

Criminal History Records Information Audit Report

September 2003



Prepared by
Criminal History Records
Audit Center



ILLINOIS
Criminal Justice Information Authority

This audit was prepared by the Criminal History Records Audit Center, a division of the Research and Analysis Unit at the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Illinois Criminal Justice information Authority

Rod R. Blagojevich, Governor
Sheldon Sorosky, Chairman
Lori G. Levin, Executive Director

Research and Analysis Unit

Dr. Gerard F. Ramker, Associate Director
Karen Levy McCanna, CHRI Audit Center Manager
Christine Devitt, Research Analyst
Christopher Humble, Research Analyst
Susan Williams, Research Analyst
Eric Grommon, Research Assistant

This report was published pursuant to grant 98-DB-MU-0017 and 99-DB-BX-0017 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The Crime Control Act of 1990 requires each state to allocate at least five percent of its Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula grant funds for the improvement of criminal justice records. This audit is paid for with some of the funds made available to Illinois. The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the activities of the following program offices and bureaus: Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Institute of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office of Victims of Crime.

Points of views or opinions contained within this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. Any portion of this publication may be reproduced for research purposes, provided proper credit is given to the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Printed by authority of the State of Illinois
September 2003

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the full support of the Illinois State Police Bureau of Identification, the Chicago Police Department, and numerous participating law enforcement agencies. The Authority would especially like to thank the following individuals:

Illinois State Police

Kenneth Bouche, Deputy Director
John Jesernik, Bureau Chief
Terrance Gough, Asst. Bureau Chief
Charity Berard, Executive II
James Reed, Former Bureau Chief

Law Enforcement Agencies

The following law enforcement agencies participated in the audit. The Authority thanks the personnel in each of the participating agencies for their cooperation with this effort.

Assumption Police Department	Marengo Police Department
Beecher Police Department	Maryville Police Department
Bloomington Police Department	Morrisonville Police Department
Bridgeview Police Department	Mount Auburn Police Department
Carrollton Police Department	Mount Morris Police Department
Chicago Police Department	Northwestern University Police Department
Christian County Sheriff's Office	Oak Brook Police Department
Clinton Police Department	Oglesby Police Department
East Hazel Crest Police Department	Orland Park Police Department
Edgar County Sheriff's Office	Pana Police Department
Edinburg Police Department	Riverdale Police Department
El Paso Police Department	Round Lake Heights Police Department
Elk Grove Village Police Department	Round Lake Park Police Department
Fairbury Police Department	Rushville Police Department
Flora Police Department	Shelbyville Police Department
Glenview Police Department	Stonington Police Department
Grandview Police Department	Swansea Police Department
Greenup Police Department	Taylorville Police Department
Harrisburg Police Department	Tazewell County Sheriff's Office
Havana Police Department	University of Illinois Springfield Police Department
Hazel Crest Police Department	Villa Grove Police Department
Illinois State Police	Westchester Police Department
Kincaid Police Department	Winnebago County Sheriff's Office
Lockport Police Department	

Finally, the Audit Center would like to thank several Authority staff members for their insights and comments during the audit. Thanks to:

Candice M. Kane, Ph.D., Former Executive Director

Robert P. Boehmer, General Counsel

Laura Egger, Grant Monitor

Daniel Dighton, Public Information Officer

James D'Archangelis, former Project Manager

James Thurmond, former Auditor

Copyright 2003 Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

120 S. Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016

Chicago, IL 60606-3997

312-793-8550

Executive Summary

This audit of the Illinois criminal history record system, maintained by the Illinois State Police (ISP), was another in a series of assessments conducted by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) pursuant to requirements of the Bureau of Justice Assistance funding guidelines. This audit was designed as a follow-up to the 1995 *statewide* audit conducted by ICJIA. That audit was conducted on CCH records created before federal funds were made available to states for the improvement of their criminal history records (under the Crime Control Act of 1990). This audit was conducted on records created after Illinois began its participation in the program (covering the period 1994-1998), and just before a major re-write of ISP's Computerized Criminal History (CCH) database was implemented in September, 1999. The findings presented here measure the progress made since 1995 and serve as a benchmark by which to assess future improvements to the Illinois criminal history record system.

This audit focused primarily on the progress Illinois has made toward achieving compliance with criteria established by the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Those criteria consider a state's criminal history records of sufficient high quality to merit waiver of the requirement to set aside funds for record improvement, if 95 percent of current records and 90 percent of records maintained over the past five years are of high quality for several key factors. Areas of criminal history record quality were specifically investigated in this audit include:

- 1) *Accuracy* of CCH records compared to source documents provided by local agencies,
- 2) *Timeliness* in which local agencies submit required criminal history information to the state system, and the further timeliness of processing that information at the state repository,
- 3) *Completeness* of the criminal history information included on the CCH record,
- 4) *Flagging* the records of convicted felons.

A statewide sample of 2,072 arrest records from the period 1994-1998, submitted to the audit by 50 randomly selected local law enforcement agencies, was used for the assessment of record accuracy and completeness. A sample of 4,644 arrest cards, state's attorney decisions, court dispositions and custodial submissions mailed to the ISP in 2001 were tracked for timeliness.

The audit findings, in general, pointed to progress made by ISP toward improving the quality of Illinois criminal history records, particularly in light of the tremendous volume of information processed on a daily basis.

The findings and recommendations presented here should offer additional direction for continued improvement.

Arrest Information Findings

- The number of known arrests at the local law enforcement level without corresponding CCH records dropped by 50 percent since the last statewide 1995 audit. Only 8 percent of cases in the audit sample could not be located on CCH.
- Warrant arrests were the most problematic type of arrest in terms of corresponding records not being found on CCH, accounting for 40 percent of all arrests (8 percent of total arrests) not found on CCH.

Recommendation

Properly reporting a warrant arrest is a complex activity given the different policies and procedures in place. The Illinois State Police should develop a less complex set of reporting requirements and train local agencies on the proper procedures for warrant arrest reporting.

Accuracy Findings

- More state 5-part fingerprint cards submitted to ISP were filled out completely by local agencies compared to the previous audit. The one variable that continued to contribute to incompleteness of data was *class of offense*, missing in over one-quarter of the cards.
- Overall, 73 percent of the CCH records audited had information that *exactly* matched the corresponding state 5-part arrest cards submitted by local agencies. The *statute* citation field contained the most discrepancies.
- ISP automated editing routines were responsible for creating discrepant name entries on CCH compared to the arrest card. In cases where an alias name (and, in some cases, alias date of birth) was included by local agencies on the arrest card, in addition to the name used at arrest, the edit routine truncated the field down so that the last name data supplied is lost. The final data posted to the *name* field is actually the alias name. This error results in the loss of information on the name (or date of birth) last used by the subject, which can be important to law enforcement.

Recommendation

While the advancement of technology has proven beneficial for Illinois criminal justice agencies, it is not without its own problems. Technology will only be able to improve the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of reporting if it is applied based on consistent reporting policies using standardize reporting procedures. The Illinois State Police should test the automated edit routines on a regular basis to ensure that data is being accurately transmitted and posted.

Timeliness Findings

- With the increased use of electronic technologies, the volume of mailed (paper) CHRI submissions to ISP was substantially lower in 2001 than in 1994, most notably for custodial and arrest submissions.
- The timeliness of mailed submissions by local agencies in 2001 was observed to be at about the same level as in 1994, with only custodial submissions approaching close to the time frames set by Illinois statutes. Less than half of mailed arrest, state's attorney, or court submissions were received by ISP within the mandated time frames. It should be noted that mailed submissions have significantly declined due to the implementation of electronic reporting.
- Close to three-quarters of all mailed arrest submissions were *posted* to CCH within the 90 day timeframe required by BJA standards, an improvement over the compliance rate observed in the 1995 audit. Forty-one percent of mailed state's attorney submissions and 10 percent of mailed court submissions were found posted to CCH at 90 days after receipt from the local agency. On the other hand, 87 percent of county jail custodial receipts were posted to CCH within 90 days.

Recommendation

Local reporting agencies need regular training on mandated CHRI reporting procedures. The Illinois State Police should re-focus energy into improving their program of field training and incorporate a quality check procedure, such as a performance audit, on local agency submissions. These activities should reflect technological advances, including electronically integrated reporting, and should enhance efforts toward uniform reporting across disparate local agency reporting policies and procedures.

Completeness Findings

- The completeness of records on CCH, defined as having all expected information on the arrest, court and custodial disposition improved substantially since the 1995 audit. Overall, 84 percent of cases had state's attorney decisions, 74 percent had court dispositions, and 97 percent had expected custodial information posted.
- Overall, 59 percent of CCH records audited had complete CHRI information. The absence of state's attorney information, which is required by Illinois statute, lowered the completeness rate. Illinois law provides the opportunity for state's attorney's dispositions to be filed on their behalf by another agency.
- Warrant arrests were observed to have lower rates of court disposition information, as did cases where the state's attorneys' filing decisions were posted automatically with the arrest posting ("direct file").

- If the BJA standard of complete disposition information is used (where state's attorneys' filings are not required), there were little or no difference across Illinois geographic regions in terms of complete disposition information reporting rate (75 percent) on CCH records.

Recommendation

CCH records with "direct file" state's attorney decisions are less likely to have corresponding court dispositions posted, compared to those records with state's attorney decisions submitted via the state 5-part card. The subsequent state's attorney dispositions are important to the accuracy and completeness of CHRI. The Illinois State Police should determine if they are receiving subsequent state's attorney disposition submissions from "direct file" counties, and whether they are being posted to CCH. The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority CHRI Audit Center and the Illinois State Police should continue to work cooperatively to determine the cause of subsequent state's attorney dispositions not received.

Conviction Status Indicator Findings

- All CHRI records have an assigned conviction status indicator or "flag" assigned. The indicators include categories of "Felony Conviction," "Misdemeanor Conviction," "No Conviction," or "Pending or Unknown."
- The number of rapsheets "flagged" as Felony Conviction records has increased to 68 percent, up from an initial 25 percent when the Conviction Status data element was first introduced on CCH rapsheets.
- The conviction indicator for misdemeanors appears to be lost when a "pending" or incomplete felony disposition is added to the rapsheet.
- There is no way for CCH record users to know whether out-of-state convictions were used to determine the individual's conviction status, since the "out-of-state" indicator is an internal CCH data element only.

Recommendation

The Conviction Status Indicator is an effective marker for determining repeat offenders when correctly applied. Because the indicator is based in part on non-Illinois offenses the user should be made aware when the status indicator represents information from other states.

Summary

The 2003 CHRI Audit report has been completed using reporting requirements set out in the Criminal Identification Act as well as Bureau of Justice Assistance standards to determine the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of Illinois Computerized

Criminal History Information in relationship to the 1995 CHRI Audit report. While, Illinois is still not in complete compliance with BJA standards improvements have been made.

The following full report text provides in-depth analysis of Illinois' reported and posted computerized criminal history information.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Federal Audit Standards	5
Methodology	8
Findings	14
I. Arrests Not Found On CCH	15
Overall Sample	15
II. Accuracy of CCH Records	17
Methodology	17
Sample	18
Findings	20
III. Timeliness of Mailed Submissions Received by ISP (Receipt and Posting)	30
Methodology	32
Sample	32
Findings	32
IV. Completeness of CCH records	42
Methodology	44
Sample	44
Findings	45
V. Conviction Status Indicator (Felony “Flags”)	61
Methodology and Sample	63
VI. Summary of Findings – How Does Illinois Rate?	66
VII. National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) Progress	67
Bibliography	91

Map

Map A: Illinois Counties In Audit	10
-----------------------------------	----

Tables

Table 1: Volume of SIDs Added to CCH	2
Table 2: Volume of Submissions Received by ISP	3
Table 3: Stratification of Audit Agencies by Region	11
Table 4: Audit (Arrest) Cases by Region	13
Table 5: Arrest Cases, by Document Type and Year	13

Table 6: Cases Found on CCH, by Document Type	15
Table 7: Cases Not Found on CCH, by Year	16
Table 8: Accuracy Audit Sample (5-Part Card cases), by Region	19
Table 9: Accuracy Audit Sample, by Year	19
Table 10: Completeness of State 5-Part Arrest Cards	20
Table 11: Accuracy of “Fatal Error” Fields for Arrest Data Posted to CCH	23
Table 12: Accuracy of Statute Citation Data Element on CCH Records	25
Table 13: Accuracy of Other Identifying Data Elements on CCH	26
Table 14: Overall Accuracy of Arrest Records, Within Regions	29
Table 15: Discrepant Cases Observed, by Region	30
Table 16: Volume of Mailed Submissions to ISP, per Timeliness Test Period (1994 and 2000)	33
Table 17: Timeliness of Mailed Arrest Reporting to ISP	33
Table 18: Timeliness of Mailed State’s Attorney’s Disposition Reporting to ISP	34
Table 19: Timeliness of Mailed Court Disposition Reporting to ISP	35
Table 20: Timeliness of Mailed Custodial Reporting to ISP	36
Table 21: Timeliness of Posting Mailed Arrest Submissions	38
Table 22: Timeliness of Posting Mailed State’s Attorney Dispositions to CCH	39
Table 23: Timeliness of Posting Mailed Court Dispositions to CCH	40
Table 24: Timeliness of Posting Mailed Custodial Submissions to CCH	41
Table 25: Comparison of Mailed Submission Posting to CCH in 90 Days, 2000 vs. 1994	41
Table 26: Completeness Audit Sample of Arrests, by Region and Year	44
Table 27: CCH Status of State’s Attorney Dispositions, by Year	46
Table 28: Types of State’s Attorney Decisions Found on CCH	46
Table 29: CCH Status of Court Dispositions	49
Table 30: Court Dispositions Found on CCH, by Region and Year	51
Table 31: CCH Court Status of Warrant Arrests, by State’s Attorney Filing Type	52
Table 32: Total Sample CCH Court Status by State’s Attorney Filing Type	52
Table 33: Types of Court Dispositions Found on CCH	53
Table 34: CCH Completeness Status of Cases by Court Disposition Type	54
Table 35: Conviction Court Cases by Sentence Type	55
Table 36: CCH Custodial Status by Type	56
Table 37: Distribution of Custodial Segments Found	57
Table 38: Overall CCH Completeness	57
Table 39: Records Complete on CCH According to the IL Statute Criterion, by Region	59
Table 40: Records Complete on CCH According to the BJA Criterion, by Region	59
Table 41: Distribution of Conviction Status Indicators (2001)	63
Table 42: Follow-Up of Cases with “Pending or Unknown” Conviction Status in 2001	64
Table 43: Follow-Up of Cases with Misdemeanor Conviction Status in 2001	65
Table 44: BJA “Report Card”	67

Appendices

Appendix A: Letter of request for arrest data	69
Appendix B: Reporting Requirements for the Audit Time Period 1994-1998	70
Appendix C: Page 1 of the State 5-Part Card	71
Appendix D: Definitions of Illinois Regions	72
Appendix E: Automated Disposition Reporting Definitions	73
Appendix F: Court Disposition Reporting Methods	80
Appendix G: ISP Certified Livescan Agencies	82
Appendix H: III Participating States	85
Appendix I: National Criminal History Improvement Program	86
Appendix J: Glossary	87

Introduction

The administration of justice depends on the swift, positive identification of apprehended individuals, and further, a complete and accurate determination of their prior criminal history. Decisions made throughout the entire criminal justice process from police decisions to detain suspects, charging decisions by state's attorneys, bond setting and sentencing decisions by judges, and even security placement decisions in correctional facilities all rely on timely and accurate criminal history record information.

The Illinois State Police (ISP) is designated by statute¹ to manage the state central repository for criminal history record information (CHRI) on individuals arrested in Illinois. Its Bureau of Identification (BOI) is charged with: 1) *collecting* criminal history records submitted by police, state's attorneys, courts, and corrections, 2) *maintaining* the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) database, and 3) *disseminating* automated individual records (or "rapsheets") to authorized users.² Further, the BOI has the responsibility to maintain records of personal identifiers (including demographic data and fingerprints) for all arrested persons, the mechanism by which these criminal history events are linked.³

The CCH database maintained by ISP is the fifth largest in the country. In January, 1994, the database held records on 2.1 million individuals, a 51 percent increase from the number of records held in 1984 (*1995 CHRI Audit Final Report*). By 1999, the CCH database held records on an estimated 3.5 million persons (*Trends & Issues Update: Collecting and maintaining criminal history records in Illinois, 2001*). In 1999, BOI staff processed approximately 523,000 fingerprints. Within the period July 2001-February 2002, the figure rose another five percent, to over 560,000 fingerprints processed. These are submitted in various formats (electronic and paper) by more than 1,000 state and local criminal justice agencies in Illinois. These agencies must comply with strict timeframes for submitting criminal history information to the repository as specified by state statute.⁴ BOI staff also return responses to inquiries for identification and criminal history record information in various formats electronically and via fax or mail. Technological advances have enabled the BOI to provide responses to 99 percent of electronic submissions within 2 hours.

¹ Criminal Identification Act, 20 ILCS 2630

² Illinois Uniform Conviction Information Act, 20 ILCS 2635

³ Criminal Identification Act, 20 ILCS 2630/4

⁴ Criminal Identification Act, 20 ILCS 2630/2.1

Table 1: Volume of SIDs Added to CCH

Year	Applicants	Criminal/Applicant	Criminal	Total Added
1994	31,107	9,101	80,645	120,853
1995	37,711	10,353	99,692	147,756
1996	61,524	9,288	82,789	163,601
1997	83,600	8,749	84,544	177,893
1998	73,425	7,169	66,722	147,316
1999	66,856	7,978	133,478	208,312

Note: "Criminal/Applicant" indicates individuals with both a criminal and an applicant inquiry entry added to the CCH transcript.

Source: Illinois State Police Bureau of Identification

Table 2: Volume of Submissions Received by ISP

	1994	1995*	1996	1997	1998	1999
Fingerprint Based Electronic (Livescan)						
Arrest	190,679	97,793	214,909	224,586	252,273	294,024
Custodial**	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	36,319
Fingerprint Based Paper						
Arrest	317,937	106,301	202,462	224,073	200,184	165,609
Custodial	29,942	24,592	33,470	36,904	21,319	13,090
Applicants	12,538	9,697	12,985	11,944	12,614	9,317
Death Notices	1,702	354	2,725	1,553	1,339	1,156
Access & Review	734	448	1,219	2,935	2,918	3,643
Stop Order	151	85	225	140	66	46
Non-Fingerprint Based Electronic						
Court Dispositions	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	1,050,957 ***
Custodial Status Change	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	not applicable	62,770
Non-Fingerprint Based Paper						
Court Dispositions	69,195	30,517	80,718	66,409	55,702	33,210
Custodial Status Change	25,385	13,820	30,039	36,863	20,561	95,503
Court Initiation	50,143	Discontinued				
States Attorney Dispositions	429,389	48,076	92,005	86,312	85,260	163,101
Inquiries	12,448	5,790	9,504	8,331	7,276	4,146
Record Challenges	48	30	21	56	66	50
Stop Order Cancellation	10,782	3	3	1	1	0
Total						
	1,151,073	337,506	680,285	700,107	659,579	1,846,941

*1995 data cover the months of January – June only.

** Custodial submission include both the Illinois Department of Corrections and county jails.

*** Additional records were posted to the system following conversion to electronic reporting.

Source: Illinois State Police Bureau of Identification

The BOI also has the task of computerizing all subsequent criminal justice events on the individual's arrest record. The volume of these submissions is staggering as well – during the seven-month period July 2001-February 2002, over 800,000 submissions (state's attorney dispositions, court dispositions, and custodial status changes) were received for processing. However, state's attorney and court submissions are not fingerprint based. Therefore, the five-part reporting form developed by BOI for non-livescan submissions has a common pre-printed number, allowing the separate pieces used by the state's attorney and circuit court clerk to be linked back to the original arrest event. The actual fingerprinting and event linking processes used by ISP are described in detail in the Findings Section of the report.

Besides traditional criminal justice purposes, Illinois has allowed public access to conviction information collected by the repository. As a result, requests for records by non-criminal justice entities, such as employers, licensing bodies, firearm dealers, and even the general public, has skyrocketed over the last decade. In the period July 2001 – February 2002 alone, BOI processed more than 500,000 requests for records from non-criminal justice users under the Illinois Uniform Conviction Information Act. Such requests comprise the second largest category of non-fingerprint based inquiries for CHRI, and even outnumber required court disposition submissions. The accuracy and completeness of CHRI become even more important for non-fingerprint based requests, since ISP must rely on demographic data to locate the correct CCH records, rather the positive identification afforded by fingerprints based requests⁵.

Keeping all this information current and accurate is a tremendous undertaking. The CCH database, first automated in the early 1970's, underwent a large-scale redesign in the late 1980's. Since 1995, the ISP has been developing and refining a new information system to replace the older version, which was still largely based on paper submissions. Assisted by federal funds allocated specifically for the improvement of state criminal record information systems, and informed by findings of numerous audits performed by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA), ISP has designed a new system that improves the quality and usefulness of criminal history records. The current system, which became fully operational in June 1999, relies heavily on electronic digital technologies for reporting arrests.

In order to ensure the quality of CHRI, state law requires the ICJIA to act as the sole, official, criminal justice body of Illinois to conduct periodic audits of the procedures, policies, and practices of the state central repository for CHRI, to verify compliance with federal and state laws and regulations governing such information.⁶ ICJIA has conducted periodic audits of the state central repository since the early 1980s. Historically, audit reports presented findings on the accuracy and completeness of the criminal history information disseminated by ISP, the reporting timeliness of required events to the repository by local criminal justice agencies, and additional analysis of a

⁵ Approximately 13,700 (3 percent) UCIA requests are received by ISP as finger-print based submissions, as well.

⁶ Illinois Criminal Justice Information Act, 20 ILCS 3930/7-i.

specific criminal history issue of current interest. For instance, the 1983 audit report examined custodial reporting of criminal history information by the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) and the 1999 audit report focused on court disposition reporting in Cook County.

This audit presents a statewide analysis of CHRI accuracy, completeness and timely submission, for the CCH re-design time period 1994-1998. To obtain a random sample of 2,251 arrest cases submitted for audit from 50 law enforcement agencies across Illinois, auditors examined: 1) the accuracy of arrest records posted to the CCH database compared to original arrest documents; 2) the completeness of disposition reporting for those arrests, and 3) the timeliness of mailed arrest submissions to ISP during May and October, 2000. In addition, the criminal history issue of felony “flagging”, or designating convicted felons on the criminal history records (rapsheets) disseminated by ISP was examined for the first time.

This audit was designed to assess the quality of data during the CCH redesign transition period, 1994-1998, when the changes in CCH database programming and their incremental implementation might have had unintended negative effects on the quality of criminal history record information collected and disseminated from CCH. This audit timeframe was also chosen as a follow-up to the 1995 audit, which utilized the same audit methodology on a statewide sample of arrest events.

Federal Audit Standards

Beginning in federal fiscal year 1992, all states receiving Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Assistance Formula Grant funds⁷ were required to allocate at least 5 percent of their total award for improvement of their individual state criminal history records, with the goal of building an accurate and useful system of criminal records at the national level. This set-aside rule would apply until certain requirements, established by the United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), were met.

For current records, states must ensure:

1. 95 percent of felony arrest records and fingerprints initiated with an arrest during the last year are complete.
2. 95 percent of current felony arrests records contain disposition information, if a disposition has been reached.
3. 95 percent of current sentences to and releases from prison are available.
4. 95 percent of current arrest records identify felonies.

Additional standards for this 2003 audit are the guidelines enumerated below. This audit examined records first recorded at least five years ago, so the second set of criteria established by BJA apply as well.

⁷ Under the Crime Control Act of 1990 amended Part E of the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act.

For records created in the past five years:

1. a reasonable attempt is made to collect and maintain complete arrest, disposition, and incarceration information for 90 percent of felony arrests;
2. a reasonable attempt to identify, or “flag,” felony offenders for 90 percent of the offenses in the state central repository;
3. automate all criminal justice histories and fingerprint records including all criminal history and master name index records; and
4. new records with prior manual records are entered into the automated files (including the manual record).

Finally, BJA established four requirements for *timely reporting and posting* of criminal history records information:

1. The state central repository should enter felony offenses into the automated system within 30 days of receipt and all other records should be entered within 90 days.
2. Within 24 hours, fingerprints must be submitted to the state for all arrests and to the FBI Identification Division (ID) for the subject’s first arrest.
3. Final dispositions must be reported to the state repository within 30 days of the decision.
4. When appropriate, final dispositions must be reported to the FBI within 90 days after the dispositions is known.

Past Audit Findings

Past audits conducted by the Authority have set the initial baseline for Illinois’ progress toward achieving compliance with the BJA standards enumerated above. The major findings include:

Completeness

- In 1990, more than 58 percent of current arrests on the CCH database were missing both state’s attorney and final court dispositions. *BJA standards require 95 percent of current arrests to contain final dispositions.*
- In 1992, 56 percent of inmates’ criminal history records were missing state’s attorney dispositions and 46 percent were missing final court dispositions. *BJA standards require 95 percent of current arrests to contain final dispositions.*
- In the 1995 audit, only 43 percent of *all* arrests recorded on rapsheets (including current and previous arrests) had corresponding court dispositions. *BJA standards require 90*

percent of historic records (past five years) to contain final dispositions.

- In the 1995 audit, 77 percent of current IDOC incarcerations were reflected on rapsheets. *BJA standards require 95 percent of current sentences to and releases from prison are available.*
- For 1996 Cook County records, 52 percent of reportable dispositions were not posted to CCH. Thirty-one percent of reportable dispositions were not added to the CCH database because the original arrest had not been posted previously, although the Circuit Clerk's Office had forwarded a court disposition on the case. *BJA standards require 95 percent of current arrests to contain final dispositions.*
- In 1996, 25 percent of Cook County court dispositions were not posted to CCH because of manual data entry errors in statute citation by the Circuit Clerk's office. *BJA standards require that 95 percent of current felony arrest records contain disposition information, if a disposition has been reached.*

Accuracy

- In the 1995 audit, approximately 11 percent of arrest records contained discrepancies on arrest statute citation when the local arrest card was compared to the corresponding CCH record, although less than 1 percent of name or date of birth fields (also required for correct record posting to CCH) were discrepant. *BJA standards require that complete and accurate criminal history records must fully, without error, reflect all statutorily required criminal justice transactions.*
- In the 1995 audit, 26 percent of arrest records were missing offense class on *both* the local arrest card and corresponding CCH entry, and another 4 percent contained discrepancies between the local arrest form and CCH on offense class. *BJA standards require that complete and accurate criminal history records must fully, without error, reflect all statutorily required criminal justice transactions.*

Timeliness

- In the 1995 audit, only one quarter of law enforcement agencies were submitting mailed arrest information within four days of arrest, as required by law. *BJA standards require that, within 24 hours, fingerprints must be submitted to the state for all arrests.*

- In the 1995 audit, 91 percent of electronic arrest submissions (via livescan technology) were received within 2 days of arrest, well within Illinois statutory time limit. *BJA standards require that, within 24 hours, fingerprints must be submitted to the state for all arrests.*
- In the 1995 audit, 47 percent of state’s attorney dispositions and 40 percent of court dispositions were received by the ISP within the statutorily prescribed 30 days after disposition. *BJA standards require that final dispositions must be submitted to the state within 30 days of the decision (state’s attorney charging decision reporting is not mandated by BJA).*
- In the 1995 audit, 72 percent of custodial receipts and status changes were received by ISP within 30 days of the fingerprint date on the custodial card. *BJA standards require final dispositions to be reported to the state repository within 30 days of the decision (custodial receipt and status change reporting timeframes are not specifically addressed in BJA standards).*

These previous findings serve as the historical perspective for the audit findings presented in this report. The 1995 audit was conducted on local agency arrest records generated from 1989-1993, and timeliness measures taken on CHRI submissions during the first six months of 1994. The audit was designed as a follow-up to that previous audit. Here, local arrest records generated from 1994-1998 were audited, and timeliness measures were taken on mailed CHRI submissions to ISP during May and October 2000, with a follow-up six months later.

Methodology

Overall Audit Sample

As in the 1995 audit, the *reverse auditing* methodology was used to assess the accuracy and completeness rates of criminal history records posted to the CCH repository. In this procedure, copies of original arrest forms were requested from a stratified random sample of law enforcement agencies, representing approximately five percent of all Illinois law enforcement agencies. These arrest events were then matched to corresponding entries on the CCH rapsheets, in order to assess the completeness and accuracy of those entries. While the original request to local agencies specified only felony arrests (see request letter in Appendix A), a wide variety of arrest offenses were received. Only arrests statutorily mandated to be reported to the CCH repository from 1994 through 1998 were included in this audit. This would include all felony arrests and those for class A and B misdemeanors, as well as specified arrests under the Illinois Vehicle Code. The complete listing of charges can be found in Appendix B.

More specifically, auditors requested copies of state five-part arrest reporting forms from five percent of local law enforcement agencies, for all arrests reportable to CCH, for two one-month periods, April and October, of the years 1994 through 1998.⁸ The state five-part reporting forms are used by police departments, state's attorneys, and circuit clerks to report arrest, charge, and disposition information. A copy of this form can be found in Appendix C. If copies of state five-part reporting forms originally submitted to the State Police did not exist, agencies were asked to submit copies of local arrest documents for felony arrests made during the audit period. Subsequently, auditors used these arrest documents to determine whether all arrests and corresponding court disposition information was posted to the CCH database.

As in previous audits, the law enforcement agencies included in the sample were stratified by the five geographic areas of the state (Chicago, the rest of Cook County, Collar counties, Urban counties, and Rural counties). These regions are defined in more detail in Appendix D. Such stratification would allow for a representative statewide geographic sample of law enforcement agencies, as well as representation by arrest volume. The counties represented by the audit agencies are shown in Map A.

⁸ April and October were chosen to enhance comparability of findings with the 1995 audit report.

Map A Illinois Counties In Audit



Seventy randomly selected local law enforcement agencies (a target five percent of agencies in the audit sample representing all geographic regions) were contacted with a request for arrest data. Copies of arrest documents, either five-part cards or a variety of other types of local arrest documents, were received from 50 agencies. As requested, these arrests occurred in April and October in the years 1994-98. Four agencies reported that they had made no arrests during those particular months, and five agencies refused access to their arrest records. The Chicago Police Department (CPD) was requested to supply arrests for one *day* in April and October, for each audit year, due to the volume of their arrests. CPD, which has been a livescan agency (electronic submission of arrest information) since 1992, was unable to provide copies of the livescan transmissions for the audit time period, and thus provided copies of initial arrest reports instead, but only for the years 1997 and 1998. Table 3 illustrates the resulting stratified sample, based on four regions.

Table 3: Stratification Of Audit Agencies By Region

Region	Total Number of Agencies by Region	Number of agencies solicited	Number of agencies in sample
Chicago	-	1	1
Cook	134	14	9 (7%)
Collar	130	8	6 (5%)
Urban	227	17	9 (4%)
Rural	327	30	21 (6%)
Other*	-	-	4
Total	818	70	50

*Includes ISP Districts and ISP Division of Criminal Investigation arrests.

The 50 participating agencies included 42 police agencies, 4 county sheriff's offices, and 4 units of the Illinois State Police.

Excluded cases

A total of 2,251 arrest cases were received from the 50 participating agencies. Police agencies contributed 1,751 (78 percent) cases, sheriff's offices contributed 480 (21 percent) and Illinois State Police units contributed 20 cases (1 percent). Unexpectedly, 1,084 (48 percent) were local agency report documents rather than the requested 5-part cards. These report documents included a variety of internal arrest reports, investigation reports, custodial reports from sheriff's offices, Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) reports, and court indictments. The remaining 1,167 (52 percent) cases were state 5-part cards.

Upon closer inspection of all documents received, auditors determined that 179 (8 percent) cases did not meet the criteria of the audit and should be excluded from the final

audit sample. Seventeen cases (9 percent) were discovered to be duplicate copies made inadvertently by local agency staff. The remaining 162 cases were excluded because they did not meet at least one of the following audit criteria:

- 1) Arrest reports from the local agencies needed to include sufficient identifiers (name, race, sex, date of birth, agency name, date of arrest) to be able to locate the corresponding entry on CCH; *15 (9 percent of 162) cases excluded.*
- 2) Arrest charges needed to be CCH reportable offenses, as defined in Appendix B (e.g., local municipal charges were excluded); *16 (10 percent) cases excluded.*
- 3) All documents needed to be for an *arrest* event, not a custodial receipt, since the audit methodology called for tracking the completeness of the CCH entry from the starting point of the arrest segment. *42 (26 percent) cases excluded.*
- 4) Particularly for cases represented by local arrest forms, there needed to be evidence that an arrest card had been, in fact, submitted to CCH; *89 (55 percent) cases excluded.*

The 89 cases not meeting the last criterion included: 68 cases where the arrest form indicated the subjects were not fingerprinted at all, either because they were suspects only or had been bonded out in the field by the officer; and 21 cases where the arrest form indicated an arrest card had not been submitted to CCH, either because the subject was being held on a non-criterion type, non-reportable event of warrant (out-of-state pending extradition, notice to appear, failure to appear, or issuance of warrant), or the subject had been released without charging prior to a formal booking procedure.

Resulting Audit Sample

Auditors determined there were an average of 227,423 total index and drug arrests in Illinois each year⁹, 1994-1998, from 818 local law enforcement agencies, reported to the Illinois Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program.¹⁰ At the 95 percent confidence level, with a desired confidence interval of ± 5 percent, this arrest volume would require a total sample size of 1,920. The resulting audit sample consisted of 2,072 cases that met all criteria for inclusion. Therefore, the results of this audit can be expected to be representative of the arrests submitted to the CCH repository with a satisfactory level of confidence and precision. Table 4 presents the breakdown of cases by region, for both the initial cases received and the final sample.

⁹ The yearly average, 1994-1998, for each region separately, can be found in Appendix C.

¹⁰ The UCR is a crime statistics reporting program, mandated by Chapter 20 ILCS 2630/8. Reporting agencies submit monthly data on crime index offenses (murder, criminal sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault/battery, burglary, theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson) and drug offenses.

Table 4: Audit (Arrest) Cases By Region

Region	Received cases	Final audit sample
Chicago	703 (31%)	679 (33%)
Cook	377 (17%)	348 (17%)
Collar	107 (5%)	104 (5%)
Urban	684 (30%)	610 (29%)
Rural	360 (16%)	311 (15%)
Other	20 (1%)	20 (1%)
Total	2,251 (100%)	2,072 (100%)

The final audit sample consisted of 1,149 (55 percent) state five-part card (5-PC) cases and 923 (45 percent) local arrest form (LF) cases. As can be seen from Table 5, not every agency was able to provide us with arrest documents for all years requested. As previously noted, CPD is represented in this audit by 679 LF cases, for the years 1997 and 1998. Table 5 also shows a steady drop in arrest cases submitted over the five audit years. Other than CPD, the number of LF cases submitted by other agencies for those most recent two years was significantly less than the earlier years, 35 for 1997 and 15 in 1998.

Table 5: Arrest Cases, By Document Type And Year

	Arrest Cases				
	Five-Part cards (5-PC)		Local Arrest Forms (LF)		
	Agencies	Cases	Agencies	Cases	Yearly Total
1994	29	266	8	57	323 (16%)
1995	26	230	11	52	282 (14%)
1996	25	231	10	85	316 (15%)
1997	22	207*	15	359**	566 (27%)
1998	24	215*	9	370**	585 (28%)
Total	-	1,149 (55%)	-	923 (45%)	2,072 (100%)

* Includes 30 livescan cases in 1997; 85 livescan cases in 1998.

**Includes 324 Chicago Police Department (CPD) cases in 1997; 355 CPD cases in 1998.

The final audit sample represented 1,640 (79 percent) cases from police agencies, 412 (20 percent) cases from county sheriff's offices, and 20 cases (1 percent) from Illinois State Police units.

Warrant arrests

The original audit sample (2,251 cases) contained 408 (18 percent) cases where the officer indicated an outstanding warrant for the subject. A full 50 percent (n=204) of these warrant cases were submitted by sheriff's offices, a disproportionate percentage compared to their total percentage of sample cases (20 percent). In addition, all 20 of the ISP unit cases were warrant arrests. This might be expected, given that state police and sheriff's officers' duties include highway patrol, special investigations, service of warrants, and fugitive transportation more often than municipal police.¹¹ Among other reasons for case exclusion, 19 out-of-state warrant and other non-criterion warrant charge cases ("failure to appear", "notice to appear", or "issuance of warrant") had been previously removed from the sample. According to ISP policy, these types of warrant arrests are not to be submitted to the Illinois CCH system. Once non-criterion cases were excluded from the initial audit sample, 355 (17 percent) warrant cases remained. Again, cases from sheriff's offices (46 percent) and state police units (5 percent) were over represented, compared to their contribution of total cases.

Findings

Audit findings are presented on the five major aspects of the audit. They include:

- Arrests Not Found on CCH (1994-98)
- Accuracy of CCH records (1994-98)
- Timeliness of Submissions to CCH (2000-01)
- Completeness of CCH records (1994-98)
- Analysis of rapsheet *Conviction Status* data element (Felony Flag) (2001-02)

¹¹ Trends and Issues 1997, p.13-17.

I. Arrests Not Found On CCH

Overall Sample

The first audit task was to locate the corresponding CCH entry for the 2,072 arrest events in the audit sample. Several steps were performed to locate CCH records. Using the pre-printed Document Control Number (DCN) on the 5-PC cases (1,149 cases), auditors used the maintenance screens of the CCH database to try to find the corresponding arrest event on CCH. This was the most reliable method of CCH record location. Likewise, the 679 CPD cases contained the Central Booking (CB) number, which functions as the unique CHRI linking number for that agency. This number was also used to locate the corresponding CCH records. The CCH database was searched by this method for 1,828 (88 percent) audit arrest records.

For the remaining 244 cases, a less reliable and slower process needed to be performed. Each *person* entered on CCH is assigned a unique State Identification (SID) number at their first arrest. All CHRI events associated with that SID can then be located. Without fingerprints on which to base the CCH search, a Soundex inquiry based on demographic descriptors must be made. These inquiries require: person's full name, race, sex and date of birth. Since the aim of our CCH search was to identify a particular arrest segment, date of arrest and arrest agency name (or identification number) were required as well.

Table 6: Cases Found On CCH, By Source Document Type

Arrest Document Type	Found	Not Found	Total
Five-part card	1,095 (95%)*	54 (5%)**	1,149 (100%)
Local arrest form	804 (87%)	119 (13%)	923 (100%)
Total	1,899 (92%)	173 (8%)	2,072 (100%)

* Includes 113 livescan cases

** Includes 2 livescan cases

As can be seen from Table 6, only 8 percent of the sample cases could not be located on CCH. This is less than half of the 17 percent rate encountered in the 1995 audit, a considerable improvement over that audit period. The 5 percent rate of five part cards that could not be located on CCH was also half the 10 percent rate reported in the 1995 audit. The fact that only two (2 percent) of the total 115 arrests submitted via livescan technology could not be located on CCH speaks to the improvements afforded by the increased use of technology.

The percentage of cases not found on CCH was similar from 1994 until 1998, when the rate was cut in half (Table 7). A separate analysis of CPD cases showed evidence of the same drop between 1997 and 1998. Overall, of the 679 CPD cases in the final audit sample, 49 (7 percent) were not found on CCH. However, 30 cases (9

percent) were not found in 1997, and only 19 (5 percent) cases were not found in 1998, consistent with the trend for the rest of the state.

Table 7: Cases Not Found On CCH, By Year

Audit Year	Total Not Found	Total Cases
1994	35 (11%)	323
1995	25 (9%)	282
1996	31 (10%)	316
1997	53 (9%)	566
1998	29 (5%)	585
Total	173 (8%)	2,072

Warrant arrests not found on CCH

Overall, 15 percent (290) of the found cases were warrant arrests, while 38 percent (65) of cases not found on CCH were warrant arrests. This disparity may be due to ISP policies and procedures regarding warrant arrest submissions to CCH. According to the CHRI User’s Manual (1995) the arresting agency *should not* forward the arrest fingerprint card to CCH under certain circumstances, including:

- When the warrant was issued in another county, and that county will not extradite (in which case, the subject is released without charging).
- For out-of-county warrants where extradition will occur, when other charges besides the warrant arrest exist and have already been submitted to CCH by the originating law enforcement agency (to avoid duplication of arrest entries on the subject’s rapsheet for the same offense).

Warrant arrest cases were included in the final audit sample as a follow-up to the 1999 audit report that indicated confusion on the part of local agencies as to how and when to report warrant arrests to CCH. It may be that the higher percentage of warrant arrests not found on CCH, compared to warrant arrests found on CCH, represents increased local agency understanding of ISP policies on warrant arrests.

Finding #1: The percentage of cases not found on CCH has improved since the previous audit, from 17 percent to 8 percent. Close to forty percent of these “missing” cases were warrant arrests, which have more complex CCH submission criteria than original arrest cases.

“No Record” cases

Of the 173 cases not found on CCH, it was determined that, for 74 (43 percent) arrest events, the subject had no record at all on CCH. Close to one-third of these “no record” cases were also warrant arrests. Again, these may not have been submitted to CCH for the reasons above. Other “no record” cases could be the result of expungement, or permanent deletion from the CCH database, under certain statutorily defined conditions.¹² On the other hand, local agencies *are* to submit arrest fingerprint cards, even for out-of-county extradition cases, if an initial inquiry reveals that an arrest card for the subject has not been submitted for the original arrest event.

RECOMMENDATION

Properly reporting a warrant arrest is a complex activity given the different policies and procedures in place. The Illinois State Police should develop a less complex set of reporting requirements and train local agencies on the proper procedures for warrant arrest reporting.

II. Accuracy of CCH Records

Methodology

BJA standards require that complete and accurate criminal history records must fully, without error, reflect all statutorily required criminal justice transactions. Errors can occur at various stages in the process of creating criminal history record information: from errors made at the local level on forms submitted to the state repository, errors made in initial data entry into the CCH database, to errors in the manner in which CHRI events are linked and disseminated to end users of the information. Further, not all errors have equal impact on the availability and validity of CHRI.

Previous audits have distinguished between levels of variables, the accuracy of which directly impacts the ability to enter CHRI onto the CCH database. These are:

- 1) *Critical information* on the state five-part card needed to identify the submitting agency and the specific arrest event being reported. These variables are the *Originating Agency Identification number (ORI)*, the pre-printed *Document Control Number (DCN)*, and for our audit purposes, the unique *State Identification Number (SID)*.
- 2) Subject identification/statute citation variables, without which arrest events cannot be posted (or included on an individual’s record) to CCH. Such errors must be corrected by the submitting agency and resubmitted. These variables include *subjects’ full name, date of birth, arrest charge statute citation* (act, article, paragraph, and section), *literal statute description*, and for our audit purposes, *date of arrest*.

¹² 20 ILCS 2630/5

- 3) *Other identifying information* collected on the state five-part card, such as *race*, *sex*, *statute class* (felony, misdemeanor), and *arrest type* (warrant or original arrest).

In this audit, only variable categories #2 and #3 (above) were audited for accuracy on the CCH rapsheet as compared to the state-five part card. Audit staff used the critical information variables (#1 above) to locate corresponding records on CCH. Material errors on these variables may have precluded us from locating the CCH entry altogether, so that, in essence, all records “found on CCH” in the audit sample were 100 percent accurate as to ORI, DCN, and SID variables. The CCH record location process did reveal some interesting findings regarding these critical information variables, however, which are reported below.

Previous audits had employed a variety of criteria to differentiate among the types of discrepancies noted between the state 5-part card and the CCH entry. This audit focused on *inconsistencies* between the two sources that would be sufficient to change the meaning of the information submitted by the local agency. For example, CCH entries with a different data posted in the *name*, or *race code*, or *statute citation*, fields as compared to the state 5-part card, were counted as discrepancies. Where at all possible, obvious data errors submitted by local agencies (e.g., invalid statute citations or race codes) were noted as the source of discrepancy.

Finally, the accuracy and overall quality of CCH data is dependent on whether local agencies fill out the necessary 5-part card fields in the first place. Therefore, an analysis of the overall completeness of information recorded on the state 5-part cards, for the variables included in the audit, was conducted.¹³

Sample

For the accuracy audit, only the state five-part (5-PC) cases found on CCH (1, 095 cases) were included. Since, technically, these were the actual records used to create the corresponding CCH entries, any deviation from their content as reflected on CCH would indicate some correction or error (automated or manual) had occurred on that record. Further, the 1995 audit had included a three-way comparison among local arrest forms, and the corresponding state 5-part cards and CCH entries, and the findings indicated a much higher rate of discrepancies between the local arrest forms and the CCH records on most variables. Since we did not have corresponding state 5-part cards to the local arrest forms submitted for audit here, we could not replicate that methodology.

The one drawback to this approach was that the 679 cases from CPD could not be audited for accuracy, since only local arrest forms could be supplied by that agency. CPD reports arrest information to CCH via livescan, and was unable to provide auditors with livescan transcripts for the audit time period. However, analyses were conducted on

¹³ Accuracy results, when presented by variable type, are expressed as a percentage of cases able to be audited on that variable.

the CPD data to corroborate findings from other local agency livescan transcripts. The remaining 125 LF cases (7 percent of the total audit sample) were excluded from the accuracy audit sample, since these cases lacked too many of the data fields being audited on the state 5-part card (particularly statute citation).

**Table 8: Accuracy Audit Sample (5-Part Card Cases),
By Region**

Region	Agencies	Cases audited	Percent
Cook	9	324	30%
Collar	6	101	9%
Urban	7	439	40%
Rural	16	211	19%
Other*	4	20	2%
Total	42	1,095	100%

* ISP units

The accuracy audit sample was represented by 34 police agencies, 4 county sheriff's offices, and 4 ISP units. In addition, the sample also included 113 (10 percent) livescan cases, one agency each from the Cook County and Urban regions.

Table 9: Accuracy Audit Sample, By Year

Year	Cases	Percent
1994	257	23%
1995	219	20%
1996	222	21%
1997	191	17%
1998	206	19%
Total	1,095	100%

As can be seen from Table 9, the audit sample, used for accuracy testing, was fairly evenly distributed across all the years under investigation. However, the 113 (10 percent) livescan cases appear only in 1997 and 1998, when that technology was first widely introduced beyond Chicago.

Findings

Overall completeness of state 5-part card information

Arrest information on CCH is dependent on the availability and quality of the information submitted by local agencies on the state 5-part card. Therefore, an analysis of the completeness of the variables under consideration in the accuracy audit, as reflected on the state 5-part cards completed at arrest, was conducted. The accuracy audit included only those cases with complete information for the field being audited. Overall, 222 (20 percent) of all cases in the sample had complete information entered in *every field*, although another 49 cases had data present, but were obscured by poor photocopying. Including these cases increases complete cases to 25 percent.

Table 10: Completeness Of State 5-Part Arrest Cards (N=1,095)

Critical Variables	Cases w/Missing Information	Cases Illegibly Photocopied	Total Incomplete	Percent w/ Incomplete Field	Total Cases Audited on Data Element
ORI	6	7	13	1%	0**
DCN	20*	0	20	2%	0**
SID	618	2	620	57%	0**
Fatal Error Variables					
Name	0	2	2	<1%	1,093
Date of Birth	5	72	77	7%	1,023
Statute Citation	10	10	20	2%	1,084
Other Identifying Variables					
Race	0	0	0	0%	1,095
Sex	0	2	2	<1%	1,093
Class of offense	363***	2	365	33%	1,093
Date of arrest	10	6	16	1%	1,089

*20 cases submitted for audit had been copied onto a different state 5-part card to create an “office copy”.

** Not audited for accuracy, but used to locate CCH records.

***The CCH entry was audited for these records.

As can be seen from Table 10, very little of the fatal error information (that would prevent the arrest from being posted to CCH) was missing on the state 5-part card.¹⁴ On the other hand, the SID number was missing for more than half (56 percent) of all cases, making it necessary for auditors to conduct a Soundex search for the corresponding CCH record. However, this is not a required field for posting a record to CCH, and was not included in the accuracy audit. There were 472 (43 percent) cases where SID was the only missing information, increasing the number of “complete” 5-PC cases to 743 (68 percent).

Lastly, a full one-third of all 5-part card cases were missing the class of offense. This is somewhat higher than the 28 percent missing charges reported in the 1995 audit. Further inspection revealed that 105 livescan cases (91 percent) were missing class of offense on the livescan transcript, although a class of offense was included on the CCH record. Excluding these cases reduced the number of missing class on 5-part card cases to 258 (26 percent), more in line with previous audit findings.

Many of those 5-part card cases missing class of offense were for theft and drug offenses, which may be determined later by the state’s attorney’s office, based on the value stolen, amount of drugs involved, or the subject’s prior criminal history. However, this missing information on the arrest segment may have an impact on the Conviction Status variable included on the rapsheet (discussed in more detail in that section).

Finding #2: Overall, 68 percent of all state 5-part arrest cards examined were filled out completely by local agencies. This is an improvement over the previous audit. The one variable that continued a high rate of incomplete data on the state 5-part card was class of offense (33 percent).

Critical information data elements

These variables were used to by auditors to search for the corresponding CCH entries. By definition, then, their accuracy was verified when the corresponding records were able to be located on CCH. However, several interesting findings regarding these variables became evident during the search process.

ORI

There was a marked improvement in the recording of ORIs by local agencies on the state 5-part card. Compared to the 1995 audit, which found more than 12 percent of the cases missing this critical field, only 6 cases (<1 percent) did not have the ORI recorded (Table 10). This information allows ISP to process the arrest card much more quickly than if staff need to take additional steps to process the case without it.

¹⁴ That these cases were successfully posted to CCH indicates that they went through a correction process between the local agency and ISP staff sometime after the original card was submitted to ISP, since these “fatal error” fields are absolutely necessary.

DCN

Only 20 (2 percent) of the cases, all from the same agency, were submitted for audit with DCN numbers that did not match the CCH entry (10). All of the arrest events from these cases were found on CCH, nonetheless, by matching agency ORI, date of arrest and charges. Upon closer inspection, it appears that the local agency was creating its own copy of the arrest card by hand-copying the information onto another state 5-part card.

SID number

As previously discussed, more than half (57 percent) of all state 5-part cards were missing this information (Table 10). It is possible that some of these persons did not have a CCH record established prior to the arrest included in the audit sample. To estimate how many subjects might have not been arrested before, ISP provided the range of SID numbers assigned at the beginning of every year. From this information, it was determined that approximately 38 percent of the SID numbers in the audit sample fell outside these ranges, indicating that the subject had been assigned their number prior to the year under consideration. Applying this estimate, approximately 235 cases with no SID number recorded on the state 5-part card were likely to have an SID number available. The majority (86 percent) of all cases submitted from sheriff's offices were missing SID numbers. This may be due to procedures followed during the central booking process conducted at those offices on behalf of surrounding local police agencies, or for some reason may be more likely to deal with first time offenders compared to a local police department.

A second, potentially, more serious problem was also discovered regarding SID numbers. Many more cases than expected, at least 25 of the 5-PC cases and another equal number of LF cases, actually had more than one SID assigned to the individual by ISP.¹⁵ The SID is a unique number assigned to the individual when a fingerprint card is not matched to any others already in the database (considered a "no hit"). However, it is possible that a match is later found which had already been issued a SID. Although these duplicates are supposed to be merged, or consolidated, into one unique number per individual, auditors discovered enough problem cases with multiple master files to warrant a more in-depth investigation into this issue.¹⁶

Fatal error data elements

The subject's (first and last) name, date of birth, statute citation of arrest offense, and date of arrest were audited for accuracy. The first three variables are required for posting a record to CCH. Table 11 presents the results.

¹⁵ The incidence of duplicate SID numbers was not systematically tracked by auditors during the CCH record location process, and only became apparent midway through the audit. Therefore, the number of cases reported here is the *minimum* number discovered.

¹⁶ Throughout the audit, individual records with serious problems were referred back to ISP for correction.

Table 11: Accuracy Of “Fatal Error” Fields for Arrest Data Posted To CCH

Data Element	Accurate	Discrepant	Total Audited
Name (First, Last)	1,014 (93%)	81 (7%)	1,095 (100%)
Date of Birth	1,000 (98%)	20 (2%)	1,020 (100%)
Statute Citation	1,021 (94%)*	63 (6%)**	1,084 (100%)

*Includes 80 cases where the statute citation included more detail on either the 5-part card or CCH entry, but did not change the arrest offense.

**Includes only those cases where the CCH entry does not match citation *and* literal, completely changing the offense as recorded on the state 5-part card.

Name

A total of 81 (7 percent) cases had discrepancies between the name entry (first and last) on the arrest card compared to the CCH record. However, this is much higher than the one percent error rate reported in the 1995 audit. Closer examination of the 81 discrepant cases revealed that the *alias name* recorded on the state 5-part card had been entered as the name at arrest on the CCH record. The actual name at arrest, which could be completely different than the alias name in some cases, appeared only in the general list of alias names at the beginning of the CCH record, not linked to a specific arrest event. It also appears that this error on mailed submissions to ISP, which are processed by independently contracted data entry operators, was corrected by 1998. On the other hand, only livescan arrest submissions, which are created by local agency personnel and submitted directly to the CCH database, were found with this alias name error in 1998. This suggests a livescan training issue that should be addressed by ISP and the livescan vendors.

Chicago Police Department (CPD) cases were examined separately, to determine if alias names were a problem for that agency, as well. Thirty-two (5 percent) cases of the 630 submitted for audit had alias names recorded on CCH instead of the name on the arrest report, slightly lower than the incidence for the 5-part card sample (above). All but four of these alias name cases were from 1997, the earliest year of audit data for CPD. This would corroborate the conclusion that an ISP processing problem had been occurring in the mid-1990’s regarding the name field, that was corrected by 1998.

Finding #3: It appeared that the ISP has corrected a flaw in CCH data entry procedures resulted in alias names and dates of birth being entered on the arrest segment, rather than the name given at the time of arrest. This error occurred in both mailed and livescan submissions prior to 1998.

Date of Birth

All but 20 (2 percent) of date of birth entries were found to be accurate when the state 5-part card was compared to the CCH record. These discrepancies were due almost entirely to the fact that the *alias* date of birth was entered on CCH, not the actual date of birth. In some cases, an alias date of birth was recorded on the state 5-part card, but not an alias name, thus creating a CCH arrest segment with mixed alias and reported-at-arrest information. Again, this seems to indicate a flaw in CCH data entry procedures.

A similar problem for alias date of birth could not be examined for CPD cases, since the livescan transcripts could not be supplied for audit. Offender information is entered by booking officers into an automated information system that populates the related fingerprint based transcript. The interface used does not supply the booking officer with an alias date of birth field. Auditors were unable to determine the cause of this problem for CPD records examined.

Finding #4: It was found that alias dates of birth, when present on the state 5-part card, were being recorded on CCH instead of the date of birth reported at arrest. In some cases, the CCH entry would contain an inconsistent mix of alias and reported date of birth information.

Statute Citation

Previous audits conducted by ICJIA, as well as internal error reports generated by ISP, corroborate that the offense statute citation data element is one of the more problematic data elements for both local agencies and the CCH database. Punctuation and spacing to denote chapter, section, and paragraph of Illinois statutes can be quite complex, with slight differences denoting completely different crimes. In addition, to accommodate the varying lengths of data to be reported, these data are often reported using an open text data field. This allows any number of punctuation formats to be used as well. At the same time, edit routines must recognize invalid citations, in whatever manner they are reported. Given all this complexity, a higher discrepancy rate would be expected for this data element.

In order to simplify the accuracy audit on this data element, only the first charge recorded on the state 5-part card was audited.¹⁷ It was found that the vast majority (87 percent) of statute citation entries on CCH matched those on the state 5-part cards exactly as submitted by the local agency, including the same level of detail in section and subparagraph notations (e.g., 720 ILCS 5.0/16-1-a-1-a)(Table 12). However, another 6 percent (63 cases) had more detailed citation information recorded on the arrest card than reflected on the CCH entry. This would indicate that a statute citation edit routine was truncating the original entry, or that improper manual data entry was occurring. This

¹⁷ The 5-part card sample was evenly split between cases with only one charge recorded on the state 5-part card (557 cases) and cases with multiple charges (538 cases).

problem, while not changing the meaning of the statute, results in less charge information recorded on CCH than was submitted for posting.

Table 12: Accuracy Of Statute Citation Data Element On CCH Records

Entry on CCH vs. 5-part card	Number	Percent
No discrepancy	941	87%
5-part card more detailed	63	6%
CCH entry more detailed	17	1%
CCH entry and 5-part card not matched – citation error on 5-part card	40	4%
CCH entry and 5-part card not matched – citation changed on CCH	23	2%
Total	1,084	100%

More serious errors were found, however, in 63 cases (6 percent) where the statute citation entries on the CCH record and state 5-part card did not match (Table 12). This is much higher than the 2.3 percent rate of inaccurate citations between the state 5-part cards and CCH found in the previous audit. In approximately two-thirds (40) of those cases, the local agency reported the citation inaccurately (e.g., 720 ILCS 5/15-1 for theft, instead of the correct 720 ILCS 5/16-1). A particular problem for local agencies was how to correctly report an *attempted* offense. Instead of marking an “a” in the appropriate box on the 5-part card (CSA column),¹⁸ the local agency would write the statute citation for “attempt” (720 ILCS 8-4) and then indicate which offense was attempted in the offense description field (e.g., burglary).¹⁹ In these cases, the literal description of the charge remained the same on both sources, and only the actual citation was changed.

In the remaining 23 (2 percent) cases where the citation on the CCH entry did not match the state 5-part card, neither the statute citation *or* literal description matched the state 5-part card. It would appear that most of these were cases with a decimal point in the citation. For example, criminal drug conspiracy (720 ILCS 570/405.1), was truncated on the CCH entry to **Calculated** Criminal Drug Conspiracy (720 ILCS 570/405). This truncation results in a completely different statute, which was not the intent of the submitting agency. These errors constitute “material” errors, and appear to indicate a problem with the statute citation data entry and/or edit routines. However, this material error is limited to a single county across two agencies (22 cases = police department; 1 case = sheriff’s department). Because the cases are confined to two agencies, the error

¹⁸ This box is where the inchoate offenses of conspiracy, solicitation, or attempt are indicated (see Appendix B).

¹⁹ Since a valid statute citation is a required field for posting, cases with invalid citations submitted by local agencies went through a correction process sometime after the state 5-part card was filled out to enable the arrest to be recorded on CCH.

may be occurring within the local agency reporting procedures. The identified cases have been forwarded to the ISP for investigation and correction.

Finding # 5: No discrepancy was found on the statute citation data element for 87 percent of the cases audited. However, the rate of inaccurate statutes citations (6 percent) found in this audit was much higher than in the previous audit (2 percent). Two-thirds of inaccuracies could be traced to invalid citations submitted by local agencies, although the remaining inaccuracies appear to be the result of CCH edit routines for statutes with decimal points, which incorrectly truncate those citations. The result may be an arrest charge recorded on CCH that was not the intent of the arresting agency.

Finding #6: Overall, this audit found higher rates of discrepancies on each variable included in this category (name, date of birth, statute citation) than the previous audit. It appears that CCH data processing has contributed to this higher discrepancy rate.

Other Identifying data elements

In order to conduct a non-fingerprint based inquiry for a CCH record, certain subject identifiers are required. These include: name, race, sex, and date of birth. The date of arrest and class of offense data elements were included in this category of variables, as well. Table 13 presents the results of the accuracy audit on these identifying data elements.

Table 13: Accuracy Of Other Identifying Data Elements On CCH

Other Identifying variables	Accurate	Discrepant	Total Audited
Race	1,087 (99%)	8 (1%)	1,095
Sex	1,095 (100%)	0 (0%)	1,095
Date of Arrest	1,080 (99%)	9 (1%)	1,089
Class of Offense	933 (85%)*	160 (15%)	1,093

*Includes 363 cases where offense class was missing from both the state 5-part card and indicated as “Z” (unknown) on the CCH record.

Race and Sex

As can be seen in Table 13, the identifying variables were almost completely accurate on CCH, as compared to the state 5-part card. These data elements are recorded at the beginning of the rapsheet, not within the arrest segment. Should different values for the subject’s race or sex be reported to CCH subsequently, this information is added cumulatively to the record. Therefore, if *any* of the values for race or gender on CCH matched the one recorded on the state 5-part card, that was counted as an accurate record.

Valid ISP race codes are: W (White), B (Black), A (Asian/Pacific islands), I (American Indian or Alaskan), and U (unknown). The eight discrepancies in the race field were due to one agency using the code “H” (for Hispanic), instead of a valid ISP

race code. In five of those cases, the code was corrected as “W” on CCH, in two cases, the CCH race field was left blank, and in one case, the subject’s record reflected multiple race values submissions (“B/W”).

Chicago Police Department (CPD) cases were also checked regarding race code entries on CCH, since that agency uses its own internal race code system. It was determined that 47 (7 percent) cases had a code “4” (Hispanic) recorded on the arrest form (although the corresponding livescan entry is unknown). Of these, 29 (62 percent) had “W” recorded on CCH, 15 (33 percent) had “U” recorded on CCH, and 2 (4 percent) had “B” recorded on CCH. It is possible that, in the 15 “U” records, an internal CPD code had been submitted to CCH, instead of a valid ISP code. If so, the small number of those cases (2 percent overall), would indicate that the majority of CPD cases are submitted to ISP with valid race codes.

Date of Arrest

The date of arrest ranked third for the most accurate data element audited, when the CCH entry was compared to the state 5-part card. Only nine cases (1 percent) were found to be discrepant. Four cases had a CCH date that was an average of 20 days later than the arrest card date, while the other five had a CCH date that was actually the *day before* the arrest card date. It is not clear what CCH processing event could have caused that error to occur.

As with other data elements where discrepancies suggested CCH processing problems, CPD arrest data was examined to see if any corroborating patterns could be detected. Auditors found 136 (22 percent) cases (of the 603 CPD cases included in the accuracy audit) that did not have arrest dates on CCH that matched the arrest report. Of these, 5(4 percent) had a date on CCH that was one day later than on the arrest form. It is possible that these few cases were actually submitted to ISP via livescan on the following day, and are not technically discrepant. The remaining 131 discrepant cases (96 percent) had CCH arrest dates that were months, and in some cases, more than a year later than the local arrest form date. It is apparent that these cases had been added to the CCH system after the underlying court case was completed, possibly once a court disposition triggered a request for the arrest information not already posted on CCH. ISP uses the “date of arrest” field as a “date of posting” field, if necessary, to log in these missing arrest segments. The discrepant CCH dates all fell within four consecutive months, but only within one week in each month, (e.g., March 4, 5, 6, 7, then April 23, 24, 25, 26, etc.). This further suggests that these cases were part of a backlog being entered much later after the arrest event. However, ISP should enter the *original* date of arrest, not the date the event is eventually posted to CCH.

Class of Offense

This data element was the most problematic in the accuracy audit. It is needed at the time of arrest to determine whether the arrest offense is reportable to CCH. Only felony cases (Class M, X, 1, 2, 3, and 4) and Class A and B misdemeanor offenses were

reportable to CCH during the period 1994-1998 (see Appendix B for the full list of CCH criterion offenses). However, it was missing from 363 (33 percent) 5-part card cases. The corresponding CCH records were checked, and ISP used the value “Z” (for unknown) for those missing class values. These cases were considered accurate.

Of the remaining 730 audited, 160 (15 percent of the total records) were found to have discrepant class of offense values on CCH compared to the state 5-part card. This is close to four times higher than the rate of discrepancies found in the previous audit (4.4 percent). Closer examination revealed that 152 (95 percent of discrepant cases) of these cases had a valid class of offense recorded on the state 5-part card, but the CCH entry was a “Z” for unknown. CCH processing is causing local arrest information to be changed from that intended by the arresting agency. In this case, the class of offense is linked to the statute citation, and those statutes that could be a number of classes, particularly theft and drug charges, are defaulted to “unknown” by CCH programming. However, this default should be overridden when valid class information is received.

Finding #7: For three of the four data elements included in this category (race, sex, date of arrest), the state 5-part card and corresponding CCH entry matched exactly. This is the same high level of accuracy found in the 1995 audit.

Finding #8: The most problematic data element audited was the class of offense. The rate of discrepancy (15 percent) was approximately twice as high as any other data element included in the accuracy audit, and almost four times as high as the rate found in the 1995 audit. It appears that automated charge tables used in CCH processing are substituting generic offense class values for the ones actually recorded in the state 5-part cards.

Overall CCH Accuracy

It was determined that, overall, 799 (73 percent) of 5-part card cases had CCH entries that accurately reflected the corresponding state 5-part card. The remaining 296 (27 percent) had some discrepancy between the CCH record and the state 5-part card. The majority of these discrepancies were due to CCH processing, particularly class of offense data elements and alias names and dates of birth.

Using the rate of discrepancies (27 percent) observed in the total sample as an “average” for comparison, Table 14 presents the overall accuracy of CCH records by geographic region. All things being equal, it would be expected that the number of discrepancies between state 5-part cards and CCH records within each region would approximate this total observed discrepancy rate. Differences from that “average” rate would point to differences in local agency reporting practices which positively or negatively affect the quality of arrest submissions. For example, the 106 livescan cases submitted from the Urban region comprised 24 percent of the total sample from that region, and 26 (24 percent) of those livescan cases were observed to be discrepant with the CCH record. For two groups (Rural and Other), the proportion of discrepancies observed, *within region*, was about equal to expectation. Two groups, (Cook, Urban) had

greater than expected discrepancies observed, *within region*, while one group (Collar) had fewer than expected discrepancies. Interestingly, the Rural region audit sample was actually comprised of the most local agencies of any region in the sample (Table 3), and yet the accuracy discrepancies observed within that region was no greater than the overall “average”. The remaining regional groups in the audit sample were comprised of many fewer local agencies, and yet exhibited different discrepancy patterns. As far as differences in reporting methods, the 106 livescan cases in the Urban region had an observed discrepancy rate of 24 percent, which is slightly less than the “average”, while the remaining 5-part card submissions (333 cases) in that region had an observed discrepancy of 35 percent, for one of the highest regional rates.

Table 14: Overall Accuracy Of Arrest Records, Within Regions

Region	Accurate	Discrepant	Total	“Average” Expected Discrepancy rate (total sample rate)	Difference (regional rate compared to “average”)
Cook (outside Chicago)	65 (64%)	36 (36%)	101 (100%)	27%	+9%
Collar	263 (81%)	61 (19%)	324 (100%)	27%	-8%
Urban	300 (68%)	139* (32%)	439 (100%)	27%	+5%
Rural	156 (74%)	55 (26%)	211 (100%)	27%	-1%
Other**	15 (75%)	5 (25%)	20 (100%)	27%	-2%
Total	799 (73%)	296 (27%)	1,095 (100%)	100%	---

*Includes 26 livescan cases (24 percent of the urban livescan cases, with a difference of -3 percent from the “average”)

**ISP Units

Table 15 examines the breakdown of discrepant cases (n=296) by region. Again, the observed proportion of discrepant cases would be expected to mirror the proportion of cases submitted by each region. For example, the 113 livescan cases comprised 10 percent of the total accuracy audit sample, and also 9 percent (28 cases) of the total discrepant cases observed. Three of the five regions (Cook, Rural, Other) had the observed discrepant cases very close to the expected number. On the other hand, the two regions with the largest contributions (Collar, Urban), each show the largest differences between observed and expected discrepant cases. However, the differences are in *opposite* directions. This suggests that the local reporting practices were the source of these differences.

Table 15: Discrepant Cases Observed, By Region

Region	Discrepant cases Observed	Discrepant cases Expected (by sample submission rate)	Difference
Cook (outside Chicago)	36 (12%)	9%	+3%
Collar	61 (21%)	30%	-9%
Urban	139 (47%)	40%	+7%
Rural	55 (18%)	19%	-1%
Other	5 (2%)	2%	0%
Total	296 (100%)	100%	---

Finding #9: Overall, 73 percent of the records in the accuracy audit had matching information on all audited elements between the state 5-part card and the corresponding CCH record. Within regions, the proportions of discrepant cases were generally less than expected (by about 10 percent). On the other hand, when just the discrepant cases are considered, the regions do not remain represented in the same proportion as their audited records counterpart. This suggests differences in local reporting practices.

RECOMMENDATION

While the advancement of technology has proven beneficial for Illinois criminal justice agencies, it is not without its own problems. Technology will only be able to improve the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of reporting if it is applied based on consistent reporting policies using standardize reporting procedures. The Illinois State Police should test the automated edit routines on a regular basis to ensure that data is being accurately transmitted and posted.

III. Timeliness of Mailed Submissions Received by ISP (Receipt and Posting)

Criminal history record information is not useful if it is not submitted to the state repository in a timely manner, and further, if it is not processed and made available (posted) on the individual’s record (rapsheet). In Illinois, there are two sets of standards which prescribe timeframes for local CHRI submissions to the state repository, Illinois law and BJA standards. The more stringent of the two is mandated by Illinois statute²⁰ which specifies that:

- 1) Arresting agencies must submit arrest fingerprint cards for criterion offenses within 24 hours of arrest;

²⁰ Criminal Identification Act 20 ILCS 2630/2.1

- 2) State's attorney dispositions (e.g., charges filed or not filed) must be reported within 30 days of the decision;
- 3) Court dispositions must be reported within 30 days of decision; and
- 4) Custodial dispositions are to be reported within 30 days of the decision.

However, Illinois law is silent on how quickly these submissions must be made available to users (posted to the system).

In order to be exempted from the five percent set-aside requirement of federal Byrne funds, Illinois must demonstrate it is meeting BJA standards regarding the timely processing of criminal history record information by the state repository, as well:

- 1) Central repositories should enter felony offenses into the automated system within 30 days of receipt and all other records are to be entered within 90 days.
- 2) Fingerprints are to be submitted to the state repository and to the FBI Identification Division (ID) within 24 hours. In states using a single reporting source for FBI reporting, such as Illinois, the state repository must forward fingerprints, when appropriate, to the FBI within two weeks of receipt.
- 3) Final dispositions must be reported to the state repository and, when appropriate, to the FBI, within 90 days after dispositions are known. All records other than felony offense information are to be entered within 90 days of receipt.

Volume of Mailed Submissions

Various technological advances made by ISP regarding the CCH database, combined with increased local agency capability to submit to ISP in various electronic formats, have steadily reduced the volume of mailed submissions from most components of Illinois' criminal justice system. For example, the CCH database was re-written to take full advantage of electronic technologies improvements for the automated reporting of arrests and dispositions. An example, would be integration of livescan reporting and electronic information management systems, which will allow automated population of corresponding data fields, thus reducing redundant data entry. This system became fully operational in September 1999.

In addition, funding became available during the 1990s for local law enforcement agencies to purchase the necessary equipment to submit arrest event information electronically (via livescan), and the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC) initiated the Automated Disposition Reporting (ADR) system for the electronic processing and submission of court disposition data. (See Appendix F and G for a current list of livescan agencies and circuit courts participating in the ADR system.) Lastly, IDOC capability to submit custodial fingerprint cards electronically via the Correctional Institutional Management information System (CIMIS) became fully operational.

Methodology

The timeliness analysis was designed to assess both local agency compliance with statutorily mandated submission timeframes, and ISP achievement of BJA standards regarding timeliness of CHRI processing. The initial timeliness audit sample included all *mailed* submissions received by ISP during two three-day cycles in May 2000 and October 2000. This data collection methodology was employed to be comparable to the 1995 audit timeliness. Auditors recorded information on three basic data elements for every submission: submitting agency's ORI, the date of arrest or disposition, and Document Control Number (DCN). A follow-up on these events was conducted 60 and more than 90 days later, in August 2000 and February 2001, to determine whether they had been posted to the CCH system.

Sample

The timeliness audit dataset included: 2,281 arrest events, 1,327 state's attorney dispositions, 896 court dispositions, and 140 custodial dispositions from county jail facilities,²¹ for a total of 4,644 criminal justice event submissions received by the ISP during the total data collection period.²²

Findings

Table 16 presents the mailed submission volume for the three day data collection cycle used in 2000 (most recent data audited), compared to the three day data collection cycles used in 1994 (last year of data audited for completeness across all categories).

²¹ The Illinois Department of Corrections reports its custodial receipts and status changes electronically via Correctional Institution Management Information System (CIMIS).

²² A total of 204 cases (4 percent) originally received by ISP from all sources were excluded from the timeliness audit because of some problem with the date variable, which made it impossible to determine the length of time between the event and receipt by ISP.

**Table 16: Volume Of Mailed Submissions To ISP Per Timeliness Test Period
(1994 And 2000)**

Test Period	Arrest		State's attorney		Court		Custodial (receipts and status changes)	
	2000	1994	2000	1994	2000	1994	2000	1994
Timeliness 1	1,118	1,399	899*	619	686	340	90	439
Timeliness 2	1,163	1,547	428	929	210	201	50	331
Total	2,281	2,946	1,327	1,548	896	541	140	770

*Includes 125 submissions from one agency that spanned the previous 12 months.

Timeliness of Mailed Arrest Submissions

Arrest submissions include fingerprint cards that positively link the offender to the event. The submission may be received via the U.S. Postal Service or livescan. These fingerprint submissions can initiate a new criminal history record or link a subject to an existing record. If a new record is initiated, the offender is assigned a unique SID that will be used to link any subsequent criminal history events to the offender.

The date of arrest on 2,281 mailed arrest cards was compared to the date of receipt by the ISP. In order to control for inconsistencies in mail delivery service, audit staff considered any record received within four days of arrest to be in compliance.

Table 17: Timeliness Of Mailed Arrest Reporting To ISP

	2003 Audit Cases	2003 Audit Percentages	1995 Audit Percentages
Within 4 days	541	24%	26%
5-10 days	924	41%	39%
11-20 days	443	19%	16%
21-30 days	97	4%	9%
31 days or more	276	12%	8%
Total	2,281	100%	98%*

As can be seen from Table 17, the percent of compliant arrest submissions received by ISP was just less than that found in the previous audit. Further, the majority of mailed arrest submissions received in 2000 continued to be received by ISP within 10 days of arrest, the same finding as in 1994. It would appear that this mailed arrest submission rate is quite stable in Illinois, although the volume of arrests submitted by mail was close to one-third less in 2001 than in 1994.

According to ISP figures, arrest submissions submitted on paper (mailed and faxed) accounted for less than one-third of all arrest submissions for the period July 2001-February 2002.²³ In the future, electronic submissions, which were found in the 1995 audit to be in compliance with state and federal guidelines 91 percent of the time, will compensate for the slower arrival of mailed arrest submissions to ISP. The issue of the timeliness of electronic submissions will be examined in future audits.

Timeliness of Mailed State’s Attorneys’ Dispositions

A total of 1,327 state’s attorney submissions were received by ISP during the timeliness data collection period. Illinois law specifies that state’s attorneys’ dispositions are to be submitted within 30 days of the event. BJA standards are silent regarding state’s attorney charging information, although any decisions to not file charges (considered to be a final disposition) are to be reported to the state repository. With the advent of “direct filed” state’s attorney charging decisions by certain larger police jurisdictions (see the Completeness of CCH Records Section), it is anticipated that ISP will receive even less mailed state’s attorney submissions in the future.

Table 18: Timeliness of Mailed State’s Attorney’s Disposition Reporting to ISP

	Number of cases	Percentages
Within 30 days	490	37%
31-60 days	247	19%
61-90 days	200	15%
91 days and over	381	29%
Total	1,327	100%

As can be seen in Table 18, a much larger percentage of mailed state’s attorney’s dispositions (37 percent) were received within the statutorily required timeframe (within 30 days of the event), as compared to mailed arrest events. However, this was a decrease of 10 percent compared to the previous audit, where 47 percent of state’s attorney submissions were received within 30 days of the decision.

²³284,036 electronic arrest submissions and 93,794 paper submissions.

According to ISP figures, approximately one-third of state’s attorney dispositions are received by mail, compared to electronic submissions.²⁴ In this case, however, the proportion of compliant mailed state’s attorney submissions decreased by 10 percent in 2001, compared to 1994.

Timeliness of Mailed Court Dispositions

A total of 919 court dispositions were mailed to ISP during the two time test periods. Illinois law states court dispositions are required to be submitted within 30 days of the event. As can be seen in Table 19, the number of mailed dispositions received within the 30-day timeframe was 43 percent, a slight increase from the 40 percent compliance rate observed in the 1995 audit.

According to ISP figures, only 6 percent of all court dispositions received during July 2001-February 2002 were not electronic submissions.²⁵ As observed with mailed arrest reports, the percentage (less than half) of compliant mailed court submissions held steady in 2001, compared to 1994. Again, the vast majority of electronic court submissions *should* be received within the mandated timeframe.

Table 19: Timeliness Of Mailed Court Disposition Reporting To ISP

	Number of cases	Percentages
Within 30 days	385	43%
31-60 days	137	15%
61-90 days	63	7%
91 days and over	311	35%
Total	896	100%

Timeliness of Mailed Custodial Submissions

According to the Criminal Identification Act, custodial status submissions are to be submitted within 30 days of the event. Additionally, the act indicates that all fingerprint-based submissions must be forwarded to the ISP within 24 hours of the event. The 140 mailed submissions received by ISP from county jail facilities during the initial test period were analyzed for receipt within 30 days of the correctional status date.

²⁴ 201,477 electronic state’s attorney submissions and 92,186 paper submission. These figures may not include “direct file” state’s attorney decisions automatically reported by the nine arresting agencies using this option.

²⁵ 440,486 electronic court submissions and 28,802 paper submissions.

Table 20: Timeliness Of Mailed Custodial Reporting To ISP

	Number of cases	Percentages
Within 30 days	110	79%
31-60 days	18	13%
61-90 days	6	4%
91 days and over	6	4%
Total	140	100%

As can be seen in Table 20, over three quarters (79 percent) of mailed submissions reviewed were received within the recommended time frame. This is an increase from the 72 percent observed in the 1995 audit, although the volume of mailed custodial submissions audited for timeliness in that audit was found to be substantially less than in the previous audit.

Finding #9: The results of the timeliness audit for mailed submissions to ISP showed little change from the results obtained in the 1995 audit. Custodial submissions continued to be those most compliant with statutorily mandated submission timeframes (79 percent submitted within 30 days from local jail facilities), with less than half of mailed arrests, state’s attorney decisions or court dispositions arriving at ISP within the required timeframes. However, with the implementation of electronic reporting technologies, mailed submissions now account for less than twenty percent of all submissions received by ISP.

Posting of mailed submissions to the CCH database

Once criminal history record information is received from local agencies, it must be entered into the CCH system, and from there, undergo additional processing to be added to the individual’s existing rapsheet, or be established as the first event of a new record if no previous one exists. An event is “posted” to CCH when it is made available to others on an individual’s rapsheet. While Illinois statutes do not specify timeframes within which ISP must process the CHRI received from local agencies, BJA guidelines require that felony arrest information should be posted to the CCH database within 30 days of receipt. All other submissions should be posted within 90 days.

One of the crucial aspects of CHRI processing is the classification of the accompanying fingerprints. ISP utilizes the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) to assist fingerprint technicians in matching the submitted fingerprints to any already stored in the CCH database. Basically, the technician sends the original fingerprint images thru the AFIS reader, which then computerizes the image. Once a mathematical algorithm is established for the computerized image, it can then be used by the technician to compare all possible matches found by the AFIS file search. This process eliminates the manual searching of fingerprint card files previously done, thereby increasing the speed and accuracy of fingerprint processing. Fingerprints that cannot be

properly classified delay the posting of the arrest segment to CCH, since the unusable prints are sent back to the local agency for correction. Re-fingerprinting becomes problematic in the cases where the subject has already been released from custody, and, as a result, it is possible that the arrest may never be posted.

The analysis of ISP posting timeliness was conducted in two phases: 1) 60 days after the initial data collection period, all submissions were tracked to determine if they appeared on the individual's rapsheet, and 2) 90 days after initial data collection a second follow up was conducted, again to determine the number of initial events posted to CCH. The pre-printed Document Control Number (DCN) on the mailed submission was used to identify the corresponding CCH entry on the rapsheet. The posting date, which does not appear on the actual rapsheet, was located on database maintenance screens made available to auditors at ISP's Bureau of Identification.

Timeliness of Posting Mailed Arrest Submissions to CCH

Arrest submissions received in a paper format from local agencies are forwarded to a data entry vendor for manual entry onto a magnetic tape. The tape of data is then forwarded to the ISP for loading into the CCH database. If the event cannot be posted due to an error made by the local reporting agency, ISP returns the submission to the local agency with an error correction sheet, which the agency resubmits to the ISP with the corrected data. If the error is not correctable, but the event can be posted, the card is processed. Then the ISP sends an error correction sheet to the submitting agency, which the agency resubmits to the ISP with the corrected data.²⁶ The previous audit found that delays in processing mailed submissions can occur when ISP experiences problems with its outside data entry vendors.

All 2,281 mailed arrest submissions (regardless of class) collected at the initial test periods were included in this posting analysis. As Table 21 indicates, very few (7 percent) mailed arrest submissions were posted to CCH within 30 days. However, over 73 percent were posted within 90 days, the BJA required timeframe for posting all submissions other than felony arrests. It is critical that arrest events be posted to CCH in the most timely manner possible, since subsequent dispositions cannot be posted without the arrest to which they are linked.

²⁶ The processing of arrest submission information received electronically is the same as outlined for mailed submissions. Because electronically submitted arrest information is loaded directly into the CCH system, manual entry is unnecessary.

Table 21: Timeliness Of Posting Mailed Arrest Submissions

	Number of Cases	Percentages
Within 30 days	164	7%
31-60 days	1,389	61%
61-90 days	108	5%
91 days and over	26	1%
Not Posted	594	26%
Total	2,281	100%

The 594 (26 percent) mailed arrest submission not posted after 90 days could be the result of “fatal errors”, or errors made by the local submitting agency in the critical data elements needed to process the arrest event (DCN, ORI, Name, Date of Birth, and Statute Citation).²⁷ The arrest submission must be corrected by the local agency before it can be posted. (See the Accuracy Audit Section for more detail on the types of errors encountered). The “not posted” rate in the 1995 audit was 42 percent, although it was documented that ISP was experiencing problems with its outside data entry vendor that was creating a CCH processing delay during the audit data collection period. Therefore, it is not known if the lower “not posted” rate found in this audit reflects a true improved posting rate compared to 1994.

Timeliness of Posting Mailed State’s Attorney Submissions to CCH

State’s attorney’s dispositions are submitted on the second copy of the state 5-part card. The subject’s identifying information as recorded by the arresting agency, as well as the pre-printed DCN remain on that copy, and can be used to link the filing decision with the arrest event on the individual’s rapsheet.

The CCH entry procedure for mailed state’s attorney dispositions is the same as for arrest cards. An outside vendor enters the data, using the double-entry verification procedure. When the disposition information is entered into the CCH system, the computer first searches the existing record for that individual (based on fingerprints), and further, searches for an arrest event with the same DCN. The state’s attorney information will be added to the rapsheet (beneath the corresponding arrest) if a match is found. If the fingerprint-based arrest submission was not posted to the CCH database, the disposition data is routed to a pending file until the fingerprint submission is posted. Periodically, the ISP electronically reviews the pending file to update criminal history records. Like arrest submissions, the ISP microfilms and stores dispositions and then destroys the paper submissions after they are posted to a CCH record. As mentioned earlier, electronic submissions are processed in the same manner, although they are entered directly onto the CCH system without requiring an outside vendor for data entry.

²⁷ Auditors were unable to review the original documentation once the forms had been processed and placed into storage.

BJA standards require that all submissions other than felony arrests be posted within 90 days of receipt by the state central repository. As can be seen in Table 22, a larger percentage of mailed state’s attorney submissions were posted to CCH within the first 30 days after receipt (22 percent), compared to mailed arrest submissions (7 percent). In other words, a link between the state’s attorney disposition and corresponding arrest event could be made immediately for about two in 10 cases. A total of 41 percent of mailed state’s attorney submissions were posted to CCH within the BJA 90 day timeframe. As might be expected, the percent (59 percent) of “not posted” state’s attorney submissions is even higher than for arrest submission, due to the subsequent linking of state’s attorney disposition to arrest event that is required for these events to be posted to CCH.

Table 22: Timeliness Of Posting Mailed State’ Attorney Dispositions To CCH

	Number of Cases	Percentages
Within 30 days	291	22%
31-60 days	43	3%
61-90 days	208	16%
91 days and over	1	<1%
Not posted	784	59%
Total	1,327	100%

Timeliness of Posting Mailed Court Dispositions to CCH

Court disposition submissions arrive at the ISP via mail, magnetic tape or electronically. The information from the court’s section of the state 5-part card is then processed in much the same manner as for arrest and state’s attorney’s disposition submissions. The DCN and identifying information is checked against the existing CCH database to search for any previously posted arrest. If a match is found, the court disposition information is added to the individual’s rapsheet (beneath the corresponding arrest and state’s attorney segments). If no match is possible, then the submission is kept in a “pending” file until an associated fingerprint arrest submission is received. If an error is determined, then the error notification process is initiated. A missing arrest segment will prevent the court disposition from posting to the rapsheet, while a missing state’s attorney segment will not. Finally, sentence information on cases with a conviction is also part of the court disposition section of the state 5-part card, and is posted to the rapsheet after the court disposition information.

BJA standards require that all submissions other than felony arrests be posted within 90 days of receipt by the state central repository. As can be seen in Table 23, not only were very few (10 percent) court dispositions posted within the 90-day BJA required timeframe, but most (88 percent) of the court dispositions received by ISP in the audit

test periods were not posted to CCH *at all during the follow-up period*.²⁸ The 1995 audit found even fewer (just 12 submissions out of 1,072) court submissions posted within 90 days. When ISP tracked those un-posted cases a year later and found three-fourths still awaiting *entry* onto the CCH system, and the rest not able to be *posted* because of submission errors.²⁹

Table 23: Timeliness of Posting Mailed Court Dispositions to CCH

	Number of Cases	Percentages
Within 30 days	67	8%
31-60 days	13	1%
61-90 days	11	1%
91 days and over	16	2%
Not posted	789	88%
Total	896	100%

Timeliness of Posting Mailed Custodial Submissions to CCH

Custodial submissions may be divided into two types: receipt and status change. The custodial receipt submissions include fingerprints and are processed in the same manner as an arrest fingerprint submission. It is important to note that the custodial fingerprint submissions are submitted on a new state 5-part card, with its own pre-printed DCN, different than the arrest DCN that links the criminal justice events up to this point. The court case number is used to link the custodial receipt submission with the preceding events. Once the new custodial DCN is posted to CCH, subsequent custodial status change submissions (e.g., reports of release from jail or prison) are linked to that DCN.

BJA standards require that all submissions other than felony arrests be posted within 90 days of receipt by the state central repository. As can be seen in Table 24, a majority (70 percent) of custodial submissions (receipts and status changes) were posted within 30 days of receipt by ISP. Nine percent of mailed custodial submissions were not posted within the 90-day follow-up period. While the previous audit had treated custodial receipts and status changes separately, when averaged together, the results from that audit correspond to the findings for mailed custodial submissions reported here. However, the total *number* of mailed custodial submissions observed during the 2000-2001 timeliness test periods was more than five times less than observed in 1994.

²⁸ Due to time and resource constraints, this audit did not attempt to track mailed CHRI submissions past the initial 90-day follow-up period.

²⁹ The 1995 audit reported that 236 court dispositions were not postable, 811 court dispositions were not entered, and 13 court dispositions were labeled as unknown regarding the posting status.

Table 24: Timeliness of Posting Mailed Custodial Submissions to CCH

	Number of Cases	Percentages
Within 30 days	98	70%
31-60 days	23	16%
61-90 days	2	1%
91 days and over	5	4%
Not posted	12	9%
Total	140	100%

Overall Timeliness of Posting Mailed Submissions to CCH

In general, ISP’s timeliness in posting *mailed* criminal history record information to CCH has improved compared to the timeliness audit completed in 1994. Mailed custodial submissions come closest to being posted within the 90-day timeframe required by BJA, while the majority of mailed court dispositions continue not to be posted within the 90-day timeframe (Table 25). The increase in mailed arrest submissions posting within 90 days is particularly encouraging, since the timely posting of arrest events allow for the subsequent timely posting of the other criminal justice events associated with the incident. It is also recognized that mailed submissions included in this timeliness audit now account for less than twenty percent of all submissions processed by ISP, although there will continue to be local agencies that mail their submissions to ISP for the foreseeable future. Future audits will focus on the timeliness of electronic submissions.

Table 25: Comparison of Mailed Submission Posting to CCH In 90 Days, 2000 vs. 1994

	2003 Audit	1995 Audit
Arrest submissions	74%	58%
State’s attorney dispositions	41%	37%
Court dispositions	10%	<1%
Custodial receipt and status change (county jails only)	87%	<1*

*Average of custodial receipts and status changes as reported on the 1995 audit report

Finding # 10: While the timeliness of ISP posting of criminal history record information has improved in every area since the last timeliness audit (1994), the posting of mailed court submissions continues to be problematic. Without timely final disposition information, the usefulness of the criminal history record information is severely diminished.

RECOMMENDATION

Local reporting agencies need regular training on mandated CHRI reporting procedures. The Illinois State Police should re-focus energy into improving their program of field training and incorporate a quality check procedure, such as a performance audit, on local agency submissions. These activities should reflect technological advances, including electronically integrated reporting, and should enhance efforts toward uniform reporting across disparate local agency reporting policies and procedures.

IV. Completeness of CCH records

The purpose of the state 5-part card is to have a single document that follows the subject through every phase of criminal justice processing, from arrest to sentencing, to standardize, and facilitate CHRI reporting to ISP. Each page of the five-part reporting form serves a specific purpose. The first page is the Arrest Report (Face Sheet), and as already described in the Accuracy Audit, is used for reporting subject identification and arrest charge information, while the last page is the actual fingerprint card. The second page of the 5-part card is an identical copy of the Arrest Report, since the original must be submitted to ISP (as explained in the Mailed Timeliness Audit). The third page of the 5-part card is the State's Attorney Disposition Report, which has the subject identification and arrest charge information carbon-copied. The state's attorney's office is to indicate its charging decision (filed, not filed, modified charges) and submit the form to ISP within 30 days of the decision, as specified by Illinois law. Finally, page four is the Court Disposition Report, which the circuit clerk uses to record the final charge(s), court case number, disposition code, and decision date. A Sentence Section on that same form is used to record any sentence information, including sentence code, length of sentence, any fine amounts and decision date. The court disposition form is to be submitted to ISP within 30 days of the court decision.

As discussed in the Timeliness Audit, a separate Custodial Fingerprint card is initiated for those received at a correctional facility (state prison or county jail). This new card has its own pre-printed DCN, and is also five pages long. The first copy is used to record the inmates' identification information, the receiving institution, and date received. The last copy is the actual fingerprint card. These are both to be submitted to ISP within 30 days of the date the inmate is received. Pages 2 through 4 are used to report custodial status changes.

Electronic submissions of CHRI operate on the same principle. For example, once arrest information (demographics, arrest charge and fingerprints) is sent electronically via the livescan machine to the CCH database, paper copies with the same DCN are generated and are to be forwarded to the state's attorney or circuit court clerk. These copies are then treated as any other copy of the state 5-part card. The one difference is in automated court disposition reporting (ADR). In the ADR process, the court clerks input the disposition information into an automated file, which is forwarded to the Judicial Management Information Systems (JMIS) Division of the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC). JMIS formats these submissions from around the

state and forwards them to ISP, among other state agencies.³⁰ While this has aided in the editing and standardizing of court disposition submissions to ISP, the DCN must be input by the clerk into the ADR input file, instead of remaining intact on the court submission paper copy.

ISP has the responsibility of linking all information received from the various criminal justice agencies to the proper individual, and further, linking all associated decisions made for a particular arrest event, so that when requested, an automated criminal history record can be provided. The basis for this linking is the fingerprint card submission that initiated the criminal history record, and further, the DCN associated with that fingerprint card. The pre-printed DCN allows all copies of the state 5-part card to be matched, as they are received. As the findings from the Accuracy and Timeliness audits have already shown, ISP may receive the information out of sequence when the local agencies exceed state mandated timeframes for reporting, and further, the submitted information may be incomplete or contain material errors that prevent ISP from posting it to CCH.

Unfortunately, as the posting of CHRI events is a cumulative process, the posting of court disposition information has historically suffered the most from a lack of completeness. That is, unless the originating arrest segment has been submitted and posted, the state's attorney and court disposition must stay in a "pending" file, unavailable to the rest of the CCH database. Previous audits of the CCH database conducted by ICJIA have documented that less than half of arrests recorded on Illinois rapsheets had corresponding court dispositions. Since the last statewide audit (conducted on cases initiated during the period 1989-1993) both ISP and the AOIC have initiated projects aimed at improving availability of court disposition information on CCH records. ISP has formed the Disposition Acquisition Unit to monitor local disposition reporting and actively pursue missing dispositions, and has made improvements in its computerized edit routines to be able to process court disposition submissions with less restrictive data format requirements. AOIC has continued to improve its ADR project to collect better quality court information.

BJA standards require that 95 percent of current felony arrest records contain disposition information if a disposition has been reached. Disposition is defined as case termination by release without charging, prosecutor declination, or court adjudication. In addition, a reasonable attempt should be made to improve the availability for 90 percent of felony arrests during the past five years. Illinois law has one additional disposition requirement, that state's attorneys must report *all* decisions (charges filed, added and modified), not just declinations.³¹

The previous ICJIA audit conducted to assess disposition reporting on a *statewide* sample of criminal history records was completed in 1997 (*The 1996 Criminal History Records Audit, March 1997*). That audit was a follow-up to the 1995 audit, and was

³⁰ Department of State Police, Division of Operations; Secretary of State, Driver Services Division; and Secretary of State, Mandatory Insurance Division.

³¹ Criminal Identification Act, 20 ILCS 2630/2.1

conducted specifically to determine reasons for the finding that only 30 percent of arrests had corresponding court dispositions. This current CCH Record Completeness Audit, conducted on a statewide sample of records from 1994-1998, was designed to examine the completeness of dispositions for the years immediately following, which also coincided with the time period preceding the CCH re-write implemented in 1999.

Methodology

The purpose of the Completeness Audit was to determine the number of cases in which the originating arrest event posted on CCH also had the corresponding state’s attorney, court, sentence, and custodial (as applicable) information. This was done both through access to the actual maintenance screens at the Bureau of Identification, and via inspection of printed criminal history transcripts. At each decision point - at arrest, at filing of charges, at final court disposition, and at custodial receipt – cases were determined to be either “Complete on CCH” (no other decision required), or still requiring information from the next decision point. Cases considered “Complete on CCH” were then excluded from the sample of cases to be examined at the next decision point, but were added to the total of “Complete on CCH” cases. In this way, a more accurate picture of cases missing *expected* information could be obtained, rather than merely tabulating the amount of information found posted on CCH at each decision point.

Sample

For the sample of 2,072 arrest events included in the audit, auditors attempted to locate the corresponding records on CCH. (See the Cases Not Found on CCH Section for a complete description of the location process). In all, 1,899 (92 percent) audit arrest events were located on CCH. These cases became the Completeness Audit sample. This sample of arrests from 50 law enforcement agencies around the state further involved charging decisions of 25 state’s attorney’s offices and court dispositions from 16 circuit court clerk’s offices. Table 26 shows how the Completeness Audit sample of arrests is distributed by geographic region and year of arrest.

Table 26: Completeness Audit Sample of Arrests, by Region and Year

Year	Chicago	Cook	Collar	Urban	Rural	Other*	Total
1994	-	64	16	113	79	16	288
1995	-	60	20	127	49	-	256
1996	-	52	22	149	60	2	285
1997	294	78	20	71	49	2	514
1998	336	87	23	79	31	-	556
Total	630	341	101	539	268	20	1,899

*ISP units

Findings

Final Disposition at Arrest

The first stage of the Completeness audit was to identify the cases, if any, that were terminated before reaching the state's attorney or court. Since 1993, just before the beginning of the audit time period (1994), ISP developed the capability to post police decisions of "Released Without Charging" to CCH, to be able to capture that information if submitted by law enforcement agencies. While the majority of cases with that disposition indicated on the local arrest form in the original audit sample were not found on CCH (see the Cases Not Found on CCH Section for a more detailed discussion), seven cases, all from Chicago Police Department, were found. These cases were excluded from the next stage of the Completeness Audit, as no other disposition was expected. The Completeness Audit sample was now comprised of: seven *complete* cases, and 1,892 arrest cases expecting a state's attorney decision.

State's Attorney Dispositions

Of the 1,892 cases remaining in the Completeness Audit, 1,590 (84 percent) had posted state's attorney dispositions. This rate of posted state's attorney information is much lower than the approximately 99 percent posting rate of state's attorney information found in the years 1989-1992, as covered by the 1995 audit. The higher rate of missing information corroborates the finding from the 1997 audit that state's attorney postings to CCH were trailing arrest postings by an ever-widening margin.³²

Table 27 shows the breakdown of state's attorney information, by year. As can be seen, the percent of state's attorney dispositions located fluctuated somewhat over the five audit years, and never reached the 99 percent level observed in the 1995 audit. The most problematic year for missing state's attorney information appeared to be 1996. As for the 302 (16 percent) cases where a state's attorney segment was *not* found, 72 (4 percent) cases ended at arrest, with no other disposition information, another seven cases (<1 percent) had nothing but custodial information recorded after the arrest segment, and the largest group (223 or 12 percent) was missing state's attorney information, although court disposition information was posted on the rapsheet.

³² Based on analysis of ISP Statistical Reports on Arrests, state's attorney postings lagged behind arrests by 31,000 in 1992, and reached 54,000 in 1994 (*The 1996 Criminal History Records Audit, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, March 1997*).

Table 27: CCH Status of State’s Attorney Dispositions, by Year

CCH Status	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	Total
Total Found	242 (84%)	216 (84%)	199 (70%)	439 (85%)	494 (89%)	1,590 (84%)
Not Found categories:						
a) No State’s Attorney, but court segment found	34	33	60	66	30	223 (12%)
b) Arrest segment only found	10	7	25	8	22	72 (4%)
c) Custodial only found	2	0	1	1	3	7 (<1%)
Total Not Found	46 (16%)	40 (16%)	86 (30%)	75 (15%)	62 (11%)	309 (16%)
Total Sample	288 (100%)	256 (100%)	285 (100%)	514 (100%)	556 (100%)	1,899 (100%)

Of the 1,590 cases where a state’s attorney segment was found, the majority of decisions reported was a filing decision (Table 28). Only 6 percent of all observed state’s attorney segments were for charge declinations or modifications. Illinois law requires that state’s attorneys report *all* decisions, not just the declinations that BJA standards specify.

Table 28: Types Of State’s Attorney Decisions Found On CCH

Disposition Type	Cases	Percent
Direct Filed	1,124	71%
Filed*	380	24%
Modified*	14	<1%
Added*	26	2%
Not Filed	46	3%
Total	1,590	100%

*223 more cases had court segment but no State’s attorney posted; these could be assumed to be additional “filed” cases that did not get posted; (n= 643 “filed”)

Final Disposition at State’s Attorney Decision

The 46 (3 percent) cases where the state’s attorney declined to file charges were considered to be “Complete on CCH” cases, since no further court disposition is required. The cumulative total of “Complete on CCH” cases to this point is 53, or 3 percent of the total Completeness sample.

Warrant Arrest Cases

The Completeness audit sample included 290 (15 percent) cases where the initiating arrest was a warrant arrest. Overall, 208 (72 percent) of these cases were found to have state's attorney information posted on the CCH record. This is 12 percent less than the overall state's attorney completeness rate (84 percent) for the total sample (Table 27).

Further analysis revealed that warrant arrest cases accounted for three of the seven (43 percent) cases where the CCH record included only custodial information (jail facility receipt) following the arrest segment (and no intervening court information). Further, these cases accounted for 23 (32 percent) CCH records that ended with arrest segment, with no other disposition information posted. These cases also accounted for 55 (25 percent) cases where the state's attorney segment was missing, but the CCH record had posted court dispositions. In all these outcomes, warrant arrest cases were observed in greater proportion than their contribution to the sample (15 percent). As mentioned in the Cases Not Found Section, warrant arrests are subject to more complex CCH submission criteria, and further, the underlying court events may eventually take place in another county (or even another state) from the where the arrest took place. All of these factors may contribute to the likelihood that these cases will be less complete on CCH.

Direct Filing

The single greatest type (71 percent) of state's attorney decision found on CCH in the Completeness audit was "direct filing" of charges (Table 28). In reality, this is an automatic CCH posting which does not require the submission of a state's attorney's part of the state 5-part card. Since 1987, ISP has allowed counties to report state's attorney information in this fashion, and has automatically posted these records to CCH since 1991. That is, once ISP receives the police department's submission, the state's attorney filing decision is posted as a "direct filing" at the same time the arrest is posted. During the audit period 1994-1998, eight counties in Illinois participated in direct filing state's attorney information to CCH:

- Cook County (all felony and misdemeanor charges)
- DuPage County (all felony and misdemeanor charges)
- Winnebago County (all felony and misdemeanor charges)
- St. Clair County (misdemeanor charges)
- Will County (all felony and misdemeanor charges)
- Madison (misdemeanor charges)
- Carroll County (misdemeanor charges)
- Stephenson County (all felony and misdemeanor charges)

The Completeness audit sample contained direct file cases from three counties listed above, with audit submissions from Chicago Police Department for the years 1997 and 1998 comprising 55 percent of the total direct file cases.

While direct filing of state's attorney information obviously increases the number of records on CCH with state's attorney filing information, there are several other drawbacks to this practice. First, for this type of state's attorney information on CCH it is even more important for the ISP to post the corresponding arrest segment to CCH than other submissions made via the state 5-part card, since no other state's attorney information is received for those cases. This places an even greater responsibility on the police departments in those counties for accurate and timely CHRI submissions to ISP.

Second, *none* of the 86 audit cases where the state's attorney segment reported charge declination or modification were from direct filing counties. This finding suggests that important information, particularly about charges not filed, is not being reflected on CCH records in those counties, even if such information is being reported to CCH by those State's Attorney's Offices as required by Illinois law. According to the *Survey of State Criminal History Information Systems, 1999*, published by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Illinois estimated in its survey response that there were 33,300 prosecutorial declinations filed in 1999, and that the state repository had been notified of 95 percent of these decisions. However, the findings of this audit suggest that there may be a problem in *posting* any subsequent state's attorney decision, once a "direct file" segment has been automatically added to the CCH record. The loss of declination information, in particular, can result in court dispositions remaining "open" on CCH, when in reality, no prosecution of a particular charge was actually initiated.

Finding # 11: Overall, 84 percent of cases were found to have a state's attorney disposition posted on CCH. Most of those (71 percent) were filing decisions posted automatically via practice of "direct filing" (an agreement between ISP and certain state's attorney's offices that an arrest event posted on CCH will automatically trigger an additional posting of the State's Attorney's filing decision). These automatic postings increase the proportion of state's attorney segments posted on CCH, although they add no additional charge information beyond what was submitted at arrest.

Finding # 12: State's attorney dispositions and charge modification decisions were only found for cases from counties where the "Direct File" option is not used. The "Direct Filing" practice may result in expectations of further court information for cases where charges were actually not filed.

Finding # 13: Approximately 15 percent of cases in the Completeness audit were warrant arrest cases. These cases were not as complete (72 percent) with respect to state's attorney information compared to the total sample (84 percent), and accounted for proportionately more cases without state's attorney information than would be expected based on their representation in the total sample.

RECOMMENDATION

CCH records with "direct file" state's attorney decisions are less likely to have corresponding court dispositions posted, compared to those records with state's

attorney decisions submitted via the state 5-part card. The subsequent state’s attorney dispositions are important to the accuracy and completeness of CHRI. The Illinois State Police should determine if they are receiving subsequent state’s attorney disposition submissions from “direct file” counties, and whether they are being posted to CCH. The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority CHRI Audit Center and the Illinois State Police should continue to work cooperatively to determine the cause of subsequent state’s attorney dispositions not posted.

Court Dispositions

The total Completeness sample for the court disposition analysis included 1,846 cases where a court disposition would be expected to be found. Court disposition information can be posted to CCH as long as the initiating arrest has been posted; it is not dependent on state’s attorney information being posted first. Overall, 1,358 (74 percent) cases were found to have court disposition information, a tremendous increase over any previous audit (30 percent of court dispositions were found for current arrests in the 1995 audit, and 43 percent were found for all previous arrests recorded on those rapsheets). Table 29 shows the CCH status of court dispositions.

As can be seen, the largest group of records without court information ended at state’s attorney segment (18 percent). A second group of records (72, or 4 percent) were observed that did not have any court information after the state’s attorney segment, only custodial receipt information (either IDOC or county jail). In these cases, the custodial information, which is based on a different DCN than the originating arrest.³³ This court case number was supplied by the state’s attorney segment, since the court case information had not been posted to CCH. The remaining 79 (4 percent) cases without court information had essentially stopped at the arrest segment, as previously reported in the state’s attorney completeness findings.

Table 29: CCH Status of Court Dispositions

CCH Status	Cases	Percent
Found	1,358	74%
Not Found categories:		
a) Arrest segment only	72	4%
b) CCH records complete at State’s Attorney disposition	337	18%
c) Custodial found only (no state’s attorney or court)	7	<1%
d) No court, but custodial found	72	4%
Total Not Found	488	26%
Sample Total	1,846	100%

³³ It is important to note that a custodial event is a fingerprint submission and is added to the rap sheet in chronological order regardless of associated systemic events.

Some of the most likely reasons for the observed increase in court dispositions on CCH is the improvement in technology, particularly coordination between AOIC and ISP in the ADR project, and the work of ISP's Disposition Acquisition Unit. Not only is more dispositional information being sent electronically,³⁴ ISP has continued to refine its programming to accept less stringent data formats, thereby allowing more information to be accepted by the CCH database. For example, allowing a disposition with appropriate date information to be posted using a "literal" indicator directing the user to contact the appropriate circuit court clerk's office for disposition details. At the same time, ISP staff has actively pursued missing disposition via several avenues, including the development of the Unreported Disposition Acquisition computer programs (first implemented in 1990), manual retrieval of missing dispositions, and even the addition of a new disposition code "record not available" to be able to account for dispositions no longer physically available.

The audit sample included submissions from 16 of the 22 court circuits in Illinois, and from 19 counties within those circuits. Eleven (58 percent) of those counties reported via ADR or other electronic formats, while the other eight counties submitted CHRI information via mailed copies of the state 5-part card. However, since the counties varied in their manner of court submissions over the course of the audit period (1994-1998), it was not possible to present a more detailed analysis of ADR reporting counties compared to the others. This issue will be addressed further in the upcoming 2003 audit.

Table 30 presents the breakdown of cases with court dispositions found on CCH, by geographic region and year. As can be seen, the rate of court dispositions found on CCH was even better than the overall 74 percent in every region except Cook County. The 1996 ICJIA audit, which had focused on court disposition reporting in Cook County, had documented problems in the ability of ISP to process court submissions from that county. In that audit, only 48 percent of cases had been found to have court dispositions posted on CCH. The average total for Cook County observed here (399, or 67 percent) reflects improvements made in response to the 1996 audit. In fact, the 138 CPD cases found with "arrest dates" in 1999 and court disposition dates for those events in 1998 (see Accuracy Section) were likely cases that could be posted once those processing issues were solved. On the other hand, court disposition posting rates for CPD cases were found to be the lowest of the Illinois geographic regions. Rates of court dispositions postings in Cook County will be examined again in the upcoming 2003 audit.

³⁴ See Appendix F for the listing of county court clerk's offices reporting through the ADR system, on line reporting, and reporting via magnetic tape.

Table 30: Court Dispositions Found on CCH, by Region and Year

Year	Chicago	Cook	Collar	Urban	Rural	Other	Total
1994	-	37	14	99	62	16	228
1995	-	52	16	87	40	-	195
1996	-	45	15	103	41	1	205
1997	172	68	16	58	41	2	357
1998	227	48	18	58	22	-	373
Total	399	250	79	405	206	19	1,358
Percent of Audit Sample Total	(623) 54%	(341) 73%	(98) 81%	(514) 79%	(250) 82%	(20) 95%	(1,846) 74%

Finding# 14: Overall, court dispositions were found on CCH in 74 percent of cases where a court disposition was expected. This is the highest rate of court disposition postings found in any ICJIA audit.

Finding # 15: Every geographic region outside of Cook County showed even higher rates of court disposition found on CCH than the overall average, as high as 82 percent for the rural region

Warrant Arrests

At the court disposition analysis stage, the audit sample contained 285 warrant arrests. Table 31 shows the CCH status of court dispositions for those cases, in relation to the type of state’s attorney filing. As can be seen, court dispositions were found for 63 percent of the warrant arrest cases, which is among the lowest rates of observed court dispositions found on CCH. On the other hand, warrant arrest cases where state’s attorney filing decisions were submitted via state 5-part cards to ISP were most likely to have court dispositions on CCH, compared to direct filed cases. Again, the automatic nature of direct file postings reduces the amount of scrutiny such arrests receive. In the counties without direct file, the state 5-part card is routed through the criminal justice system as designed, allowing more agencies access to information about the arrest, and more chances for subsequent actions to be reported and posted to CCH.

Table 31: CCH Court Status of Warrant Arrests, by State’s Attorney Filing Type

Court CCH Status	State’s Attorney Segment Found		State’s Attorney Segment Not Found	Total
	Direct Filed	Filed		
Found	52 (43%)	73 (88%)	55 (68%)	180 (63%)
Not Found	69 (57%)	10 (12%)	26 (32%)	105 (37%)
Total	121 (100%)	83 (100%)	81 (100%)	285 (100%)

Finding# 16: Warrant arrests were less likely to have court dispositions posted (63 percent), compared to the overall Completeness sample (74 percent). Further, warrant arrests with “direct file” state’s attorney dispositions were less likely (43 percent) to have corresponding court dispositions found on CCH, compared to those with those with state’s attorney segments filed via the state 5-part card.

Direct Filing Cases

An analysis of CCH court dispositions in relation to the state’s attorney filing type was conducted on the entire Completeness Audit sample, as well. Table 32 shows that, as with warrant arrests, the cases with “direct filed” state’s attorney decisions were least likely to have corresponding court dispositions posted on CCH. If prosecutorial declinations occurred in some of these cases, but those decisions were not forwarded to ISP and/or were not posted to CCH, then those court cases segments remain incomplete on CCH indefinitely. The lower rate of court disposition posting in direct file cases may also suggest technical problems in linking court disposition information with the corresponding arrest/state’s attorney segment, or some unintended negative effect on the flow of case information in the counties now using the direct file option.

Table 32: Total Sample CCH Court Status by State’s Attorney Filing Type

Court CCH Status	State’s Attorney Segment Found		State’s Attorney Segment Not Found*	Total
	Direct Filed	Filed		
Found	752 (67%)	382 (91%)	224 (74%)	1,358 (74%)
Not Found	371 (33%)	38 (9%)	79 (26%)	488 (26%)
Total	1,123 (100%)	420 (100%)	303 (100%)	1,846 (100%)

Finding# 17: Cases with “direct file” state’s attorney decisions were less likely to have corresponding court dispositions found on CCH (67 percent), compared to those with state’s attorney decisions filed via state 5-part cards (an average of 82 percent).

RECOMMENDATION

The Authority recommends that ISP look into the reasons why CCH records with “direct file” state’s attorney decisions are less likely to have corresponding court dispositions posted compared to those records with state’s attorney decisions submitted via the state 5-part card. A combination of factors may be contributing to this phenomenon including non-submission and/or posting of state’s attorney dispositions in some of these cases, a technical problem that is preventing court dispositions from being linked to the arrest event, or possible problems with the flow of case information from police to the court.

Court Disposition Types

The actual court dispositions found on CCH were combined into three categories using ISP definitions, identify further disposition information, if any, that would be expected in each case. (The complete list of court dispositions accepted by ISP are listed in Appendix E.) The three categories are:

- 1) Convictions:
- 2) Non-Convictions (including findings of not guilty, dismissals, and various decisions not to further prosecute): and
- 3) Interim Dispositions (including withholding final judgment pending completion of supervision, warrant issued, unfit to stand trial).

Table 33: Types of Court Dispositions Found on CCH

Court Disposition Categories	Cases	Percent
Convictions	583	43%
Non-Convictions	477	35%
Interim Dispositions	298	22%
Total	1,358	100%

Conviction Dispositions

Of the 1,358 cases with court dispositions found on CCH, 583 (43 percent) were for convictions. Incarceration sentence information was tracked for these cases, to determine which would be expected to have custodial information posted on CCH. The results are discussed in the Custodial Dispositions Section.

Non-Conviction Dispositions

Of the 1,358 cases with court dispositions found on CCH, 477 (35 percent) were for non-convictions. These cases were considered terminated, with no further segments

required on CCH. However, the degree to which these cases were “Complete on CCH”, or had every expected segment posted on the CCH record varied. Table 34 shows that 78 (16 percent) were missing the state’s attorney segment. According to the Illinois Statutes standard, these would not be considered complete, while all 477 cases would be considered complete according to BJA standards.

Table 34: CCH Completeness Status of Cases by Court Disposition Type

Court Disposition Type	State’s Attorney Segment Found	State’s Attorney Segment Not Found	Total
Conviction	477 (82%)	106 (18%)	583 (100%)
Non-Conviction	399 (84%)	78 (16%)	477 (100%)
Interim	259 (87%)	39 (13%)	298 (100%)
Total	1,135 (84%)	223 (16%)	1,358 (100%)

Once data collection began in this audit, it was apparent that the most problematic category was Interim Dispositions. As can be seen from Appendix E, these include a wide range of dispositions that can occur *before* final adjudication of the case (such as warrant issued or quashed), *at sentencing* (such as withholding judgment of guilt pending the outcome of a specified term of supervision), or *post-sentencing* (such as revocation of probation or parole). Some of these interim dispositions could result in multiple court disposition entries on a case, which had not been accounted for in the original data collection procedures. Therefore, the Interim Disposition cases were counted as having court segments on CCH, but were not included in the final Completeness Audit stage of determining Custodial status on CCH. While this methodology undercounted the number of convictions found (since some Interim Dispositions are made at, or post-sentencing),³⁵ it was the least ambiguous way to determine which cases would be expected to have a custodial segment posted to CCH.

Table 34 also shows the degree to which Interim disposition cases were found to have corresponding state’s attorney segments. As can be seen, this group of cases was found to have the highest rate of state’s attorney information, as compared to the other court disposition types. On the other hand, 60 percent of Interim Disposition cases were from Cook County (a “direct file” county), which would account for the higher rate of found state’s attorney segments for this group of cases. As with the Non-Conviction disposition cases, all 298 Interim Disposition cases would be considered “Complete on CCH” according to BJA standards (which do not require state’s attorney filing decisions

³⁵ Based on yearly statistics reported by the AOIC (*Annual Report of the Illinois Courts, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998*) the average conviction rate in Illinois for the audit time period, 1994-1998 was 67 percent. Adding together both Conviction and Interim disposition categories found on CCH in this audit brings the sample conviction rate to 65 percent, in line with the actual court statistics.

be posted on CCH), while 259 (87 percent) would be considered “Complete on CCH” according to Illinois Statute standards.

Custodial Dispositions

The presence of a custodial segment was tracked for the remaining 583 (31 percent) cases where a court conviction was indicated on CCH. Table 35 presents the type of sentence imposed on these cases, as recorded on CCH. As can be seen, more than half of the cases (337 or 58 percent) received an incarceration sentence of either prison or jail term, while another 175 (30 percent) received a non-incarceration sentence. These latter cases were considered “Complete on CCH”, since no other information would be expected on CCH. Another 71 (12 percent) had no sentence information, so that it could not be determined if a custodial segment would be expected.

Table 35: Conviction Court Cases by Sentence Type

Sentence Status	Conviction Court Cases	Percent
Incarceration	337	58%
Non-incarceration	175	30%
Sentence Not Found	71	12%
Total	583	100%

A total of 337 (58 percent) cases received a sentence of incarceration (prison or jail), for which a custodial segment would be expected on CCH. Of these, only 9 (3 percent) did not have an expected custodial segment recorded on CCH (Table 35). This 97 percent rate of expected custodial segments on CCH is the highest found in any previous ICJIA audit. In the previous (1995) audit of custodial completeness, 77 percent of court cases with a prison sentence had an IDOC custodial segment present, although only 15 percent jail sentence cases had corresponding custodial segments on CCH. It must be remembered, however, that the methodology for the Custodial Completeness audit differed from past audits, in that cases with Interim court dispositions had been excluded from this phase of the Completeness Audit during data collection. Had the cases with post-sentence interim dispositions been able to be included, the rate of custodial completeness on CCH might have been somewhat lower than found here.

Table 36: CCH Custodial Status by Type

Custodial Information Type	Cases	Percent
Received	255	76%
Discharged	43	13%
Released onto Correctional Supervision	26	8%
Revocation of Correctional Supervision	4	<1%
Custodial Not Found	9	3%
Total	337	100%

Finding # 17: Almost every (97 percent) incarceration sentence case where custodial information was expected was found to have some sort of custodial information posted to the CCH record. The majority of those cases (76 percent) reflected a custodial receipt.

Custodial Segments Found on CCH with Missing Court Dispositions

As previously discussed, the custodial fingerprint card has a different pre-printed DCN than the arrest card that initiates the CCH record for an arrest event. The custodial event is a fingerprint submission and is added to the rap sheet in chronological order regardless of associated systemic events. The audit found 90 cases where court information was missing yet custodial information was posted to the CCH record. Seven of those were missing all information except the initial arrest, while 83 had a state’s attorney decision posted besides the custodial information. However, 71 (85 percent) of those cases were “direct file” state’s attorney decisions, which are automatically generated by the CCH database when the arrest is posted. Therefore, it can be concluded that 78 (87 percent) of these cases with custodial segments posted without the associated court disposition were basically postings of the fingerprint-based information received. Because the court disposition information was missing from these CCH records, these custodial postings could not be included in the total of cases for which custodial information had been expected (Table 35). Further, the custodial card is not presently designed to capture court information, other than the court case number by which the custodial information is linked to the proper arrest sequence on the CCH record. Therefore, the presence of a custodial segment in the absence of the court disposition does not inform the CCH user about the charges for which the subject was incarcerated.

It was further determined that 20 (26 percent) of these cases were warrant arrests, which was 7 percent of all warrant arrests (290) in the sample. However, warrant arrests represented only 15 percent of the entire Completeness Audit sample, so again, it would seem that these arrests contribute disproportionately to problem records in the CCH database.

Table 37: Distribution of Custodial Segments Found

Placement of Custodial Segment on CCH Record	Cases	Percent
Arrest and Custodial Only	7	2%
Arrest, State’s Attorney, Custodial Only	83	20%
Custodial Found as Expected	328	78%
Total	418	100%

Finding# 18: It was found that nearly one-quarter (22 percent) of the custodial segments posted on CCH were appended to cases with missing court dispositions. However, the custodial fingerprint card is not designed to capture court information (other than court case number) and thus cannot, by itself, inform the CCH user about the court disposition.

Overall Completeness of the Audit Sample

Table 36 presents the “CCH Completeness” of the audit sample at each segment found on the CCH record, as determined by the information that would be expected as the case progressed through the criminal justice system. This is a summary of discussion of each individual segment of the CCH record observed in the Completeness Audit.

Table 38: Overall CCH Completeness

Expected CCH Segment	Found as Expected	Not Found	Total Expected	Case Disposed	Unable to Determine if Expected	Audit Sample Total
State’s Attorney	1,590 (84%)	302 (16%)	1,892 (100%)	7	-	1,899
Court	1,358 (74%)	488 (26%)	1,846 (100%)	53	-	1,899
Custodial	328 (97%)	9 (3%)	337 (100%)	705 (37%)	857* (45%)	1,899

*Includes 767 cases with missing state’s attorney, court, or custodial segments, and 90 custodial segments appended to CCH records with missing court dispositions.

However, the overall completeness of an *individual* CCH record is determined by whether it contains *all* required information regarding to arrest, court disposition, and incarceration (if any) imposed on the subject. A separate analysis of the 1,899 cases included in the Completeness Audit was conducted, according to two separate criteria relevant to individual CCH record completeness:

- 1) “IL Complete” (Illinois Law Complete) - the most stringent definition, as required by Illinois law, is that the arrest, state’s attorney decision, court disposition, sentence, and custodial (if applicable) be present on the CCH record, and;

- 2) “BJA Complete” – following the BJA standard, which includes all decisions in #1, except that state’s attorney decisions need only be reported for declinations. Therefore, under this definition, a case could be considered CCH Complete if the state’s attorney segment was missing but all other applicable segments were present.

It was determined that:

- 1,117 (59 percent) of the 1,899 cases were “Complete on CCH” according to Illinois Statute requirements (having all arrest, state’s attorney *filing*, court disposition, and custodial segments, as applicable).
- 1,334 (70 percent) of the 1,899 cases were “Complete on CCH” according to BJA standards (having all arrest, state’s attorney *declinations*, court disposition, and custodial, as applicable).

The difference in the two results, as indicated above, is the degree to which state’s attorney information is required. Since the BJA standards are concerned with *final* dispositions on CCH, only state’s attorney declinations (which terminate the case) are required when considering CCH record completeness. The “direct filing” of state’s attorney filing decisions has aided in increasing the percentage of CCH records with all expected segments under both Completeness criteria, as compared to the 1995 audit, where less than 30 percent of records were found to have all required information posted to CCH.

A further analysis was conducted to determine if the rate of complete CCH records differed by geographic region. As can be seen from Table 39 and Table 40, the five Illinois regions did differ with respect to the extent of complete CCH records. There were also dramatic differences *within* region when the BJA criterion of completeness was applied, compared to the Illinois Statutes criterion. For example, cases from the Urban and Rural regions were each evenly split on proportion of complete CCH records when the Illinois Statute criterion was applied (Table 39), while the “direct file” Cook County, and Chicago (within Cook County) had 10-20 percent more cases complete on CCH.

**Table 39: Records Complete on CCH According to The IL Statute Criterion,
by Region**

Records Complete on CCH	Chicago	Cook	Collar	Urban	Rural	Other	Total
Yes	385 (61%)	242 (71%)	75 (74%)	272 (51%)	133 (50%)	10 (50%)	1,117 (59%)
No	245 (39%)	99 (29%)	26 (26%)	267 (49%)	135 (50%)	10 (50%)	728 (38%)
Total	630 (100%)	341 (100%)	101 (100%)	539 (100%)	268 (100%)	20 (100%)	1,899 (100%)

Interestingly, when the state’s attorney filing decision is not required on CCH (under the BJA criterion), the difference *between* regions disappears. Close to three-quarters of CCH records in *all* Illinois regions have complete information (although Chicago exhibits a somewhat lower rate). This finding shows that *court* disposition reporting (and posting to CCH) has improved uniformly around the state. On the other hand, state’s attorney decisions remain under-represented on CCH, particularly in counties not participating in the automatic “direct file” option. Further, this state’s attorney filing option does not improve the likelihood of court dispositions appearing on CCH records, since the other regions meet or even exceed the rate of complete records for “direct file” counties, once the state’s attorney segment is removed from consideration (Table 40).

**Table 40: Records Complete on CCH According to the BJA Criterion,
by Region**

Records Complete on CCH	Chicago	Cook	Collar	Urban	Rural	Other	Total
Yes	387 (61%)	243 (71%)	80 (79%)	404 (75%)	204 (76%)	16 (80%)	1,334 (70%)
No	243 (39%)	98 (29%)	21 (21%)	135 (25%)	64 (24%)	4 (20%)	565 (30%)
Total	630 (100%)	341 (100%)	101 (100%)	539 (100%)	268 (100%)	20 (100%)	1,899 (100%)

In conclusion, ISP can increase the percentage of cases “Complete on CCH” further by monitoring the submissions of certain types of cases identified in this audit, namely warrant arrests, “direct file” cases, and custodial submissions where court dispositions are missing on CCH.

For warrant arrests, education of local agencies as to the policies and procedures for submission of these cases to CCH will reduce the number of arrests on the CCH database that need not be submitted because the originating agency already did so. As for “direct file” cases, the state’s attorney’s offices in the counties with this automatic posting practice may benefit from periodic training as to their responsibility to report their charge declination and modification decisions that may occur before final court disposition. This will increase the number of cases on CCH with complete information, since it can be determined with more certitude that a court disposition is not expected. Finally, as to cases where custodial fingerprint cards or status changes posted by ISP without the corresponding court dispositions, these cannot be considered “complete” unless the court information is posted as well. For the small volume of these cases observed (22 percent of custodials posted in the audit sample) it should be possible to acquire the necessary dispositions at the time of entry onto CCH.

Finding# 19: According to BJA criteria, 70 percent of the Completeness Audit cases were found to include every expected segment on CCH, while according to the more stringent requirements base on Illinois Statutes, 59 percent of the same cases would be considered “Complete on CCH”. The difference between the two criteria lies in the degree to which state’s attorney information is required.

Follow-up of Findings from the 1999 CHRI Audit

The problems experienced in court disposition reporting were analyzed in detail in the 1999 audit report; *Criminal History Records Audit: Disposition Reporting in Cook County*. The lack of complete disposition reporting and posting was attributed to several factors:

- Corresponding arrest was not posted to CCH
- Case open – no disposition yet
- No charges filed on arrests
- Case expunged – no disposition reportable
- Problem with DCN only
- Problem with DCN and statute citation
- Problem with statute citation only
- Unable to determine why disposition was not posted

As a follow-up to the 1999 audit report, the Illinois State Police and the Cook County Circuit Clerk’s Office were contacted to provide information on the actions taken to improve disposition reporting.

The ISP indicated that the most significant change is the implementation of an automated “cross-walk” table for the offense citation data field that allows a disposition of unspecified statute to be reported. The table allows data fields that may have some errors to be corrected and thus be posted to the rap sheet. Other efforts include an evaluation of data acceptability standards, collection of historical court disposition information, and research of technological solutions identified in the CHRI system. As of October 2001, the ISP attributes a 53.75 percent reduction in their calculated error rate of Cook County court disposition posting to these activities.³⁶

Information provided by the Cook County Circuit Clerk’s Office identified several steps taken to improve disposition reporting.³⁷ The clerk’s office has entered into an agreement that shifts the responsibility of the appropriate edits to Chicago Police Department booking numbers to the ISP. A system that flags problem offense citation entries and makes punctuation corrections when possible has been installed. The clerk’s office has expanded its use of livescan to capture electronic booking information. Finally, all submissions are sent to the ISP daily, errors are indicated and returned electronically for correction.

RECOMMENDATION

The Authority recommends that ISP direct efforts towards making sure that state’s attorney declinations are posted, and that missing court dispositions for cases where custodials are received are located and posted. These steps will increase the proportion of complete cases on CCH, in compliance with BJA requirements.

V. Conviction Status Indicator (Felony “Flags”)

BJA standards require that, for records created in the past five years (the criterion that applies to this audit sample), a reasonable attempt must be made to identify, or “flag,” felony offenders for 90 percent of the offenses in the state central repository. In response to this BJA requirement, and The Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act, Public Law No. 103-159, ISP developed a data element, which appears at the beginning of the individual’s rapsheet, called Conviction Status Indicator.

As with other BJA requirements already discussed, Illinois has it’s own, usually more stringent, guidelines. In this case, ISP devised and implemented a conviction status indicator data element as part of the CCH re-write in the mid-1990’s, which is applied to all cases, not just to felony conviction cases. This data element is meant to reflect the *cumulative* conviction status, not just of Illinois cases, but also of *all* cases for that individual reported from 41 participating states in the Interstate Identification Index (III) Program operated by the FBI. Illinois became a participant in this federal program in

³⁶ This figure is taken from correspondence between the Illinois State Police and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority dated October 18, 2001. The error rate is an ISP daily calculation of the average number of submissions that went to error, posted, and pending.

³⁷ Correspondence between the Cook County Circuit Clerk’s Office and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority dated November 9, 2001.

1993, the last “big state” to join, according to BJA, as part of Illinois’s initial CHRI Improvement Project. (See Appendix H for a list of other states participating in the III program.) Conviction information accepted through the III program must have been initially activated by fingerprints in the state of origin.

Initially, ISP staff developed software programs to determine whether offenders in Illinois’ CCH database were convicted felons. A three-step algorithm was developed to determine the correct conviction status indicator. First, the class of offense field in the court conviction disposition was checked, followed by a check for the existence of a state correctional (IDOC) custodial record, as well as the conviction status field. Using this algorithm, felony flags were set for the 2 million CCH records in the existence at the time (mid-1990’s). The definition of a felony used in this algorithm was that contained in the Federal Gun Control Act of 1968.³⁸

There are four conviction status options that may appear on a rap sheet they include:

- Felony Conviction:
- Misdemeanor Conviction:
- No Convictions:
- “Pending or Unknown”.

Only one of these status options will appear on the rapsheet, with “Felony Conviction” status remaining unchanged, even in the event of a subsequent misdemeanor conviction.³⁹ The actual status indicated on the rapsheet is applied via an automated procedure developed by ISP. An internal CCH database element, the multi-state indicator, is set to “M” if conviction information from another state is used in the determination of that record’s status. The Conviction Status value has the opportunity to be updated whenever there is Illinois CHRI activity reported to the state repository, as well as when tapes of the latest III events are forwarded twice yearly to ISP from the FBI.

In essence, then, *every* case in the CCH database with a felony conviction known to ISP, and further, to the FBI, has that conviction status marked on the rapsheet. This, then, constitutes 100 percent compliance with the BJA “felony flagging” requirement. Since this audit was the first conducted on records having this field, only a preliminary examination was conducted. The purpose of this audit task was to verify that all CCH records contained a Conviction Status value, and further, whether the status was ever changed once it was assigned. Because the actual conviction status was based on information from the III program not available to the auditors at the time the rapsheets were obtained, the *accuracy* of the conviction status could not be tested.

³⁸ Source: www.NCJRS.org/PDFFiles/152977.PDF; the felony definition in the The Gun Control Act of 1968, Public Law 90-618, sec 922 is as follows: “...conviction in any court of a crime punishable by imprisonment for a term exceeding one year...”

³⁹ The exception to this would be if the individual obtained an expungement from the court for the original felony conviction (20 ILCS 2630/5).

Methodology and Sample

The Conviction Status value was recorded for 1,899 cases, or all those cases where the arrest segment was found on CCH during the initial data collection phase (May-July, 2001). Those cases without “Felony Conviction” already noted on the rapsheet were re-examined the following year (after at least one update tape from the FBI would have been received) to see if any statuses actually changed.

Table 41 presents the distribution of the Conviction Status values observed at the initial data collection time period. While the clear majority of cases (68 percent) in the audit sample were already “flagged” as felony conviction cases,⁴⁰ another 21 percent had only “Pending or Unknown” status indicated. This indicator is applied to the rapsheet by ISP when there is an event missing a final court disposition or when the final disposition is missing an offense class to make it unclear whether the conviction was for a felony or misdemeanor offense. This recent distribution can be compared to the conviction status of the entire CCH database in the mid-1990’s when the “felony flag” was first applied to all 2 million records. At that time, 25 percent of offenders were flagged as felons, 25 percent as non-felons, and 50 percent were flagged as “pending or unknown” (NCJRS, 152977.PDF, p.84).

Table 41: Distribution of Conviction Status Indicators (2001)

	Number of cases	Sample Proportion in 2001	Initial CCH Database Proportion in mid-1990’s
Felony Conviction	1,295	68%	25%
Misdemeanor Conviction	178	9%	25%
No Conviction	22	2%	-
Pending or Unknown	404	21%	50%
Total	1,899	100%	100%

As can be seen from Table 41, the percentage of offenders in the CCH database has increased substantially (from 25 percent) since the project’s inception, while the proportion of “pending or unknown” cases has decreased by 30 percent. It is also true that all cases are assigned a Conviction Status value, although it can be argued that the 404 (20 percent) cases flagged as “pending or unknown” did not provide useful conviction information. Therefore, the state repository is very close to the BJA requirement that 90 percent of all felony offenders be identified, but is not 100 percent compliant.

⁴⁰ This is *not* the same as saying only 68 percent of all felony cases had a “Felony Conviction” status. Although the audit did begin with a sample of felony arrests, it is the *latest* CHRI activity, often from another state, that drives the Conviction Status indicator.

Follow-up of “Pending or Unknown” Cases

Since it was not possible to assess the validity of the Conviction Status indicator due to the fact that it is based, in part, on conviction information from other states, auditors took the opportunity to investigate the issue of updating the indicator value once it has been assigned by ISP. The 404 cases with “Pending or Unknown” status indicated at initial data collection in 2001 were re-examined.

Table 42 shows the conviction status of those records as of July 2002. As can be seen, the majority of cases (77 percent) still had “pending or unknown” as the Conviction Status Indicator. Of the 82 (20 percent) that had a different Conviction Status indicator in 2002, 52 cases (13 percent) now had “Felony Conviction” as the indicator on the rapsheet, 12 (3 percent) now were indicated as “Misdemeanor Conviction”, and 18 cases (4 percent) changed to “No Conviction”.

Lastly, Table 40 shows that, of the 404 cases re-examined, only 58 (14 percent) had an Illinois arrest event or court disposition posted to the rapsheet during the first six months of 2002. These data indicate that the observed low level of current criminal justice activity (at least in Illinois) for persons arrested more than four years ago will result in a majority of “pending or unknown” cases to remain with that inconclusive conviction status. With no more recent CHRI activity to trigger a new disposition, there is no reason for it to change. On the other hand, it is not known whether the change in conviction status for the 62 cases (76 percent) with *no* Illinois CHRI activity in 2002 were due to convictions in other states participating in the III program, or because of disposition acquisition related to a request for the individual’s record under the Uniform Conviction Information Act.

**Table 42: Follow-Up of Cases With “Pending Or Unknown” Conviction Status
in 2001**

2002 Conviction Status	Cases*	Cases with CHRI posted in 2002**
Felony Conviction	52 (13%)	19/52 (36%)
Misdemeanor Conviction	12 (3%)	0/12 (0%)
“No Conviction”	18 (4%)	1/18 (5%)
“Pending or Unknown”	310 (77%)	38/310 (12%)
Total	392 (100%)	58/392 (15%)

*12 cases were inaccessible via LEADS in 2002.

** Illinois CHRI only

Finding #: 20 The proportion of offenders in the CCH database “flagged” as felons has increased by more than 40 percent since the project’s inception in the mid-1990’s, while the proportion of records “flagged” as “pending or unknown” has dropped by 30 percent.

Finding # 21: While all Illinois rapsheets now have a Conviction Status indicator, in response to BJA standards that 90 percent of felony offenders should be identified or “flagged”, at least 20 percent of audited records were assigned inconclusive conviction status (“pending or unknown”). When re-examined a year later, a majority (77 percent) of those cases still had inconclusive conviction status.

A follow-up of the Conviction Status indicator for cases “flagged” as Misdemeanor Conviction was also conducted. As can be seen from Table 43, the majority of cases (154 or 87 percent) remained Misdemeanor Conviction cases, while 23 (10 percent) other cases changed their conviction status designation. While four cases moved in the “expected” direction, to a felony designation, it was disconcerting to find that 18 (10 percent) had actually *lost* a designation of “conviction” (albeit misdemeanor) by now being designated “pending or unknown”. It is apparent that the algorithm used by ISP to assign Conviction Status is sensitive to either a new arrest segment posting that is has not yet received a corresponding court disposition, or to missing class of offense information in the court disposition, whether from Illinois or any of the other 40 participating III program states. This is apparently creating a situation where conviction information could actually be lost over time.

Table 43: Follow-Up of Cases With Misdemeanor Conviction Status in 2001

2002 Conviction Status	Cases*	Cases with CHRI posted in 2002**
Felony Conviction	4 (2%)	1/4 (25%)
Misdemeanor Conviction	154 (87%)	2/154 (1%)
“No Conviction”	1 (<1%)	1/1 (100%)
“Pending or Unknown”	18 (10%)	15/18 (83%)
Total	177 (100%)	19/177 (10%)

* 1 case was inaccessible via LEADS in 2002.

Finding# 22: When the cases designated as Misdemeanor Conviction Status in 2001 were followed-up in 2002, the majority (87 percent) has not changed conviction designation. However, 10 percent of the cases were found to be “flagged” as “pending or unknown”. This loss of conviction information could be due to new (Illinois) CCH activity, which might reflect missing class of offense information on court dispositions, or some other condition set in the ISP algorithm used to create the Conviction Status Indicator.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1) The Authority recommends that ISP conduct a periodic search of the CCH database for cases with the “Pending or Unknown” conviction status indicator, as part of its Disposition Acquisition initiative, so that more cases with actual felony convictions missing court dispositions could be “flagged” as felony conviction cases. It is possible that missing information on court dispositions (from Illinois

courts or other states) is preventing Illinois convicted felons from receiving a Felony Conviction designation.

- 2) The Authority recommends that ISP inform all users of Illinois CHH records that the Conviction Status Indicator reflects conviction information from many other states as well as Illinois. This could be accomplished through the printing of the internal CCH “multi-state indicator” value on the rapsheet along with the Conviction Status field. This additional data element will increase the usefulness of conviction status information (when decision makers know that the information is a more complete picture of the subject’s criminal history), and will also alleviate confusion that may arise when the Conviction Status indicator does not match the facts as indicated on the Illinois rapsheet. This may be an important issue for Illinois jurisdictions close to the border of other states, where offenders have increased opportunity for out-of-state criminal activity.

VI. Summary of Findings – How Does Illinois Rate?

The purpose of the BJA set-aside waiver requirements is to provide an objective standard by which the quality of a state’s criminal history records can be judged. These are the requirements that must be met before a state can cease to apply 5 percent of its Byrne Funds towards CHRI improvement. Throughout this audit report, the various BJA criteria were cited, against which the audit findings could be measured. As a summary, Table 44 presents the BJA criteria and Illinois’ progress, as measured by this audit, toward compliance with those federal funding requirements.

Table 44: BJA “Report Card”

BJA Standard	Illinois’ Grade
For Current CCH Records (Timeliness of mailed submissions, 2001)	
ISP to post felonies within 30 days of receipt to CCH	≤ 30 days = 7% 31-60 days = 61%
ISP to post non-felony CHRI within 90 days of receipt	Arrest posted = 73% State’s Attorney posted= 41% Court disposition posted= 10% Custodial Status posted= 87%
Local agencies to report fingerprint submissions to ISP within 24 hours of arrest	≤4 days = 26% 5-10 days = 39%
Completeness of CCH Records Created in the Last Five Years (1994-1998)	
90% of felony arrests have (expected) disposition and incarceration information posted	State’s attorney posted=84% Court disposition posted=74% Custodial Status posted=97%
95% of current felony records have a disposition	74%
95% of current sentences to and releases from prison are available	Custodial Status = 97%
90% of felonies are “flagged” (all felony submissions with a felony convictions status indicator)	Conviction status indicator other than “pending or unknown” = 79%
Other CCH Database Improvements	
Automate all CHRI, including master fingerprint cards	All master fingerprint files have been transformed into an automated form = 100%
Automate all new CHRI files	All new files are maintained in an automated form = 100%

VII. National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) Progress

The ISP has undertaken a number of other initiatives regarding the CCH database to achieve compliance with the federal mandates. Using funds provided by the National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) the ISP created an integrated and automated master name index of subjects based on a fingerprint record. The index lists all of a subject’s contacts with the criminal justice system. The system integrates information on warrants, orders of protection, sex offender status, gang affiliation,

firearm owner's identification, and parole status with information on the CCH database, which includes arrest, charge, and final disposition records.

Since 1999, ISP has been developing and implementing an enterprise-wide model of integrated justice information systems. At the center of the model is the widely distributed use of electronic digital technology (livescan) to capture fingerprints and transmit data from local arresting agencies to the ISP. As of August, 2002, there were 117 local law enforcement sites in Cook County using livescan, and another 96 law enforcement agencies using livescan in the rest of the state. Also, the clerks of the circuit court in two major counties, DuPage, and Peoria, implemented on-line procedures for reporting dispositions to the ISP for inclusion on rap sheets. Sixty-Seven other counties report court dispositions to ISP via the ADR program administered by the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts.

ISP also implemented new software for processing and retrieving criminal history record information. For information processing, the revised system included a new method for identifying errors and notifying reporting agencies. In addition, the system was designed with an automated auditing module and with the ability to produce standard management reports. For users, ISP developed a Windows-based graphical user interface program to access the CCH database.

Finally, ISP implemented a new automated system for accessing fingerprint records. The new automated fingerprint identification system provided direct access to fingerprint files and was fully operational by 1999. For a summary listing of NCHIP activities and the listing of livescan agencies refer to Appendices G and I.

Appendix A

April 20, 2000

Chief or the Honorable XXXXX
YYYY Police Department or Sheriff's Office
Address
City, IL ZIP

Dear Chief or Sheriff XXXXX:

The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority audits the state's criminal history records to measure the quality of information available to rap sheet users. This year, the Authority is auditing felony arrest information submitted by local law enforcement agencies to the Illinois State Police. The goal is to determine whether felony information on the Computerized Criminal History (CCH) database is timely, accurate, and complete. This audit represents an opportunity to evaluate the quality of criminal history records for the benefit of your officers and the community you serve.

In order to conduct this audit, the Authority needs "source" documents from your agency. Please send us copies of your agency's state five-part reporting forms for all felony arrests that occurred in the months of April and October in 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, and 1998. If state five-part reporting forms are not available, please send us copies of local arrest reports for felony offenses that occurred during the sample time frame.

In the final report, which will be completed and mailed to you in the spring of 2001, the Authority will present statistical data on the accuracy and completeness of submissions from reporting agencies. Based on audit findings, state and local criminal justice officials can devise strategies for improving reporting procedures.

Please call me at 312-793-8404 if you have any questions or would like to receive a copy of the audit methodology. The audit team looks forward to working with you on this project. Thank you.

Sincerely,

James D'Archangelis
Project Manager

cc: James Thurmond, Auditor
Christopher Humble, Auditor

Appendix B

Reporting Requirements for the Audit Time Period 1994-1998

An Arrest Fingerprint Card **must** be submitted to the BOI for adults arrested for the following charges:

- Any felony charge
- Class A Misdemeanor
- Class B Misdemeanor
- 625 Illinois Compiled Statutes 5.0-4 (Motor vehicle anti-theft laws)
- 625 Illinois Compiled Statutes 5.0/11-204.1 (Aggravated fleeing or attempt to elude a police officer)

The following charges are **not** mandated to be reported:

- Any traffic violations except those mentioned above, *including* 625 Illinois Compiled Statutes 5.0/11-501(a) 1(d) 2 (Driving under the influence of alcohol, other drug, or combination of both)
- Conservation Offenses as defined in the Supreme Court Rule 501(c) that are classified as Class B misdemeanors

An Arrest Fingerprint Card must also be submitted for *juveniles* who are arrested or taken into custody for the following charges:

- Unlawful use of weapons under Section 24-1 of the Criminal Code of 1961
- Forcible felonies as defined in Section 2-8 of the Criminal Code of 1961
- Class 2 or greater felony under the Cannabis Control Act
- Class 2 or greater felony under the Illinois Controlled Substances Act
- Chapter 4 of the Illinois Vehicle Code (anti-theft laws)
- All criterion offenses applicable to adults (above) where the court has decided to try the juvenile as an adult

Appendix C

State Five Part Arrest Card

Appendix D

Definitions of Illinois Regions

Chicago: City of Chicago boundaries, under the jurisdiction of the Chicago Police Department (228.13 sq. miles; 2,807,709 estimated 1998 population).

Yearly average arrests, 1994-1998: 105,691

Cook County (outside Chicago): The rest of Cook County (640 sq. miles; 2,384,617 estimated 1998 population).

Yearly average arrests, 1994-1998: 35,028

Collar Counties: The five counties immediately surrounding Cook County: DuPage, Kane, Lake, McHenry, Will (2,306.59 sq. miles; 2,638,348 estimated 1998 total population).

Yearly average arrests, 1994-1998: 25,098

Urban Counties: The 22 counties (outside Cook and collar counties) defined by the U.S. Census Bureau as existing within a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA)⁴¹ these include: Boone, Champaign, Clinton, DeKalb, Grundy, Henry, Jersey, Kankakee, Kendall, Macon, Madison, McLean, Menard, Monroe, Ogle, Peoria, Rock Island, Sangamon, St. Clair, Tazewell, Winnebago, Woodford (13,223.48 sq. miles; 2,422,083 estimated total 1998 population).

Yearly average arrests, 1994-1998: 39,134

Rural Counties: The remaining 74 counties in Illinois (39,189.63 sq. miles; 1,875,613 total estimated 1998 population).

Yearly average arrests, 1994-1998: 22,472

⁴¹ According to the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, an MSA designation is made if: 1) the county includes a city of at least 50,000 population, or 2) the county includes an urbanized area of at least 50,000 residents with a total population of at least 100,000, or 3) the county is adjacent to has strong economic or social ties to the central city.

Appendix E

Automated Disposition Reporting (ADR) Data Dictionary from the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, January 2002.

100 Series – Conviction Dispositions, Sentence Information to Follow:

- Guilty: A defendant enters a plea of guilty or is found guilty by the court or jury and judgment is entered.
- Guilty/Mentally Ill: A defendant enters a plea of guilty but mentally ill (due to mental illness at the time of the commission of the criminal offense) or is found guilty buy mentally ill by the court or jury and judgment is entered.
- Ex Parte/Finding of Guilty: A defendant fails to appear on a traffic, conservation, or ordinance violation where the penalty is a fine only. The court enters a judgment against the defendant in the defendant's absence.
- Guilty/20 ILCS 301/40-10: A defendant is convicted of a crime and ordered to undergo drug/alcohol treatment as a condition of probation pursuant to 20 ILCS 301/40-10. The judgment of conviction may be vacated upon successful completion of the treatment and other terms and the conditions of probation.
 - This is a special code used only as provided in the above statute.
- Adjudicated Delinquent: A minor enters a plea of guilty or is found guilty of a criminal offense by the court or jury and adjudicated to be delinquent.
- EJJ/Guilty: A minor subject to an Extended Jurisdiction Juvenile (EJJ) prosecution who enters a plea of guilty or is found guilty by a court or jury and is sentenced as a juvenile. An adult sentence is also imposed and stayed.
- EJJ/Adult Sentence Imposed: A minor whose juvenile sentence which was subject to an Extended Jurisdiction Juvenile (EJJ) prosecution is vacated and the corresponding adult sentence is entered.

200 Series – Non Conviction Dispositions, No Sentence Information to Follow:

- Not Guilty: A defendant is found not guilty by court or jury.
- Not Guilty/Insane: A defendant is found not criminally responsible for conduct due to a mental disease or defect.
- Not Guilty/Directed Verdict: A defendant is found not guilty by the court at the conclusion of the prosecution's case as a matter of law.

- Not Guilty/Guilty of Lesser and Included Offense: A defendant is not found guilty of the charged offense, but guilty of a lesser and included offense within the same count.
- Nolle Prosequi: A formal entry on the record showing the decision of the prosecuting officer not to proceed with the prosecution.
- No Bill: A document filed of record that reflects a finding of insufficient evidence to warrant the return of a formal charge by a Grand Jury.
- Transferred/No Jurisdiction: The cause is transferred to another jurisdiction for final disposition.
- Dismiss: An order is entered by the court disposing of an action prior to a trial or before completion of a trial.
- Dismiss/State Motion: An action is dismissed against the defendant upon the motion of the State's Attorney.
- Dismiss/Defense Motion: An action is dismissed against the defendant upon the motion of the defendant.
- Dismiss/Court: An action is dismissed against the defendant upon the motion of the court.
- Dismiss/Superseded by Indictment or Information: An original complaint or information is dismissed against the defendant and replaced by a formal information or indictment.
- Dismiss/No Probable Cause: An action is dismissed against the defendant following a preliminary hearing where the court found that there was no probable cause shown that the defendant committed the offense.
- Dismiss/Want of Prosecution: An action is dismissed against the defendant due to a lack of prosecution.
- Non-suit: A judgment is taken against a plaintiff who has failed to appear or prosecute their case.
- Stricken Off with Leave to Reinstate: A case is removed from the docket by the court subject to reinstatement.
- Death Suggested/Cause Abated: A case is terminated by the court upon a determination of the defendant's death.

- Charge Amended/Reduced: An original charge is amended or reduced to another charge.
- Governor's Pardon: Act of grace from governor which mitigates the punishment the law demands.
- Expunge: Process by which criminal record(s) are obliterated or sealed.
 - This disposition is not currently reported to any agency.
- Commuted Sentence: Substitution of a lesser penalty or punishment for a greater one by the governor.
 - This disposition is not currently reported to any agency.
- Merged with Another Offense: An offense is merged with another offense, usually a more serious offense, when a single criminal act constitutes multiple offenses. The defendant is found guilty on each offense, but judgment and sentence can only be entered once.
- Delinquency Petition Withdrawn: An order is entered allowing the delinquency petition to be withdrawn.
- Not Proven/Not Adjudicated Delinquent: The court determined that a minor has not committed a criminal offense.
- Dismissed/Transferred to Adult: A juvenile petition is dismissed, and the cause is to be filled in criminal court.
 - This disposition is not currently reported to any agency.
- Dismissed/Transferred to Juvenile: An action is dismissed against the defendant and the cause is to be filed as a juvenile proceeding.
 - This disposition is not currently reported to any agency.

300 Series – Interim Dispositions/Forfeitures, No Sentence Information to Follow:

- 30 Day Notice of Continued Court Date/DL Suspension Pending: The court continues the case for a minimum of 30 days and requires a notice to be sent to the defendant who has posted an Illinois driver's license or a non-resident driver who has signed a promise to comply and has failed to appear.
- 30 Day Notice of Continued Court Date/Forfeiture Pending: The court enters an order declaring the bond to be forfeited and a notice of the court's order is mailed to the defendant who has posted a bond other than those described above (30 Day

Notice of Continued Court Date/DL Suspension Pending) and has failed to appear. The cause is continued for at least 30 days.

- Judgment on Forfeiture: The court enters a judgment against the defendant following a forfeiture proceeding.
 - This code follows above (30 Day Notice of Continued Court Date/Forfeiture Pending) when the defendant fails to appear.
- Failure to Comply/NRVC: An order of failure to appear is entered against a non-resident driver who has signed a “promise to comply” and failed to appear within the time frame specified.
 - This code follows the 30 Day Notice of Continued Court Date/DL Suspension Pending code. If the driver is a resident of a member state of the Non-Resident Violator Compact (NRVC), a “Notice of Failure to Comply” will be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the driver’s home state for suspension of driving privileges.
- Order of Failure to Appear/Illinois DL to the SOS: An order of failure to appear is entered against an Illinois driver who has posted a license as bail and failed to appear within the time frame specified.
 - This code follows the 30 Day Notice of Continued Court Date/DL Suspension Pending code. This will result in the driver’s license being suspended by the Secretary of State.
- Child Support Suspension: An order is entered to suspend the license of an Illinois driver who has failed to make child support payments.

400 Series – Interim Dispositions/Withhold Judgment, Sentence Information to Follow:

- Withhold Judgment/710 Probation/720 ILCS 550/10: A defendant enters a plea of guilty or is found guilty by the court or a jury for a violation of the Cannabis Control Act, judgment is withheld, and the defendant is sentenced to probation as a first-time offender.
- Withhold Judgment/1410 Probation/720 ILCS 570/410: A defendant enters a plea of guilty or is found guilty by the court or a jury for a violation of the Controlled Substances Act, judgment is withheld, and the defendant is sentenced to probation as a first-time offender.
- Withhold Judgment/Supervision: A defendant enters a plea of guilty or is found guilty by the court or a jury, judgment is withheld, and the court imposes a disposition of supervision.

- Withhold Judgment/720 ILCS 5/12-4.3: A defendant enters a plea of guilty or is found guilty by the court or a jury for a violation of aggravated battery of a child, judgment is withheld, and the defendant is sentenced to probation.
 - Pursuant to Public Act 89-313, this disposition option was eliminated from the statute. Therefore, this code is not valid for offenses committed after January 1, 1996.
- Juvenile Continuance Under Supervision: The court's determination that the cause is to be continued under supervision after the minor's stipulation or admission to the facts supporting a petition and before the finding of adjudication.
- Withhold Judgment/520 ILCS 5/3.5: A defendant enters a plea of guilty or is found guilty by the court or a jury for a violation of the Wildlife Code, judgment is withheld, and the defendant is sentenced to probation as a first-time offender.

500 Series – Interim Dispositions, No Other Sentence Information to Follow:

- Unfit to Stand Trial: A defendant is found to be unfit to stand trial, plea, or be sentenced pursuant to Article 104 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1963, 725 ILCS 5/104 et. al.
- Sexually Dangerous/725 ILCS 205/1.01: A defendant is declared by the court to be suffering from a mental disorder coupled with criminal propensities to the commission of sex offenses.
- Mistrial: A trial is terminated and declared void prior to the return of a verdict.
- Warrant Issued: An order is entered by the court directing the arrest of a person.
- Warrant Quashed/Withdrawn/Recalled: A previously issued warrant is terminated by one of these methods.
- BFW Issued: An order is entered for a bond forfeiture warrant (BFW) by the court directing the arrest of the defendant for failure to comply with the conditions of release on bond.
- BFW Quashed: A previously issued bond forfeiture warrant is quashed.

600 Series – Revocation/Vacate Dispositions, Sentence Information May Follow:

- Revocation/Vacate/Probation: A court action nullifying a previous order of probation.
- Revocation/Vacate/Conditional Discharge: A court action nullifying a previous order of conditional discharge.

- Revocation/Vacate/Supervision: A court action nullifying a previous order of supervision.
- Revocation/Vacate/720 ILCS 550/10: A court action nullifying a previous order of probation for a first-time offender under the Cannabis Control Act.
- Revocation/Vacate/720 ILCS 570/410: A court action nullifying a previous order of probation for a first-time offender under the Controlled Substances Act.
- Revocation/Vacate/Probation 720 ILCS 5/12-4.3: A court action nullifying a previous order of probation for the offense of aggravated battery of a child.
 - Pursuant to Public Act 89-313, this sentencing option was eliminated from the statute. Therefore, this code is not valid for offenses committed after January 1, 1996.

650 Series – Modifications to Trial Court:

- Modified/Trial Court: A subsequent order of the court which modifies a previously entered dispositional or sentencing order.
- Vacated Trial Court: A court order vacates a previously entered dispositional or sentencing order.
- Vacate Adult/Juvenile Sentence Completed: A court order vacates an adult sentence upon the completion of a juvenile sentence resulting from an Extended Jurisdiction Juvenile prosecution.

700 Series – Subsequent Dispositions, No Sentence Information to Follow:

- Probation Terminated: A previously entered order of probation is terminated.
- Conditional Discharge Terminated: A previously entered order of conditional discharge is terminated.
- DUI School Completed: A report is filed with the clerk that reflects the defendant completed a court ordered DUI School.
- Failure to Pay/Notice to SOS, 625 ILCS 5/6-306.6: The issuance of a notice to the Secretary of State, pursuant to 625 ILCS 5/6-306.6, when an Illinois resident has failed to pay a traffic fine.
- Paid in Full/Compliance of 705: The issuance of a notice to the Secretary of State, pursuant to 625 ILCS 5/6-306.6, that all amounts due have been paid in full.

- Terminated Unsatisfied: An order entered by the court that terminates a previous order of probation, supervision, or conditional discharge showing the defendant did **not** successfully complete the full conditions of the order.
- Terminated Satisfied: An order entered by the court that terminates a previous order of probation, supervision, or conditional discharge showing the defendant successfully completing the full conditions of the order.

800 Series – Reviewing Court:

All dispositions under this series of codes are actions resulting from a review by a higher court, such as the Supreme Court and Appellate Court of Illinois.

- Reversed/Reviewing Court: A reviewing court has reversed the decision of the trial court.
- Remanded/Reviewing Court: A reviewing court has returned the case to the trial court for further proceedings.
- Modified/Reviewing Court: A reviewing court has modified the decision of the trial court.
- Vacate/Reviewing Court: A reviewing court has rescinded the decision of the trial court.

888 Series – Special Disposition Code:

- No Charge Disposition/Not Available: This code should be used only when trying to report a historical disposition where the information has been destroyed or cannot be located.

Appendix F

Court Disposition Reporting Methods, by County

Automated Disposition Reporting (ADR):

Adams	Macoupin
Bond	Madison
Boone	Marion
Bureau	Marshall
Calhoun	Mason
Carroll	Massac
Christian	Mercer
Clay	Monroe
Clinton	Montgomery
Coles	Morgan
Crawford	Ogle
DeKalb	Pope
DeWitt	Pulaski
Douglas	Putnam
Effingham	Randolph
Fayette	Richland
Ford	Rock Island
Grundy	Saline
Iroquois	Sangamon
Jackson	Stephenson
Jefferson	St. Clair
Jersey	Tazewell
JoDavies	Union
Johnson	Vermillion
Kane	Wabash
Kendall	Washington
LaSalle	Wayne
Lee	Whiteside
Livingston	Will
Logan	Williamson
Macon	

ADR Testing:

Alexander	Lake
Clark	McLean
Franklin	White

On-Line reporting:

DuPage
Peoria

Magnetic Tape (batch) reporting:

Cook

Paper reporting:

Brown
Cass
Champaign
Cumberland
Edgar
Edwards
Fulton
Gallatin
Greene
Hamilton
Hancock
Hardin
Henderson
Henry
Jasper
Kankakee
Knox
Lawrence
McDonough
McHenry
Menard
Moultrie
Perry
Piatt
Pike
Schuyler
Scott
Shelby
Stark
Warren
Winnebago
Woodford

Appendix G

ISP Certified Law Enforcement Livescan Agencies, August 2002

County Sheriff's Offices:

Adams County Sheriff	Macoupin County Sheriff
Boone County Sheriff	Madison County Sheriff
Bureau County Sheriff	McHenry County Sheriff
Champaign County Sheriff	McLean County Sheriff
Christian County Sheriff	Mercer County Sheriff
Clark County Sheriff	Morgan County Sheriff
Coles County Sheriff	Ogle County Sheriff
Cook County Sheriff	Peoria County Sheriff
DeKalb County Sheriff	Perry County Sheriff
DeWitt County Sheriff	Randolph County Sheriff
DuPage County Sheriff	Rock Island County Sheriff
Effingham County Sheriff	Saline County Sheriff
Grundy County Sheriff	Sangamon County Sheriff
Henry County Sheriff	Schuyler County Sheriff
Iroquois County Sheriff	Shelby County Sheriff
Jackson County Sheriff	St. Clair County Sheriff
Jefferson County Sheriff	Stephenson County Sheriff
Jersey County Sheriff	Sterling County Sheriff
Kane County Sheriff	Vermillion County Sheriff
Kankakee County Sheriff	White County Sheriff
Kendall County Sheriff	Whiteside County Sheriff
Knox County Sheriff	Will County Sheriff
Lake County Sheriff	Winnebago County Sheriff
Livingston County Sheriff	Williamson County Sheriff
Logan County Sheriff	Woodford County Sheriff
Macon County Sheriff	

Police Departments (outside Cook County):

Addison Police Department	CenComm E911 Center (Round Lake Beach area)
Algonquin Police Department	Champaign Police Department
Alton Police Department	Collinsville Police Department
Aurora Police Department	East St. Louis Police Department
Batavia Police Department	Edwardsville Police Department
Belleville Police Department	Elmhurst Police Department
Bolingbrook Police Department	Fairview Heights Police Department
Carbondale Police Department	Granite City Police Department
Carol Stream Police Department	Gurnee Police Department
Carpentersville Police Department	Jacksonville Police Department

Joliet Police Department
Lake Forest Police Department
Lake in the Hills Police Department
Lisle Police Department
Lombard Police Department
Mt Vernon Police Department
Mundelein Police Department
Naperville Police Department
Oakbrook Police Department
Ottawa Police Department

Quincy Police Department
Springfield Police Department
St. Charles Police Department
Vernon Hills Police Department
Waukegan Police Department
West Chicago Police Department
Wood River Police Department
Woodstock Police Department
Zion Police Department

Police Departments in Cook County (CABS participants):

Alsip Police Department
Arlington Heights Police Department
Barrington Police Department
Barrington-Inverness Police
Department
Bartlett Police Department
Bedford Police Department
Bellwood Police Department
Berkely Police Department
Berwyn Police Department
Blue Island Police Department
Bridgeview Police Department
Broadview Police Department
Brookfield Police Department
Buffalo Grove Police Department
Burbank Police Department
Burnham Police Department
Burr Ridge Police Department
Calumet City Police Department
Chicago Heights Police Department
Chicago Ridge Police Department
Cicero Police Department
Country Club Hills Police
Department
Countryside Police Department
Crestwood Police Department
Des Plaines Police Department
Dolton Police Department
East Hazel Crest Police Department
Elgin Police Department
Elk Grove Village Police Department
Elmwood Police Department
Evanston Police Department

Evergreen Park Police Department
Flossmoor Police Department
Forest View Police Department
Forest Park Police Department
Franklin Park Police Department
Glencoe Police Department
Glenview Police Department
Glenwood Police Department
Hanover Park Police Department
Harvey Police Department
Hazel Crest Police Department
Hickory Hills Police Department
Hillside Police Department
Hodgekins Police Department
Hoffman Estates Police Department
Hometown Police Department
Homewood Police Department
Justice Police Department
LaGrange Police Department
Lansing Police Department
Lemont Police Department
Lincolnwood Police Department
Lynwood Police Department
Lyons Police Department
Matteson Police Department
Maywood Police Department
McCook Police Department
Melrose Police Department
Marionette Park Police Department
Midlothian Police Department
Morton Grove Police Department
Mt Prospect Police Department
Niles Police Department

Norridge Police Department
North Riverside Police Department
Northbrook Police Department
Northfield Police Department
Northlake Police Department
Oak Forest Police Department
Oak Park Police Department
Oaklawn Police Department
Olympia Fields Police Department
Orland Hills Police Department
Orland Park Police Department
Palatine Police Department
Palos Heights Police Department
Palos Hills Police Department
Park Forest Police Department
Park Ridge Police Department
Prospect Heights Police Department
Richton Park Police Department
River Forest Police Department
River Grove Police Department

Riverdale Police Department
Riverside Police Department
Rolling Meadows Police Department
Roselle Police Department
Rosemont Police Department
Saulk Village Police Department
Schaumburg Police Department
Schiller Park Police Department
Skokie Police Department
South Holland Police Department
Stone Park Police Department
Streamwood Police Department
Summit Police Department
Thornton Police Department
Tinley Park Police Department
Westchester Police Department
Western Springs Police Department
Wheeling Police Department
Wilmette Police Department
Winnetka Police Department

Other Livescan Sites in Illinois:

Illinois State Police District 5
Illinois State Police Academy
Champaign County Juvenile Center
Peoria County Probation & Court
Services
Peoria County Juvenile Center
Sangamon County Juvenile Center
Cook County Jail Reporting Shack
Cook County State's Attorney
Cook County Corrections

Cook County Bridgeview
Cook County Fugitive
Cook County Markham
Cook County Maywood
Cook County Rolling Meadows
Cook County Skokie
Cook County Criminal Court
Daley Center
Daley Center Basement

Appendix H

Participant States for the Interstate Identification Index (III) and National Fingerprint File Program, March 2000

Interstate Identification Index Participants:

Alabama	Nevada
Alaska	New Hampshire
Arizona	New Jersey
Arkansas	New Mexico
California	New York
Colorado	North Carolina
Connecticut	North Dakota
Delaware	Ohio
Florida	Oklahoma
Georgia	Oregon
Idaho	Pennsylvania
Illinois	South Carolina
Indiana	South Dakota
Iowa	Texas
Maryland	Utah
Michigan	Virginia
Minnesota	Washington
Mississippi	West Virginia
Missouri	Wisconsin
Montana	Wyoming
Nebraska	

National Fingerprint File Participants:

Florida
New Jersey
North Carolina
Oregon

Appendix I

National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP) 1996-2000 Summary

During 1996, the Illinois State Police (ISP) utilized NCHIP grant funds to support activities necessary to design and implement a re-write of automated criminal history record information (CHRI).

1. ISP staff worked to define the scope and prepare work plans for the CHRI redesign.
2. The necessary information included a review of known issues with current computerized criminal history (CCH) system, a review of automated CCH systems in other states, and collect information from Illinois' local criminal justice agencies.
3. Local agency information was collected through a series of county level meetings, information from local agency data system vendors, and a survey of local agencies.
4. Finally, ISP hired a consultant to coordinate the redesign project.
5. The request for proposals was released for review in late 1996.

During 1997, ISP activities were directed toward the award of the redesign project to American Management Systems and modernizing the automated fingerprint system (AFIS).

1. ISP staff reviewed vendor proposals and awarded AMS the contract in the spring of 1997.
2. Vendor proposals for modernization of AFIS were also reviewed.
3. Once contract negotiations were completed, AMS worked with ISP to strategize the implementation of the AFIS and the CCH system.
4. A data conversion plan was completed for livescan and non-livescan submissions.
5. The team worked on a strategy to address the interface of law enforcement administration data system (LEADS) applications and users with the new system.
6. In the fall of 1997, local agencies were solicited for project feedback.

By the end of 1997, ISP and AMS had completed a plan to collect in-put from non-criminal justice CHRI user agencies concerning the re-design. The re-design team was collecting technical specifications for implementation and developing a graphical user interface (GUI) for demonstration.

Appendix J

Glossary

Accuracy:	The degree to which a criminal history records transcript correctly reflects information reported to the Illinois State Police by local agencies.
Arrest:	The taking into police custody of someone believed to have committed a crime, regardless of whether the person is formally charged.
Authority:	The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
Batch data entry:	The process of transcribing data from source documents stored up during a single workday into a computerized database, usually by typing at a keyboard.
Bureau of Identification:	The division in the Illinois State Police responsible for collecting, maintaining and disseminating computerized criminal history record information.
Coding Forms:	A formatted document with blank fields that can be filled with a set of symbols for representing data. The information is entered into a computerized database which allows data to be recorded and organized for analysis.
Collar Counties:	The five counties surrounding Cook County: Lake, Kane McHenry, Du Page and Will.
Completeness:	The degree to which a computerized criminal history (CCH) record transcript reflects all information reportable to the Illinois State Police.
Criminal Justice System:	All activities by public agencies pertaining to the prevention or reduction of crime or enforcement of criminal law. These include, but are not limited to, the prevention, detection and investigation of crime; the apprehension of offenders; the protection of victims and witnesses; the administration of juvenile justice; the prosecution and defense of criminal cases; the trial, conviction and sentencing of offenders; and the correction and rehabilitation of offenders, which includes imprisonment, probation, parole and treatment.

Criminal Justice Transactions:	An official record of an individual's interaction with the criminal justice system.
Custodial Releases:	Individuals who have been released from the Illinois Department of Corrections.
Disposition:	Generally, an action by a criminal or juvenile justice agency (e.g. a court or state's attorney office) that signifies a portion of the justice process is complete and/or that jurisdiction is terminated or transferred to another agency.
Disposition Acquisition Unit:	A unit of the Illinois State Police that collect and record dispositions on the computerized criminal history (CCH) database.
Document Control Number:	A number used by the Illinois State Police to link each disposition event to a related arrest.
Event:	Each of the several types of criminal history record submissions that are reportable to the Illinois State Police. Submissions include arrest, state's attorney dispositions, court dispositions, and custodial receipt or status changes.
Felony:	A criminal offense punishable by a sentence in state prison of one year or more or by a sentence of death.
Five-Part Reporting Form:	A five-paged form used by law enforcement agencies, State's attorneys, and circuit clerks to report arrests, charges, and disposition information to the Illinois State Police. This form is initially filled out by the arresting agency and subsequent pages are routed for processing to other reporting agencies.
IDOC:	The Illinois Department of Corrections.
ISP:	The Illinois State Police.
Livescan:	An automated device, which acquires, transmits, and print out electronic images directly from fingers that are rolled onto scanning pads.
Missing:	A record not entered on the computerized criminal history (CCH) records database.

Offense:	An act committed (or omitted) in violation of a law forbidding or (commanding) such an act.
ORI:	Originating Agency Identifier, a unique nine-character sequence that identifies a particular agency.
Posted data:	An event or other information that has been attached to an individual's record on the CCH database.
Prison:	A state confinement facility operated for the incarceration and correction of convicted felons in Illinois.
Rapsheet:	The entire computerized criminal history (CCH) record of a given offender. Also known as a <i>transcript</i> .
Receipt (custodial):	The intake of an offender into an Illinois prison or jail, which is required to report the intake to the Illinois State Police.
Record:	The accumulation of all criminal history and non-criminal history events that are placed in the computerized criminal history (CCH) records database.
Rural (county):	A county that does not have a boundary within a Metropolitan Statistical Area or an association with an MSA.
Source document:	The original written or printed record of a person's formal contacts with the criminal justice system.
State central repository:	The agency responsible for the collection, maintenance and dissemination of computerized criminal history (CCH) record information. In Illinois, the state central repository is the Illinois State Police (ISP).
Stratified sample:	In a stratified sample, the population is divided into segments and independent samples are taken within each segment. Subgroups are called strata. The members of a stratum usually share some common characteristic, such as region or income level.
Submission (of events):	The act of reporting criminal history event information from an agency to the state central repository.

Timeliness (data entry):	The time frame within which criminal history record information is entered at the state central repository once it is received from reporting agencies.
Timeliness (reporting):	The time frame within which agencies responsible for reporting criminal history record information to the state central repository.
UCR (index arrests):	Uniform Crime Reporting, a program which provides a gauge of crime based on the submission of data by law enforcement agencies on selected reported crimes (index) and arrests that are most likely to occur with adequate frequency to provide a sufficient basis for depicting overall crime.
Urban county:	A county within a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) or one having a strong association with an MSA.

Bibliography

Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (1999). Annual Report of the Illinois Courts: Statistical Summary, 1998. Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, Springfield, IL.

Bureau of Justice Assistance (1997). Early Experiences with Criminal History Records Improvement. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington D.C. Available at: <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/152977.pdf>.

Bureau of Justice Statistics (1999). Survey of State Criminal History Systems. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington D.C.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (1999). Criminal History Records Audit: Disposition Reporting in Cook County. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (1997). The 1996 Criminal History Records Audit. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (1995). A Comprehensive Examination of the Illinois Criminal History Records Information (CHRI) System: Final Report of the 1995 Criminal History Records Audit. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (1994). An Overview of the Illinois Criminal History Records Information CHRI System: Part I of the 1995 Criminal History Records Audit. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (1992). 1992 Audit of the Illinois Computerized Criminal History System. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (1991). Annual Audit Report for 1990: Audit of Illinois' Computerized Criminal History System. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (1983). Annual Audit Report for 1982-1983: Data Quality of Computerized Criminal Histories. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (2001). Trends & Issues Update: Collecting and Maintaining Criminal History Records in Illinois. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (1997). Trends and Issues 1997. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, Chicago, IL.

Illinois State Police (1995). CHRI User's Manual. Illinois State Police Bureau of Identification, Springfield, IL.



ILLINOIS STATE POLICE
Information & Technology Command

Rod R. Blagojevich
Governor

Larry G. Trent
Director

July 29, 2003

Dr. Gerald Ramker, Associate Director
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
120 South Riverside Plaza, Suite 1016
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Dr. Ramker:

We appreciate the work that your staff has done in the compilation of the 2003 Illinois Criminal History Records Information (CHRI) Audit Report. This document will be very useful as we continue to make improvements to the accuracy, timeliness, and completeness of the state's criminal history data.

For the most part, we concur with the findings of your staff with the exceptions contained herein. There are some findings in the audit that must be investigated further. We appreciate that your staff has already begun meeting with our personnel to develop an understanding of these findings.

Through continued collaboration with other stakeholders and making improvements to the CHRI system, we have made significant strides in the posting of dispositions for Cook County arrests. We are now in the process of continuing this process with other counties. While this Audit shows improvements in many areas, we will see even greater improvements in audits of future time periods.

Sincerely,

Kenneth A. Bouche
Deputy Director

Arrest Information Findings

- The number of known arrests at the local law enforcement level without corresponding CCH records dropped in half since the last statewide 1995 audit. Only eight percent of cases in the audit sample could not be located on CCH.
- Warrant arrests were the most problematic type of arrest in terms of corresponding records not being found on CCH, accounting for 40 percent of all arrests (8% of total arrests) not found on CCH.

Recommendation

Properly reporting a warrant arrest is a complex activity given the different policies and procedures in place. The Illinois State Police (ISP) should develop a less complex set of reporting requirements and train local agencies on the proper procedures for warrant arrest reporting.

ISP Response: We concur. An even greater percentage of arrests posted to CHRI will occur as more agencies utilize Livescan devices and the ISP conducts CHRI audits on police agencies. Regarding warrant arrests, a very detailed explanation on the procedure for submitting warrants to the BOI was submitted in the Summer of 2002 CHRI Agency Newsletter. Warrant procedures have also been discussed at Livescan User Group Meetings as well as during other interactions with agencies. We will examine the current procedures for submitting warrant arrests in hopes of improving the process.

Accuracy Findings

- More state 5-part fingerprint cards submitted to ISP were filled out completely by local agencies compared to the previous audit. The one variable that continued to contribute to incompleteness of data was *class of offense*, missing in over one-quarter of the cards.
- Overall, 73 percent of the CCH records audited had information that *exactly* matched the corresponding state 5-part arrest cards submitted by local agencies. The *statute* citation field contained the most discrepancies.
- ISP automated editing routines were responsible for creating discrepant name entries on CCH compared to the arrest card. In cases where an alias name (and in some cases, alias date of birth) was included by local agencies on the arrest card, in addition to the name used at arrest, the edit routine truncated the field down so that the last name data supplied is lost. The final data posted to the *name* field is actually the alias name. This error results in the loss of information on the name (or date of birth) last used by the subject, which can be important to law enforcement.

Recommendation

While the advancement of technology has proven beneficial for Illinois criminal justice agencies, it is not without its own problems. Technology will only be able to improve the accuracy, completeness and timeliness of reporting if it is applied based on consistent reporting policies using standardize reporting procedures. The Illinois State Police should test the automated edit routines on a regular basis to ensure that data is being accurately transmitted and posted.

ISP Response: We concur. Many of the issues relating to an incorrect class of offense occur due to the Statute/Class correlation process. For example, if CHRI receives an arrest for Battery with the offense class of "4," it will default the class to "Z" or unknown. That is because Battery can only be a class "A" offense. This correlation was implemented instead of rejecting the arrest submission. Once we can auto-generate error reports to Livescan agencies, we will consider removing this correlation for Livescan agencies. As more agencies utilize Livescan devices, the Statute Citation field should contain less discrepancies because this field on the Livescan devices has a drop down box that contains all available statute citations. The edit routine that caused the truncating of names and/or dates of birth had been corrected.

Timeliness Findings

- With the increased use of electronic technologies, the volume of mailed (paper) CHRI submissions to ISP was substantially lower in 2001 than in 1994, most notably for custodial and arrest submissions.
- The timeliness of mailed submissions by local agencies in 2001 was observed to be at about the same level as in 1994, with only custodial submissions approaching close to the time frames set by Illinois statutes. Less than half of mailed arrest, state's attorney, or court submissions were received by ISP within the mandated time frames. It should be noted that mailed submissions have significantly declined due to the implementation of electronic reporting.
- Close to three-quarters of all mailed arrest submissions were *posted* to CCH within the 90 day timeframe required by BJA standards, an improvement over the compliance rate observed in the 1995 audit. Forty-one percent of mailed state's attorney submissions and 10 percent of mailed court submissions were found posted to CCH at 90 days after receipt from the local agency. On the other hand, 87 percent of county jail custodial receipts were posted to CCH within 90 days.

Recommendation

Local reporting agencies need regular training on mandated CHRI reporting procedures. The Illinois State Police should re-focus energy into improving their program of field training and incorporate a quality check procedure, such as a

performance audit, on local agency submissions. These activities should reflect technological advances, including electronically integrated reporting, and should enhance efforts toward uniform reporting across disparate local agency reporting policies and procedures.

ISP Response: We concur. ISP is in the process of focusing more attention on CHRI user training and CHRI audits. We are also focusing more energy into electronic reporting by agencies. Although this audit focuses on paper submissions, our timeliness for electronic submissions has improved dramatically and most users are now submitting electronically.

Completeness Findings

- The completeness of records on CCH, defined as having all expected information on the arrest, court and custodial disposition improved substantially since the 1995 audit. Overall, 84 percent of cases had state's attorney decisions, 74 percent had court dispositions, and 97 percent had expected custodial information posted.
- Overall, 59 percent of CCH records audited had complete CHRI information. The absence of state's attorney information, which is required by Illinois statute, lowered the completeness rate. Illinois law provides the opportunity for state's attorney's dispositions to be filed on their behalf by another agency.
- Warrant arrests were observed to have lower rates of court disposition information, as did cases where the state's attorneys' filing decisions were posted automatically with the arrest posting ("direct file").
- If the BJA standard of complete disposition information is used (where state's attorneys' filings are not required), there were little or no difference across Illinois geographic regions in terms of complete disposition information reporting rate (75%) on CCH records.

Recommendation

CCH records with "direct file" state's attorney decisions are less likely to have corresponding court dispositions posted, compared to those records with state's attorney decisions submitted via the state 5-part card. The subsequent state's attorney dispositions are important to the accuracy and completeness of CHRI. The Illinois State Police should determine if they are receiving subsequent state's attorney disposition submissions from "direct file" counties, and whether they are being posted to CCH. The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority CHRI Audit Center and the Illinois State Police should continue to work cooperatively to determine the cause of subsequent state's attorney dispositions not received.

ISP Response: We are investigating the “direct file” issue. Regarding warrants, we concur. We also concur with the Authority’s reasoning for this occurrence. The Authority stated that many of these warrant arrest could be for “out of county” or “out of state charges” where we would not expect to see further action regarding the warrant arrest. In addition, if the agency submitted a warrant arrest where an original arrest card was filed, subsequent actions would attach to the original arrest and not to the warrant arrest. We ask agencies not to submit arrest cards for warrant arrests where an original arrest card was processed. If they do send them to us, however, we do post them to the record.

Conviction Status Indicator Findings

- All CHRI records have an assigned conviction status indicator or “flag” assigned. The indicators include categories of “Felony Conviction,” “Misdemeanor Conviction,” “No Conviction,” or “Pending or Unknown.”
- The number of rapsheets “flagged” as Felony Conviction records has increased to 68 percent, compared to the initial 25 percent when the Conviction Status data element was first introduced on CCH rapsheets.
- The conviction indicator for misdemeanors appears to be lost when a “pending” or incomplete felony disposition is added to the rapsheet.
- There is no way currently for CCH record users to know whether out-of-state convictions were used to determine the individual’s conviction status, since the “out-of-state” indicator is an internal CCH data element only.

Recommendation

The Conviction Status Indicator is an effective marker for determining repeat offenders when correctly applied. Because the indicator is based in part on non-Illinois offenses the user should be made aware when the status indicator represents information from other states.

ISP Response: We concur. Regarding the conviction indicator for misdemeanors, the current response is intentional. When a new arrest is posted to the rap sheet, the conviction indicator changes to “pending” to advise our users that there is an arrest that is pending a court disposition. Regarding out of state convictions, it is not our intent to show users out of state information. In most cases, federal policies prohibit ISP from disseminating out of state information to our non-criminal justice users.

ISP Response to Findings:

Finding #1: *The percentage of cases not found on CCH has improved since the previous audit, from 17% to 8%. Close to forty percent of these “missing” cases were warrant arrests, which have more complex CCH submission criteria than original arrest cases.*

ISP Response: We concur. We are pleased but not satisfied with the improvement in the reporting of cases. We will examine the current procedures for submitting warrant arrests in hopes of improving the process.

Finding #2: *Overall, 68 percent of all state 5-part arrest cards examined were filled out completely by local agencies. This is an improvement over the previous audit. The one variable that continued a high rate of incomplete data on the state 5-part card was class of offense (33%).*

ISP Response: We concur.

Finding #3: *It would appear that the ISP has corrected a flaw in CCH data entry procedures resulted in alias names and dates of birth being entered on the arrest segment, rather than the name given at the time of arrest. This error occurred in both mailed and livescan submissions prior to 1998.*

ISP Response: We concur. This was a programming problem and was corrected as a Day 1 approach. Unfortunately, there is no way to identify which historic records would require correction.

Finding #4: *It was found that alias dates of birth, when present on the state 5-part card, were being recorded on CCH instead of the date of birth reported at arrest. In some cases, the CCH entry would contain an inconsistent mix of alias and reported date of birth information.*

ISP Response: We concur. This was a programming problem and was corrected as a Day 1 approach. Unfortunately, there is no way to identify which historic records would require correction.

Finding # 5: *No discrepancy was found on the statute citation data element for 87 percent of the cases audited. However, the rate of inaccurate statutes citations (6%) found in this audit was much higher than in the previous audit (2%). Two-thirds of inaccuracies could be traced to invalid citations submitted by local agencies, although the remaining inaccuracies appear to be the result of CCH edit routines for statutes with decimal points, which incorrectly truncate those citations. The result may be an arrest charge recorded on CCH that was not the intent of the arresting agency.*

ISP Response: We will further investigate this issue.

Finding #6: Overall, this audit found higher rates of discrepancies on each variable included in this category (name, date of birth, statute citation) than the previous audit. It would appear that CCH data processing has contributed to this higher discrepancy rate.

ISP Response: We will further investigate this issue. The data conversion when upgrading to AMS-CHRI could have contributed to this higher rate.

Finding #7: For three of the four data elements included in this category (race, sex, date of arrest), the state 5-part card and corresponding CCH entry matched exactly. This is the same high level of accuracy found in the 1995 audit.

ISP Response: We concur.

Finding #8: The most problematic data element audited was the class of offense. The rate of discrepancy (15%) was approximately twice as high as any other data element included in the accuracy audit, and almost four times as high as the rate found in the 1995 audit. It would appear that automated charge tables used in CCH processing are substituting generic offense class values for the ones actually recorded in the state 5-part cards.

ISP Response: We will further investigate this issue. Our response to the “Accuracy” finding listed on page 2 provides an explanation for this issue.

Finding #9A: Overall, 73 percent of the records in the accuracy audit had matching information on all audited elements between the state 5-part card and the corresponding CCH record. Within regions, the proportions of discrepant cases were generally less than expected (by about 10 percent). On the other hand, when just the discrepant cases are considered, the regions do not remain represented in the same proportion as their audited records counterpart. This would suggest differences in local reporting practices.

ISP Response: We concur. We expect this rate to improve as more agencies report electronically and the ISP field staff conducts CHRI audits on agencies.

Finding # 9B: The results of the timeliness audit for mailed submissions to ISP showed little change from the results obtained in the 1995 audit. Custodial submissions continued to be those most compliant with statutorily mandated submission timeframes (79% submitted within 30 days from local jail facilities), with less than half of mailed arrests, state’s attorney decisions or court dispositions arriving at ISP within the required timeframes. However, with the implementation of electronic reporting technologies, mailed submissions now account for less than twenty percent of all submissions received by ISP.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. Despite the efforts of BOI as well as the agencies involved, we have not been able to improve the timeliness of paper submissions. Therefore, we have focused attention on receiving submissions electronically.

Finding # 10: While the timeliness of ISP posting of criminal history record information has improved in every area since the last timeliness audit (1994), the posting of mailed court submissions continues to be problematic. Without timely final disposition information, the usefulness of the criminal history record information is severely diminished.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. Despite the efforts of BOI as well as the agencies involved, we have not been able to improve the timeliness of paper submissions. Therefore, we have focused attention on receiving submissions electronically. We have also developed a proposal called eAFIS that would not only improve the timeliness of disposition reporting, but would also improve the accuracy of the submission by ensuring positive identification through fingerprints attached to court dispositions.

Finding # 11: Overall, 84 percent of cases were found to have a State's Attorney disposition posted on CCH. Most of those (71%) were filing decisions posted automatically via practice of "direct filing" (an agreement between ISP and certain State's Attorney's Offices that an arrest event posted on CCH will automatically trigger an additional posting of the State's Attorney's filing decision). These automatic postings increase the proportion of state's attorney segments posted on CCH, although they add no additional charge information beyond what was submitted at arrest.

ISP Response: We concur that this occurs but do not see any issues with this procedure. If the state's attorney adds charges or decided not to file charges, we update the records after they notify us.

Finding # 12: State's Attorney declinations and charge modification decisions were only found for cases from counties where the "Direct File" option is not used. The "Direct Filing" practice may result in expectations of further court information for cases where charges were actually not filed.

ISP Response: We are investigating this issue further. If a State's Attorney chooses not to file charges, adds charges, or modifies the charges, BOI does enter this decision. Direct file counties rarely decline, add, or modify charges so this type of situation may not have presented itself in the random samples used by the Authority in their audit.

Finding # 13: Approximately 15 percent of cases in the Completeness audit were warrant arrest cases. These cases were not as complete (72%) with respect to state's attorney information compared to the total sample (84%), and accounted for proportionately more cases without state's attorney information than would be expected based on their representation in the total sample.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. We also concur with the Authority's reasoning for this occurrence. The Authority stated that many of these warrant arrest could be for "out of county" or "out of state charges."

Finding# 14: Overall, court dispositions were found on CCH in 74% of cases where a court disposition was expected. This is the highest rate of court disposition postings found in any previous ICJIA audit.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. ISP and our stakeholders have invested significant time, effort, and resources to improve disposition posting rates throughout the state.

Finding # 15: Every geographic region outside of Cook County showed even higher rates of court disposition found on CCH than the overall average, as high as 82 percent for the rural regions.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. A check of our database for submissions over the last 5 years would reveal posting rates in the 90 percentile for Cook County. This improvement is due to many programmatic changes to our system coupled with the retrieval of missing Cook County dispositions for arrests over the last 5 years. We will be making similar improvements in other counties with our objective being to post 95 percent of dispositions for all reportable offenses over the last 5 years statewide.

Finding# 16: Warrant arrests were less likely to have court dispositions posted (63%), compared to the overall Completeness sample (74%). Further, warrant arrests with "direct file" state's attorney dispositions were less likely (43%) to have corresponding court dispositions found on CCH, compared to those with those with state's attorney segments filed via the state 5-part card.

ISP Response: We will be investigating this issue further.

Finding# 17A: Cases with "direct file" state's attorney decisions were less likely to have corresponding court dispositions found on CCH (67%), compared to those with state's attorney decisions filed via state 5-part cards (an average of 82%).

ISP Response: We will be investigating this issue further. The posting of a court disposition and the posting of a State's Attorney decision are not dependant upon one another.

Finding # 17B: Almost every (97%) incarceration sentence case where custodial information was expected was found to have some sort of custodial information posted to the CCH record. The majority of those cases (76%) reflected a custodial receipt.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding.

Finding# 18: It was found that close to one-quarter (22%) of the custodial segments posted on CCH were appended to cases with missing court dispositions. However, the custodial fingerprint card is not designed to capture court information (other than court case number) and thus cannot, by itself, inform the CCH user about the court disposition.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. This was true for the time period of the audit. Since 1999, custodial receipt fingerprint cards does contain data fields to capture charge and sentence information.

Finding# 19: According to BJA criteria, 70 percent of the Completeness Audit cases were found to include every expected segment on CCH, while according to the more stringent requirements based on Illinois Statutes, 59 percent of the same cases would be considered "Complete on CCH". The difference between the two criteria lies in the degree to which state's attorney information is required.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. We will work with state's attorneys in order to improve in this area.

Finding #: 20 The proportion of offenders in the CCH database "flagged" as felons has increased by over 40 percent since the project's inception in the mid-1990's, while the proportion of records "flagged" as "pending or unknown" has dropped by 30 percent.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. Our ongoing dispositions acquisition efforts for felonies should have an impact on the increase in this felony flag indicator.

Finding # 21: While all Illinois rapsheets now have a Conviction Status indicator, in response to BJA standards that 90 percent of felony offenders should be identified or "flagged", at least 20 percent of audited records were assigned inconclusive conviction status ("pending or unknown"). When re-examined a year later, a majority (77%) of those cases still had inconclusive conviction status.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. As the Authority points out, our records originally showed us at 80 percent and subsequently showed us at 85 percent in this category.

Finding# 22: When the cases designated as Misdemeanor Conviction Status in 2001 were followed-up in 2002, the majority (87%) has not changed conviction designation. However, 10 percent of the cases were found to be "flagged" as "pending or unknown". This loss of conviction information could be due to new (Illinois) CCH activity, which might reflect missing class of offense information on court dispositions, or some other condition set in the ISP algorithm used to create the Conviction Status Indicator.

ISP Response: We concur with this finding. However, the conviction information was not lost. We feel that it is important to advise our users that new arrest information is present on the rapsheet even though we have not received the court disposition. We do so by changing the flag to pending.