CY 2005, the Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment program accomplished its goal of providing community correction alternatives that serve the offenders' treatment needs. The projects reported serving 4,117 offenders. Seventy-three percent of the offenders served in this program were male. The distribution by race/ethnicity was: 20 percent African-American, 71 percent Caucasian, one percent Latino, and eight percent other or unknown race/ethnicity. An average of 38.5 bed days were saved for each offender in projects designed as alternatives to incarceration.

More than half of the projects provide mental health treatment/education (65 percent) and substance abuse treatment/education (63 percent). Other services provided by 10 percent or more of the projects were: job training/placement (49 percent), family services (25 percent), basic education/GED (20 percent), assessment (14 percent), and problem-solving skills development (13 percent). Offenders in this program averaged 34.9 hours of treatment per week. When the service was provided by a project, offenders received an average of 5.5 hours per week for both substance abuse education and cognitive-behavioral treatment. Other types of services for which offenders received three hours or more treatment per week were: problem solving skills development (4.2 hours), educational/vocational training (3.9 hours), and Twelve Step (3.8 hours).

Of the offenders terminated from these programs during CY 2005, 68 percent successfully completed their program. Those successfully completing their program averaged 162 days in the program. Twenty-percent of the offenders were unsuccessfully terminated from the program, two percent absconded, and 10 percent were terminated under another status. Lack of cooperation was the most common reason for unsuccessful termination (56 percent). Failed urinalysis and other indications of drug use were responsible for 19 percent of those unsuccessfully terminated.

Victim Services

During CY 2005, Ohio's Victim Services program served 16,761 victims of crime. Eighty-nine percent of these people were victims of violent crime. Domestic violence accounted for 55 percent of all victims served by the Ohio program. Victims of rape accounted for another 11 percent of the victims. Seventy-three percent of the victims served were female. Seventy-two percent of the victims were Caucasian, 18 percent African-American, one percent Latino, and the remainder were of another racial group or their race/ethnicity was unknown. Mentally/emotionally-challenged victims were 42 percent of the special needs populations served by Ohio's Victim Services program. Thirty percent were juveniles and 11 percent were Appalachians. No other group comprised more than 10 percent of the special needs populations served.

Crisis intervention, court advocacy, and education were the services most commonly provided directly to victims by the Ohio projects during CY 2005. More than 70 percent of the Victim Services projects provided each of these three direct services. Medical services were the least likely to be directly provided (12 percent). More than half of the Ohio projects made referrals for counseling, shelter, court advocacy, medical services, and crisis intervention.

Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS)

The CJIS Policy Board continues to meet on a regular basis 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 Plan was updated in 2002. 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.

Notable accomplishments during CY 2005 include:

- The Ohio Department of Public Safety (ODPS) is upgrading its LEADS system to have its connected devices National Crime Information Center 2000 Services-compliant. ODPS completed the first phase to convert to DMPP2020 protocol. Some of the regional interface agencies are now complete.
- The Ohio Law Enforcement Toolkit (LEOT) is an OIBRS/NIBRS-compliant records management system developed by OCJS. By the end of 2005 there were 313 Ohio law enforcement agencies using the existing system. It is anticipated that the LEOT will reach Ohio Local Law Enforcement Information Sharing Network (OLLEISN) Level II certification early in 2006.
- More than 315 Ohio law enforcement agencies contributed data to the OIBRS Repository in 2005, which is then electronically forwarded to the FBI in the NIBRS format. The OIBRS Portal was enhanced to enable agencies to view their IBR validation errors online before submitting their data to OCJS. An OIBRS Partners Portal was also unveiled enabling vendors to check their edits in their software applications online against the edits in the OIBRS Repository.
- Recommendations to the Policy Board 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. By the end of 2005 there were 16 counties with signed MOUs to enable their data to be searchable through JJIS and six counties were actually searchable through JJIS.

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 the funding decisions.

SECTION I:

INTRODUCTION TO PROGRAMS ACTIVE DURING CY 2005 AND FUNDED UNDER THE BYRNE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM FROM FISCAL YEARS PRIOR TO 2004

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 five program areas in which local constituents could apply.

Multi-Jurisdictional Law Enforcement Task Forces

This program contributes to the goal of controlling illegal drugs by identifying, investigating and arresting drug traffickers operating in 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.

Crime Prevention and Community Policing

The goal of this program is 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. By accomplishing these goals, the program assists in controlling drugs and reducing violent crime.

Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment

This program is designed to increase community-based alternatives to incarceration and detention for non-violent offenders in Ohio, including residential and non-residential substance abuse programs, drug and mental health courts. By intervening in the drug-crime cycle, this program contributes to both the goals of controlling illegal drugs and reducing violent crime.

Victim Services

The goal of this program is to provide crime victims with needed services so that they may overcome the trauma of victimization, participate in all critical states of the criminal justice process, and return to full, active lives. The importance of victim services found in the 2000 Byrne Needs Assessment was later reinforced in OCJS's 2001 Family Violence Needs Assessment. Effective victim services contribute to the long-term operations of the justice system. Effective intervention can also contribute to a reduction in violent crime.

Criminal Justice Information Systems

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.

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 2005 Ohio awarded funds to law enforcement, prosecutors and direct victim service providers.

The STOP Program (Services Training Officers Prosecution) supports 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 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

During CY 2005, the Ohio Byrne Grant Program funded nine independent research projects totaling \$796,465. The research projects included program evaluations of crime prevention, disaster/terrorism preparedness, alternatives to incarceration, substance abuse treatment, offender reentry programs, and drug courts. Another research project studied the utility of NIBRS data for program planning. The research projects are described as part of their respective program area performance summaries.

SECTION III:

SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS ACTIVE DURING CY 2005 AND FUNDED UNDER THE BYRNE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAM FROM FISCAL YEARS PRIOR TO 2004

**Program Area A:
Law Enforcement Task Forces**

All of the Law Enforcement Task Forces in operation during CY 2005 were funded with FFY 2004 funds. None of the task forces were supported with funds from previous federal fiscal years.

**Program Area B:
Crime Prevention and Community 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 2005, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded from pre-FFY 2004 funds 23 Community Crime Prevention/COP projects in the amount of \$1,070,903.

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 2005 Program Accomplishments

During 2005, the Ohio Crime Prevention/COP program accomplished its objectives of increased inter-agency collaboration and citizen-police cooperation by providing services for more than 500 individuals. These services were provided by a variety of agencies throughout Ohio, including three projects implemented by law enforcement agencies, five projects by non-law enforcement local service providers, three by courts and prosecution, three by statewide associations, and two by state agencies.

**Ohio Community Crime Prevention/COP At-a-Glance
Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Persons Directly Served</i>	<i>Total</i>
Number of persons directly served	515
Number of youth	192
Number of law enforcement and other criminal justice	299
Other	24

Overview of Project Performance

Twenty-five percent of the projects were located in the metropolitan areas of Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati, and 44 percent were located in other metropolitan areas (Dayton and Akron) or in rural counties. Thirty-one percent of projects had statewide influence.

Most of the Ohio crime prevention projects provide more than one program. Statewide in 2005, there were 33 crime prevention programs funded through Byrne, an average of 2.1 per project. Forty-eight percent of these programs served youth and their caregivers in some capacity.

Because youth programs comprised such a large percentage of all crime prevention programs, a discussion of juvenile crime prevention programs is provided, followed by a discussion of prevention programs not specific to juveniles.

Crime Prevention Programs: Juvenile Programs

Programs serving juveniles were grouped into four categories based on their primary identified focus: youth violence prevention, general crime prevention, school-related programs, and youth enrichment programs. In all, 14 programs fell into these categories.

Youth Oriented Crime Prevention Programs Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects

Type of program	Number of programs	Percent of all programs
Youth violence prevention	1	7.1%
General crime prevention	1	7.1%
School related programs	4	28.6%
Youth enrichment programs	2	14.3%
Juvenile diversion programs	4	28.6%
Other	2	14.3%

The following bullets highlight the types of programs funded within the categories.

- The youth violence prevention program consisted of a workshop in conflict resolution.
- One funded program entitled “Youth for Justice” is a unique national prevention initiative that teaches youth to solve problems in their school and community, thus reducing crime or the fear of crime.
- School programs for youth focused on academic tutoring as well as working with youth of different age groups identified by the school as being at-risk. An after-school art-based intervention program for at-risk youth, Smarts Works, was also funded.
- Youth enrichment programs included a mentoring program and a multi-day youth retreat that included workshops on a variety of topics promoting youth enrichment, such as substance abuse awareness and education, team building, anger management, and community service.
- Several juvenile diversion programs were funded to allow youth involved in the criminal justice system to remain in the community and to receive enhanced educational and social services.
- Projects in the “Other” category provided at-risk youth with alternatives to delinquent behavior, including community service projects and recreational outings.

Crime Prevention Programs: Non-Juvenile Programs

Crime prevention programs not specific to juveniles tended to fall into three categories: 1) crime prevention and reduction through increased law enforcement efforts; 2) crime prevention and reduction through community awareness and participation; 3) crime prevention and reduction through training. In all, 19 programs fell into these categories. The following bullets highlight specific efforts.

Crime Prevention Programs Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects

Type of program	Number of programs	Percent of all programs
Crime prevention/reduction through increased law enforcement efforts	9	47.3%
Crime prevention/reduction through community awareness and participation	3	15.8%
Crime prevention/reduction through training	7	36.8%

- The majority of law enforcement crime prevention/reduction programs increased staff sizes for law enforcement as well as for court security. Additionally, the hiring of a prosecutor's criminal investigator reduced the time local law enforcement spent on pretrial preparation more than 50 percent during the first full year.
- All community crime prevention/reduction programs focused on bringing together local stakeholders (local residents, businesses, organizations) to conduct community meetings on crime prevention, to form advocacy clusters and block watches, and to organize crime prevention activities.
- More than one-third of crime prevention programs provided training to law enforcement and other criminal justice-related personnel on the following topics:
 - Leadership training for law enforcement.
 - Drug and alcohol abuse training for correctional officers to improve their interaction with prison residents who have a substance abuse problem.
 - Court security training to members of the court security staff.

Summary of Pre-FFY 2004 Crime Prevention/COP Research and Evaluations

COUNTY PROFILE PROJECT

Ohio State University

There is a shortage of data that state and local officials can use for planning purposes, including strategic and tactical planning, the preparation of funding proposals and required reports to federal and state agencies. The data that is available is not readily accessible to many users, compromising the ability of state and local officials to

undertake quality data-driven planning efforts in the criminal justice arena. The purpose of the County Profile Project was to determine the feasibility of developing profiles of Ohio's counties that could be used by OCJS and other state and local justice agencies for planning and strategic development. An Ohio county was chosen to pilot the project. OCJS provided JAG funding to two universities to engage in this multi-phase project.

The first phase, which was completed by Kent State University in 2004, involved interviews with local county representatives to determine what county data sources were available and accessible, as well as what data sources were desired but were not available. In addition, Kent State researchers also contacted state agencies to determine the accessibility of data at this level of government.

The second phase of the project, which was conducted by Ohio State University, was a citizen attitude survey of Belmont County residents. The purpose was to provide relevant information on citizens' perceptions on justice-related issues. Belmont County residents were asked to report on their own fear of crime as well as their behaviors in response to crime fears, and they were asked to provide their opinion about law enforcement and various criminal justice and social services.

Program Area C: Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment

III. C. 1. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Program Area C is open to all eligible units of local government. Applicants are to develop projects aimed at increasing community-based alternatives to incarceration and detention for non-violent offenders in Ohio. During CY 2005, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded, from pre-FFY 2004 grants, 4 Corrections, Alternatives and Treatment projects in the amount of \$175,119.

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

Program Area C Goals:

To increase community-based alternatives to incarceration and detention for non-violent offenders in Ohio, including residential and non-residential substance abuse programs, drug and mental health courts.

Program Area C Objectives:

- Increase community-based alternatives to incarceration and detention for non-violent offenders in Ohio, including residential and non-residential substance abuse programs, drug and mental health courts.

Program Area C Activities and Requirements:

- The collaboration must include a local Community Corrections Act Board if available, or a collaboration board representing law enforcement, common pleas judges, probation, community, public and private agencies.
- In absence of the proposed project, the offenders would be confined.
- Offenders receiving the proposed services are non-violent.

- The 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 applicants must provide the admission requirements for the proposed program.
- The applicants must summarize the system used to assess offenders and refer them to appropriate services.
- The applicants must summarize the treatment program, including an example of a typical offender's day.
- The applicants must describe how offenders' progress in the project will be monitored and the sanction system that will be used for compliance/non-compliance.
- The applicants must provide criteria for successful/unsuccessful program completion.

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

Program performance measures and evaluation methods focus on the following:

- The number of offenders diverted from incarceration and number of incarceration bed days saved.
- The number of offenders in treatment and other service programs and successful/unsuccessful completion of programs.
- The types of services/treatment offered to offenders and number of hours of service provided.

III. C. 4. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

Summary of CY 2005 Program Accomplishments

During CY 2005, the Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment programs accomplished the goal of providing community correction alternatives that serve the offenders' treatment needs. The projects reported serving 1,047 offenders. Two projects focused specifically on providing an alternative to incarceration. These projects estimated an average of 78 incarceration bed days saved per offender. Other projects provided treatment to offenders. Such projects indicated providing an average of 12 hours a week of counseling, training, and education services to offenders. Of the offenders terminated across all Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment programs during 2005, 55 percent successfully completed their program.

**Ohio Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment
At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>CY 2005 Total</i>
Total number of offenders served	1,047
Average number of bed days saved per offender	78 days*
Percent of offenders successfully completing program	55%
Percent of offenders not successfully completing program	45%

* Mean number saved when both the average number of bed days and the number of offenders were reported for those projects in which diversion from incarceration was a primary objective.

Overview of Project Performance

Of the direct service projects, 39 percent served post-adjudication offenders and 61 percent served prison re-entry offenders. The projects reported serving 1,047 offenders, an average of 150 per project per year. Of the projects reporting termination rates, these projects reported that 55 percent of offenders successfully completed their program. Seventy-four percent of offenders served were male. Caucasians made up 58 percent of all offenders served.

Offenders Served by Projects
Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Percent Male</i>	<i>Percent Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
African-American	20%	8%	28%
Caucasian	44%	14%	58%
Latino	1%	<1%	1%
Other	1%	<1%	1%
Race/Ethnicity unknown	8%	3%	11%
Total	74%	26%	100%

Programs within Corrections, Alternatives, and Treatment fell into two broad categories: alternatives to incarceration and offender treatment. Programs that were specifically designed to divert offenders from jail or prison, such as specialized courts, indicated saving an average of 78 incarceration bed days per offender.

Offender treatment was provided by numerous Ohio programs. Mental health treatment and substance abuse treatment/education made up more than two-thirds of all offender programs offered by projects. More than 40 percent of all projects offered job training and placement programs.

Programs with Services Provided
Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects

<i>Service</i>	<i>Percent of Programs with Service*</i>
Mental health treatment/counseling	29%
Substance abuse treatment/education	43%
Job training/placement	49%
Basic education/GED	14%
Housing placement	3%

*All of the projects provided more than one type of service.

Projects reported an average of 12 hours per week of treatment services provided to offenders. More than 90 percent of these hours fell in the areas of counseling and substance abuse treatment/education.

**Average Number of Treatment Hours Provided to Offenders
Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Type of Treatment</i>	<i>Average Number of Hours per Week when the Service is Provided</i>
Twelve step	6 hours
Cognitive behavioral	4 hours
Substance abuse education	1 hour
Other	1 hour
Total	12 hours

Alcohol was reported as the offender's primary drug of choice by 40 percent of programs, followed by cocaine (24 percent) and marijuana (22 percent). Methamphetamine was reported to be the primary drug of choice by 8 percent of projects, and heroin by 5 percent of projects.

Of the offenders terminated from the Ohio projects during CY 2005, the average number of days in the program prior to an unsuccessful termination was 74 percent the length of those successfully completing the program.

**Successful Completion
Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Types of Termination</i>	<i>Percent of All Offenders Terminated</i>	<i>Average Number of Days in the Program*</i>
Percent successfully completed	55%	129.4 days
Percent terminated from the program unsuccessfully	35%	173.5 days
Percent absconded from their program	2%	1 days
Percent reported as "Other"	7%	5.9 days

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

Lack of cooperation accounted for 48 percent of those unsuccessfully terminated from the programs. Thirty-four percent were terminated for failed urinalysis or some other indication of drug use.

Reason for Unsuccessful Termination Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects	
<i>Reason for Unsuccessful Termination</i>	<i>Percent of Offenders</i>
Lack of cooperation	48%
Unexcused absences	3%
Failed urinalysis	3%
Other indication of drug use	31%
Other	14%

CONSEQUENCES OF MENTAL HEALTH COURT

Kent State University

There is a clear need for implementation of programs that will lead to an increase in appropriate treatment for people who are mentally ill, in crisis, and who, as a result, come to the attention of police officers and the courts. Diversion programs such as mental health court may have the ability to change the lives of individuals. Research on the mental health court is therefore critical to help determine for whom and under what conditions mental health court programs affect consumers' psychological well-being so that behavioral changes occur as a result.

With the assistance of JAG funding, researchers at Kent State University and the Northeastern Ohio University College of Medicine, with the assistance of several other local agencies, have been conducting an extensive multi-year evaluation on the Akron Municipal Mental Health Court, Ohio's first and longest running mental health court (since 2001). The focus of the evaluation is the consequences of mental health court for consumers.

The research team has been collecting data — including incarcerations, hospitalizations, use of services, outcome data, and interviews — on those who successfully completed the Akron Mental Health Court Program, and is comparing their data to the data of three other groups: 1) those who failed to complete the court program; 2) those who declined to enter the program; and 3) those who were outpatient civilly committed. Information from three other Ohio mental health courts is also being collected to determine the effects of mental health court on consumers and to compare and contrast the effects of different mental health courts.

RETURNING HOME: UNDERSTANDING THE CHALLENGE OF PRISONER REENTRY IN OHIO

Urban Institute

In 2004, the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction released 28,177 prisoners from prisons across the state, nearly six times the number of prisoners released in 1980. Ohio has the seventh largest prison population in the country and 22 percent of released prisoners return to Cuyahoga County, with 79 percent of those returning to Cleveland. The sheer number of prisoners being released annually, along with a growing appreciation for the substantial challenges that ex-prisoners face as they reenter society and the fiscal consequences of unsuccessful reintegration, has brought prisoner reentry to the forefront in both Ohio and nationwide.

This project is a multi-year, multi-state study of returning prisoners, their families, and the communities in which they live. The intention of the project is to inform state and local policy regarding prisoner reentry. The study is being implemented in Ohio, Maryland, Illinois, and Texas. In 2005, OCJS funded a portion of the Ohio reentry study involving interviews with prisoners before and after their release and with family members of released prisoners. Focus groups and interviews were also conducted with

residents and stakeholders in Cleveland communities that are experiencing the largest concentrations of returning prisoners.

OHIO BATTERERS INTERVENTION PROGRAM EVALUATION

University of Toledo

Batterers Intervention Programs (BIPs) are a priority for Ohio's justice system. The Ohio Advisory Council on Family Violence has advocated for such a study for several years. Further, there is a link between BIPs and domestic violence courts. Such courts already exist in Ohio and other communities are considering establishing them. However, the research literature has mixed findings on the effectiveness of BIPs. The question then is why establish a domestic violence court if there are no effective services available?

This multi-year study was funded to answer whether effective BIPs exist in Ohio. The first of the three stages was conducted during CY 2005. BIPs in Ohio were identified and basic data collected on each program (number of clients, treatment modality, etc.). A final report is being written describing BIPs in Ohio and their similarities and differences.

The second phase will use the final report from the first phase to identify sites to be included in the second and third phases. The second phase will consist of a process evaluation at each site as well as collecting baseline data for the outcomes evaluation. The process evaluation is essential because: (1) without a thorough knowledge of the programs and services actually delivered, there is no basis for attributing outcome findings, and (b) it is common in the literature of the field to see references to the community context being perhaps as important as the treatment modality in the outcomes that result from the BIP. The third phase will be the outcome evaluation as BIP clients are followed and additional data collected.

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 2 Victim Services projects with funding from pre-FFY 2004 funding cycles in the amount of \$41,311.

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).
- Applicants must describe the process the project will take to assure victim/juror/witness safety.
- Applicants must indicate that the services proposed in the application are not a duplication of existing services within the community. Applicants 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 2005 Program Accomplishments

During CY 2005, the Ohio Victim Services Program was particularly effective in achieving its objective of providing victims with needed services and information. The program served 2,418 victims of crime in Ohio, 94 percent of whom were victims of violent crime.

**Ohio Victim Services At-A-Glance
Calendar Year 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Activity</i>	<i>CY 2005 Total</i>
Victims Reported Served	2,418
Percent Female Victims	72 %
Percent of Clients Who were Victims of Violent Crime	94 %
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Education	70 %
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Crisis Intervention	70 %
Percent of Projects Directly Providing Court Advocacy	80 %

Overview of Project Performance

During calendar year 2005, projects funded through Ohio's Victim Services Program report serving 2,418 clients. Each of the funded projects funded served an average of 242 clients. Victims of domestic violence accounted for 34 percent of all clients served by the Ohio program during CY 2005.

**Ohio Victim Services Clients by Race/Ethnicity
CY 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>	<i>Percent Male</i>	<i>Percent Female</i>	<i>Total</i>
African-American	2%*	6%	8%
Caucasian	24%	62%	86%
Latino	<1%	<1%	1%
Other Race/Ethnicity	< 1%	1%	2%
Race/Ethnicity Unknown	<1%	2.5%	3%
Total	28%	72%	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.*

Thirty-seven 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 18 percent of victims served by Ohio's program. All other groups comprised more than 10 percent of the special needs populations.

**Ohio Victim Services Special Needs Populations
CY 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Special Needs Group</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Appalachians	20%
Mentally/Emotionally Challenged	18%
Juveniles	51%
Medically Challenged	2%
Older People	5%
Lesbian/Gay/Bi-sexual/Transgender	<1%
English Second Language	3%
Migrant Farm Workers	0%

During CY 2005, victims of violent crimes accounted for 92 percent of all clients served by Ohio's program. Eight percent were victims of property offenses and less than one were victims of other offenses. No elder abuse or neglect was reported by the projects. As in the past, domestic violence was the single largest offense category, accounting for 34 percent of victims served by Ohio's Victim Services Program. Note, however, 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 Services
CY 2005, Pre-FFY 2004 Projects**

<i>Offense</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Attempted Murder	1	0%
Rape	659	29%
Other Sexual Assault	163	7%
Domestic Violence	766	34%
Assault	278	12%
Other Violent Offenses	131	6%
Property Offenses	70	8%
Elder Abuse/Neglect	0	0%
Child Abuse/Neglect	94	4%
Other Offenses	15	<1%

Services provided by Ohio's Victim Services projects can be grouped as services the projects provide directly to victims and services to which they refer victims. During CY 2005, the projects reported an average of 5.1 services provided directly. The projects reported an average of 4.5 services to which they referred victims. 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 Services Provided
CY 2005**

<i>Type of Service</i>	<i>Percent of Projects Providing the Service Directly</i>	<i>Percent of Projects Providing Referrals for the Service</i>
Education	70%	50%
Court Advocacy	80%	70%
Crisis Intervention	70%	40%
Training for Courts	40%	20%
Transportation	40%	20%
Counseling	60%	70%
Life Skills	40%	30%
Shelter	30%	70%
Medical Services	10%	60%
Other	70%	20%

Court advocacy is the single most common service projects provided in CY 2005, being reported as occurring 80 percent of the time. Education, crisis intervention, and “other” represent the second most common direct services mostly being performed by projects. In contrast, counseling and shelter are the type of service most likely to be referred. In general, the Ohio Victim Services projects are inclined toward providing crisis intervention, education and court-related services. The projects were more likely to refer victims to other agencies for medical services, crisis intervention, and education.

**Program Area E:
Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS)**

III. E. 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.

During CY 2005, the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services funded from pre-FFY 2004 grants 14 CJIS projects from pre-FFY 2004 funds in the amount of \$381,981.

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

Program Area E Goal:

The purpose of this program area is to meet the criminal justice information needs of 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 E 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 E 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. E. 3. PROGRAM PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND EVALUATION METHODS

The number of Ohio agencies participating in CJIS-related programs.

The number of times Ohio criminal justice agencies access data through CJIS-related programs.

III. E. 4. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND EVALUATION RESULTS

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 this 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 completed the first phase to convert to DMPP2020 protocol. Some of the regional interface agencies are complete, and the rest need to be done by the end of the year. 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. There are more than 15,000 voice radios in use covering the entire state and more than 1,500 vehicles using data. The Ohio Office of Information Technology administers the ongoing technical assistance and maintenance to capture mobile voice and data coverage in the state.

Ohio Law Enforcement Officers Toolkit software (OIBRS) (CJIS Task 36)

The Ohio Law Enforcement Toolkit (LEOT) is an OIBRS/NIBRS-compliant records management system developed by OCJS. By the end of 2005, there were 313 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. It is anticipated that the LEOT will reach Ohio Local Law Enforcement Information Sharing Network (OLLEISN) Level II certification early in 2006.

Ohio Incident-Based Reporting System (OIBRS) Repository (CJIS Task 59)

OCJS currently administers the OIBRS Repository for Ohio crime data collection. More

than 315 Ohio law enforcement agencies contributed data to the OIBRS Repository in 2005 that is 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 IBR reporting standard to automate crime reporting in Ohio. The OIBRS Portal was enhanced to enable agencies to view their IBR validation errors online before submitting their data to OCJS. An OIBRS Partners Portal was also unveiled enabling vendors to check their edits in their software applications online against the edits in the OIBRS Repository.

Juvenile Justice Information System (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 (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. By the end of 2005 there were 16 counties with signed MOUs in place to enable their data to be searchable through JJIS and six counties were actually searchable through JJIS.