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The primary purpose of this study is to examine the Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program (MCI) by analyzing its components and assessing to what extent these components were successfully implemented. The MCI concept was to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of criminal investigations. MCI was developed and implemented by the Atlanta Bureau of Police Services (ABPS) and initiated in Zone One of the Bureau.

The stated objectives of the MCI Program were: (1) to train and motivate patrol officers to conduct and document thorough preliminary investigations, thus improving the preliminary reports for the continuing investigations; (2) to develop a case screening method which would identify cases which are most susceptible to solution, thereby allowing efforts to be directed towards cases most likely to be solved; (3) to improve the efficiency of investigations through improved case management; (4) to increase the rate of case acceptance by the prosecutor
and the rate of conviction of prosecuted cases; through more thorough preparation (of cases); and (5) to develop a monitoring system which would allow for evaluation of the criminal investigation process.

The conclusions of this paper have been reached based upon the results of an exploratory inquiry of policies, procedures, reports and performance data relative to the implementation of the MCI program in Zone One of the ABPS. In addition, conclusions were drawn based on the results of attitudinal surveys distributed among MCI participants.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Because of the chance occurrence of crime and the necessity for its immediate investigation, once an offense comes to police notice, no single unit of the force can be charged with every investigation. Many will have a role, but the principal units will be the patrol and investigative elements.

Perhaps the basic idea or objective of criminal investigations is the conviction of the perpetrator of the crime. To achieve the above, investigative duties must be assigned to specific elements in order to fix precisely the responsibility for their performance. The selection of the unit to which each duty will be assigned should be based on three considerations: (1) economy of manpower; (2) the immediate availability of service; and (3) the effectiveness of performance.

When viewed objectively the patrol element is the logical unit to be assigned responsibility for making preliminary investigations of crime, and, for certain classes of crime, complete investigations.¹

The remaining investigative duties or the continuing investigation, which consists of the apprehension of the criminals, the recovery of stolen property, and the preparation

of the cases for presentation in court are clearly the responsibilities of the investigative element.

Consequently, research studies into the criminal investigations process have demonstrated ways in which traditional investigative approaches have fallen short of an optimal use of resources. The findings from the Rand Corporation's Criminal Investigations Study suggest that the role of the patrol officer has been underestimated in the initial investigation; and the value of the detective in follow-up activities overestimated; and the role of both the patrol officer and the investigator can be redefined in a way that can improve the allocation of resources devoted to investigation activities.\(^2\)

In response to these findings, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice (NILE/CJ) began the development of a program for managing criminal investigations aimed at remedying the inefficiencies documented in the studies. The NILE/CJ awarded grants to five police departments to test the MCI process in 1976. In 1979, the Atlanta Department of Public Safety (ADPS) applied for grant funding to test the concept in a large metropolitan police department. In 1980, the ADPS was awarded grant funding to implement the MCI concept. As instituted by the Atlanta Bureau of Police Services (ABPS) the overall goal of MCI as stated in the grant proposal is:

\[\text{Improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of criminal investigations, by}\]

\(^2\)City of Atlanta, Department of Public Safety, Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program Grant Proposal (Atlanta, Georgia: City of Atlanta, March 30, 1979), p. 2.
enhancing the role of patrol officers in preliminary investigations and by improving the management of follow-up investigations.\(^3\)

The primary purpose of this paper is to view the Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program, by analyzing its components and assessing the extent to which these components were successfully implemented. Further, the study will identify problematic areas identified by participants in the project, and as well provide recommendations to respond in these problematic areas.

The Problem and Its Setting

The Atlanta Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program (MCI) was initially funded for the grant periods extending from February 1, 1980 to September 30, 1980 and October 1, 1980 to July 30, 1981 for the amount of $55,906. These funds were allocated on a 90 percent federal, 5 percent state and 5 percent local ratio. An extension of the obligation period for the second period was approved, thus extending it to July 31, 1982.

On November 15, 1980 MCI implemented in Zone One. The personnel involved in the program included: 39 uniform patrol officers, 6 detectives, 5 sergeants, 2 lieutenants and 1 major. The primary purpose of the MCI program was to:

...provide a vehicle designed to enable the Police Bureau (Zone One) to more effectively utilize

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 4
resources available for the investigative function.\textsuperscript{4}

This belief is based on the assumptions that all crimes do not have an equal potential for solution, that many crimes will solve themselves when certain solvability factors are present and that those cases which lack solvability factors should be screened out of the investigative process,\textsuperscript{5} therefore freeing more time for the investigator.

As stated, the overall goal of MCI reflects an attempt to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the management of criminal investigations. From this goal, five operational components are presented:

1. Initial Investigation Component
   The objective is to train and motivate patrol officers to conduct and document thorough preliminary investigations.

2. Case Screening Component
   The objective is to develop a case screening method which will identify cases which are most susceptible to solution.

3. Managing the Continuing Investigation
   The objective is to improve the efficiency of investigations through improved case management.

4. Police/Prosecutor Relationships
   The objective is to increase the rate of case acceptance by the prosecutor and the rate of conviction of prosecuted cases, through more thorough preparation of cases.

\textsuperscript{4}Planning and Research Unit, Atlanta Department of Public Safety, MCI Project Evaluation (Atlanta, Georgia: City of Atlanta, May 1982), p. 2.

\textsuperscript{5}Ibid.
5. Monitoring Component

The objective is to develop a monitoring system which will allow for evaluation of the criminal investigation process.\(^6\)

During the spring of 1982, the writer served as an intern with the City of Atlanta Department of Public Safety for a sixteen week period in the capacity of research assistant. As an intern, the writer was employed in the Planning and Research Unit. Her primary responsibilities were to assist the Grants Manager in monitoring Public Safety grants and further to engage in a process evaluation of the Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine whether to continue the project, expanding it to all police zones or to discontinue the project, all together.

In order to fulfill the responsibilities of the job, it was necessary to review printed materials obtained from various sources, to interview project participants and to analyze quantitative data collected from the MCI project sites for selected periods.

Statement of the Problem

The precise question which this paper addresses is: To what extent does the Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program effect the improvement of criminal investigations in Zone One of the ABPS?

The concern for improving the criminal investigations functions is not a new one, rather many police departments over the past decade have made such attempts. Managing criminal

\(^6\)MCI Grant Proposal, pp. 8-14
investigations as defined in the police environment is the organizing and coordinating of patrol and investigative functions. This concept had not been pursued in the ABPS prior to the implementation of the MCI program. The primary emphasis with the Atlanta MCI program was expanding the role of the patrol officer from that of "report taker" to lead investigator. Prior to MCI, the traditional investigation functions were assigned to the investigators who were to receive the follow-up cases.

Consequently, recent researchers believe that ultimate success of the investigations is enhanced by active patrol participation in preliminary investigations. Further, the value of the patrol officer in the initial investigation can be enriched in a way that will improve the allocation of resources devoted to investigative activities.

Overall, the MCI program was an attempt to improve the effectiveness of the criminal investigations function, however, due to various problems such as lack of training and administrative responsiveness the overall success of the program was hampered.

Methodology

An exploratory method of research was utilized to ascertain the extent to which the Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program impacted upon the improvement of criminal


8 Ibid.
investigations in Zone One of the ABPS. Primarily, an exploratory study is undertaken for three distinct purposes: 1) to satisfy the researchers curiosity and desire for better understanding, 2) to determine the feasibility of undertaking a more careful study, and 3) to develop the methods to be employed in a more careful study. This exploratory research allowed the writer to obtain a comprehensive awareness of the MCI concept and its effects upon the criminal investigation process.

The data gathered was obtained from primary and secondary sources. The primary data was collected from interviews with the administrative sergeant assigned to the MCI program and the ADPS Grants Manager. The interviews were structured consisting of open-ended questions concerning the actual development of MCI and the degree of its progress in Zone One.

In addition to the primary data, secondary data was obtained from written documents, including: books, journals, pamphlets, reports and studies. Further, two attitudinal surveys were conducted by Zone One of the ABPS and members of the Planning and Research Unit. The survey attempted to solicit the opinions, attitudes, perceptions and expectations of MCI participants about the project. Moreover, the surveys served as a mechanism to identify problematic areas as seen by MCI participants.

---

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Nature of Criminal Investigations

Before defining the nature of the investigative function implied by Managing Criminal Investigations (MCI), it is important to fully understand those features of the traditional function to which MCI is responsive. The traditional investigative process consists of four basic stages:

1. Incident Report and Preliminary Investigation,
2. Screening and Case Assignment,
3. Follow-up Investigation, and
4. Clearance and Arrest10

The investigative process is initiated when the patrol officer responds to the scene of a crime. The patrol officer is responsible for assisting the victim and for conducting a preliminary investigation often limited to an effort to determine the facts of the incident and the location of witnesses. He may also be responsible for securing the crime scene and determining if an evidence technician should be called to the scene. As the patrol officer is expected to return to patrol as quickly as possible, the preliminary investigation reporting form generally requires no more than basic information about the crime, the crime scene, the victim, the suspect and any

known witnesses. This information is turned over to the investiga-
tive division where the investigator assigned to the case
commonly retraces the steps taken by the patrol officer.\textsuperscript{11}

Incident reports submitted during the day are generally
distributed to the appropriate investigative unit the next
morning. Case assignments are made on the basis of the units
crime specialty or its geographic responsibility. Once assigned
to a unit, assignments to individual investigators are most
often made according to one of the following methods:

1. assignment to the investigator whose area
   of specialization matches the case;

2. assignment on the basis of current work-
   loads of individual detectives; or

3. assignment of all cases occurring within
   a specific time or geographical location
   to one investigator.\textsuperscript{12}

According to Peter Greenwood, whatever the assignment
policy, its effect is to add, on the average, one or two new
cases per day to the investigators load. But the actual incre-
ments are typically irregular—perhaps six one day, then only
one in the next two days. The assignment rate of serious crimes
will be somewhat less, averaging perhaps two cases to an inves-
tigator per month.\textsuperscript{13}

The screening of cases before assignment to an

\textsuperscript{11}Ibid., p. 12.

\textsuperscript{12}Donald F. Crawley et al., \textit{Managing Criminal Investiga-
tions: Manual} (Washington, D.C.: University Research Corporation,

\textsuperscript{13}Greenwood, \textit{The Criminal Investigation Process}, Vol.
investigator is relatively rare, as some follow-up is expected on all cases. However, in some departments the supervisor may review the case or apply "solvability factors" to determine if the investigator should proceed once the case is assigned. In other departments, case screening occurs.

As a result of individual detective's action on an informal basis, each detective has traditionally taken the cases assigned to him or her and sorted them into two categories: (1) those which are worth pursuing because information and leads are alive and likely to lead to solution, and (2) those which will never be solved on the basis of information available (and on the basis of experience gained in attempting to track down similar cases in the past). 14

Once the investigator receives an assignment, he may compare the case against the files for similar characteristics or modus operandus (M.O.'s). In response to his initial review, the investigator is likely to classify the case into one of three categories. The first, having the most immediate priority, is one where a suspect has been identified, witnesses remain to be interviewed, or there are strong leads (such as a license number) which may allow easy identification of the suspect. The second priority case is one which is serious enough to warrant attention even in the absence of concrete leads. In such cases the investigator may attempt to re-interview the victim, search the scene for evidence or weapons, and try to locate additional witnesses. Even these serious cases are discontinued after a day or two if no obvious leads are developed. 15 The lowest priority case is a


routine incident in which there are no obvious leads. The investigator may recontact the victim or check this case against the files, but usually little action is taken and the investigation is quickly discontinued. Typically, the investigator spends the morning reviewing cases, completing paperwork, processing prisoners and making required court appearances. Activities of the late morning and afternoon are determined largely by the investigator. Most often his time will be spent in interviews or in completing reports. Greenwood and Petersilia note that the investigator:

... conducts, in his own time interviews and checks around the community according to his own sense of priority about each case, the difficulty or attractiveness of conducting the various interviews, transportation difficulties, and fellow investigator's activities.16

In addition, investigators keep few, if any, records of their activities, the results of their interviews, or the specific information and leads gathered in the course of their duties. The investigator "... only records telephone numbers, addresses, nicknames, as necessary, on scraps of paper." Information put into the official case folder is only what is required. Transcript of witness statements are made only in the most important case.17

The investigator's responsibilities following the arrest of a suspect may place considerable demands on his time. Many

(Santa Monica: Rand Corporation, October 1975), p. 6.

16Ibid., p. 7.
17Ibid., p. 9.
departments require the investigator's involvement in case preparation even if the arrest was effected as the result of patrol activity. In other departments, the arresting patrol officer may take major responsibility for supplying the prosecutor with the necessary information. In either case, however, the detective is usually expected to interview the suspect in an attempt to gain information which will clear other crimes. He may also arrange for lineups in cases where the suspect may have been seen by the victim. In general, the detective has little contact with the prosecutor during case preparation. However:

... in many jurisdictions the prosecutor will require the investigator to consult with him about the facts of the case at the time of filing. If he helped solve the case, the investigator will have to be a witness in court.18

The organization of the investigative unit, the role definitions of investigative personnel and the stages of the investigative process represent the basic components of the investigative function. This description of the traditional view of these components should serve as a background against which the innovations comprising MCI can be explored.

The Purpose of Managing Criminal Investigations

The concept of managing criminal investigation is tied directly to the most effective use of the personnel resources available to the Bureau of Police Services. Research indicates that an important way which this can

18Ibid., p. 9.
be done is to improve the criminal investigative function, eliminating duplication of effort and focusing resources on those cases with the highest probability of solution.

According to a study made by the Rand Corporation in 1975:

The single most important determinant of whether or not a case will be solved is the information the victim supplies to the immediately responding patrol officer. If information that uniquely identifies the perpetrator is not presented at the time the crime is reported, the perpetrator by and large, will not be identified.  

Further findings indicate that all criminal cases do not have an equal potential for solution; "that a large number of cases solve themselves" when particular investigative elements (i.e., solvability factors) are present; and that in the absence of these elements certain cases should be screened out of the investigative process.

Since the patrol officer is usually responsible for initiating the investigation when a crime has been committed on his beat, it is believed that his complete participation is a must. Suitable coordination of the patrol and detective divisions multiplies the effective strength of detectives without commensurate loss to the patrol division. Each patrol officer

should serve as the eyes and ears of the detective division and otherwise assist in the investigation of crimes and suspicious persons. 22

Supervising officers should urge the patrol officer to continue his effort to apprehend criminals who have operated on his beat on the ground that the effectiveness of patrol, on a beat as well as throughout the community is measured in part by the crime rate. The detective assigned to a case should discuss it with the patrol officer on whose beat the crime occurred and encourage him to continue his efforts. Clearance and recoveries, which are a measure of detective accomplishment, increase when the detective has patrolman working for him in this manner. The effectiveness of the department in the investigation of crimes is further increased by keeping the patrol force currently informed of the operations. 23

The process of criminal investigations usually involves several phases. First, the preliminary investigation which is handled by the patrol officer. In small departments, the entire investigation will be handled by the patrol force personnel. However, in most larger departments, after the first phase is completed by the uniform personnel, the case is handled by specialists if the case was not successfully completed by the patrol force. The entire procedure should be a systematic,


23Ibid., p. 370.
coordinated effort by all the personnel involved. Traditionally, these efforts have lacked both "systematics" and coordination, thus many phases of criminal investigations have been significantly weakened.  

Because of this weakening, attempts have been made to pursue avenues which would enhance the criminal investigative process. This research attempts to view in general the managing of criminal investigations and in specific, the role of the patrol officer in this process, via preliminary investigations.

The Rand Study and Findings

In 1973, the Rand Corporation was awarded a grant by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to undertake a nationwide study of the criminal investigation practices of major metropolitan police agencies. The primary purposes of the study were to describe how police investigations were organized and managed and to assess the contribution of various investigation activities to overall police effectiveness. The study concentrated on the investigation of Index Offenses—serious crimes against unwilling victims. (Index Offenses include, burglary, robbery, larceny, rape, criminal homicide, aggravated assault and auto theft.) Information on current practices was obtained by a national survey of all municipal or county police agencies that employed more

---

than 150 officers or that served jurisdictions with a 1970 population in excess of 100,000. Interviews and observations were conducted in more than 25 departments selected to represent different investigative styles.25

The findings from the study viewed, one, the investigative efforts and arrest; second, how the investigator's time is spent; third, the collection and processing of physical evidence; and fourth, preparing a case for prosecution.

In reference to the investigative efforts and arrest, the Rand Study showed that approximately 30 percent of all index arrests are produced by patrol officers responding to the scene of the crime. In 50 percent of all index arrests, the identity of the perpetrator was supplied by a victim or witness at the time of the initial crime report--leaving only about 20 percent of all arrests which could possibly be attributed to the efforts of the investigative unit. Through careful study, it was discovered that actually 3 percent of all index arrest appeared to result from special investigation efforts where organization, training or skill could make any conceivable differences.26

Furthermore, in the second finding it was revealed that nearly half of a typical investigator's time is devoted to administrative assignments of general surveillance which are not directly related to the investigator's caseload and are unlikely to produce arrest.27 Subsequent findings indicate

26 Ibid., p. 3.
27 Ibid., p. 4.
that little time or attention was devoted to the investigator's
training or management. Most of the departments did not offer
special training when a patrol officer was promoted to inves-
tigator. "Investigative skills were expected to be acquired
on the job." 28

In the area of collection and processing of physical
evidence, the findings show that in most of the departments
surveyed, use of technicians to collect physical evidence was
made to aid in solving cases. However, the study showed that
these measures have not been extremely productive in solving
cases due to inadequate resources. Further, studies suggest
that it was the judgement of the patrol officer which deter-
mined whether physical evidence should be collected. If the
patrol officer reported that some evidence might be available
at the scene, an evidence technician would be dispatched, when
available, to make a search. 29

In reference to case preparation for prosecution, the
study showed that police investigators were more oriented to-
wards clearing cases, rather than the problems of successful
prosecution following an arrest. According to Brownstein and
Kamrass, in some cases, the prosecutor may accept some marginal
cases that would have been stronger if not for some weaknesses,
such as alienated witnesses or evidence not obtained, that was

28 Ibid.

29 Donald F. Crawley and Jerome H. Miron, Managing Patrol
Operations: Manual (Washington, D.C.: University Research Cor-
attributable to police operations.  

Four major recommendations emerged from the Rand findings:

1. The coordination of post-arrest investigation activities with the prosecutor, by either assigning investigators to his office or by allowing him to exert more guidance over the policies and practices which they follow. This move was expected to result in a higher percentage of prosecutable cases.

2. The patrol officers be given a larger role in conducting preliminary investigations, both to provide an adequate basis for case screening and to eliminate the need for redundant efforts by an investigator. It appears that most cases can be closed on the basis of the preliminary investigation and that patrol officers can be trained to conduct them adequately. This expanded role for patrol officers is also consistent with other moves toward geographic decentralization and patrol officer job enrichment.

3. That additional resources be devoted to processing latent prints and that improved systems be developed for organizing and searching latent print files.

4. In conducting follow-up investigations for those cases which a department elected to pursue, distinction should be made between those cases which involved only special investigation or legal skills. The former could be handled by lower level clerical personnel while the latter could be assigned to a major offense bureau for careful monitoring and continuous evaluation.

**General Components of MCI**

The report from the Rand Study was not taken lightly, rather the findings brought about the publishing of reports

---


of other attempts to improve the managing of criminal investigations. In addition, efforts to demonstrate the practical value of research on investigation practices was pursued by LEAA's National Institute. These efforts involved the awarding of grants to five police departments which had indicated an interest in implementing a number of investigative reforms: Rochester, New York; Montgomery County, Maryland; Birmingham, Alabama; Santa Monica, California; and St. Paul, Minnesota.\textsuperscript{32} The purpose of these experiments was to determine how police departments would go about implementing reforms when they were given the freedom and resources to do so.\textsuperscript{33}

The participating departments were encouraged to concentrate on reforms in the following five areas, which since have come to be considered as primary components of an MCI program. They include:

1. Initial Investigations

Patrol officers were to be given greater responsibility for initial investigations with their attention focused on the presence or absence of specific "solvability factors" which would determine whether a case should be closed.

2. Case Screening

A formal system of case screening was to be developed to select cases which merited continuation, based on the information disclosed by the patrol officers initial investigation.


\textsuperscript{33}Ibid.
3. Managing the Continuing Investigation

Investigation supervisors were to develop techniques for the systematic assignment of cases and periodic review of their progress.

4. Police Prosecutor Relations

The degree of coordination between police investigation and prosecution activities was to be expanded with the objective of increasing the percentage of cases.

5. Investigation Monitoring System

Each department was to develop a statistical reporting system which could be used to evaluate the effectiveness of specific investigative units.

Field Test Experiences

The findings from the field test experiences are based on interviews with the participants and observations by outside observers. These findings include: (1) the departments which substantially expanded the patrol officer's role in conducting initial investigations experienced a significant increase in the time required for these investigations to be conducted, (2) regardless of the criteria which were formally specified for case closure decision, case screening appeared to be highly subjective in most departments, (3) although case screening resulted in substantially lower investigator caseloads, only one department elected to make any substantial reduction in its number of investigators, (4) none of the departments met

with any significant community dissatisfaction as a result of early case closure without investigator follow-up, rather, all of them adopted some form of written notification to inform victims of the status of their case, (5) the two departments which worked with their prosecutors to improve the quality of their cases, and kept records of the results, reported a significant increase in the percentage of cases accepted for prosecution, (6) all of the departments developed a statistical reporting system which was adequate for evaluative purposes, (7) none of the departments reported a significant change in arrest or clearance rates which could be attributed to changes in their investigation practices. Other researchers have suggested a number of innovations which could conceivably improve the performance of investigative units with emphasis on the patrol officer.

The Rochester System

Though not labeled MCI, various police departments in the country have made attempts to find viable means for improving their criminal investigation procedure. One such city was Rochester, New York, which served as a model for Atlanta's experimentation with the MCI concept. In the case of Rochester, as in many urban cities, the chief problems which produced a need for improving the investigative function was: 1) poor management, in general, 2) inefficient use of investigative resources within the investigations division, and 3) lack of

---

coordination between investigative and patrol personnel.

The problems detailed by the Rochester Study included: the investigative units seemed to emphasize fruitless paperwork, such as completing follow-up reports which duplicated patrol work; and frequently conducting investigations that resulted in the reclassification of reported crimes and "unfound" cases.

Another specific problem seemed to stem from the fact that the investigations division was centralized, and that any given detective in any given week was probably working on crimes far removed geographically from the crimes of the previous week. Because of this, many detectives lacked knowledge of localized crime patterns that were useful in solving crimes.

In reference to investigative and patrol personnel relationships, the two parties tended to have no involvement and thus disregarded one another. Patrol officers often sensed that their preliminary investigative efforts were more or less ignored by the investigative personnel assigned the case; there was little motivation for them to take a case seriously, since investigative personnel would start their investigation all over again from the beginning. And even when patrol officers did conduct valuable investigations they rarely received any appreciation for their work. It was suggested that apart from the historical fact that investigative personnel have customarily had higher status than patrol officers, the institutional arrangement of centralized investigations division encourage the detective's feeling of separatedness from patrol officers
and vice versa.\textsuperscript{36}

In 1971, the Rochester police department, in response to the above problems planned an experimental project of team policing or as they called it Coordinated Team Patrol (CTP). The chief goal was to determine whether the CTP system could improve the department's investigative and apprehension operations.\textsuperscript{37}

The first move with the project was to make sections of the detective units responsible for definite geographical areas. This change was intended to give investigative personnel a better understanding of crime patterns with those geographical areas and incidentally, to reduce the number of patrol officers whose preliminary investigations would be followed up by each section.

The department initiated its pilot team project in two areas of the city selected for this decentralized form of policing which was to be carried out by permanent teams composed of both patrol officers and investigative personnel working together day by day. Two team commanders were selected to lead the team. These commanders were expected to function largely on their own, however, having to report to the unit commander. No careful selection of team patrol officers and investigative personnel was made, so there would be no questions about the concept of team policing as a structural arrangement being unsound. What

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid., p. 30.

had to be determined was whether a typical mixture of police personnel, under good leadership, could make team policing work.  

When the project area were selected, the patrol officers already working these areas were assigned and the investigation division was responsible for selecting the detectives and other investigative personnel. The two teams went into operation on March 15, 1971, and were designated Teams B and C. After a short time, it was concluded that Team B was no more effective than standard patrol, due to the lack of effective administrative responsiveness from the team commander. In January 1972, due to lack of effective performance, Team B was dissolved and Team A was formed.

The findings from the Rochester System which aimed to improve the investigation function are shown as viable results. In overall effectiveness, it was reported that the two experimental teams, made arrest in a larger percentage of cases initially classified as robbery, burglary and larceny than did non-team personnel, in the case of crime disposition (arrest) and crime clearance. Furthermore, the experimental teams made more on-scene arrest than did the non-team. Some of the factors contributing to these differences included the following:

1. Greater team emphasis on arrest as an indication of success.

---

38 Ibid., p. 17.
39 Ibid., p. 18.
40 Ibid., p. 30.
2. More frequent response by investigative personnel to crimes in progress.

3. Occasional use (by one team only) of investigative personnel to block criminal escape route.

4. More intensive use by teams of photographs of criminal suspects.\(^{41}\)

Although teams had greater success in arresting suspects (in percentage terms) for the three crimes in question, they had less success than non-team personnel in obtaining prosecution of suspects arrested at a crime scene or immediately following a crime where witnesses gave complete information on the identity and whereabouts of a suspect.

Another finding represented preliminary investigations. One of the objectives of the Rochester experiment was to determine whether this new mode of policing could improve the quality of preliminary criminal investigations carried out by patrol officers. It was anticipated that the Rochester System would enhance the relationship between the investigative personnel and patrol officers. Because both were assigned to the teams and therefore had to work closely day after day, it was expected that relationships would improve.

Further, team commanders were deeply involved in the investigative process at every stage. They had to become aware of the effectiveness of both preliminary and follow-up investigations, since they were held accountable for team success. Team commanders stressed to patrol officers that preliminary

\(^{41}\)Ibid., p. 38.
investigations had to be complete and reliable in order for the "early case closure" procedure to work. The system allowed team investigators to become familiar with team patrol officers and gave the investigators the opportunity to train and guide patrol officers in carrying out preliminary investigations. 42

The findings show that preliminary investigations were not actually improved, the difference occurred because of better team use of preliminary investigations. However, the two experimental police teams were significantly more successful than non-team personnel in making arrests for burglary and robbery as a result of follow-up investigations. Consequently, there was no difference between team and non-team personnel in terms of the percentage of arrested adults prosecuted for the three offenses in question, after a follow-up arrest.

To ascertain the success of the team concept, the Rochester Police Department carried out a survey of the participating teams and of the non-team. The positive attitudes among team patrol officers revealed in this survey were essential to the success of the Rochester experiment, including success in follow-up investigations. Because team patrol officers felt more favorably inclined towards team investigators, information was exchanged readily between patrol and investigative personnel, both formally and informally. (Questions and responses from the survey are listed in Appendix A). The overall response, in reference to the program was that it was more effective than the traditional approach of policing.

42Ibid., p. 38.
III. THE MANAGING CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION
INCENTIVE PROGRAM

Overview of the Atlanta Bureau of Police Services

The Atlanta Bureau of Police Services serves to preserve the public peace and good order of the City of Atlanta minimizing loss of life and property or injury. As a professional organization, the ABPS is committed to the task of providing the citizens of Atlanta the highest level of police services.

In 1979, with the signing of a consent decree, a long-standing hiring and promotion freeze was lifted from the Bureau. Employment of sworn personnel began for the first time in almost six years. In 1980, recruiting efforts were intensified in an effort to bring the Bureau to full complement by the Recruiting Section initiating a massive drive in the Atlanta area. Recruiters additionally ventured out of state to Philadelphia and Detroit for the purpose of attracting qualified police officers. At the end of 1980, full employment was achieved.

The Bureau is made up of five zones which consists of fifty-six beats covering the entire Atlanta area. Beat (Exhibit 1) and Zone (Exhibit 2) maps are provided on the next two

44 Ibid.
45 Ibid., p. 49.
EXHIBIT 1

CONFIGURATION OF POLICE PATROL BEATS FOR THE CITY OF ATLANTA, GEORGIA

Source: Department of Public Safety, 1982.
EXHIBIT 2

POLICE ZONES FOR THE CITY OF ATLANTA

Source: Department of Public Safety, 1982.
pages. The staffing of the Bureau consists of sworn and non-sworn personnel. There are approximately 1,335 sworn personnel in the Bureau. Of this 1,335, 906 are assigned as patrol officers and 203 are investigators. The remaining 226 sworn individuals include: 134 sergeants, 57 lieutenants, 18 captains, 11 majors, 4 deputy chiefs, 1 chief and 1 commissioner. To get an overall view of the Bureau's staffing by positions, table 1 has been prepared. To understand the two areas of focus in

TABLE 1

BUREAU OF POLICE SERVICES STAFFING
BY POSITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Authorized</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1391</strong></td>
<td><strong>1335</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


this study, a physical breakdown is required. Tables 2 and 3 provide a breakdown of police officers and investigators in Field Operations, inclusive of the zones, and the Criminal Investigations Division.

Consequently, the Field Operations Division and the Criminal Investigations Division of the Atlanta Bureau of Police Services are indeed responsible for the primary functions of actual police work. As Table 2 denotes, the zones are composed of only patrol officers and thus, it is expected that, "only preliminary investigations will take place at the zone level." Therefore, all continued investigations are distributed to the Criminal Investigations Division located within the downtown headquarters.

The remaining members of the sworn personnel are located in the following organizational components: the Office of the Commissioner of Public Safety, the Office of the Chief of Police, the Career Development Division and the Administrative Service Division. Table 4 provides a personnel breakdown of these components.

Nature of Zone One

Zone One consists of 44.3 square miles (35 percent of the city's total acreage), 434 street miles, and is the largest district of the city's five patrol zones. The zone operates in two sectors, Section B (the northern sector) which is comprised

\[\text{\textsuperscript{47}}\text{City of Atlanta, Department of Public Safety, Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program Grant Proposal (Atlanta, Georgia: City of Atlanta, March 30, 1979), p. 7.}\]
# TABLE 2

## FIELD OPERATIONS DIVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE</th>
<th>DIVISION TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dep. Chief</td>
<td>Dep. Chief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt.</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt.</td>
<td>Capt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt.</td>
<td>Lt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv.</td>
<td>Sgt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.</td>
<td>Inv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15</td>
<td>Total 749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ZONE ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Capt.</th>
<th>Lt.</th>
<th>Sgt.</th>
<th>Inv.</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ZONE TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Capt.</th>
<th>Lt.</th>
<th>Sgt.</th>
<th>Inv.</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ZONE THREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Capt.</th>
<th>Lt.</th>
<th>Sgt.</th>
<th>Inv.</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ZONE FOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Capt.</th>
<th>Lt.</th>
<th>Sgt.</th>
<th>Inv.</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ZONE FIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Capt.</th>
<th>Lt.</th>
<th>Sgt.</th>
<th>Inv.</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## SPECIAL OPERATIONS SECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Capt.</th>
<th>Lt.</th>
<th>Sgt.</th>
<th>Inv.</th>
<th>P.O.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE 3
CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS DIVISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE</th>
<th>DOWNTOWN TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dep. Chief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Dep. Chief | 1 | Major | 1 |
| Capt.      | 2 | Capt. | 2 |
| Lt.        | 10| Lt.   | 1 |
| Sgt.       | 19| Sgt.  | 1 |
| Inv.       | 134| Inv.  | 18 |
| P.O.       | 185| P.O.  | 1 |
| **Total**  | 185| **Total** | 185 |

**Crimes Against Persons Section**

| Major | 0 | Capt. | 1 |
|Lt.    | 2 | Lt.   | 3 |
|Sgt.   | 7 | Sgt.  | 7 |
|Inv.   | 41| Inv.  | 52 |
|P.O.   | 1 | P.O.  | 1 |
|**Total** | 52| **Total** | 64 |

**Licenses/Permits Section**

| Major | 1 | Capt. | 0 |
|Lt.    | 1 | Capt. | 0 |
|Sgt.   | 1 | Lt.   | 1 |
|Inv.   | 4 | Sgt.  | 1 |
|P.O.   | 2 | Inv.  | 9 |
|**Total** | 8| **Total** | 17 |

**School Detective Section**

| Major | 0 | Capt. | 0 |
|Lt.    | 1 | Capt. | 0 |
|Sgt.   | 1 | Lt.   | 1 |
|Inv.   | 9 | Sgt.  | 9 |
|P.O.   | 6 | Inv.  | 6 |
|**Total** | 17| **Total** | 17 |

**Homicide Task Force**

| Major | 0 | Capt. | 0 |
|Lt.    | 1 | Capt. | 0 |
|Sgt.   | 4 | Lt.   | 1 |
|Inv.   | 27| Sgt.  | 4 |
|P.O.   | 6 | Inv.  | 27 |
|**Total** | 38| **Total** | 38 |

### TABLE 4

**ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL COMPONENTS OF THE ABPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC SAFETY</th>
<th>CHIEF OF POLICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comm. 1</td>
<td>Chief 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 0</td>
<td>Major 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. 2</td>
<td>Capt. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. 1</td>
<td>Lt. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. 4</td>
<td>Sgt. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv. 12</td>
<td>Inv. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. 9</td>
<td>P.O. 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 29</td>
<td>Total 197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAREER DEVELOPMENT DIVISION</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DIVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Chief 1</td>
<td>Deputy Chief 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 1</td>
<td>Major 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt. 0</td>
<td>Capt. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lt. 3</td>
<td>Lt. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sgt. 9</td>
<td>Sgt. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inv. 3</td>
<td>Inv. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. 22</td>
<td>P.O. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit 22/61</td>
<td>Total 114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of six beats, is predominantly residential with middle and high income families. Sector A consists of seven beats, it has four low rent housing projects, a residential (middle income families), and a business district.\textsuperscript{48}

The primary nature of the crime in Zone One consists of burglary, robbery, larceny and auto theft. The above index crimes in this zone rank number one in relation to the other zones in the city.

As viewed on an earlier chart, Zone One's personnel make-up consists of 101 patrol officers with six sergeants, two lieutenants, one captain and one major.

This police service delivery area, Zone One, was selected as the MCI project site because it was very reflective of the environment, problems, and resources availability throughout the City of Atlanta. (A zone map, Exhibit 3, is included on the following page.)

**Development of MCI**

The concept of MCI came about in the City of Atlanta as a response to the need to make the most effective use of the personnel resources available to the Bureau of Police Services. Preliminary research indicated that an essential component of this effort was the need to improve the criminal investigation function, eliminating duplication of effort and focusing on those cases with the highest probability of solution.

\textsuperscript{48}City of Atlanta, Department of Public Safety, Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program Grant Proposal (Atlanta, GA: City of Atlanta, March 30, 1979), p. 21.
Source: City of Atlanta, Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program Grant Proposal, 1982.
Upon concluding the preceeding, an MCI task force was formed to revise the MCI program design to accommodate the needs of the ABPS. The Atlanta MCI program design resulted from a number of program planning activities undertaken by the planning staff. These included: review of the MCI program as outlined in the Program Design: Managing Criminal Investigations; attendance at several MCI training programs sponsored by the University Research Corporation, and technical assistance from Police Chief, Thomas Hasting of the Rochester Police Department and Robert Wasserman from the University Research Corporation.

The composition of the task force included: the director of the Planning and Research Unit of the ABPS, the Deputy Chief of Field Operations, Zone One administrators and other sworn and non-sworn participants. The initial adaptation of MCI was accomplished within the Planning and Research Unit under the overall guidance of the MCI Coordinating Task Force.

Implementation Plan

Through the commitment of the MCI concept, the MCI Task Force developed an MCI implementation plan which detailed implementation via each program component. In reference to component one, Initial Investigation, the proposal was to alter


50 City of Atlanta, Department of Public Safety, Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program Grant Proposal (Atlanta, GA: City of Atlanta, March 30, 1979), p. 1.
the role of the patrol officer from report taker to "lead searcher," and provide a number of important supportive mechanisms to assist in the role change. The primary steps of implementation for this component included: the studying of the proposed offense/incident report solvability factors, proposed screening/routing system, and implementation time frames to insure that they were consistent with the needs of the MIC program.

Upon completing the above, the Task Force attempted to analyze the personnel resources and needs of the Bureau, and define the functions of patrol officers and detectives as they related to the increased emphasis on preliminary investigations. Further recommendations were made as to whether reallocation of personnel would be needed when the duties of the patrol officer were broaden. To accommodate training needs, the Task Force supervised the development of a training program for officers and their supervisors, which provided instruction in investigative and managerial skills needed for the MCI program.\(^5^1\) The training for the patrol officers included the following skills:

1. searching for solvability factors  
2. completing the revised reporting form  
3. interviewing witnesses and victims  
4. area canvassing  
5. detecting physical evidence, and  
6. assessing the potential for case solution.\(^5^2\)

The training program for patrol supervisors covered the management skills needed to adequately supervise patrol officers in

\(^5^1\)MCI Grant Proposal, p. 8.  
\(^5^2\)City of Atlanta, Department of Public Safety, Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program Grant Proposal (Atlanta, Georgia: City of Atlanta, March 30, 1979), p. 10.
their expanded role and to use information from the monitoring system in patrol allocation decisions.

The objective of the Case Screening component was to separate "unsolvable" cases from those offering a reasonable potential for successful closure through investigation. In this way, investigative resources are limited to the potentially most productive cases. Case screening involved the routing of copies of "unsolvable" reports back to the patrol zones. This would necessitate the development of a standardized system for filing these reports in the zones and involved the assignment of additional clerical personnel to zone headquarters. Further, a method for advising victim to report additional information which may be discovered after the initial investigation and for reopening cases when appropriate was developed.

The third component, Managing the Continuing Investigation, was an attempt to develop a management system to monitor and to control the course of each case under investigation. The features included an "action book" in which things that must be accomplished to complete the investigation were listed. As the investigation would proceed, the tasks would be documented and checked off so any subsequent investigator could pick up the case and proceed in an efficient manner. Further, a detailed log of all activities relating to the investigation was to be maintained. An example of these activities included checking out

53 Ibid., p. 10.
witnesses regardless of their contribution to the solving of the case. The ultimate objective of this document was to prevent duplication of effort.

In order to locate pertinent information about an item in other places or documents both within and outside the case file, a cross reference sheet was to be included on each case. Also, a supervisor's review book was to be used to show that each investigation had been assessed on a timely basis and that it was proceeding according to plan. Additionally, a logical system of case jackets and a filing system was to be instituted to facilitate the consistent and thorough preparation and retention of case documents. To assist in the above, a system of supervisory review (whereby the continuing investigation of a case is to be suspended after a given lapse of time or after all leads have been exhausted) was to be developed. Further, the Task Force supervised the development of a training program to acquaint detectives with the new case management and screening procedures and the use of the new reporting form.54

The objective of component four, Police/Prosecutor Relationships, was to increase case acceptance and conviction rates. Case preparation procedures were to be developed which were consistent with requirements of the City Solicitor, Solicitor General, and District Attorney. The Task Force was to work towards improving communications between the police and prosecutorial agencies to insure that case preparation was consistent with

54City of Atlanta, Department of Public Safety, Managing Criminal Investigations Incentive Program Grant Proposal (Atlanta, Georgia: City of Atlanta, March 3, 1979), p. 11.
evidentary needs.

At the Municipal Court level, the Task Force would work with the Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee. The Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee serves to coordinate activities of the police and City Solicitor, providing a forum for policymakers to discuss issues of common concern.

At the Superior and State Court Levels, the recently established Bindover Analysis and Review Team (BART) was to provide liaison between the Bureau and the Offices of the District Attorney and Solicitor General. Supplied by the Police Legal Advisor, BART's primary responsibility was to establish a uniform procedure for the preparation of all criminal cases bound over to the Superior and State Courts in Fulton and DeKalb Counties. BART reviews bindover case documents for completeness, legibility, legal sufficiency, and timely transmission to appropriate prosecutors. A file is established for each case bound over to Superior or State Court, containing all reports, supplements and/or statements necessary for prosecution. These documents are delivered in package form to the appropriate court, and a receipt is obtained. The reports which BART determines to be illegible, incomplete or unprofessionally prepared or which do not contain the necessary elements for prosecution are returned to the officer through his supervisor, with a statement of the corrective action required and the deadline for receipt of the same.

Since case preparation can also be enhanced through accurate feedback on case dispositions, the Task Force was expected
to work with the Legal Advisor, the City Solicitor, Solicitor General, and District Attorney in an effort to establish a formal system for communicating monthly counts of dispositions and results to police supervisors.55

In component five, the Monitoring System, the Task Force obtained the services of a consultant. The consultant was to examine the format of reports already prepared by the Bureau of Police Services and to modify it where necessary. In the designing of the monitoring system, the system's users were to be defined, the system requirements were to be defined, component goals were to be examined, performance measures were to be specified, a data collection plan developed and a processing plan developed. Data collection and processing were to use appropriate manual and computerized systems, depending on resource availability.56

The monitoring system would allow police administrators to make ongoing assessments of MCI operations in at least the following areas:

1. efficiency of the initial investigative proceeds and the performance of individual patrol officers;

2. allocation of patrol resources;

3. consistency with which the screening criteria are applied;

4. problems in the management of continuing investigations; and

55 Ibid., p. 12.

5. effect of policy changes in police/prosecutor relationships.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{57}Ibid., p. 15.
IV. AN ANALYSIS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE MCI INCENTIVE PROGRAM

The following section focuses on an analysis of the success of the MCI program at the Atlanta Bureau of Police Services in addressing the objectives of the program components. The objectives of the program were identified in the previous section, but are listed again for the convenience of the reader.

**Initial Investigation Component**

To train and motivate patrol officers to conduct and document thorough preliminary investigations.

**Case Screening Component**

To develop a case screening method which will identify cases which are most susceptible to solution.

**Managing the Continuing Investigations**

To improve the efficiency of investigations through improved case management.

**Police/Prosecutor Relationships**

To increase the rate of case acceptance by the prosecutor and the rate of conviction of prosecuted cases, through more thorough preparation of cases.

**Monitoring System**

To develop a monitoring system which will allow for evaluation of the criminal investigation process.50

---
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Although various measures can be used to determine program effectiveness, the most feasible and realistic procedure must be developed in a manner which allows the precise analysis of performance in addressing the objectives of the program. The proper execution of this comparison can determine the effectiveness of the Atlanta MCI program.

The following analysis is presented in sections by objectives. The analysis is based on the utilization of a series of secondary data relating to the development and implementation of the MCI program at the ABPS. The various data elements were collected from the MCI monthly reports, MCI quarterly reports, MCI staff, attitudinal surveys, MCI Grant Proposal, and other documents from the project site dating from July 1981 to December 1981.

The main secondary data utilized were two attitudinal surveys conducted on October 5, 1981 in Zone One. The surveys were developed and administered by two members of the Planning and Research Staff of the Atlanta Public Safety Department. It was administered to examine both patrolmen and detective perception of distinct elements of the MCI function. The surveys' focus included the preliminary investigation, patrol-detective working relationships and investigative case judgement. Fifty-five police officers were given the surveys to complete. The officers surveyed were assigned to day, evening and morning

---

Criminal Investigations Incentive Program Grant Proposal (Atlanta, Georgia: City of Atlanta, March 30, 1979), pp. 8-14.
watches. Twenty of the officers were actually interviewed by
members of the Planning and Research Unit, the remaining officers
completed the survey prior to roll call. Further, there were
four ranking officers among the fifty-five surveyed.

**Initial Investigation**

This part of the analysis seeks to examine the degree
of success for the Initial Investigation component. The objec-
tive of this component centers around training and motivating
patrol officers to conduct and document thorough preliminary
investigation. It is evident that in any program, moreover,
with MCI, that training can provide the foundation for the re-
definition of roles and operating assumptions. The importance
of training cannot be minimized in any endeavor such as this.
Training is essential for the effective and efficient operation
of an MCI program.

The results of the attitudinal surveys conducted in
October 1981 suggest that there appeared to be the absence of
adequate training for MCI personnel and from a personal inter-
view with the administrative sergeant assigned to MCI, it was
indicated that (as a result of the initial training conducted
three weeks prior to implementation in November 1980 for uniform,
detective and supervisory personnel by the program consultant
from Rochester, New York) the training of newly assigned uniform
personnel of Zone One was conducted by a detective, who had

---
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recently been assigned to the pilot project and had no prior training or knowledge of MCI as a programmatic concept. This training instructor received her information from a video taped lecture developed by the program consultant, and an MCI manual designed for the Rochester, New York Police Department.

The instruction of the MCI concept to newly assigned officers consisted of:

1. viewing of a taped lecture approximately two and one half hours in length;
2. distribution of the MCI Manual; and
3. a question and answer segment, if warranted.\(^6\)

After reading the above training schedule, it can be seen that perhaps the most important element of the MCI program was taken quite lightly.

In the attitudinal surveys distributed to the patrol officers and detectives, various questions were asked which fall within the perimeter of the first objective. These questions emphasize training and patrol officer role enhancement:

**Patrol Survey**

**Question No. 3:** Do you feel you have received adequate training in the overall concept of MCI?

**Response:** Thirty-seven and two-tenths percent of the patrol officers surveyed felt that they had only received fair training on the MCI concept; 33.3 percent felt they had received good training; 17.6 percent felt that they had received poor

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 8.
training and 11.8 percent had no opinion on the training.

Question No. 20: Since MCI began have you noticed an increase in the investigative responsibilities of patrol officers?

Response: Thirty-eight and eight-tenths percent of the patrol officers had noticed a significant increase; 28.6 percent had noticed some increase; 18.4 percent had noticed a very little increase; 10.0 percent had no opinion and 4.1 percent had noticed no increase.

Question No. 22: How competent do you feel in evaluating case solvability and making recommendations for follow-up investigations?

Response: Forty-five and eight-tenths percent felt that they were somewhat competent; 25.0 percent felt neutral; 14.6 percent felt very competent; 10.4 percent had no opinion; 2.1 percent felt somewhat competent and 2.1 percent felt very incompetent.

Question No. 23: How often does your supervisor confer with you about case solvability factors or recommendations for follow-up?

Response: Thirty-five and four-tenths responded seldom; 27.1 percent responded never; 25.0 percent responded sometimes and 12.5 percent responded frequently.

Question No. 24: Has your incentive to do thorough preliminaries changed since the beginning of MCI?

Response: Forty-six percent felt their incentive had remained the same; 26.1 percent felt their incentive increased somewhat; 10.5 percent felt their incentive deteriorated somewhat; 8.7 percent felt their incentive increased markedly and 8.7 percent felt that their incentive deteriorated markedly.
Question No. 25: Does your supervisor encourage you to complete a thorough preliminary investigation for criminal cases?
Response: Thirty-eight and three-tenths percent felt some encouragement was given; 23.0 percent felt little encouragement was given; 19.1 percent felt much encouragement; 10.6 percent felt no encouragement and 8.5 percent felt neutral.

Question No. 26: Since MCI began in November 1980 do your feel you have been completing more thorough preliminary investigations?
Response: Forty-three and five-tenths percent felt there was no change; 39.1 percent felt somewhat more thorough; 6.5 percent had no opinion; 2.2 percent felt less thorough and 2.2 percent felt much less thorough.

Question No. 27: Since MCI began in November 1980, has there been a change in how your work is supervised?
Response: Fifty-five and three-tenths percent felt there was no change; 42.5 percent felt somewhat more closely and 2.1 percent felt much more closely.

Question No. 17: Since MCI began how often have you sought advice from permanent MCI investigators?
Response: Thirty-one and three-tenths percent said they had sought advice sometimes from investigators; 20.8 percent sought advice frequently; 20.8 percent never sought advice, 20.8 percent seldom sought advice and 6.3 percent sought advice very frequently.

Question No. 18: Within the past six months, how many times have you actively participated in any follow-up investigation activities for criminal cases?
Response: Thirty-seven and three-tenths percent had participated in follow-ups 1-3 times; 25.0 percent had participated
10 or more times; 20.8 percent had never participated; 16.1 percent had participated 4-6 times and 6.3 percent had participated 6-7 times.

Question No. 19: How often within the past six months have patrol officers received credit for closing a case when providing information leading to an arrest by detectives?

Response: Twenty-two and nine tenths percent had frequently received credit for case closure; 22.9 percent didn't know; 20.8 percent seldom received credit; 18.8 percent had never received credit; 10.4 percent sometimes had received credit; and 4.2 percent had very frequently received credit.

Question No. 13: How much of a difference did the MCI program make in your day to day activity?

Response: Twenty-five and five-tenths percent felt MCI made no important change; 25.5 percent felt it made a minor change; 21.6 percent felt it made a major change; 15.2 percent felt MCI made a moderate change and 11.8 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 15: How would you characterize your understanding of the MCI program as it affects your daily activities?

Response: Forty-six and seven-tenths percent felt they had a fair understanding; 40.0 percent felt they had a good understanding; and 13.8 percent felt they had an excellent understanding.

Question No. 16: Upon arriving at the crime scene, how helpful are permanently assigned investigators in assisting you to complete the preliminary investigation?

Response: Twenty-eight and six-tenths percent felt investigators were somewhat helpful; 20.4 percent felt they were very helpful; 14.5 percent felt that they were neither helpful nor unhelpful; 12.2 percent felt they were not
Detective Survey

Question No. 8: Before MCI started, to your knowledge, how often did detectives redo preliminaries already completed by patrol?

Response: Twenty-five percent almost always had to redo preliminaries; 25.0 percent very frequently had to redo preliminaries; 25.0 percent frequently had to redo preliminaries and 25.0 percent didn't know.

Question No. 20: How would you rate the quality of preliminary reports prepared by patrol officers and assigned within the past six months?

Response: Fifty percent stated that preliminaries were satisfactory; 25.0 percent felt that preliminaries were excellent and 25.0 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 21: Within the past six months, what percentage of cases assigned to you have you found it necessary to redo certain investigative activities previously completed by patrol officers?

Response: Fifty percent of the investigators had to redo 1-10 percent of certain investigative activities; 25.0 percent of the investigators had to redo 11-25 percent of certain investigative activities and 25.0 percent had no opinion.62

61 City of Atlanta, Department of Public Safety, Managing Criminal Investigation Patrol Officer Attitudinal Survey (Atlanta, Georgia: City of Atlanta, October 1981).

62 City of Atlanta, Department of Public Safety, Managing Criminal Investigation Detective Attitudinal Survey (Atlanta, Georgia: City of Atlanta, October 1981).
Analysis

One of the recommendations which emerged from the Rand findings indicated a need to adequately train patrol officers in conducting thorough preliminary investigations. The above was recommended, since the study showed that most cases can be cleared on the basis of preliminary investigations. According to the responses of the attitudinal surveys distributed to patrol officers, the officers felt they had received fair to good training in the MCI concept and through MCI there had been job enrichment, hence an increase in investigative responsibilities. Though responsibility had increased, the patrol officers maintain that their incentive to do more thorough investigations had not been altered. However, according to the detectives surveyed, there had been an improvement in the quality of preliminary investigations conducted by uniform officers. This observation was based on the need prior to MCI to "redo" most or many preliminary reports submitted by patrol officers. However, since MCI or over the third and fourth quarters of MCI's implementation, 50 percent of the detectives stated that only 1-10 percent of the preliminary reports required partial rewording, thus noting an improvement by patrol officers.

To further illustrate the effects of this component, patrol case clearance rates can be examined. The actual clearance rate for target crimes (larceny and burglary) cleared by the initial patrol investigations averaged for the third and fourth period 12.8 percent. In essence, this means that of the 404 cases assigned to patrol officers, 12.8 percent were cleared
by arrest or exceptionally cleared by the initial investigation. According to the MCI administrative sergeant, this supersedes the clearance rate prior to MCI's inception.\(^{63}\)

Though there have been attempts to place greater emphasis on the patrol officer's role, "this component has not been developed as much as it could be, but the patrol officers role has been altered from the traditional role of 'report taker.'\(^{64}\) One way in which the role has been altered is in reference to follow-up investigations.

As stated earlier, the patrol officer's increased responsibility in the investigative process can be an asset and can assist in solving manpower resource problems. Hence, since July 1981, patrol officers in MCI have been assigned cases for follow-up investigation when various elements were present. Consequently, 6.5 percent of all follow-up cases were assigned to patrol officers. According to the patrol officer's attitudinal survey, from a statistical perspective it showed that nearly 80 percent of the uniform personnel had actively participated in follow-up investigations.

Although the surveyed participants felt that their training had only been fair or good and the training may have appeared a bit incomplete, from patrol performance (case clearance) and investigator responses the patrol officers did show

---

\(^{63}\) Interview with Charles Wilson, Administrative Sergeant, Managing Criminal Investigation Incentive Program, Atlanta, Georgia, April 24, 1982.

\(^{64}\) Ibid.
some improvement in conducting and documenting preliminary investigations and did receive expanded responsibilities. It is the writer's belief that with more emphasis on this training element a much more expanded component could have been achieved.

Case Screening Component and Managing the Continuing Investigation Component

Components two and three have been combined because survey responses jointly relate to these components, thus joint discussion is preferred by the writer. Within these components, the idea was to develop a case screening method which would identify cases which were most susceptible to solution and identify a system for managing the continuing investigation. In the case screening component, an administrative sergeant was assigned to serve as case screener. The initial case screener resigned shortly after the implementation of the MCI program. The sergeant assigned to fill his place was assigned without any formal training in the MCI concept. However, it is important to note that absence of formal training in MCI did not impair the administrative sergeant's ability to function in the capacity of case screening supervisor, because of previous training in criminal investigations and years of service with ABPS.65

In a survey questionnaire administered to MCI investigators during the fourth quarter, 87.5 percent stated that the supervisor's knowledge and application regarding the guidelines of the MCI concept were excellent.

65MCI Evaluation, p. 8.
In order to provide a basis of analysis for case screening and Managing the Continuing Investigation, the following questions were extracted from the detectives attitudinal survey:

** Detective Survey: **

Question No. 15: How would you compare the MCI program with the way criminal investigations were managed previously in the department?

Response: Fifty percent felt MCI was much better; 25.0 percent felt that MCI was moderately better and 25.0 percent felt MCI was poorer.

Question No. 17: Within the past six months, what has been your average caseload at any point in time (please estimate)?

Response: Fifty percent said their average caseload was 11-25 cases; 25.0 percent said their average caseload was 6-10 cases; and 25.0 percent said their caseload was over 50 cases.

Question No. 18: On the average how many new cases are assigned to you each month?

Response: Fifty percent said they were assigned 13 or more cases; 25.0 percent said they were assigned 11-12 more cases and another 25.0 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 19: Do you consider this caseload to be:

Response: Seventy-five percent said the caseload was about right; and 25.0 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 22: Since MCI started has there been a change in the way assigned cases match individual investigator's skills and experience?

Response: Twenty-five percent felt there was a much better match; 25.0 percent felt there was a better match; 25.0 percent felt there was no change in the matching of skills and experience; 25.0 percent had no opinion.
Question No. 24: Are assigned cases filed or suspended promptly when investigative leads are exhausted?

Response: Fifty percent felt they were promptly; 25.0 percent felt they were very promptly; and 25.0 percent had no opinion.

Question No. 29: How would you compare the workability of cases assigned to you under MCI with those assigned before MCI?

Response: Fifty percent felt they were much more workable now; 25.0 percent felt they were more workable now and 25.0 percent had no opinion.

Analysis

The primary concern in the Case Screening and Managing the Continuing Investigation components is to provide a system which would ultimately screen out cases which proved to be unsolvable, and devise a means for better management of those cases which according to research have proven to be solvable. This concept can be accredited to the Rand findings on criminal investigation case solvability. This finding suggests that all criminal cases do not have an equal potential for solution, and that a large number of cases solve themselves when certain solvability factors are present; and that in the absence of these elements certain cases should be screened out of the investigative process.

In response to the need for case screening, the ABPS instituted a Teleservice Unit under a grant program entitled, "Managing Calls for Service." Consequently, this program was

66 Detective Attitudinal Survey.

67 Peter W. Greenwood, Rand, p. 2.
initiated prior to MCI, but was to work in conjunction with the case screening component of MCI. Police officers were assigned to serve as dispatchers for calls for service and thereafter screen out those calls that did not demand police presence. In reference to the Teleservice Unit, many of the MCI participants felt that it had contributed to their ability to screen cases, but even with this process, police presence was still required for "conducting" the initial report. However, in the case screening component, the case screener was ultimately responsible for screening cases for visible solvability factors, and upon finding cases worthy of follow-up investigation, assigning them to patrol officers and/or detectives.

According to the detectives surveyed, overall caseloads since MCI were "about right" in reference to the number assigned. Further, it appeared that the case screener had taken more time in assigning cases to match individual detectives skills and experiences. Consequently, due to case screening, more cases were accepted for follow-up that were more workable than prior to the MCI concept.

Moreover, the case screening and managing the continuing investigation concept emphasizes the need to free or release additional time for investigators to pursue other means of policing. The management component emphasizes how managing the caseloads can enable better utilization of manpower. By managing follow-up investigations, it is shown that the manpower can be

---

68 MCI Evaluation, p. 11.
used more creatively. For example, during the first quarter of operation, six detectives were actively working cases, by managing and developing component two (assigning patrol officers to follow-up investigations), during the second quarter of 1981, four detectives were used for actual case assignments. The creative usage of released personnel was identified in specific directed patrol, which concentrated on working a specific geographic area. This particular practice allowed detectives to work in a closer atmosphere with the patrol officers, further enhancing patrol/detective relationship.

**Police/Prosecutor Relationship**

The basic objective of the police/prosecutor component is to develop case preparation procedures consistent with prosecutorial requirements for charging, indictment and conviction. (Further, it is essential that a mechanism be developed to provide feedback to the police on case disposition.) Although the attempt was made to enhance the police/prosecutor relationship, it was impaired due to various factors. One such factor was that the liaison assigned to the prosecutor's office was transferred early in the project and the position was not filled until February 1982, thus placing a hindrance on this component's success. Responses from patrol officers and detectives on their view of current relationships are presented from the attitudinal surveys.

---

69 Ibid.
70 Ibid., p. 10.
Patrol Survey:

Question No. 9: Within the last six months how often have you received feedback from members of the DA's office concerning prosecution results on felony cases in which you have been involved?

Response: Forty-seven and one-tenth percent said they had never received feedback; 17.6 percent said they had sometimes received feedback; 13.7 percent said they had seldom received feedback; 9.8 percent not applicable; 5.9 percent said very frequently and 5.9 percent said frequently.

Question No. 10: Before MCI began, how would you rate your familiarity with the state's attorney requirements for prosecuting cases?

Response: Twenty-nine and four-tenths percent felt somewhat knowledgeable; 25.5 percent felt knowledgeable; 21.6 percent were not familiar; 19.6 percent felt slightly familiar; 3.9 percent felt very knowledgeable.

Question No. 11: Since the implementation of MCI has your knowledge of case prosecuting requirements changed?

Response: Thirty-nine and two-tenths felt there had been no change; 17.6 percent had no opinion; 15.7 percent felt they had a greater knowledge; 23.5 percent felt they had a somewhat greater knowledge; 3.9 percent felt they had a much greater knowledge.

Question No. 12: How would you characterize the MCI program as it was planned and implemented?

Response: Thirty-three and three-tenths percent felt it was fair; 27.5 percent felt it was good; 19.6 percent felt it was poor; 17.6 percent had no opinion; 1.9 percent felt it was excellent.71

71 Ibid.
Detective Survey:

Question No. 9: Within the last six months, how often have you received feedback from members of the prosecuting attorney's office concerning prosecution results on felony cases in which you have been involved?

Response: Fifty percent felt that feedback had been seldom; 25.0 percent felt that feedback had been never; and 25.0 percent felt that feedback had been frequently.

Question No. 10: Within the last six months, how often were your felony cases accepted for prosecution on the original charge?

Response: Seventh-five percent felt very frequently and 25.0 percent felt frequently.

Question No. 11: Before MCI began, how would you rate your familiarity with the prosecuting attorney requirements for prosecuting cases?

Response: Fifty percent felt very knowledgeable; 25.0 percent felt knowledgeable; and 25.0 percent felt slightly familiar.

Question No. 12: Since the implementation of MCI, has your knowledge of case prosecution requirements changed?

Response: Fifty percent felt they had a somewhat greater knowledge; 50.0 percent felt there was no change.

Analysis

A primary recommendation of the Rand findings suggested the need for better coordination of post-arrest investigation activities with the prosecutor, by either assigning investigators to his office or by allowing him to extend more guidance over the

---

72 Patrol Officer Attitudinal Survey.
policies and practices which they follow. This modification resulted in a higher percentage of prosecutable cases. The Atlanta MCI program attempted to address this finding in the context of Component Four. The aim was to increase the rate of case acceptance by the prosecutor and the rate of conviction of prosecuted cases, through more thorough preparation (of cases).

According to the patrol and detective survey responses, prior to MCI little if any direct contact was exchanged between police and prosecutors, hence there existed no real relationship. Survey responses indicated that MCI had not markedly or significantly enhanced the overall quality of police/prosecutor relationships. Few of the patrol responses suggested an overwhelming indication of a totally enhanced relationship between the two departments. For example, only 11.8 percent of the patrol officers stated that they had frequently or very frequently received feedback from members of the DA's Office. On the other hand, detective responses indicated that the level of prosecution had been enhanced since MCI. Seventy-five percent of the detectives surveyed responded that since MCI, felony cases were being accepted more frequently by the DA. Although survey responses suggest that prosecutorial feedback was not provided in most instances, statistical results compiled with respect to cases accepted and cases bound over indicate an improvement in

73Peter W. Greenwood, Rand, p. 2.

NOTE: The percentage of target cases accepted for prosecution for patrol officers averaged 50.6 percent and for detectives, 45.5 percent for periods three and four.
case preparation.

Even with the use of MCI, not all cases accepted were bound over to the courts; the reason for this, according to Brownstein and Kamrass,

... the prosecutor may accept some marginal cases that would have been stronger if not for some weaknesses such as alienated witnesses or evidence not obtained that was attributed to police operations.74

However, during the third and fourth quarters of MCI operations, the actual number of cases filed with the prosecutor's office was 84. Of these 84 cases, 53 were actually bound over to the courts, 2 were dismissed (due to insufficient evidence), 8 were WOP (victims decision not to pursue the case) and 21, the arrest was pending.

**Monitoring System**

The primary objective of the final component is to provide a means of systematically eliciting and maintaining data and information on program performance, as well as providing an ongoing means for assessing MCI operations via program components. The internal monitoring system was provided by the assigned crime analyst and information generated by the Case Screening Supervisor (administrative sergeant). This system of monitoring was planned and developed as a mechanism for obtaining feedback. This process involved the compiling of monthly and quarterly evaluation reports based on the evaluation criteria presented in the grant proposal. Monitoring was

expected to be a means for providing police administrators with continuous feedback on the performance of the investiga-
tive process. Though monthly and quarterly reports were com-
piled, little of this information was actually analyzed, rather it was presented in raw statistical charts and submitted to the Chief and Commissioner for review.

In considering the failure of the monitoring system, the issue of personnel must be discussed. Early in the program, the trained crime analyst assigned to the program resigned and a uniform officer was reassigned to the office to assume his responsibilities. The newly assigned uniform officer developed and implemented the monitoring system. Shortly after implementa-
tion, he was transferred to another unit. Several months afterwards, another uniform officer (who served as victim assis-
tance officer) was assigned the analyst task. From the above observation, it is evident that a trained crime analyst was not continuously employed, nor was the position maintained. The actual absence of a trained crime analyst prohibited management from receiving valuable information which impacted on day to day decision-making reflected by use of the monitoring system.

According to MCI participants, if this system had been expanded as proposed, more concrete information on the Atlanta pilot project could have been collected as the program pro-
gressed, and minor problems could have been detected. Addi-
tionally, it could have provided a further basis for analyzing program effectiveness.

75MCI Evaluation, p. 13.
V. CONCLUSION

The introduction of the MCI program within the ABPS represented the implementation of a revolutionary concept in the traditional approach to managing criminal investigations. The project implementation was exceptionally well documented and much significant data for relevant measurement was collected. Surveys and other data collection activities went beyond those that were originally identified in the grant proposal. Unfortunately, prior to dissolving the program, it is not clear whether the Department adequately reviewed this data.

The review of the attitudinal survey given to MCI participants suggests an overall conclusion that Atlanta successfully implemented the MCI project. Further, from studying the development and implementation of the project it is clear that it has improved the effectiveness of the patrol officers and investigators assigned to Zone One.

Within the Initial Investigation Component, significant indicators suggest modifications and improvements in patrol officer's roles and performance. The patrol officers roles were broadened through increased direction and increased responsibilities. Further, overall preliminary reports were more carefully conducted and documented. Additionally, data collected show that the percentage of case clearances by patrol officers increased by as much as 50 percent, during the MCI program, while case assignments
remained constant.

The Case Screening Component was implemented according to the implementation guidelines and contributed to the achievement of the other program objectives. The value of this particular objective (the screening out of predictably "unsolvable" cases) could provide a significant payoff in future program expansions. With respect to the Managing the Continuing Investigation Component, the findings suggest an improvement in managerial control over the continuing investigation process. These findings are viewed as an attempt to equalize caseloads, identify proper case assignments and enhance investigator responsiveness.

Findings relative to the Police/Prosecutor Component, suggest that the qualitative nature of case preparations by police officers did improve, however, due to the lack of feedback in case disposition, by the District Attorney's Office little substantive contact was maintained between the departments.

In the final component, The Monitoring System, little, if any actual monitoring was accomplished, thus the objective of the component, to provide continuous feedback on the performance of the MCI process, was not obtainable.

Although hampered by various problems, the MCI pilot program was successful in its attempt to improve the criminal investigations management process. The project offered a valuable guide into circumstances under which meaningful change can occur in the criminal investigation process. As it will take several years to assess the value of such a concept, the findings of the study suggest significantly enhanced potential when
the approach is implemented in the appropriate manner.

Although the program was dissolved, several recommendations have been formulated by the writer, which could have offered a basis for refinement.

1. **Training.**—The obtaining of personnel adequately trained in the MCI concept to develop an effective instructional program for uniform, investigation, supervisory and top management personnel should have been an internal priority. Also, for training success, the instructor(s) for the program should have possessed a sound understanding of MCI prior to teaching. Further, the training should have included an instrument to evaluate course comprehension. With these training concerns, a more competent group of participants could have been produced.

2. **Personnel.**—The program should have been permanently staffed with sufficient personnel to effectively function. Moreover, it is important to assign managers who are interested in and understand the MCI concept.

3. **Monitoring.**—The development of the monitoring system, to ascertain performance measures, initiate corrective action and direct policy formulation or change should have remained a priority of the project since monitoring program development is the primary means for obtaining feedback.
## ATTITUDE SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Are you, the patrol officer, interested in conducting a thorough preliminary investigation which will assist in solving crime?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>No 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you, the patrol officer, feel you have the proper amount of time to do a thorough investigation?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>No 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you, the patrol officer, encouraged by your commanding officers to do a thorough preliminary investigation?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>No 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Would a crime-specific, forced-choice report, where you would have to answer certain questions assist you in the preliminary investigation of a crime?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>No 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is the response time, by members of the Technicians Unit, adequate to assist you, when required, in the preliminary investigation of a crime?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>No 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is the response time by investigators adequate to assist you, when required, in the preliminary investigation of a crime?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>No 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do investigators roll in without being dispatched with the patrol units to assist in the investigation of a crime?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>No 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Are investigators helpful in assisting you with your preliminary investigation when they arrive on the scene of the crime?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam*</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. After you, the patrol officer, have conducted your preliminary investigation of a crime, and have forwarded your reports, do you receive any kind of feedback with regard to suspects or vehicles which investigators may have developed in the case and who may be located in or frequent your patrol area?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam*</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>No 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Do you, the patrol officer, feel you receive the proper recognition and credit when you are helpful in furnishing critical information leading to the arrest of a person involved in a crime, or actually make the arrest yourself?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>No 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ATTITUDE SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you, the patrol officer, feel that uniformed officers and detectives working out of the same office, as in the CTP concept, are more effective in solving crime than the present system of separation of patrol officers and Criminal Investigation Section?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Is there a morale problem between the uniform officers and investigators?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam*</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you think the CTP concept, with officers and investigators working closely together, is a step toward improving the morale problem if you feel one exists?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Do you, the commanding officers, and the patrol officers, feel that following your submission of an initial investigative report, which indicates no chance of apprehension of the perpetrator, that the report should be administratively closed at the unit command level, providing more time for Criminal Investigation Section investigators and Coordinated Team Patrol investigators to follow up on more solvable cases?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Would a series of questions and preliminary investigative suggestions, dealing with specific crimes, assist you in doing a better, more thorough preliminary investigative report?</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nonteam</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | Always | Sometimes | Never |
|---------------------------------|---------|----------|
| Team | 53 | 55 | 43 | 2 |
| Nonteam* | 79 | 31 | 68 | 1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>Half</th>
<th>Few</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonteam*</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Statistically significant difference.
APPENDIX B

ATLANTA BUREAU OF POLICE SERVICES

ATTITUDBINAL SURVEYS
MANAGING CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS - POLICE
OFFICER ATTITUDINAL SURVEY

Please answer all questions based on your personal experience and check the appropriate boxes below.

1. Your current rank:
   ( ) Patrol officer (47)=(92.2%)
   ( ) Sergeant (3) =(5.9%)
   ( ) Lieutenant (1) =(1.9%)

2. Your time in service with this department:
   ( ) One year or less
   ( ) Greater than one, but less than three years (12)=(23.5%)
   ( ) Three years or more, but less than six years (6) =(11.8%)
   ( ) Six years or more, but less than nine years (16)=(31.4%)
   ( ) Nine years or more, but less than twelve years (6) =(11.8%)
   ( ) Twelve years or more (6) =(11.8%)

3. Do you feel that you have received adequate training in the overall concept of MCI?
   ( ) Excellent training
   ( ) Good training (17)=(33.3%)
   ( ) Fair training (19)=(37.2%)
   ( ) Poor training (9) =(17.6%)
   ( ) No opinion on training (6) =(11.8%)

NOTE: The first number within ( ) reflects the number of responses, the second reflects percentage of responses.
4. Before the decentralization of detectives how would you rate patrol and detectives attitudes toward each other?

( ) Very positive ( ) Negative (15) = (29.4%)
( ) Positive (6) = (11.8%) ( ) Very negative (6) = (11.8%)
( ) Neutral (19) = (37.2%) ( ) No opinion (5) = (9.9%)

5. Has the amount of interaction between detectives and patrol changed since decentralization?

( ) Increased markedly ( ) Remained the same (5) = (9.8%) (23) = (45.1%)
( ) Increased moderately (23) = (45.1)

6. Since the decentralization of detectives in Zone One have detectives and patrol attitudes towards each other changed?

( ) Much more (4) = (9.8%) ( ) More negative (1) = (1.9%) positive ( ) Much more negative
( ) More positive (28) = (54.9%)
( ) No change (18) = (35.3%)

7. How would you evaluate overall working relationships between patrol officers and permanently assigned detectives?

( ) Excellent (7) = (13.7%) ( ) Poor (5) = (9.8%)
( ) Good (19) = (37.3%) ( ) No opinion (4) = (7.8%)
( ) Fair (16) = (31.4%)

8. Do you feel assigning patrol officers and detectives to the same district improves effectiveness in the criminal investigations process?

( ) Effectiveness significantly improved (14) = (27.5%) ( ) Effectiveness somewhat improved (26) = (50.9%)
( ) Effectiveness somewhat improved (26) = (50.9%) ( ) Effectiveness significantly improved (1) = (1.9%)
( ) No change (5) = (9.8%) ( ) No opinion (5) = (9.8%)
9. Within the last six months, how often have you received feedback from members of the DA's office concerning prosecution results on felony cases in which you have been involved?

( ) Very frequently (3)=(5.9%)  ( ) Seldom (7)=(13.7%)
( ) Frequently (3)=(5.9%)  ( ) Never (24)=(47.1%)
( ) Sometimes (9)=(17.6%)  ( ) Not applicable (5)=(9.8%)

10. Before MCI began, how would you rate your familiarity with the State's attorney requirements for prosecuting cases?

( ) Very knowledgeable (2)=(3.9%)  ( ) Slightly familiar (10)=(19.6%)
( ) Knowledgeable (13)=(25.5%)  ( ) Not familiar (11)=(21.6%)
( ) Somewhat knowledgeable (15)=(29.4%)

11. Since the implementation of MCI has your knowledge of case prosecution requirements changed?

( ) Much greater knowledge (2)=(3.9%)  ( ) No change (20)=(39.2%)
( ) Greater knowledge (8)=(15.7%)
( ) Somewhat greater knowledge (12)=(23.5%)

12. How would you characterize the way the MCI program was planned and implemented?

( ) Excellent (1)=(1.9%)  ( ) Poor (10)=(19.6%)
( ) Good (14)=(27.5%)
( ) Fair (17)=(33.3%)  ( ) No opinion (9)=(17.6%)
13. How much of a difference did the MCI program make in your day-to-day activities?

( ) Major change (11) = (21.6%) ( ) No important change (13) = (25.5%)

( ) Moderate change (8) = (15.7%) ( ) No opinion (6) = (11.8%)

( ) Minor change (13) = (25.5%)

14. How would you compare the MCI program with the way criminal investigations were managed previously in the department?

( ) MCI Much better (8) = (15.7%) ( ) MCI poorer (4) = (1.9%)

( ) MCI moderately better (13) = (25.5%) ( ) MIC much poorer (2) = (3.9%)

( ) Not much difference (19) = (37.3%) ( ) No opinion (5) = (9.8%)

15. How would you characterize your understanding of the MCI programs as it affects your daily activities?

( ) Excellent understanding (6) = (13.3%) ( ) Fair understanding (21) = (46.7%)

( ) Good understanding (18) = (40%) ( ) Poor understanding

16. Upon arriving at the crime scene, how helpful are permanently assigned investigators in assisting you to complete the preliminary investigation?

( ) Very helpful (10) = (20.4%) ( ) Not very helpful (6) = (12.2%)

( ) Somewhat helpful (14) = (28.6%) ( ) Not helpful at all (6) = (12.2%)

( ) Neither helpful nor unhelpful (7) = (14.3%) ( ) Investigators have not responded (6) = (12.2%)
17. Since MCI began, how often have you sought advice from permanent MCI investigators?

( ) Very frequently (3) = (6.3%)
( ) Frequently (10) = (20.8%)
( ) Sometimes (15) = (31.3%)

18. Within the past six months, how many times have you actively participated in any follow-up investigation activity for criminal cases?

( ) Never (9) = (20.8%)
( ) One-three times (15) = (31.3%)
( ) Four-six times (8) = (16.7%)

19. How often within the past six months have patrol officers received credit for closing a case when providing information leading to an arrest by detectives?

( ) Very frequently (2) = (4.2%)
( ) Frequently (11) = (22.9%)
( ) Sometimes (5) = (10.4%)
( ) Don't know (11) = (22.9%)

20. Since MCI began, have you noticed an increase in the investigative responsibilities of patrol officers?

( ) A significant increase (19) = (30.8%)
( ) Some increase (14) = (28.6%)
( ) Very little if any increase (9) = (18.4%)

21. To what extent does the supplementary form containing solvability factors help you complete thorough preliminary investigations?

( ) A great extent (3) = (6.3%)
( ) Some extent (19) = (39.6%)
( ) Very little if any extent (9) = (18.8%)

Somewhat incompetent (10) = (20%)
Very incompetent (7) = (14.6%)
No opinion (13) = (27.1%)
22. How competent do you feel in evaluating case solvability and making recommendations for follow-up investigations?

( ) Very competent (7) = (14.6%) ( ) Somewhat competent (22) = (45.8%) ( ) Neutral (12) = (25%) ( ) No opinion (5) = (10.4%)

22. How often does your supervisor confer with you about case solvability and making recommendations for follow-up investigations?

( ) Very competent (7) = (14.6%) ( ) Somewhat competent (22) = (45.8%) ( ) Neutral (12) = (25%) ( ) No opinion (5) = (10.4%)

23. How often does your supervisor confer with you about case solvability factors or recommendations for follow-up?

( ) Frequently (6) = (12.5%) ( ) Seldom (17) = (35.4%) ( ) Sometimes (12) = (25%) ( ) Never (13) = (27.1%)

24. Has your incentive to do thorough preliminaries changed since the beginning of MCI?

( ) Incentive increased markedly (4) = (8.7%) ( ) Incentive deteriorated somewhat (5) = (10%) ( ) Incentive increased somewhat (12) = (26.1%) ( ) Incentive deteriorated markedly (4) = (8.7%) ( ) Incentive remained the same (20) = (46%)

25. Does your supervisor encourage you to complete a thorough preliminary investigation for criminal cases?

( ) Much encouragement (9) = (19.1%) ( ) Little encouragement (11) = (23%) ( ) Some encouragement (18) = (38.3%) ( ) No encouragement ( ) Neutral (4) = (8.5%) (5) = (10.6%)
26. Since MCI began in November 1980, do you feel you have been completing more thorough preliminary investigations?

( ) Much more thorough (3) = (6.5%) ( ) Less thorough (1) = (2.2%)

( ) Somewhat more thorough (18) = (39.1%) ( ) Much less thorough (1) = (2.2%)

( ) No change (20) = (43.5%) ( ) No opinion (3) = (6.5%)

27. Since MCI Began in November 1980, has there been a change in how your work is supervised?

( ) Much more closely (1) = (2.1%) ( ) Somewhat less closely

( ) Somewhat more closely (20) = (42.5%) ( ) Much less closely

( ) No change (26) = (55.3%)
MANAGING CRIMINAL INVESTIGATIONS - DETECTIVE

ATTITUDBINAL SURVEY

Please answer all questions based on your personal experience and check the appropriate boxes below.

1. Your time in service with this department:

( ) One year or less
( ) Greater than one, but less than three years
( ) Three years or more, but less than six years
( ) Six years or more, but less than nine years
( ) Nine years or more, but less than twelve years
( ) Twelve years or more

COMMENTS: ________________________________________________________________

2. Do you feel that you have received adequate training in overall concept of MCI?

( ) Excellent training
( ) Good training
( ) Fair training
( ) Poor training
( ) No opinion on training

COMMENTS: ________________________________________________________________

NOTE: The first number within ( ) reflects the number of responses; the second reflects percentage of responses.
3. Before the decentralization of detectives how would you rate patrol and detectives attitudes toward each other?

( ) Very positive  ( ) Negative = (1)(25%)
( ) Positive  ( ) Very negative
( ) Neutral = (2)(50%)  ( ) No opinion = (1)(25%)

COMMENTS: ________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

4. Has the amount of interaction between detectives and patrol changed since decentralization?

( ) Increased markedly = (3)(75%)  Remained the same = (1)(25%)
( ) Increased moderately

COMMENTS: ________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

5. Since the decentralization of detectives in Zone One, have detectives and patrol attitudes towards each other changed?

( ) Much more positive  ( ) More negative
( ) More positive = (3)(75%)  ( ) Much more negative
( ) No change = (1)(25%)

COMMENTS: ________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________
6. How would you evaluate overall working relationships between patrol officers and permanently assigned detectives?

( ) Excellent = (1) (25%)  ( ) Poor = (1) (25%)
( ) Good = (2) (50%)  ( ) No opinion
( ) Fair

COMMENTS: 

7. Do you feel assigning patrol officers and detectives to the same district improve the effectiveness in the criminal investigation process?

( ) Effectiveness significantly improved = (3) (75%)
( ) Effectiveness somewhat improved
( ) Effectiveness somewhat worse

( ) No change = (1) (25%)
( ) No opinion

COMMENTS: 

8. Before MCI started, to your knowledge, how often did detectives redo preliminaries already completed by patrol?

( ) Almost always = (1) (25%)  ( ) Occasionally
( ) Very frequently = (1) (25%)  ( ) Seldom
( ) Frequently = (1) (25%)  ( ) Don't know -(1) (25%)

COMMENTS: 


9. Within the last six months, how often have you received feedback from members of the prosecuting attorney's office concerning prosecution results on felony cases in which you have been involved?

( ) Very frequently ( ) Seldom = (2) (50%)
( ) Frequently = (1) (25%) ( ) Never = (1) (25%)
( ) Sometimes ( ) Not applicable

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

10. Within the last six months, how often were your felony cases accepted for prosecution on the original charge?

( ) Very frequently = (3) (75%) ( ) Seldom
( ) Frequently = (1) (25%) ( ) Never
( ) Sometimes ( ) Not applicable

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

11. Before MCI began, how would you rate your familiarity with the prosecuting attorney requirements for prosecuting cases?

( ) Very knowledgeable ( ) Slightly familiar = (1) (25%)
( ) Knowledgeable = (1) (25%) ( ) Not familiar
( ) Somewhat knowledgeable

COMMENTS: ____________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
12. Since the implementation of MIC has your knowledge of case prosecution requirements changed?

( ) Much greater knowledge ( ) No change = (2) (50%)

( ) Greater knowledge ( ) No opinion

( ) Somewhat greater knowledge = (2) (50%)

COMMENTS:

13. How would you characterize the way the MCI program was planned and implemented?

( ) Excellent = (1) (25%) ( ) Poor = (1) (25%)

( ) Good = (2) (50%) ( ) No opinion

( ) Fair

COMMENTS:

14. How much of a difference did the MCI program make in your day-to-day activities?

( ) Major change = (2) (50%) ( ) No important change

( ) Moderate change = (1) (25%) ( ) No opinion

( ) Minor change = (1) (25%)

COMMENTS:
15. How would you compare the MCI program with the way criminal investigations were managed previously in the department?

( ) MCI much better = (2) (50%)  ( ) MCI poorer = (1) (25%)
( ) MCI moderately better = (1) (25%)  ( ) No opinion
( ) Not much difference

COMMENTS: __________________________________________

16. How would you characterize your understanding of the MCI program as it affects your daily activities?

( ) Excellent understanding = (2) (50%)  ( ) Poor understanding
( ) Good understanding = (1) (25%)  = (1) (25%)
( ) Fair understanding

COMMENTS: __________________________________________

17. Within the past six months, what has been your average caseload at any point in time? (Please estimate).

( ) 1-5 cases  ( ) 21-30 cases
( ) 6-10 cases = (1) (25%)  ( ) 31-40 cases
( ) 11-15 cases = (2) (50%)  ( ) 41-50 cases
( ) 16-20 cases  ( ) Over 50 cases
  = (1) (25%)

COMMENTS: __________________________________________
18. On the average, how many new cases are assigned to you each month?

( ) 1-2  
( ) 3-4  
( ) 5-6  
( ) 7-8  
( ) 9-10  
( ) 11-12  
( ) 13 or more

COMMENTS: ____________________________

19. Do you consider this caseload to be:

( ) Very excessive  
( ) Somewhat too light  
( ) Somewhat excessive  
( ) Very light  
( ) About right

COMMENTS: ____________________________

20. How would you rate the quality of preliminary reports prepared by patrol officers and assigned to you within the past six months?

( ) Excellent  
( ) Unsatisfactory  
( ) Satisfactory  
( ) No opinion  
( ) Needs some improvements

COMMENTS: ____________________________
21. Within the past six months, for what percent of cases assigned to you have you found it necessary to "redo" certain investigative activities previously completed by patrol officers?

( ) None ( ) 51-75%
( ) 1-10% = (2) (50%) ( ) 76-99%
( ) 11-25% = (1) (25%) ( ) 100%
( ) 26-50%

COMMENTS: ____________________________

22. Since MCI started has there been a change in the way assigned cases match individual investigator's skills and experience?

( ) Much better match = (1) (25%) ( ) Poorer match
( ) Better match = (1) (25%) ( ) Much poorer match
( ) No change = (1) (25%)

COMMENTS: ____________________________

23. To what extent do you use solvability factor ratings as a guide for conducting follow-up investigations?

( ) A great extent = (2) (50%) ( ) Very little if any extent
( ) Some extent = (1) (25%) ( ) No extent at all

COMMENTS: ____________________________
24. Are assigned cases filed or suspended promptly when investigative leads are exhausted?

( ) Very promptly = (1) (25%)  ( ) Not very promptly
( ) Promptly = (2) (50%)  ( ) Not promptly at all
( ) Neutral

COMMENTS: ________________________________

25. For what percent of cases assigned to you have you adhered to the ten-day suspension period?

( ) None
( ) 1-10% = (1) (25%)  ( ) 51-75% = (1) (25%)
( ) 11-25%  ( ) 76-99% = (1) (25%)
( ) 26-50% = (2) (50%)  ( ) 100%

COMMENTS: ________________________________

26. Of your present caseload, what percentage of cases do you think could be closed during the follow-up investigation?

( ) None  ( ) 51-75% = (1) (25%)
( ) 1-10% = (1) (25%)  ( ) 76-99% = (1) (25%)
( ) 11-25%  ( ) 100%
( ) 26-50%

COMMENTS: ________________________________
27. Of the cases which have been assigned to you within the past six months and closed as a result of your investigation, what proportion could have been closed by patrol officers, provided they were allotted sufficient time?

( ) None  ( ) 51-75%
( ) 1-10%  ( ) 76-99%
( ) 11-25%  =(2)(50%)  ( ) 100%
( ) 26-50%

COMMENTS: ____________________________

28. Comparing MCI to centralized investigations, do you feel that cases are closed more quickly under MCI?

( ) Much more quickly  =(3)(75%)
( ) Somewhat slower quickly
( ) A great deal more slowly
( ) Somewhat more quickly
( ) No change  ( ) Don't know

COMMENTS: ____________________________

29. How would you compare the workability of cases assigned to you under MCI with those assigned before MCI?

( ) Much more workable now= (2)(50%)
( ) Less workable now= (2)(50%)
( ) Much less workable now

( ) More workable=(1)(25%)
( ) No change

COMMENTS: ____________________________
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