

MIS SYSTEMS IN STATE PRISONS

Special Issues in Corrections

December 1999

LIS, Inc.

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Corrections
Information Center
Longmont, Colorado

National Institute of Corrections

Morris L. Thigpen
Director

Susan M. Hunter
Chief, Prisons Division

MIS SYSTEMS IN STATE PRISONS

Special Issues in Corrections

December 1999

Introduction

Management of offender data is a critical issue for every correctional agency's overall operations. With advances in the use of automated computer systems to manage data and the need for better efficiency and more accurate and timely data, management information systems (MIS systems) have become a necessary component of prison management. This is particularly true with regard to offender classification.

The data generated through an automated classification system can provide correctional managers with accurate, timely, and relevant information to plan and manage the offender population, better utilize resources, and assess risks and needs. Automation can reduce errors in scoring offenders for custody or security level and improve the system's ability to monitor the classification and assignment of offenders.

Most state corrections systems use objective classification to assign inmates to appropriate prisons, and a number of agencies use internal classification systems to guide housing, work, and program assignments. However, agencies often lack the reliable data they need to fully assess and redesign their classification systems to adapt to increased demands and a changing environment. A system's performance can be maximized through regular evaluations, conducted to determine the impact of the system on inmate operations, and validation studies, conducted to ensure the system is working as designed.

Automating the classification system is necessary for efficient system evaluation and for addressing operational issues in the daily management of offenders. These issues include managing transfers and bed space, making housing decisions within facilities, tracking disciplinary actions, scheduling and documenting classification reviews, and calculating release and eligibility dates. Programmatic functions, such as assessing inmates' needs and documenting program participation, also can be managed more effectively through automation.

About the Study

The NIC Prisons Division and Information Center conducted this study to establish a baseline describing the status of offender MIS systems in departments of corrections (DOCs) nationwide, with emphasis on their use in classification. Project staff reviewed MIS systems in terms of the data elements they typically contain, external data sources and how the data are transferred, integration with agency work processes, and reports and other system outputs.

Information for this report was obtained through a written survey completed by DOC respondents in 50 states, the District of Columbia, New York City, Cook County (Chicago, Illinois), Puerto Rico, and the Correctional Service of Canada. Respondents included MIS managers, researchers, and other agency personnel.

Project staff contacted some agencies' respondents to clarify their answers to major questions but, because of the broad scope of the survey, did not attempt to confirm all data reported. Though some study findings could possibly reflect errors in interpretation by project staff or DOC survey respondents, the study as a whole provides useful background information.

Study Highlights

Several indicators of MIS system configuration and use were compiled during the study:

- **Management functions supported.** Broadly speaking, DOCs use offender MIS systems to address two main aspects of management: the need to make appropriate decisions about individual offenders, and the need to make appropriate decisions about facility or system operations based on aggregate offender data. The more highly automated MIS systems include the data and the analytical capability to address both these needs in a comprehensive way, and most DOCs' systems cover both aspects at least minimally.
- **Offender data.** MIS systems in more than half of the DOCs contain core data on the offender's criminal history, such as jail time served, a record of warrants and detainers, a record of probation or parole violations, and prior adult convictions. MIS systems in 36 DOCs include three or more criminal history data elements.
- **System automation.** Rather than simply providing access to offender data, MIS systems typically perform a variety of functions—for example, making release eligibility calculations (36 DOCs), assisting in custody classification determinations (19 DOCs), and/or facilitating assessment (12 DOCs).
- **Data transfer.** Fewer than 10 DOCs now employ any digital transfer of offender data to the MIS from outside justice agencies and networks. Planning is underway in several locations to

develop or improve systems, enabling more data transfer in the future.

- **Overall levels of automation.** In most DOCs the offender MIS system appears to have well developed data elements and to perform a reasonable range of functions. Several agencies stood out as having MIS systems that feature significantly higher levels of automation than other jurisdictions. They include Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Vermont, and Washington. Virtually all DOCs are planning upgrades to their systems, no matter how advanced their current system.

MIS Usage for Offender-Focused Decisions

An MIS system provides information on the individual inmate to support the agency's decisions regarding that inmate. Survey responses indicate that most DOCs have information in the MIS that can be used for offender-focused decisions, such as classification, housing assignment, and program assignment. The mix of information available in the MIS for these decisions varies from agency to agency. The more highly automated systems include detailed information on individual offenders.

Common MIS data elements. The study explored whether MIS systems commonly include 18 specific types of data in four broad categories: length of incarceration, custody and security levels, housing, and discipline. DOC responses are presented in Appendix A.

- Almost without exception, DOCs have complete data on the length of stay expected for an inmate. Data on the current court order, including specific conviction offense and length of sentence, is available in 46 DOCs. The projected release date is available in 47 DOCs. A projected eligibility date for parole, supervised community release, or other community program is available in 43 DOCs.

- Data on custody and security levels are slightly less complete, overall. Current custody and security designations are available in 46 DOCs, while past custody and security designations in the current commitment are available in 43 DOCs. Other information commonly available includes intake assessment findings (33 DOCs); criminal history information (40 DOCs); gang or threat group affiliation (35 DOCs); and a record of classification overrides, if an objective classification system is used (32 DOCs).
- Inclusion of data related to housing is mixed. Current housing assignment, by facility assigned is available in 49 DOCs, and unit assignments are available in 46 DOCs. Bed assignments are included in MIS systems in 40 DOCs. DOCs in 31 states maintain information on approved transfers and 28 DOCs include data on transportation status.
- Data on disciplinary status is least likely to be included in the MIS. Information on pending disciplinary charges is available in the MIS systems in 23 DOCs; scheduled disciplinary hearing dates are available in 21 DOCs' systems. A record of disciplinary actions in the current commitment is available in 39 DOCs, and systems in 35 DOCs include disciplinary data from past commitments. Four DOCs have no information about disciplinary actions in their MIS systems.

Criminal history information. DOCs include a variety of criminal history information in their offender MIS systems. The survey asked whether the MIS system included 15 specific data elements related to criminal history and disciplinary/behavioral information from prior periods of correctional supervision. Thirty-six (36) DOCs include at least three of these elements in their MIS systems. Results are presented in Table 1, page 7, along with information on how the data become part of the MIS record.

Results indicated:

- The most commonly included piece of criminal history information is a record of jail time served (38 DOCs). Note, however, that the survey instru-

ment did not distinguish between jail time to be credited toward the current prison sentence and overall jail time served at any other time in the offender's life.

- Thirty-three (33) DOCs include data on prior warrants and detainers in the MIS.
- Thirty (30) DOCs include data on probation/parole violations. Because of the survey wording, it is not clear whether this represents data on past violations or the ability to track parole violations on the current commitment.
- Twenty-six (26) DOCs include a record of prior adult convictions and sentences.
- Twenty-two (22) DOCs include disciplinary and behavioral information from prior prison sentences.

MIS systems in fewer than half the DOCs, but still a significant number, include:

- Information on the offender's disciplinary record from prior prison commitments (22 DOCs);
- The adult arrest record (18 DOCs);
- The arrest warrant for the crime of conviction (17 DOCs); and
- The presentence investigation report (16 DOCs).

Elements least commonly included in the MIS were:

- Needs assessment data generated by the jail (13 DOCs);
- A record of other adult arraignments, indictments, etc. (13 DOCs);
- The arrest report for the conviction offense (12 DOCs);
- Disciplinary/behavioral information from the jail (10 DOCs);

- A juvenile arrest record and incarceration history (10 DOCs); and
- Needs assessment data generated by the juvenile facility (3 DOCs).

Classification. Table 2, page 8, details whether eight criminal history data elements that are most relevant to classification are included in DOCs' MIS systems. DOCs with the greatest number of data elements available for classification purposes are in Minnesota (14 of the 15 elements identified by the survey instrument), New York (14 elements), Iowa (12 elements), Tennessee (11 elements), and Rhode Island (10 elements).

Survey respondents in 19 DOCs indicated that the MIS calculates the offender's classification score or rating. These jurisdictions include Alaska, Colorado, Florida, Hawaii, Kentucky, Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, and Washington. Four of these DOCs indicated their MIS system includes only three or fewer of the listed data elements.

Assessment. Offender MIS systems in 33 DOCs include the results of the intake assessment. Table 3, page 9, identifies these agencies and their methods for placing assessment findings in the MIS.

- Eleven (11) DOCs reported that assessment responses, ratings, or recommendations are entered directly into the MIS system by agency staff during an instrument-driven assessment interview.
- In 21 DOCs, staff enter assessment ratings or recommendations into the MIS from a paper record after an instrument-driven assessment process is conducted. This includes three (3) DOCs that also have the capability for direct entry.
- In four (4) DOCs, findings are entered into the MIS after an assessment process that is not based on a formal needs assessment instrument.

The remaining agencies reported that assessment data are not included in the MIS system.

MIS Usage for Facility Management Decisions

Information on individual offenders can be aggregated by an MIS and grouped into reports for purposes such as trend analysis, budgeting, program evaluation, problem identification, scheduling, or making future projections at the facility- or agency-wide level. For the MIS to be used in institutional or systemwide decision-making the agency must decide what information is valuable and how it should be analyzed. Without such preparation, reports could be generated that have no real use in policy decision-making, management, or planning.

Data elements. Appendix A summarizes the types of data included in MIS systems. Several of these data elements are, in the aggregate, important for facility management decisions. For example, transfer dates and release eligibility dates contribute to population projections, and information on custody levels and gang or threat group affiliation can help with decisions on facility staffing levels and training. The ability to track classification overrides is important in monitoring an objective classification system.

Management reports. For this study, the ability of prison MIS systems to generate reports, either paper or on-screen, was considered an indicator of the MIS's importance in facility- or agency-level decision-making. Respondents were asked to identify which of seven reports were being produced and whether they were produced on screen, on paper, or both. Results are presented in Table 4, page 10.

- MIS systems in 29 DOCs produce five or more of the management reports identified by the survey.
- Housing assignment reports are produced by MIS systems in most jurisdictions (43 DOCs). Roughly equal numbers of DOCs receive this report in on-screen and paper outputs. This report also is both the report most often produced on-screen (31

DOCs) and the report most often produced in both on-screen and paper formats (21 DOCs).

- Aggregate reports that sort data by factors such as custody, risk, offense, and projected release date are produced in 39 DOCs. More of these reports are generated on paper (33 DOCs) than on-screen (20 DOCs).
- Reports on scheduled classification reviews are produced in 35 DOCs. Equal numbers of DOCs receive this report in on-screen and paper outputs.
- Summary reports on classification actions are produced in 32 DOCs.
- Classification override reports are produced in 29 DOCs.
- Reports providing an automatic comparison of classification status and housing assignment are produced in 24 DOCs. This report is more often produced with a paper output.
- Bedspace projection reports are produced in only 13 DOCs. Systems are more likely to produce screen outputs (10 DOCs) than paper (6 DOCs), and three (3) DOCs can produce both screen and paper outputs.

Overall, reports are more likely to be produced in a paper format than on-screen, and DOCs are likely to generate a given report in either a paper or an on-screen format rather than having the flexibility of producing it in both ways. However, for three reports, DOCs are equally likely to have either paper or on-screen outputs. These reports concern scheduled classification reviews, classification actions, and housing assignments.

Some DOCs indicated that the MIS did not produce the specific reports covered by the survey but does produce other reports. Several respondents noted that their systems can produce a variety of additional reports as needed. Some states that now produce few reports noted plans to add additional report capacity as their MIS systems are developed further.

Calculation of projected release date. Well over half the responding agencies (36 DOCs) indicated that their MIS systems calculate inmates' projected release date, factoring in, for example, anticipated fixed or percentage credits for good time or program participation. Projections are then used in the aggregate to predict facility populations over time.

Access to offender data. Access to MIS data is important for management, supervisory, or planning purposes at the central office and facility levels.

- Access is possible from both the facility and institutional level in most agencies (43 DOCs).
- Access is limited to the facility level in three DOCs (New Jersey, North Dakota, and West Virginia).

Integration with Other Justice Data Sources

Another potential feature of a highly automated offender MIS is its capability for accepting offender data from other justice information databases. Such databases include state- or regionally-managed systems and the federally managed National Criminal Information Center (NCIC), which makes nationally accumulated criminal history information available to law enforcement and corrections agencies.

Transfer of offender data. More DOCs use staff to re-enter information into their MIS systems from paper records than obtain the information via electronic data transfer. Disciplinary/behavioral data from prior prison sentences (13 DOCs) and data on probation/parole violations (14 DOCs) are most likely to be added directly from a digital source. This may reflect access to earlier records for an offender in the DOC's MIS system.

Current sources of offender data. Correctional agencies can be participants in, or eligible to obtain data from, a variety of national, regional, or state networks providing information such as warrants, arrest records, or prison and jail commitments.

- Among the DOCs surveyed, 16 indicated that they receive criminal history information in an electronic format from an automated system accessed and maintained by multiple criminal justice agencies. Agencies include the DOCs in Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Oregon, Tennessee, Vermont, and Virginia.
- Eight (8) DOCs indicated that they have access to a comprehensive database of offender information, but one that it is maintained by a single state agency rather than a consortium. DOCs include agencies in Alaska (Department of Public Safety system), Arizona (ACIC), California (California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System), Connecticut (State Police), Florida (C.J. Net), Kansas (Bureau of Investigation), Pennsylvania (Commonwealth Law Enforcement Assistance Network), Texas (Department of Public Safety system), and Washington.
- Twenty-eight (28) DOCs indicated that they include data from the NCIC system in their MIS systems.

New or updated systems for offender data exchange. Thirty-eight (38) jurisdictions indicated that the state has, or is at least discussing plans to develop, access to an integrated database for offender information. Further, respondents from the jurisdictions that are already operating such systems indicated that the systems are continuing to be improved.

Future Plans

In every DOC surveyed, respondents indicated that plans are underway to improve the agency's offender MIS system. Examples of the improvements that were described are:

- Moving from a main-frame to a client/server system;
- Moving to more off-the-shelf applications;

- Including more graphic information (such as fingerprints and photographs);
- Adding fields to the system to capture offender programming information;
- Providing for more management reports;
- Adding more probation and parole information, including pre-sentence investigation findings;
- Converting to an integrated system used by all criminal justice agencies; and
- Converting to an intranet or Internet-based system.

As technology continues to advance, DOCs will face the ongoing challenge of balancing the disruption and expense involved in upgrading their MIS systems with the gains in efficiency and effectiveness that new systems ultimately bring. The present study gives an indication of how far agencies have come in their MIS system development and where, in 1999, they have found their current balance.

NIC can provide technical assistance and training to correctional agencies making enhancements in their MIS systems for analysis and management of classification systems. For information on applying for assistance, contact Sammie D. Brown, Correctional Program Specialist, NIC Prisons Division, 320 First Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20534; (800) 995-6423 or (202) 307-3106, ext. 126; or email sbrown@bop.gov. ■

Table 1. Information Included in Corrections Department MIS Systems

	Number of DOCs with This Element in MIS System		
	Received via electronic data transfer	Entered from paper record	Total
Adult arrest record	2	16	18
Arrest warrant for conviction offense(s)	2	15	17
Arrest report for conviction offense(s)	2	10	12
Presentence investigation report on current conviction/commitment	5	11	16
Record of prior adult conviction(s)	8	18	26
Disciplinary/behavioral information from prior prison sentences(s)	13	9	22
Record of probation/parole violations	14	16	28
Record of jail time served	8	30	38
Disciplinary/behavioral information from jail	4	6	10
Needs assessment data, (e.g., medical, mental health, or substance abuse treatment needs) from jail	6	7	13
Record of other adult arraignments, indictments, dismissals, etc.	4	9	13
Record of warrants/detainers	6	27	33
Juvenile arrest record	2	8	10
Juvenile incarceration history	1	9	10
Needs assessment data, (e.g., medical, mental health, or substance abuse treatment needs) from juvenile facility	0	3	3

Table 2. Criminal History Data in Prison MIS Systems

	Arrest Record, Current Offense	Arrest Warrant, Current Offense	PSI	Prior Arrest Record	Prior Prison Disciplinary Records	Probation/ Parole Violations	Jail Time Served	Other Warrants/ Detainers
Alabama				✓	✓			
Alaska	No information provided							
Arizona							✓	✓
Arkansas					✓	✓	✓	✓
California		✓						✓
Colorado	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Connecticut					✓	✓	✓	✓
Delaware			✓					
District of Columbia	✓	✓		✓			✓	✓
Florida	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Georgia	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Hawaii							✓	
Idaho			✓				✓	✓
Illinois				✓	✓	✓		✓
Indiana				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Iowa	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Kansas				✓	✓	✓	✓	
Kentucky						✓	✓	✓
Louisiana	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Maine	No information provided							
Maryland							✓	
Massachusetts	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
Michigan				✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Minnesota	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Mississippi					✓	✓	✓	
Missouri			✓		✓	✓	✓	
Montana	No information provided							
Nebraska	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Nevada	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
New Hampshire						✓	✓	✓
New Jersey	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
New Mexico			✓	✓				
New York	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
North Carolina			✓				✓	✓
North Dakota						✓	✓	✓
Ohio	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Oklahoma				✓	✓		✓	
Oregon					✓	✓	✓	✓
Pennsylvania							✓	✓
Rhode Island	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
South Carolina	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
South Dakota		✓		✓				✓
Tennessee	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Texas		✓					✓	✓
Utah	✓			✓	✓		✓	✓
Vermont				✓			✓	
Virginia			✓	✓	✓	✓		
Washington					✓	✓	✓	✓
West Virginia	No information provided							
Wisconsin				✓				
Wyoming	No information provided							

Table 3. Assessment Information in MIS Systems

	Assessment Information in MIS			Assessment Information Not in MIS
	Formal instrument; results transferred from paper to MIS	Formal instrument; results input directly in MIS	Other method; results transferred from paper to MIS	
Alabama				✓
Alaska	✓			
Arizona	✓			
Arkansas			✓	
California				✓
Colorado	✓	✓		
Connecticut	✓	✓		
Delaware				✓
District of Columbia				✓
Florida		✓		
Georgia				✓
Hawaii	No information provided			
Idaho				✓
Illinois	✓			
Indiana				✓
Iowa				✓
Kansas	✓			
Kentucky	✓			
Louisiana			✓	
Maine				✓
Maryland	✓			
Massachusetts				✓
Michigan	✓			
Minnesota		✓		
Mississippi			✓	
Missouri	✓	✓		
Montana				✓
Nebraska		✓		
Nevada		✓		
New Hampshire				✓
New Jersey				✓
New Mexico				✓
New York	✓			
North Carolina		✓		
North Dakota				✓
Ohio	✓			
Oklahoma		✓		
Oregon	✓			
Pennsylvania	✓			
Rhode Island				✓
South Carolina	✓			
South Dakota	✓			
Tennessee		✓		
Texas			✓	✓
Utah			✓	
Vermont		✓		
Virginia	✓			
Washington	✓			
West Virginia	✓			
Wisconsin	✓			
Wyoming	✓			

Table 4. Management Reports Generated by MIS Systems

Management Reports	System produces this report with online/onscreen output	System produces this report with paper output	System produces this report in both formats	Total agencies producing this report
Housing assignment reports	31	33	21	43
Aggregate reports that sort by custody, risk behavior, offense, projected release date, etc.	20	33	14	39
Scheduled classification reviews	23	23	11	35
Summary of classification actions	20	19	7	32
Classification override report (if an objective classification system is in use)	14	22	7	29
Automatic comparison of classification and housing assignment to identify discrepancies	10	20	6	24
Bedspace projections	10	6	3	13

Appendix A. Data Elements Included in Offender MIS Systems

DATA ELEMENTS INCLUDED IN OFFENDER MIS SYSTEMS

	LENGTH OF INCARCERATION			CLASSIFICATION-RELATED DATA						HOUSING/TRANSFER RELATED DATA					DISCIPLINARY DATA			
	CURRENT COURT ORDER	PROJECTED RELEASE DATE	PROJECTED PAROLE DATE	CURRENT CUSTODY DESIGNATION	PAST CUSTODY DESIGS.	INTAKE ASSESSMENT FINDINGS	CRIMINAL HISTORY INFORMATION	GANG/THREAT GROUP AFFILIATION	OBJECTIVE CLASSIF. OVERRIDE	FACILITY ASSIGNED	UNIT ASSIGNED	BED ASSIGNED	APPROVED TRANSFERS	TRANSPORT STATUS	PENDING CHARGES	HEARING DATE	ACTIONS, CURRENT COMMITMENT	ACTIONS, PRIOR COMMITMENTS
ALABAMA	X	X	X	X						X			X	X			X	
ALASKA	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
ARIZONA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
ARKANSAS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X			X		X	X
CALIFORNIA	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
COLORADO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
CONNECTICUT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
DELAWARE	(SEE NOTE)																	
D.C.	X	X	X				X	X		X	X	X		X				
FLORIDA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
GEORGIA		X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
HAWAII	X	X	X	X	X					X	X	X		X	X	X		
IDAHO	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
ILLINOIS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
INDIANA	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
IOWA	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
KANSAS	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
KENTUCKY	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X					
LOUISIANA	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X		X					
MAINE	X	X		X	X					X	X							
MARYLAND	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
MASS.	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
MICHIGAN	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X					X	X
MINNESOTA	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X
MISSISSIPPI	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X					X	X
MISSOURI	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X

	LENGTH OF INCARCERATION			CLASSIFICATION-RELATED DATA						HOUSING/TRANSFER RELATED DATA					DISCIPLINARY DATA			
	CURRENT COURT ORDER	PROJECTED RELEASE DATE	PROJECTED PAROLE DATE	CURRENT CUSTODY DESIGNATION	PAST CUSTODY DESIGS.	INTAKE ASSESSMENT FINDINGS	CRIMINAL HISTORY INFORMATION	GANG/THREAT GROUP AFFILIATION	OBJECTIVE CLASSIF. OVERRIDE	FACILITY ASSIGNED	UNIT ASSIGNED	BED ASSIGNED	APPROVED TRANSFERS	TRANSPORT STATUS	PENDING CHARGES	HEARING DATE	ACTIONS, CURRENT COMMITMENT	ACTIONS, PRIOR COMMITMENTS
MONTANA	X		X	X	X		X			X	X	X					X	X
NEBRASKA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X				X	X
NEVADA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
NEW HAMP.	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X						
NEW JERSEY	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X
NEW MEXICO		X					X			X								
NEW YORK	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
N. CAROLINA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
N. DAKOTA	X	X		X	X					X	X							
OHIO	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X				
OKLAHOMA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
OREGON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
PENNSYLVANIA	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
RHODE ISLAND	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S. CAROLINA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S. DAKOTA		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X					X	X
TENNESSEE	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
TEXAS	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
UTAH	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X
VERMONT	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VIRGINIA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X	X
WASHINGTON	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
W. VIRGINIA	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X						X	X
WISCONSIN	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				
WYOMING	(SEE NOTE)																	

NOTES

The Alaska DOC is an integrated jail/prison system. The DOC is moving from an old flat file mainframe system to new relational database which is still being developed.

The Colorado DOC is part of the Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System, an integrated computer information system which standardizes data and communications technology throughout the primary criminal justice community: law enforcement, district attorneys, state funded courts, and state funded adult and youth corrections.

The Connecticut DOC's MIS will be converted to a relation server based system that will operate throughout the state on the Correction LAN/WAN. The state Offender Based Tracking System is being developed with the Department of Public Safety, Connecticut Chiefs of Police Association, Judicial Court and Information Systems, Board of Parole, Chief State's Attorney and the Office of Policy and Management.

Delaware has an automated system under development. Target implementation is June 2000 of a fully integrated offender management system with seamless prisons to community connection. The DOC Automated Offender Management System in Phase #1 will include Central Booking and Intake; Classification; Pre-Trial; Offender Disciplinary; Offender Grievance; Case Management; Special Programs; Escapees; Transportation; Victim Notification; Movement; Central Records Sentence Calculation.

The Florida system is comprehensive and improvements are continuing to be made. The DOC is part of a criminal justice network referred to as CJ Net which uses Internet technology in a secure Internet accessible to various law enforcement agencies throughout Florida. Prison, probation and parole staff also have direct access to mainframe.

The Illinois system makes frequent enhancements to existing modules and creates new applications.

Indiana recently published an RFP for design, development, implementation of current system and adding other functions.

Kansas is developing an integrated justice information system-Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) under the direction of the CJIS Coordinating Counsel through a Legislative Initiative.

Maryland is planning a complete redesign of its system to more fully automate and integrate data collection and enhance records management and management reports.

The Massachusetts DOC is in the process of developing and implementing a comprehensive MIS system called the Inmate Management System which will contain a comprehensive history of each inmate. Testing is being done in three pilot sites.

The Michigan DOC is responsible for adult prison and parole, and adult felony probation supervision. Systems are integrated with the Department. The DOC is also actively participating in statewide initiatives to integrate all criminal justice agencies including courts and prosecutors.

The Minnesota DOC is rewriting the database to include an automated needs assessment. The first module, which automates all classification functions, has been recently put into operation.

The Mississippi DOC is responsible for probation and parole files. The agency is planning to develop a comprehensive integrated offender tracking system to store details of all aspects of offender management.

The Missouri automated system is continuing to be enhanced. Plans include: Automated Diagnostic Document; Criminal History reporting enhancements with the state repository (MSHP); Automated backing cards with pictures; Gang affiliation; Institutional sentencing and time history screens; Summary screens; and additional reports. Currently automated to jails through REGIS/ALERT in two large metropolitan areas.

Montana has most of its data on subsystems at two major facilities. Much of the data is still on hard copy but the DOC is moving towards more electronic files.

New Jersey operates decentralized data bases at each site with limited pass-thru capabilities from Central Office. The PC based system tracks objective classification override data. The DOC incorporates a single entry transaction (SET) capability which allows classification staff to enter the offender's fingerprint based SBI (SID) # which then accesses 5 criminal justice MIS systems including: NJCCH (NJ Rap Sheets); NCIC (Wanted Person); III-O/S Rap Sheets; Primis Gavel (NJ Open Charges); and NJ OBCIS (NJ correctional History). All five reports are sent to one printer. Also see the article "Objective Jail Classification in New Jersey: A Statewide Initiative," *America's Jails*, July/August 1999, 33-36.

The New York DOC automated Population Management System is comprised of 24 subsystems which provide comprehensive inmate profile information including crime and sentence data, security designation and restrictions, test data, medical data, inmate housing location, transfer history, disciplinary history and enemies data. The system computes legal dates, issues transfer orders, prints inmate folder documents, generates facility operating reports, and provides a broad range of management reporting. Data is collected and printed on-line directly at the facility level in various function

units.

The North Carolina DOC is in the North Carolina Criminal Justice Information Network which is a joint effort among all state and local criminal justice agencies. The DOC in planning enhancements to create a Mobile Client for probation/parole officers; add workflow; make additional graphical user interface; and make web-enabled data; improve medical records on-line; and develop a module for substance abuse treatment programs.

The North Dakota DOC has contracted to purchase an offender management system that was expected to be on-line by October 1999.

Ohio will be moving from a proprietary mainframe system to an n-tier system using more open development tools and off the shelf applications.

Oklahoma is installing a new Offender Management System that will extensively automate offender data.

Oregon's offender data management is extensively automated.

Pennsylvania has an integrated justice information system called JNET. Information may be obtained via the web at www.state.pa.us/technology-initiatives/JNET/home.htm. The DOC plans improvements to capture all sentencing information and all information collected/needed at reception; provide access to information via a browser based interface; capture program information electronically; and install a statewide photo imaging system.

The Rhode Island DOC Inmate Facility Tracking System (INFACTS) tracks inmate demographics, location, classification, discipline, furlough, visitation, parole, work history, inmate payroll, and court appearances. Facility staff use the INFACTS System to produce risk assessment reports and files. Classification Hearing Officers and staff use INFACTS classification data during classification hearings. Central classification staff use the system for scheduling, approval and eventual movement of inmates. Jail and prison inmates are all located in the same complex. The Inmate Tracking System contains data on both populations. The INFACTS Enhancements Project will improve inmate admissions data reporting.

The South Carolina Department of Corrections' (SCDC's) automated system tracks inmates from intake to release—besides demographic, commitment, medical, needs assessment, and prior criminal history data, diverse applications record extensive transactions pertaining to each inmate during his/her incarceration. These transactions include: movement and transfers (including escapes and to/from courts), infractions and dispositions, grievances, time and credit earning and loss, medical encounters, program participation and achievement, work assignments and earning, projections of sentence expiration and parole eligibility dates as inmates change jobs or lose credits/time; parole reviews and decisions, gang participation, classification reviews, restitution requirements, canteen visits and expenditures, and authorized visitors and visits. To ensure comprehensive criminal history data are entered, data sets which facilitate executive information retrieval are also maintained by the Offender Information Management Branch (OIM), which performs data warehousing, executive information, statistics and analysis functions in SCDC's Resource and Information Management Division.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice(TDCJ) is currently undertaking an offender information management reengineering project through a vendor to develop and implement the redesigned systems and supporting infrastructure. TDCJ encompasses probation, institutions, and parole and links to other law enforcement entities.

The Vermont DOC's prison/jail/field information is integrated and available at all sites. Improvements are planned in the data structure relating to episode tracking; criminal charge information; program assignment/length of stay in programs; incorporating digital images in the database; and to scan certain records with certificate of authenticity provided.

The Washington DOC has awarded a contract to begin working on the Offender Management Network Information (OMNI) system. OMNI is the new name of the replacement for the Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS). The new system will allow the Department to become more proactive in its approach to offenders both in and out of state prisons. The Justice Information Network (JIN) involves state and local criminal justice agencies and law enforcement in the development of accurate, timely and secure information exchange. More information on this comprehensive integrated justice information system is available through the JIN website: <http://www.wa.gov/dis/jin>.

The Wisconsin DOC is planning the consolidation of multiple overlapping offender database systems into one integrated corrections system (ICS) database.

The West Virginia DOC proposal to implement a PC-based MIS system to replace a main frame system has been delayed due to funding constraints.

The Wyoming DOC department-wide system has been under development over the past two years and is scheduled to be implemented this year.