# VALUE OF CORRECTIONS INFORMATION: BENEFITS TO JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY

*IJIS Institute*

**Corrections Advisory Committee**

March 2016

*Principal Contributors*
Leisa Rackelmann, Unisys
Fred Roesel, Marquis Software
Kathy Gattin, IJIS Institute
Robert May, IJIS Institute
Ashwini Jarral, IJIS Institute

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# CONTENTS

# TABLE OF FIGURES

## INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this white paper is to provide a better understanding of the corrections domain, the value of information captured in corrections, and how this information may be leveraged by the larger criminal justice system to support various agencies and the people they serve.

There has been considerable discussion about the need for improving the way information is gathered and shared in criminal justice. There are several dynamics pushing for greater improvements. These dynamics include an emphasis on results, the need for improved efficiency in the use of correctional expenditures, opportunities created by legislative reforms like the Affordable Care Act (ACA), and the consequence of barriers identified by justice practitioners.

In 2008, the Association of State Correctional Administrators (ASCA) created focus groups of corrections and law enforcement agencies in 48 states. Focus group discussions revealed the most frequently noted barriers to collaboration:

❖ Inability to easily share information electronically.
❖ Lack of adequate funding to support effective information sharing operations.
❖ Lack of trust between agencies.
❖ Agency-specific, non-interoperable, and non-accessible databases and information systems that hamper effective intelligence sharing across systems.
❖ Lack of awareness of the wealth and value of information that each agency possessed.
❖ Lack of understanding about what resources and technologies are available.
❖ Lack of leadership and coordination to expedite information sharing among agencies.
❖ Lack of quality and/or currency of information contained in databases.
❖ Lack of feedback and follow-through by partnering agencies.
❖ A cacophony of competing databases, confusing acronyms, conflicting and overlapping federal initiatives, and the development of new tools and technologies rapidly replacing old ones.

> According to a report by The Pew Center for the States, *One in 31, the Long Reach of American Corrections*:
> – The American corrections system includes more than 7.3 million people, or 1 in every 31 U.S. adults…25 years ago the rate was 1 in 77.
> – Overall, two-thirds of offenders are in the community, not behind bars…1 in 45 adults is on probation or parole and 1 in 100 is in prison or jail.

This white paper addresses many of these barriers and the opportunities presented by greater accountability and reform to drive value from the use of corrections information, including the following:

❖ Reasons to share corrections information. (Why)
❖ Stakeholders and individuals that will benefit from corrections information. (Who)

❖ Major events that trigger information exchanges. (When)
❖ Specific elements that are often requested for information sharing. (What)
❖ Attention to how information can be shared, identifying both major corrections information sources and national initiatives supporting further exchange of information. (How)

For the purposes of this paper, *the criminal justice system* is defined as: all activities and agencies—state or local, public, or private—involved in crime prevention, enforcement, prosecution, and defense. This would include obvious stakeholders like jails, prisons, probation agencies, and law enforcement agencies, but also extends to stakeholders like courts, crime victims, and can include the medical and mental health agencies responsible for the disposition or treatment of justice-involved individuals.

## WHY SHARE CORRECTIONS INFORMATION?

Corrections activities are carried out through decisions made in a series of stages in the criminal justice system. Correctional services are provided as part of a systemic approach wherein agencies interact with an individual as they move through the criminal justice system. Each of these agencies collect information about justice involved individuals that should be shared in order to support their supervision.

Figure 1 provides an illustration of the stages in the criminal justice system using the primary decisions that influence process flows and outcomes. These stages include entry into the system (arrest), pretrial detention, prosecution, sentencing, sentence modification, and reentry. This white paper will explore the value of sharing corrections data throughout the criminal justice system life cycle.



Arrest → Pretrial Detention → - Prosecution - Adjudication - Sentencing → - Custody - Non-Custody → Re-entry

**FIGURE 1: CORRECTIONS INFORMATION STAKEHOLDERS**

Many people involved in the criminal justice system cycle in and out of these justice agencies throughout their lives. These agencies would benefit from sharing the information they collect in carrying out their individual and collective roles.

Correctional records represent the most extensive and complete data on justice involved-individuals. Correctional agencies collect a considerable amount of information about these individuals and their activities and associations, often through years of multiple intakes and

releases back to the community. If this information is shared, then corrections information can enhance decision making across the criminal justice system and ensure safety for justice and public safety professionals. Better coordination and collaboration facilitate broader information sharing, help reduce crime, and deliver cost savings.

According to National Institute of Justice statistics in 2014:
- Within three years of release, about two-thirds (67.8 percent) of released prisoners were rearrested…within five years of release, about three-quarters (76.6 percent) of released prisoners were rearrested.
- Of those prisoners who were rearrested, more than half (56.7 percent) were arrested by the end of the first year.

Institutional and community corrections agencies are often distinct organizations with unique cultures. These agencies generally use their own data systems and may or may not share data with outside justice or community-based organizations. This is despite the fact that corrections agencies develop a repository of valuable information, compiled over long periods of time, on justice-involved individuals. There is tremendous value in making this information available to other justice agencies in a secure manner and at the appropriate time.

Records maintained by correctional agencies include, but are not limited to: risk and needs assessments, behavior, education and treatment programs, employment history, gang associations, health information, job skills, relationship information, special needs, transition plans, and treatment history. This information provides the foundation for improved analysis and more effective decision making on individual cases. These include improved assessments, reentry planning, targeted interventions, gang information sharing, improved safety of justice involved individuals, corrections staff and the public, and more effective management and intervention programs for persons under custodial and community supervision.

Access to complete and accurate information about the individual is critical to the corrections process. This information could include information relevant to:

**VALUE OF CORRECTIONS DATA: DIVERSION**

Upon arrest and verification of identify, an individual with a history of mental health issues may be diverted to a mental health facility instead of being taken to a detention center.

❖ The mental health condition of the individual, particularly one who is potentially suicidal;
❖ The level of danger or threat the individual poses to him/herself or others;
❖ The individual's affiliations (prosocial and criminogenic) at the correctional facility; and
❖ Special circumstances relating to the individual (e.g., the individual is a sex offender).

Likewise, to be effective in the lawful surveillance and subsequent investigation of offenders about to be released to the community, law enforcement, probation, and parole officials would benefit from having access to information that corrections staff routinely collect and analyze. Since incarcerated offenders are residents for extended periods of time, their behavior and associations can be examined in great detail. For example, the prison groups with whom inmates associate are generally monitored and their activities

documented by corrections officials. This data may inform release risk management decisions and supervision strategies in the community.

Unfortunately, corrections information has not been customarily shared with law enforcement, courts, and treatment and community service providers. This failure is due to a variety of factors including disparate offender management (OMS)/jail management systems (JMS)/case management systems (CMS), distrust/poor relations between agencies, closed-off agency cultures, and differences in philosophy (i.e., mission, vision).

With recidivism rates in excess of 40 percent,[1] there is a significant need to develop strategies for enhanced information collection and sharing between corrections and other justice and public safety partners. Clearly, the operations of corrections and law enforcement agencies, as well as other criminal justice and social service agencies, will greatly benefit from the expeditious and appropriate exchange of information.

## WHO BENEFITS FROM CORRECTIONS INFORMATION EXCHANGES?

As described earlier, information gathered and maintained by correctional agencies can be beneficial to multiple stakeholders, depending on their role within the criminal justice system. It is important to recognize the need to provide the right information to the right individuals at the right time, following appropriate agreements and privacy guidelines.

Figure 2 illustrates the main stakeholders (law enforcement, service providers, victim and family services, and the courts) with which corrections may share information. The figure also illustrates the types of information exchanges that are required by these groups.

**Victim and Family Services**
- Release
- Scheduling

**Law Enforcement**
- Release
- Booking
- Intelligence
- Security and Transportation
- Warrants and Detainers

**Corrections**

**Service Providers**
- Health Records
- Inmate Records
- Release Information
- Treatment and Assessments

**Courts**
- Offender
- Sentencing
- Investigation
- Scheduling
- Warrants and Detainers

**FIGURE 2: STAKEHOLDERS**

---

[1] Pew Center on the States, *State of Recidivism: The Revolving Door of America's Prisons* (Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts, April 2011). For additional information, visit: http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org.

Stakeholders can also be classified in three categories based on their roles: internal participants, trusted partners, and external participants.

## Internal Participants

Corrections participants are typically characterized by being internal to an agency. Although not all participants are full-time employees, for the purposes of this paper, they are individuals with authorized access to JMS, CMS or OMS case management and other information systems required to complete the core mission of the corrections agency. As such, information access and exchange are typically permitted through internal policy and job classification.

In corrections, internal participants include people with the following roles:

**INTERNAL PARTICIPANTS**

- Classification
- Internal Affairs
- Teachers
- Facility Management
- Support Staff

- Counseling
- Security
- Pretrial/Probation/Parole
- Investigations
- Probation/Parole Management

- Case Management
- Medical/Mental Health
- Intake/Records
- Transportation
- Inmate Banking and Account Managers

## Trusted Partners

In the majority of cases, a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or similar legal document is created between agencies to identify the legal boundaries and limitations associated with the exchange of information. Some agreements are easier to form than others, and many are based on formal legislative exchange requirements or policy. Regardless of the type of agreement or the legal framework on which the agreement is based, all relationships are founded on trust and require a strict privacy, policy and audit compliance. Examples of trusted partners in corrections include the following:

**TRUSTED PARTNERS**

- Court Administration – schedulers, clerks, and registrars
- Criminal Justice Agencies – prosecution, criminal justice planning, pretrial services
- Customs and Immigration
- Judiciary – judges, court administration
- Law Enforcement – sworn officers, administrators, analysts, homeland security, FBI

- Local Corrections and Jail Facilities

- Public Safety Programs – victim services, protection registries, sex offender registries
- Parole Board
- Probation, Parole, and Community Services
- Sheriff – transportation, protective services, custody, law enforcement, warrant services

## External Participants

These stakeholders include community-based organizations and social services providers that are often tasked with providing the discharged offenders, probationers, and parolees re-integrative services necessary for criminal desistance. Typically, corrections agencies are required to authenticate and validate access requests on a case-by-case basis. Identity assurance is critical within this group to ensure that only pertinent information is shared with the appropriate party.

Examples of external participants in corrections include the following:

**EXTERNAL PARTNERS**

- Approved Contacts
- Community Supervision Clients
- Custody Supervision Clients Detainee
- Sentenced
- Defense Counsel
- External Service Providers
  - Behavioral Health Providers
  - Day Reporting Centers
  - Education Providers
  - Halfway Houses
  - Hospital/Medical Care
  - Housing Providers
  - Private Custodial
- Family Members
- Former Corrections Clients
- Media/General Public
- Defendants
- Other Government Service Providers
  - Driver Service
  - Education
  - General Health Services
  - Social Services
  - Veterans Affairs
  - Youth and Family Services

## WHAT TYPES OF CORRECTIONS INFORMATION NEEDS TO BE SHARED?

Corrections is often compared to a small town, since it is a microcosm of the free world. Everything required for someone to function in the free world is accessible within the corrections environment. Institutions and community corrections supervise and provide basic needs such as food, shelter, and safety in addition to education, health care, and work opportunities. Corrections staff have information about an individual's behavior, health services, education, treatment services, employment and work programs, telephone communications, associations, movements and transportation, banking, purchases, and visitations. Information associated with all these business services is captured and maintained within corrections information systems.

- ❖ Jail and institutional corrections staff have demographic and personal information about inmates, and corrections intelligence officers collect and analyze information relating to gang activity, security threat groups, and terrorism and radicalization efforts of inmates.

- ❖ Community corrections officials have information about friends, relatives, and associates of probationers and parolees on their caseloads. They also have electronic monitoring/tracking data; and information about employment, residences, and hangouts.

These officials often have the ability to search the premises and access to their computers without warrants.

Many systems are capable of being cross-referenced to produce important information and relationships between the community and those held in confinement.

Although not comprehensive the list of common information requests below draws on a range of industry expertise to highlight some of the key value components that could be available through investing in reusable information exchanges for corrections.

Types of information exchanges could include the following:

## INFORMATION EXCHANGES

- Alerts (active warrants, protective orders, multi-state offender status, extraditable out-of-state warrants, registered sex offender status, cautions, incarceration status, victim involvement)
- Aliases
- Contacts
- Court Case Information
- Custody Judgement and Sentence Information (including supervision warrant and other document information)
- Detailed Criminal History
- Health Assessment Information
- Intake Information
- License Information
- Mental Health Information
- Most Recent Risk and Needs Assessments
- Visitation Information

- Multiple Identifiers (FBI #, state ID #, SSN, driver's license #, offender #, probation and parole offender #)
- Offender Demographics
- Photos (current and historical)
- Probation and Parole Information (including probation agreement, pre-sentence reports, cause agreements, supervision orders, conditions, and other document information)
- Prosecution Information
- Related Event Information – Arrest, Booking
- Relatives and Associates
- Substance Abuse Information
- Vehicle Information
- Victim and No-contact Information
- Video
- Financial Transactions

While accessing information exchanges provides a wealth of valuable information, alerts/notifications can eliminate the need to search for information, enabling key events to be sent to appropriate agency partners as changes in offender information in corrections systems occur. Types of notifications may include the following:

---

**TYPES OF NOTIFICATIONS**

- Booking
- Incident/Arrest Report
- Warrants
- Parole and Clemency Hearings/Decision
- Changes in Cell Assignment/Location in Facility
- Protective, Restraining, and Other No-contact Orders

- Sanctions and Conditions of Relase
- Transfers (between facilities and interstate)
- Treatment Report Reminder
- Victim Notification
- Release from Jail/Prison (including furloughs, work release, escape, death)

## Exchanges between Justice and Community/Behavioral Health

There are 11.6 million jail encounters in the US each year. The criminal justice system has an obligation to provide medical care, substance abuse treatment, and mental health services to individuals during incarceration and while on supervision in the community. Successful reentry from jails and prisons requires continuity of care. Information about an individual's treatment history while incarcerated is needed by community service providers in order to treat the underlying causes of criminal behavior and to avoid delays in treatment and duplicative assessments and services.

A disconnect exists between the medical treatment provided in correctional settings and medical treatment received after transition to community care, making successful reentry of offenders into the community more difficult. Automating a corrections health and behavioral health treatment history exchange between justice, health, and correctional providers is vital to a seamless transition of care. Exchanging health and behavioral health information will improve offenders' health and reduce recidivism and associated negative impacts in communities by enhancing discharge planning, improving the efficacy of community care, and ensuring continuity of care.

## CHALLENGES TO INFORMATION SHARING

The 2014 report to Congress by the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) notes the following:

> *"The Federal Government lacks a standardized approach to control access to and discovery of sensitive information on computer networks and to include common processes to ensure compliance with legal, regulatory, and mission-area policies. Consequently, users cannot consistently obtain reliable, timely, and repeatable discovery of and access to terrorism-related and homeland security information. This includes both human-initiated and machine-speed sharing and data analytics. In addition, some departments and agencies maintain proprietary information systems that support the individual agency's needs but present a barrier to sharing relevant information with other government agencies and external partners and stakeholders."[2]*

---

[2] https://www.ise.gov/sites/default/files/2014_ISE_Annual_Report_to_Congress_0.pdf

While this statement is focused on the Federal government, similar challenges exist today and will likely continue to exist without a standard approach to exchanging information between neighboring states, within states, between local law enforcement agencies, and county-to-county/county-to-city law enforcement, corrections, justice, and public safety agencies.

State and regional fusion centers continue to be key information sharing and collaboration points between federal, state, and local government agencies, yet there are challenges, as noted by ISE, in terms of secure access to, discovery, and sharing of relevant information between Federal correctional and justice systems, state and local government agencies and stakeholders. These challenges will require attention for various stakeholders and partners to realize the value of corrections information.

Information sharing between neighboring states, state and local agencies, and local agencies (county to county/county to city) has additional challenges. These are a result of:

| VALUE OF CORRECTIONS DATA: |
| --- |
| **INVESTIGATION** |

A detective has been assigned to investigate a recent series of armed robberies. The detective has a description of the suspect and a log-quality video. He is able to access data in the county's Jail Management System and identify the offenders matching the description who have been released into the neighborhood in the last 30 days. This allows the detective to quickly create a short list of potential suspects.

❖ The large number of corrections, public safety, and justice system developed networks in house and/or purchased from vendors. It is common to have different vendors for corrections, justice, and public safety networks within a single county, cities within a county, adjacent counties, and state agencies.

❖ The lack of adoption/adherence to emerging data standards, such as the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM). Various subdomains for NIEM data models are nearing completion. Once finalized, more agencies may move forward with requiring vendors to adopt the NIEM standard.

❖ The lack of electronic systems. Currently many justice and probation networks for smaller agencies are paper based. Agencies are moving to electronic systems, for court documents, and case management but many lack the funding for sharing information electronically.

❖ Increased competition for federal grants. The inability to fund key projects at the local level limit an agency's ability to share information. Many legacy systems were not designed with information sharing in mind and require funding to be updated/replaced.

## HOW COULD CORRECTIONS INFORMATION BE EXCHANGED?

Information exchange and interoperability standards and processes can enable corrections to effectively share information and enhance the day-to-day business operations of agencies.

### Enterprise Business Services

Due to the variety of information systems, there are a great number of application services that could be made available in a service-oriented architecture (SOA) framework. This would increase timely access to key information, ensure efficient investment, enable use of enterprise capabilities, reduce/eliminate redundant processes, ease collaboration between partner agencies, maintain high levels of data integrity, and increase an agency's return on investment within the information exchange environments.

Typical corrections enterprise business services include the following:

**ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SERVICES**

- Banking (Trust Accounting)
- Biometric Identification and Fingerprinting
- Booking and Records
- Case Management
- Commissary
- Communications (Inmate Telephone)
- Community Service
- Counseling
- Disciplinary and Hearing Management
- Document Management
- Drug and Alcohol Testing Scheduling
- Education
- Electronic Monitoring
- Fine and Restitution Payment
- Gang and Security Threat Risk Management
- Health Care
- Housing

- Image Management
- Incident Management
- Intensive Supervised Probation
- Investigations
- Kiosks and Self Service
- Presentence Investigations
- Property Management
- Risk Management
- Scheduling (Staff, Transport, Inmate Programs)
- Sentence Management
- Staff Assignments
- Telephone and Correspondence Contacts
- Transportation
- Victim Services
- Visitation
- Work Programs (Pay)

In addition to the above mentioned business services, the custodial agencies typically have a requirement to facilitate, track, and manage electronic services associated with the management of the facilities and programs.

### National Standards

There are a number of national programs aimed at enhancing information sharing and improving interoperability using national standards. The key national programs currently leading the development in best practices, standards, and frameworks should be considered the first option

when building corrections information exchange capabilities. These programs include NIEM, Global Reference Architecture (GRA), and Global Federated Identity and Privilege Management (GFIPM).

### NIEM

NIEM is a partnership of the Department of Justice (DOJ), Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The program is designed to develop, disseminate, and support enterprise-wide information exchange standards and processes that can enable jurisdictions to effectively share critical information in emergency situations as well as support the day-to-day operations of agencies throughout the nation.

NIEM enables information sharing, focusing on information exchanged among organizations as part of their current or intended business practices. The NIEM information exchange development methodology results in a common understanding among participating organizations and data formatted in a semantically consistent manner. NIEM standardizes content (actual data exchange standards), provides tools, and manages processes.

Major NIEM-based Information Exchange Package Documentations (IEPDs) relevant to corrections information exchange include National Data Exchange Program (N-DEx) Incarceration Booking Pardon and Parole (IBPP), Suspicious Activity Reporting (SAR), Reentry, and Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification (SAVIN).[3]

### GRA

The GRA is an information exchange solution designed to cut implementation time and costs for justice agencies through reuse of established promising practices in IT architecture and design.

The GRA addresses various areas in the implementation of information exchange. Together, these areas form critical components of a comprehensive, replicable, and scalable solution to information sharing that balances varied technologies with the following dynamic policy considerations:

- ❖ Policy Guidance
- ❖ Reference Architecture Planning
- ❖ Service Specification Packages
- ❖ Technical Implementation Guidance

### GFIPM

The GFIPM framework provides the justice community and partner organizations with a standards-based approach for implementing security and access control capabilities to restrict access to information to those with a need and legal/statutory right to see it. The concept of globally understood metadata across federation systems is essential to GFIPM interoperability. Just as a common Extensible Markup Language (XML) data model was the key to data

---

[3] IEPDs can be found at the IEPD clearinghouse at http://iepd.custhelp.com/.

interoperability, a standard set of XML elements and attributes about a federation user's identities, privileges, and authentication can be universally communicated.

The GFIPM Metadata specification[4] and framework support the following three major interoperability areas of security in the federation:

1. Identification/Authentication—Who are the end users and how were they authenticated?

2. Privilege management—Which certifications, clearances, job functions, local privileges, and organizational affiliations associated with the end user can serve as the basis for authorization decisions?

3. Audit —What information is needed or required for the purposes of auditing systems, systems access and use, and legal compliance of data practices?

## CONCLUSION

Funding, cultural differences, bureaucracy, and technology continue to be major obstacles to corrections information sharing. Despite these barriers, a concerted effort to create technological capability that enables real-time corrections information to be shared with the broader justice and public safety community holds tremendous potential. Given the constrained fiscal outlook, limited staff resources, and technological advances, the time has come to address these challenges and more efficiently share information and operate by incorporating technology and best practices in information sharing.

The development of national data standards and effective exchange models has been cited as a key element to developing meaningful exchanges. Work has already begun in support of developing standards to enhance the broader justice and public safety exchange environment. There are also lessons that can be learned and existing activities that can be leveraged to assist the broader corrections community to engage and responsibly participate in information collaboration.

Although the authors have not attempted to include an exhaustive list of resources and links the three leading agencies that collaborated on this paper—APPA, ASCA, and the IJIS Institute—have multiple initiatives, activities, and pilot programs currently under way in support of a standards-based approach to responsible collaboration and exchange of corrections information.

Major areas of activity include:

❖ A national victim information exchange program—Statewide Automated Victim Information and Notification (SAVIN),
❖ A national gang information exchange program,
❖ Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) exchanges, and
❖ Offender reintegration information exchange initiative (Re-Entry).

---

[4] The GFIPM Metadata specification is being used in a limited pilot capacity today. Lessons learned and feedback from this pilot program were incorporated into the public release of the GFIPM Metadata specification.

As a result of these pilot programs and related initiatives, a national standard for offender information (i.e., an information definition language) is evolving. Although by no means complete, the information definitions already established cover a significant portion of record types commonly required by corrections agencies and their information exchange partners. These programs are proving to be a valuable foundation for ongoing discussion.

In addition, pilot programs and grant-funded initiatives are currently reviewing policy and privacy issues associated with sharing corrections information within a broader sphere of stakeholders, including health, education, juvenile, and social services.

Regardless of technical proficiency, existing funding, or current understanding and competence regarding information exchange, multiple opportunities exist for individuals, agencies, and industry partners to engage in national discussion regarding the future of corrections information exchange:

❖ Organizations like the IJIS Institute provide training programs covering NIEM implementation.
❖ The IJIS Institute also provides technology assistance (TA) for agencies looking to adopt standards on existing projects and new initiatives.
❖ ASCA and APPA regularly provide training and other education sessions aimed at practitioners and leaders in the field.
❖ ASCA, APPA, and the IJIS Institute currently collaborate on a number of grant-funded pilot initiatives, working directly with agencies across North America.
❖ Lastly, a number of open task forces and working groups exist through the above organizations as opportunities for industry and practitioners to collaborate and share best practices and ideas to enhance and further develop the existing programs.

> Key stakeholders can greatly enhance the value of current and future investments by
>
> ❖ Requiring the use of standards in information exchanges requested in new procurements.
> ❖ Participating in the development of a corrections enterprise architecture blueprint that will provide effective practices and a common approach.
> ❖ Embracing and building upon nationally-developed privacy and legislative guidelines and templates to address legal concerns regarding the distribution of certain information beyond the purposes for which it was originally captured.

It is critical for correctional leaders to create a consensus-based information sharing environment built on the principle of providing value for all stakeholders. Through consensus and collaboration, it is possible to develop national standards and effective practices that can be locally implemented for the benefit of individual participants in the integrated, collaborative justice and public safety environment.

## ABOUT THE IJIS INSTITUTE

The IJIS Institute unites the private and public sectors to improve mission-critical information sharing and safeguarding for those who protect and serve our communities. The IJIS Institute provides training, technical assistance, national scope issue management, and program management services to help government fully realize the power of information sharing.

Founded in 2001 as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation with national headquarters on The George Washington University Virginia Science and Technology Campus in Ashburn, Virginia, the IJIS Institute has grown to more than 300 member companies and individual associates from government, nonprofit, and educational institutions from across the United States.

The IJIS Institute thanks the Corrections Advisory Committee for their work on this document.

The IJIS Institute also thanks the many companies who have joined as Members that contribute to the work of the Institute and share in the commitment to improving justice, public safety, and homeland security information sharing. For more information on the IJIS Institute:

- ❖ Visit the website at: http://www.ijis.org/,

- ❖ Follow the IJIS Institute on Twitter: @ijisinstitute,

- ❖ Read the IJIS Factor Blog, and

- ❖ Join us on LinkedIn at: Justice and Public Safety Information Sharing.

### About the IJIS Corrections Advisory Committee

The IJIS Institute Corrections Advisory Committee focuses on the advancement of information sharing standards among the institutional and community corrections communities. The current lack of understanding of national information sharing standards is a major obstacle for administrative and IT professionals in this sector.

Through this committee, IJIS Institute Member companies can help to improve the level of understanding of standards and create awareness on the technology challenges impacting all areas of corrections. By offering expertise and advice on innovative standards and technologies, this committee will continue the IJIS Institute mission to unite industry and government in pursuit of national information sharing goals. The work of this committee will provide advisory on issues facing information sharing in corrections as an integral function of the criminal justice information system overall.

The IJIS Corrections Advisory Committee would like to thank the contributors to the *Value of Corrections Information White Paper* 1st Edition: Stephanie Cassavaugh-IJIS Institute, Brian Day-Syscon Justice Systems, Kathy Gattin-IJIS Institute, Ashwini Jarral-IJIS Institute,

Christopher Litton-Sierra Systems, Mary Marcial-Association of State Correctional Administrators (ASCA), Adam Matz-American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), Robert May-IJIS Institute, Leisa Rackelmann-Unisys, and Fred Roesel-Marquis Software.

## APPENDIX A – DEMONSTRATED VALUE – USE CASES

### Gang Information

Information about an incarcerated individual's current and former gang affiliation is especially useful to corrections intelligence operations. Having access to this information allows the corrections gang intelligence unit to plan on how this inmate is going to be appropriately monitored and to coordinate with community corrections and law enforcement units when the individual's release is planned or imminent. With this information, corrections gang intelligence and classifications units can review whom they already have in residence associated with gangs of interest and determine if the new person's arrival will create an issue within the gang hierarchy. Knowledge of what rival gangs are already represented in the corrections facility will give corrections officials the opportunity to anticipate and prepare for any issues or conflicts between the two gangs. If the newly committed inmate is already known to the DOC as a gang member, then they will be able to have the gang file sent to the receiving facility to be utilized in classification and programming decisions. If a gang-affiliated person is new to the corrections agency, then a file can be opened and appropriate steps initiated.

Because gang activity on the streets affects what is going on inside a facility, and prison gang activity relates to what is going on in the streets, constant communication between all components of the criminal justice system is critical to everyone's safety and wellbeing. It would be very useful if the courts and police agencies would inform corrections where a person about to be detained or incarcerated was living, with whom they associated, who was with them in court and whether there is any negative or positive interaction with any other gangs known to the police. Also, correctional staff needs to inform the appropriate police unit when an individual is about to be released from their custody so police officials can take steps in preparation.

Law enforcement officials would find the following information useful in their surveillance and subsequent investigations of released offenders:

- ❖ Where and with whom are released inmates going to be living?
- ❖ What is their criminal justice status (supervision level, restrictions, etc.)?
- ❖ What did they do while incarcerated?
- ❖ With whom did they associate?
- ❖ Who visited them?
- ❖ Who phoned them while in prison?
- ❖ From whom did they receive money or to whom did they transfer money?

### Law Enforcement—Corrections Communications Concerning Non-gang-related Issues

Law enforcement often have prior knowledge of special circumstances and concerns about defendants/offenders being brought to correctional custody. When, for instance, a high-profile citizen, a politician, a celebrity athlete or entertainer is going to be brought to a correctional facility, the introduction of such a defendant or offender might cause significant disruption to the routine of the facility or signal the need special accommodation from the receiving facility for

the safety and well-being of the defendant/offender or those already housed there. Law enforcement will know about these circumstances and can give corrections officials prior notice about them so they will be prepared.

Prior notification is vital to the receiving facility regarding high profile cases. This will allow appropriate staff to be notified and to determine where/how the defendant/offender will be housed and managed. This will also prepare the administration of possible media inquiries. This is also very common with sexual assault and/or child abuse offenders, who may be at risk of harassment and assault in correctional facilities.

Similarly, when a defendant/offender being brought to a correctional facility is undergoing drug withdrawal, is potentially suicidal, is angry or evidently disturbed, or has potential mental health issues, staff at the detention or corrections facility need to be notified immediately so the defendant/offender can be transferred to a facility where their specific issues can be adequately addressed; or, appropriate medical, mental health, protective custody arrangements need to be made for the defendant/offender. If the individual has significant or unusual medical/mental health needs, then prior notification to the receiving facility will benefit the detainee as well as the facility. They will be prepared upon his/her arrival with the appropriate medication, supplies, and housing arrangements already in place.