

SLED AUTOMATED INCIDENT-REPORTING SURVEY RESULTS

September 2002

**Survey conducted by:
Office of Research and Statistics
Budget and Control Board
1919 Blanding Street
Columbia, SC 29201**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
Survey Background.....	4
Summary of Part I Survey Results.....	6
Summary of Part II Survey Results	8
Part I Survey Results.....	10
Part II Survey Results	54
Appendix I: Automated Incident-Reporting Survey.....	46
Appendix II: Comments from Local Law Enforcement Officials.....	54
Appendix III: Summary of Telephone Survey.....	57
Appendix IV: Agencies That Did Not Respond.....	59
Appendix V: Part I Respondents: Police and Sheriff Departments....	60
Appendix VI: Part II Respondents: Universities and Others.....	62
Appendix VII: Part I Agencies Which are Not Automated.....	63
Appendix VIII: Part II Agencies Which are Not Automated.....	64

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In its continued efforts to improve efficiency throughout the law enforcement community in this state, the State Law Enforcement Division (SLED) needed to know how local law enforcement agencies in this state were progressing in automating their incident-reporting systems and whether or not they were developing mapping capabilities that would further their law enforcement efforts. This survey is one of many initiatives that SLED is using to identify problems and, hopefully, to develop solutions that will increase efficiency in law enforcement efforts in order to combat criminal activity in South Carolina.

In May 2002, this survey was sent to nearly 300 law enforcement agencies in South Carolina. A total of 221 responses were received and their responses are included in this report. This report is divided into two parts, Part I and Part II. Part I examines the responses of 191 law enforcement agencies that are considered the primary (police and sheriff's departments) law enforcement agencies in this state. Part II examines the responses of 30 *other* law enforcement agencies that are mostly police departments associated with universities or are associated with state agencies that have policing authority.

A brief summary of the findings of this report would suggest the following:

- Most of the law enforcement agencies that responded to this survey are at least somewhat automated; those that are not are generally the smaller agencies in locations with few incident reports, on a weekly basis.
- Smaller agencies which have only a few incident reports, on a weekly basis, find that it is cost-ineffective to automate for SLED reporting purposes.
- Agencies that are automated are hindered in progressing to a higher level of computer capability by a number of factors: budget constraints, software problems, problems with vendors, computer hardware problems, and staff and officer training.
- Agencies need guidance in determining what types of software they should purchase for their computers, who are the reliable and capable vendors they should be contracting with, and what are the exact specifications that they can provide to those vendors that will both meet their own agencies' needs and the reporting requirements of SLED.
- Agencies are not learning from the experiences of other agencies. Agencies do not seem to share their experiences, good and bad, with other law enforcement agencies. This is a role that SLED may want to consider.

SURVEY BACKGROUND

In early 2002, officials from the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Public Safety (OJPDPDS) met with officials from the State Law Enforcement Division (SLED) to discuss some of the needs and problems that SLED was anxious to address. In particular, SLED was experiencing a backlog in entering into its computer incident reports that were sent to them in paper form from local law enforcement agencies. SLED was interested in having a survey of law enforcement agencies conducted in order “... *to identify circumstances that make it difficult for local law enforcement agencies to report criminal incident information to SLED electronically and to identify issues related to adding other information useful for mapping.*” SLED contacted the Office of Research and Statistics (ORS) of the Budget and Control Board to assist them in developing the survey instrument and analyzing the results of the survey. SLED also expressed a need to assist local law enforcement agencies in developing local incident-location and arrest-location crime-type mapping capabilities to further SLED’s interest in developing statewide mapping capabilities.

With funding provided by OJPDPDS, the Office of Research and Statistics, in conjunction with SLED and OJPDPDS, developed a survey instrument (see Appendix I). This instrument was “field tested” in the following law enforcement agencies within the state: (1) North Charleston Police Department, (2) Orangeburg Sheriff’s Office, (3) Orangeburg Police Department, (4) City of Columbia Police Department, (5) Lexington County Sheriff’s Office, and (6) North Charleston Police Department. These agencies’ suggestions and comments were extremely useful in developing the final survey instrument. Appendix II contains some of the informal comments, paraphrased in some instances, made by officials at these field test locations.

ORS staff also conducted telephone interviews with law enforcement officials at ten agencies which represented a range of sizes and geographic locations – rural and urban, large and small, upstate, piedmont, and coastal. A summary of these telephone interviews is presented in Appendix III. As a result of these field tests and telephone interviews, the survey form was significantly altered, e.g., additional questions were added to the survey, existing questions were reworded for clarity, and some questions were discarded altogether. In many instances survey questions were expanded to allow respondents to explain their responses or to provide additional information.

On May 6, 2002, the surveys were mailed to 300 law enforcement agencies throughout the state. Considerable effort was expended by ORS staff to ensure that the highest possible response rate to this survey was achieved. Agencies that did not respond in a timely manner were followed-up with phone calls and survey re-mailings. Of the 300 surveys sent to law enforcement agencies, 11 agencies were under the jurisdiction of other law enforcement agencies and were, therefore, included in the responses of those agencies. Therefore there were 289 surveys from which responses were appropriate. A total of 221 responses were received within the time period necessary for inclusion in this report (two agency’s responses were too late to be included). The response rate for this survey, therefore, was 76.5 percent. A list of agencies that did not respond, or did not respond in time to be included in this report, is contained in Appendix IV.

After consulting with SLED regarding how the survey findings should be presented in this report, it was decided to divide the report into two parts: Part I includes only the responses from police and sheriffs' departments and Part II includes other types of law enforcement agencies such as the Department of Natural Resources and university and college police departments. It was felt that the operation and function of these other agencies were sufficiently dissimilar from the Part I agencies that they should be analyzed separately. (Appendix V provides a listing of the Part I respondents and Appendix VI, a listing of Part II respondents.)

It should be noted that, in some instances, a few respondents gave responses which were inconsistent or conflicted with their responses from previous questions. No attempt has been made to rectify these inconsistencies; as a consequence, table totals may vary from table to table.

In August 2002, a draft report of the survey findings was sent to SLED and OJPDPS for their comments and suggestions for further analyses of the survey findings. The draft report was also circulated among selected ORS staff for their review, suggestions and comments. Appropriate suggestions were incorporated into this final report.

SUMMARY OF PART I SURVEY RESULTS

- About 60 percent of the survey respondents stated that their incident reporting system was automated.
- Of those agencies that are automated, 92 percent enter all or most of the incident data into the computer.
- Seventy-two (72) agencies stated that they were not automated. A list of these agencies is provided in Appendix VII. (Note: The 72 agencies that indicated they were NOT automated were instructed to skip to Question 12 of the survey, which is Question 25 in this section of the report.)
- Over seventy percent of the agencies that have automated systems stated they were SCIBRS compliant; however, eighteen of these agencies stated that they sent *paper* incident reports to SLED by *mail*.
- Sixteen agencies said that they are either not SCIBRS compliant or they 'Don't know' if they are SCIBRS compliant even though they reported that their systems were automated and that they entered *all* of the incident data into their system.
- Thirty-eight agencies stated that they enter more than 100 incident reports into the computer on a weekly basis. Fourteen of these agencies sent their incident reports in paper form to SLED by mail.
- Of the agencies with automated systems (i.e., they entered all info, most info, or some info into their computer), forty-six (46) of these agencies stated that they sent their incident reports in paper form to SLED by mail.
- Software problems explained why most of the automated agencies did not send their incident reports to SLED electronically. Over one-fourth (27.78%) of these agencies stated that their software is not capable of transmitting electronically.
- Two-thirds (67.23%) of the agencies that are automated stated that the incident data are entered into a computer that is networked to other computers.
- The operating systems of the computers used by these automated agencies were mostly versions of Windows.
- The software that is being used on these computers is much more varied than is the operating systems. Versions of Vision or Visionair are common software packages used by these agencies.

- Over half (56.30%) of the agencies that purchased software from a vendor have an ongoing contract with them to provide “Full Support” for technical support, training, or upgrades.
- Thirty agencies stated that agency staff could “Output the data, or create a data file, in a variety of formats”; however, nine of these agencies stated that they sent their incident reports to SLED by mail in paper form.
- Over forty percent (41.03%) of the agencies (n=48) stated that they were “Very Satisfied” with the software package they were using for their agency’s internal purposes. There is a fairly wide range of both vendors and software packages among this group.
- Of those agencies that were somewhat or not satisfied with the software package they were using for their agency’s internal purposes (n=63), many stated that their software package was limited in its capabilities in generating various types of reports, in validating fields, is too complex, or is not “user friendly.”
- Most (64.96%) of the agencies stated that they do not have plans to purchase a new system for internal purposes.
- Results similar to those above were found for the software packages that these agencies are using for the purpose of generating data for SLED reporting purposes. Over sixty percent (61.34%) of these agencies (n=73) stated that they had no plans to purchase a new system for the purpose of generating data for SLED reporting purposes.
- Only about half (55.46%) of the agencies stated that their data entry personnel are trained in SCIBRS.
- If officers enter their own incident reports into the computer, one-third (33.61%) of the agencies (n=40) stated that these officers were not trained in SCIBRS.
- Forty-six agencies stated that they do not have plans to send their incident reports to SLED electronically. Software cost was the most common reason for not sending electronically.
- Twenty-six agencies that are not automated stated that they do not have plans to purchase one.
- Only 27 (14.21%) of 190 agencies have an automated mapping system.
- Only 23 agencies have plans to purchase an automated mapping system.

SUMMARY OF PART II SURVEY RESULTS

- Thirty agencies are included in this section of the report. A listing of these agencies may be found in Appendix VI.
- Fewer than half (14 or 46.67%) of the survey respondents stated that their incident reporting system was automated.
- Of the 14 agencies that are automated, 11 stated that they enter *all* of the incident data into the computer.
- Sixteen of the 30 agencies (53.33%) stated that they were not automated. A list of these agencies is provided in Appendix VIII. (Note: The 16 agencies that indicated they were NOT automated were instructed to skip to Question 12 of the survey, which is Question 24 in this section of the report.)
- Over half (57.14%) of the agencies that have automated systems stated they were SCIBRS compliant; however, three of these eight agencies stated that they sent *paper* incident reports to SLED by *mail*.
- Four agencies said that they are either not SCIBRS compliant or they 'Don't know' if they are SCIBRS compliant even though they reported that their systems were automated and that they entered *all* of the incident data into their system.
- Only five agencies stated that they enter more than 20 incident reports into the computer on a weekly basis.
- Of the agencies with automated systems (i.e., they entered all info, most info, or some info into their computer), eight of these agencies stated that they sent their incident reports in paper form to SLED by mail.
- Software problems explained why most of the automated agencies did not send their incident reports to SLED electronically. Four of these agencies (30.77%) stated that their software is not capable of transmitting electronically.
- Over half (57.14%) of the agencies that are automated stated that the incident data are entered into a computer that is networked to other computers.
- The operating systems of the computers used by these automated agencies were mostly versions of Windows.
- Versions of Vision or Visionair or Microsoft applications (Access, Excel, Word) are common software packages used by these agencies.

- Half (50%) of the agencies that purchased software from a vendor have an ongoing contract with them to provide “Full Support” for technical support, training, or upgrades.
- Three agencies stated that agency staff could “Output the data, or create a data file, in a variety of formats”; however, one of these agencies stated that they sent their incident reports to SLED by mail in paper form.
- Over thirty-five percent (35.71%) of the agencies (n=5) stated that they were “Very Satisfied” with the software package they were using for their agency’s internal purposes.
- Most (57.14%) of the agencies stated that they do not have plans to purchase a new system for internal purposes.
- Only three (21.43%) of the agencies stated that they were “Very Satisfied” with the software package that they are using for the purpose of generating data for SLED reporting purposes. Six agencies stated that they had no plans to purchase a new system for the purpose of generating data for SLED reporting purposes.
- Only three (21.43%) of the 14 automated agencies stated that their data entry personnel are trained in SCIBRS.
- If officers enter their own incident reports into the computer, six (42.86%) of the agencies stated that these officers were not trained in SCIBRS.
- Fourteen agencies (46.67%) stated that they do not have plans to send their incident reports to SLED electronically. Budget constraints was the most common reason for not sending electronically.
- Six agencies that are not automated stated that they do not have plans to purchase one.
- Only 1 of 30 agencies has an automated mapping system.
- Only 3 agencies have plans to purchase an automated mapping system.

PART I

SURVEY RESULTS

**PART I
SLED SURVEY RESULTS
Sheriffs and Police Departments Only**

1. Is your incident reporting system automated?

<u>Automated?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	1	0.52
No	72	37.70
Yes - All Info Entered	91	47.64
Yes - Most Info Entered	17	8.90
Yes - Some Info Entered	10	5.24
Total	191	100.00

(Note: The 72 agencies that indicated they were NOT automated were instructed to skip to Question 12 of the survey, which is Question 25 in this section of the report.)

2. Is your software SCIBRS compliant?

<u>SCIBRS Compliant?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Don't Know	11	9.24
No	23	19.33
Yes	85	71.43
Total	119	100.00

The eleven agencies that “Don’t Know” if their software is SCIBRS compliant are:

<u>Agency Name</u>
1 Andrews Police Department
2 Bamberg Police Department
3 Berkeley County Sheriff's Office
4 Chesnee Police Department
5 Darlington County Sheriff's Department
6 Fairfield Sheriff's Office
7 Greenwood Sheriff's Office
8 Kershaw County sheriff
9 Kingstree Police Department
10 Loris Police Department
11 Ninety Six Police Department

Of the 91 agencies that stated that their incident reporting system was automated *and* that they entered *all* the information into their system, the following table indicates whether or not they are SCIBRS compliant:

<u>Is your software SCIBRS compliant?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	1	1.10
Don't Know	8	8.79
No	8	8.79
Yes	74	81.32
Total	91	100.00

3. Who enters the incident report data into the computer? (Can have multiple responses.)

Who Enters the Data?	Frequency	Percent
Data Entry Staff	63	42.28
Other Staff	24	16.11
Reporting Officer	44	29.53
Vendors	0	0.00
Other	18	12.08
Total	149	100.00

Other:

- 1 Administrative Assistant to Police Dept.
- 1 Clerk of Court
- 1 Dispatch notes also are retained in narrative
- 1 Dispatchers, Data Entry, and officers
- 1 Just me (for now)
- 1 Officer enters initial report; Record tech takes this report & enters all
- 1 SCI BRS elements
- 1 Police Chief (Presently)
- 1 Receptionist (Flissa Smith)
- 1 Records Clerk
- 1 Secretary is designated to enter the incident reports
- 1 Verified by records clerk
- 1 All dispatchers
- 1 Crime analyst
- 1 Currently as of 5/6/02 Records Personnel does entry prior to 5/6/02
- 1 officers did entry
- 1 Investigator can supplement and change status. Arresting officer can add booking, but not modify original report-if he's not reporting officer.
- 1 Not entered
- 1 Officer enter is checked by chief of police. We have not yet started to
- 1 send automated report
- 1 Officers complete incident reports on a laptop, records clerk enter data
- 1 into RMS from the incident reports

4. Approximately how many incident reports are entered into the computer on a weekly basis?

Number of Incident Reports	Frequency	Percent
Missing	2	1.67
0-10	12	10.00
11-20	17	14.17
21-50	34	28.33
51-100	17	14.17
101-150	9	7.50
More than 150	29	24.17
Total	120	100.00

5. Approximately how many person-hours does it take, on a weekly basis, to enter these incident reports?

Number of Person-Hours	Frequency	Percent
Missing	2	1.67
0-10	47	39.17
11-20	19	15.83
21-50	26	21.67
51-100	12	10.00
More than 100	14	11.67
Total	120	100.00

6. How quickly are the incident reports entered into the computer?

How Quickly Entered?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	2	1.67
More than 3 Days	6	5.00
No Set Time - Depends	22	18.33
Within 2-3 Days	22	18.33
Within 24 Hrs	68	56.67
Total	120	100.00

7. How is the incident report information sent to SLED?

How Sent to SLED?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	1	0.83
Computer Disk/Tape	30	25.00
Email Attachment	33	27.50
Other	5	4.17
Paper by Mail	46	38.33
Testing with SLED	5	4.17
Total	120	100.00

8. Explain "Other" from Question 7 above.

Other Frequency
 In process of going paperless
 1
 Not sent to SLED
 1
 About to begin testing w/SLED, for a second time
 1
 Just started this system, we will start as soon as we can
 1
 Preparing to test with SLED with new system INTERACT
 1
 We are switching from disk to email
 1
 We are testing new software, we are going to start testing within the next month
 1
 Working toward testing with SLED in the future
 1

9. If you send paper incident reports to SLED, why are they not sent electronically?

(Note: multiple responses to this question are possible.)

Why Not Sent Electronically?	Frequency	Percent
Software can NOT transmit electronically	25	27.78
Software can NOT output the data in a format that SLED can read	11	12.22
Software can NOT output the data in ANY format	4	4.44
Software can NOT perform the edits as required by SLED	11	12.22
Don't know how - need technical support	10	11.11
Other	29	32.22
Total	90	100.00

OTHER:

Currently testing - not successfully finished	1
Currently upgrading our software. Will be ready to begin testing July 2002.	1
Currently, our system is inoperable due to system failure - Searching other software vendors.	1
Do not have software	1
In process of having programs written by Delta Computer System to electronically send data from AS400 to SLED	1
In process of sending electronically	1
No VCR information entered	1
Preparing to send with email attachment in order to send to SLED	1
Software not compliant with SLED requirements	1
Software still has errors	1
We can submit electronically once some corrections are made to data errors	1
We have "Spillman" SLED does not accept a "conversion" from Spillman.	1
We just installed New Vision Software-need to start testing w/SLED soon	1
Computers not connected to internet	1
Do not have program/software or the funds for purchase program/software	1
In process of correcting problems	1
Officer training and turn-over rate	1
Old reports have not been entered.	1
Only murder incident - hard copy sent	1
Setting up training with software vendor	1
Software is internal program without this ability	1
Testing	1
They request hard copies for certain reports. Murder, etc.	1

OTHER (cont.):

Waiting on SLED approval	1
We have been working to go electronic. We contracted in through Lucent Technologies in 1995; however, we have been struggling to get it to work.	1
We have just begun to enter Incident Reports with our new software (May, 2002)	1
We just passed our "testing" and are starting to submit electronically	1
Will be starting testing w/SLED within a couple of weeks	1
Will begin testing with May 2002 Data	1

The following is a list of those ten agencies (from Question 9 above) that sent incident reports to SLED by mail *and* who need technical support:

- 1 Andrews Police Department
- 2 Bamberg Police Department
- 3 Bennettsville Police Department
- 4 Calhoun Sheriff's Office
- 5 Clover Police Department
- 6 Kingstree Police Department
- 7 Lamar Police Department
- 8 Loris Police Department
- 9 North Augusta Department of Public Safety
- 10 Springdale Police Department

Of those agencies that stated they were SCIBRS compliant (Question 2), the following table indicates how these agencies sent their incident reports to SLED:

<u>How Sent to SLED?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	1	1.18
Computer Disk/Tape	28	32.94
Email Attachment	32	37.65
Other	2	2.35
Paper by Mail	18	21.18
Testing with SLED	4	4.71
Total	85	100.00

The following table shows the agencies that are SCIBRS compliant, yet sent their incident reports to SLED through the mail in paper form:

<u>Agency Name</u>
1 Bennettsville Police Department
2 Calhoun Sheriff's Office
3 City of Columbia
4 Clinton Police Department
5 Clover Police Department
6 Dillon Police Department
7 Folly Beach Police Department
8 Irmo Police Department
9 Lamar Police Department
10 Mt. Pleasant Police Department
11 Rock Hill Police Department
12 Santee Police Department
13 Spartanburg Sheriff's Office
14 Springdale Police Department
15 Sumter Police Department
16 Town of South Congaree
17 Union County Sheriff's Office
18 Wrensboro Police Department

(Note: Of these 18 agencies, only one, Clover Police Department, stated that they DO NOT plan to send its incident reports to SLED electronically (Question 25)).

Of the 91 agencies that stated that their incident reporting system was automated *and* that they entered *all* the information into their system (Question 1), the following table indicates how these agencies sent their incident reports to SLED:

<u>How Sent to SLED?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	2	2.20
Computer Disk/Tape	23	25.27
Email Attachment	29	31.87
Other	3	3.30
Paper by Mail	30	32.97
Testing with SLED	4	4.40
Total	91	100.00

Of the 38 agencies that stated they entered more than 100 incident reports into the Computer (Question 4), the following table indicates how those incident reports were sent to SLED:

How Sent to SLED?	Frequency	Percent
Computer Disk/Tape	6	15.79
Email Attachment	15	39.47
Other	1	2.63
Paper by Mail	14	36.84
Testing with SLED	2	5.26
Total	38	100.00

10. If the data are entered into a computer by your agency's staff or officers, is the computer that the incident data are entered into a "stand-alone" computer or is it connected to a network of computers, to a mainframe computer, a server, or some other device?

	Frequency	Percent
Mainframe	24	20.17
Other	3	2.52
PC Network	80	67.23
Stand Alone PC	12	10.08
Total	119	100.00

Other:

Network of "personal" computers	1
Prior to 5/6/02 laptops diskettes, downloaded into system	1
QSI -Lawsys	1
Server	3
Connected to server	1
Host and 2 other computers in the office	1
Network of "personal" computers	1
Stand-alone laptops that are decked and downloaded 2x a day onto the LAN server.	1

11. What is your operating system?

Operating System	Frequency
Missing	45
AS400	3
AS400 NT	1
AS400/New World Systems	1
AS400/Windows 2000	1
AS400/Windows NT	1
All Greenville Co is networked together thru 911	1
Cisco	1
Curren - DOS New - Windows 2000	1
DOS	1
Del I	1
Genesis	1
H. T. E./Crimes	1
IBM AS/400	1
Interact/Windows 2000 Professional	1
MS Windows 2000	1
NT	1
NT	2
NT 4 (SPGA)	1
NT 4.0	2
NT 4.0 Visions RMS and Windows 2000	1
NT and 2000	1
NT and 2000XP	1
NT, 98, Millium, XP	1
NT, AS400	1
OS/4000	1
PC-Software	1
Police Central as of 06/19/02	1
Progress	1
QS1	1
RMS Visions Windows NT/SQL Server	1
Smith Data	1
Smith Data - Compaq	1
Smith Data/QSI	1
Smith-Data -old	1
Spillman Software	1
UNIX	2
Unix platform, Blacksmith O/S	1
Vision	1
Windows	3
Windows 2000	4
Windows 2000 - Win NT	1
Windows 2000 Pro	1
Windows 2000 Professional	1
Windows 2000/NT Network	1
Windows 4.0/Server	1
Windows 95	1
Windows 98	1
Windows 98 second edition	1
Windows NS	1
Windows NT	9
Windows NT & 2000	1
Windows NT 4.0	2
Windows NT server/Windows 98 PC and laptops	1
Server: Windows NT 4.0 Workstations: Win 98 & 2000	1
We are upgrading to Sheriff Pack	1

12. What is the name(s) of the software that your staff uses, or your vendor uses, to enter the data into the computer?

Software Name	Frequency
Missing	9
"Pro Cop"	1
ASG/Developer 2000	1
Access	1
Advance Solutions Crime Software 5.441	1
Capture	1
Changing from Visions to Nicholson	1
Cisco	1
Cisco Software/10.0	1
Contact Smith Data	1
Crimes - HTE Vender	1
CrimesHTE	1
Custom Software	1
DCS, Inc.	1
DSD > used to be Lucent > Paladium	1
Dataforce	1
Enterpol	1
FoxPro	1
GEAC	1
Genesis Law Enforcement Suite 2.0	1
Genesis Software	1
H. T. E.	1
H. T. E. PUBLIC SAFETY PRODUTS	1
HTE	2
HTEPublic Safety, Inc.	1
HTEx	2
In house mainframe	1
InterAct	1
Internal Program	1
Keystone Public Safety	1
Law - Trak	1
Lawsys	1
Lawtrak (A FoxPro Based Product)	1
Microsoft Excel	1
Microsoft Windows NT	1
NBS LAWTRAK	1
NBS Lantrak	1
NBS Law Trak	1
NI BRS LAW TRAK	1
NT 4.0	1
New World Aegis Public Safety	1
New World Systems	2
New World Systems - AEGIS - AS/400 Platform	1
Nicholson Bus. Systems Lawtrak	1
Nicholson Business Systems Florence, SC	1
OTG	1
Omni -Form 4.01	1
Omni form/DELTA	1
Oracle	1
PD Manager (Digitorque Inc.)	1
Personal designed Trakit (Access based)	1
Police Central	1
Police Central - NI BRS	1
Police Central Technology for Law Enforcement	1
Police Pak	1
Police Track	1
Police Trak - IPTM - Older DOS based program with no current support	1
Police-Pak / Southern Software	1
Progress	1
Q & A	2
QS1	1
QSI	1
QSI/Smith Data	1
RMS	1
RMS (VisionAir)	1
RMS - Paperless Reporting (VisionAir)	1
RMS = (Public Safety Suite)	1
RMS Case	1
RMS by Interact	1
Same as Greenville County	1
Set Form	1
Sheriff Pack	1

Software Name (cont.)	Frequency
Smith Data	3
Smith Data - Compaq	1
Smith Data - old	1
Smith Data Currently testing Police Central	1
Smith Data LawSys	1
Smith Data QS1	1
Spillman	1
VisionAir (RMS)	1
Vision	1
Vision - RMS	1
Vision Air - Records Management System (Public Safety Suite)	1
Vision Aire Records Management Systems	1
Vision RMS	2
Vision Record Management System	1
Vision Software - DOS Version	1
Vision Software PCI Base	1
VisionAir	1
VisionAir RMS	1
Visionair	1
Visionair Public Safety Suite	1
Visionair RMS	1
Visionair RMS & "Paperless"	1
Visionair RMS (Record Management System)	1
Visionaire RMS	1
Visions	1
Visions RMS	1
Windows 2000/Microsoft	1
Windows NT	1
Custom design system by in-house personnel	1
Don't know	1
In Pursuit Denali Solutions	1
None	1

13. If you have purchased software from a vendor, what is the name of the vendor(s)?

Vendor Name	Frequency
Missing	14
ASG	1
ASG/University of SC	1
BDS - Business Data Systems	1
Bernie Harris	1
CSB Specialty Software Scott Bruder	1
Cisco Software	1
Construction Imaging Systems, Inc.	1
DCS, Inc.	1
DELTA Computer Systems	1
DSD	1
David Lovergan	1
Denali Solutions	1
Digitorque Inc.	1
Don't Know	1
Enterpol	1
Freeman's Computers	1
GEAC	1
Genesis	1
H. T. E.	1
H. T. E. purchased through Greenville County	1
HTE	3
HTEx	2
IPTM	2
InterAct	1
Interact	2
Jesse Mendeola	1
Keystone	1
N/A	1
New World	2
New World Systems	2
Nicholson Bus. System, Inc	1
Nicholson Business Support	1
Nicholson Business System	1
Nicholson Business Systems	4
Nicholson's Business	1

Vendor Name (con't)	Frequency
Nisholson's Business	1
Oracle	1
Police Central	2
Police Central, Inc.	1
QSI/Smith Data	1
Same as Greenville County	1
Smart Public Safety Software	1
Smith Data	9
Smith Data Processing	4
Smith Data and Police Central	1
Smtih Data Processing	1
Southern Software	2
Southern Softwares	1
Spillman	1
University of South Carolina	1
VisionAir	1
Vision	4
Vision Air	1
Vision Aire	1
Vision Software	1
VisionAir	8
Visionair	7
Visionaire	3
Visions	2
Visions (VisionAir)	1
Written In-House	1
Don't know	1
None	1

14. If you have purchased software from a vendor, do you have an ongoing contract with them for technical support, training, or upgrades?

Vendor Support	Frequency	Percent
Missing	12	10.08
No	16	13.45
Other	8	6.72
Yes - Full Support	67	56.30
Yes - Limited Support	16	13.45
Total	119	100.00

Explain Other	Frequency
DOS version no longer supported by Vision	1
Greenville County Sheriff's Office E911 provides our technical support	1
IPTM no longer offers support for this version of software	1
Mainframe support only	1
Not sure	1
We are currently in the process of "change"	1
We are not currently fully on-line with the software	1
We are on the system through Greenville County, do not have this info	1
Canceled	1
Consulting firm customizes, maintains software	1
The system we have is outdated and we no longer have technical support	1
Through 911 located in Greenville County	1
Will have contract in future	1

15. If you have purchased software from a vendor, can you or your staff . . . (Can have multiple responses.)

	Frequency	Percent
Generate reports on an 'as needed' basis?	76	39.38
Change or modify data entry screens to add or remove data elements?	26	13.47
Modify data entry screens to improve data entry efficiency?	20	10.36
Output the data, or create a data file, in a variety of formats?	30	15.54
None of the above - the vendor must make all modifications to the software.	24	12.44
Other	17	8.81
Total	193	100.00

Of the thirty (30) agencies that stated that they could “Output the data, or create a data file, in a variety of formats,” the following table indicates how these agencies sent their incident reports to SLED:

How Sent to SLED?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	1	3.33
Computer Disk/Tape	4	13.33
Email Attachment	12	40.00
Other	2	6.67
Paper by Mail	9	30.00
Testing with SLED	2	6.67
Total	30	100.00

16. Other (from Question 15 above)? Explain:

Other:	Frequency
Greenville County techs can make changes to data entry screens	1
Imaging Systems Only	1
Minimal Ability	1
Modifications made only by administrator or vendor	1
Note: We can make limited changes to software screens, tables, etc.	1
Software was not purchased from a vendor. Police officers put in data in computer.	1
Some reports can be generated on line, but there are limits what a user can do.	1
Formats of reports have limitations on setup and layout. Some screens have been setup as user defined, there are still limits. Some reports can be generated on-line, but there are limitations. Report formats have restrictions as to setup/layout.	1
To some extent	1
Vendor makes any screen changes and format changes	1
We have not needed to change the screens as of yet. If we do need to do one of these tasks, we would call vendor first to let us know what needs to be done and what steps to take.	1
Only as pre-programed and only in vendor formats	1
The software is supposed to do the above, but does not work consistently	1
Unknown	1
Vendor is working on other items in this list	1
Vendor will make other changes as requested	1
We can edit and modify data all fields are changed by vendor	1

17. How satisfied are you with the software package that you are using for your agency’s internal purposes?

How Satisfied?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	6	5.13
Not Satisfied	24	20.51
Somewhat Satisfied	39	33.33
Very Satisfied	48	41.03
Total	117	100.00

Of those agencies who are “Very Satisfied” with their software package (n=48), the following is a listing of their software packages:

<u>Software Name</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Missing	4
"Pro Cop"	1
Advance Solutions Crime Software 5.441	1
Contact Smith Data	1
Custom Software	1
Enterpol	1
Genesis Software	1
H. T. E.	1
H. T. E. PUBLIC SAFETY PRODUTS	1
HTEx	1
InterAct	1
Law - Trak	1
Lawsys	1
Lawtrak (A FoxPro Based Product)	1
Microsoft Windows NT	1
NBS LAWTRAK	1
NBS Lantrak	1
NIBRS LAW TRAK	1
New World Aegis Public Safety	1
New World Systems	1
New World Systems - AEGIS - AS/400 Platform	1
Nicholson Bus. Systems Lawtrak	1
Nicholson Business Systems Florence, SC	1
PD Manager (Digitorque Inc.)	1
Police Central - NIBRS	1
Police Central Technology for Law Enforcement	1
Police Pak	1
Police Track	1
Police-Pak / Southern Software	1
Progress	1
Q & A	1
QSI/Smith Data	1
RMS = (Public Safety Suite)	1
RMS by Interact	1
Set Form	1
Smith Data Currently testing Police Central	1
Vision Air - Records Management	1
System (Public Safety Suite)	1
Vision Aire Records Management Systems	1
Vision RMS	1
Vision Software - DOS Version	1
VisionAir	1
VisionAir RMS	1
Visionaire RMS	1
Windows NT	1
Don't know	1

Of those agencies who are “Very Satisfied” with their software package (n=48), the following is a listing of their vendors:

<u>Vendor Name</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Missing	2
Bernie Harris	1
CSB Specialty Software Scott Bruder	1
Digitorque Inc.	1
Don't Know	1
Enterpol	1
Freeman's Computers	1
H. T. E.	1
H. T. E. purchased through Greenville County	1
HTEx	1
IPTM	1
InterAct	1
Interact	1
New World	1
New World Systems	2
Nicholson Bus. System, Inc	1
Nicholson Business System	1
Nicholson Business Systems	3
Nicholson's Business	1
Nicholson's Business	1
Oracle	1

Vendor Name (cont.)	Frequency
Police Central	1
Police Central, Inc.	1
QSI/Smith Data	1
Smith Data	2
Smith Data Processing	3
Smith Data and Police Central	1
Southern Software	2
University of South Carolina	1
VisionAir	1
Vision	1
Vision Aire	1
VisionAir	4
Visionair	1
Visionaire	1
Written In-House	1
Don't know	1

Of those agencies who are “Not Satisfied” with their software package (n=24), the following is a listing of their software packages:

Software Name	Frequency
Missing	2
Capture	1
Cisco	1
Crimes - HTE Vender	1
CrimesHTE	1
DSD > used to be Lucent > Paladium	1
Dataforce	1
FoxPro	1
HTE	1
In house mainframe	1
Keystone Public Safety	1
NT 4.0	1
Police Trak - IPTM - Older DOS based program with no current support	1
QSI	1
RMS	1
Smith Data	1
Smith Data - Compaq	1
Smith Data - old	1
Smith Data QSI	1
Spillman	1
Vision RMS	1
Visionair RMS	1
Custom design system by in-house personnel	1

Of those agencies who are “Not Satisfied” with their software package (n=24), the following is a listing of their vendors:

Vendor Name	Frequency
Missing	6
DSD	1
HTE	2
IPTM	1
Jesse Mendeola	1
Keystone	1
Smart Public Safety Software	1
Smith Data	5
Spillman	1
Vision	1
Vision Air	1
VisionAir	1
Visionair	1
Visionaire	1

18. If you are somewhat or not satisfied with your software package, please explain.

Explain	Frequency
Missing	10
"Bugs" in systems not addressed in timely fashion or no information forthcoming on when or if problem can or will be solved	1
Cannot generate specific reports	1
Currently using outdated version (1.8) updating to 3.0	1
Data entry is difficult at times. Narrative portion of report does not automatically advance to next line. This must be done manually.	1
Debugging software took much longer than anticipated.	1
Software program was not fully functional when it went on line	1
Does not retrieve as we would like	1
Have ongoing issues that vendor has failed to rectify	1
I feel we need a better program, but money is the real issue	1
It will not send electronically to SLED, we can not generate reports	1
It's great software, but its only supplied to (2) agencies in SC, we feel left out	1
Need more report generating abilities	1
Need simplicity	1
Not currently up to date. Working out the bugs.	1
Problems with lost data, navigation and search capabilities. Limited in search and report formats.	1
Problems with software takes awhile to fix	1
RMS was a complete package deal w/laptop reporting and information transfer from SLED	1
Set up in DOS format - very difficult to learn - Smith data made a lot of promises that they did not hold up too.	1
Software is not very user friendly; not as integrated as advertised; can not use all modules purchased.	1
Some areas need to allow user to determine or delete data base entries not needed. Reports should allow for user defined searches.	1
Spillman is UNIX based, and is not adequate for information network data between the different agencies in the county.	1
System failure no way to re-establish system	1
Too early in the training phase to determine	1
Visions software seems to be designed to serve too many agencies and functions. Simplification would be good.	1
We are still experiencing problems that need to be resolved	1
We have experienced many problems such as lost data, too many screens to collect data, and search capabilities are limited. While problems are corrected, we're still limited in search & report format.	1
Would prefer software that could send to SLED	1
Certain aspects of functionality is limited.	1
Company no longer supports software; have to contact/locate individual to make any necessary changes to program.	1
Limited ability to make changes or modify output.	1
Continuous software validation problems	1
Currently updating to send entire report	1
Do not have the technical we need	1
Does not validate all fields	1
Incident reports need to be on one screen	1
It was designed inside our office and is very limited.	1
Lack of flexibility	1
Need additional training which is very expensive	1
New system, trying to work out all the kinks	1
No tech support	1
Not "friendly user"	1
Programming needs are not met on a timely basis	1
Reports are too difficult to understand	1
Some data is lost on arrest from laptop to RMS that requires manually putting it into RMS (They are working to correct this problem)	1
Some errors vendor has to correct	1
Tech support does not always understand our need	1
There are still issues that have not been corrected at this time in the software.	1
This program only allows reports in a written format.	1
Too many "runtime error" codes	1
Unable to customize reports to our departmental needs without going through another agency.	1
Unable to furnish data for other purposes	1
Upgrade will be providing what we need	1
Very inconvenient and cannot query to the need basis. System was not functional or having capability to fit the need of the Police Dept.	1
We have not accepted the DSD software which was installed in 1999.	1
We have the low end deal. Cant do things we would like to do. Basically, cant enter traffic warrants, etc.	1

19. Are there plans to purchase another system?

Plans?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	10	8.55
No	76	64.96
Yes	31	26.50
Total	117	100.00

20. How satisfied are you with the software package that you are using for the purpose of generating data for SLED reporting purposes?

How satisfied?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	10	8.40
Not Applicable	16	13.45
Not Satisfied	20	16.81
Somewhat Satisfied	21	17.65
Very Satisfied	52	43.70
Total	119	100.00

Of those agencies who are “Very Satisfied” with their software package (n=52), the following is a listing of their software packages:

Software Name	Frequency
Missing	5
Changing from Visions to Nicholson	1
Contact Smith Data	1
Custom Software	1
DCS, Inc.	1
Enterpol	1
Genesis Software	1
HTEPublic Safety, Inc.	1
HTEx	2
InterAct	1
Law - Trak	1
Lawtrak (A FoxPro Based Product)	1
NBS LAWTRAK	1
NBS Lantrak	1
NI BRS LAW TRAK	1
New World Aegis Public Safety	1
New World Systems - AEGIS - AS/400 Platform	1
Nicholson Bus. Systems Lawtrak	1
Nicholson Business Systems Florence, SC	1
PD Manager (Digitorque Inc.)	1
Police Central - NI BRS	1
Police Central Technology for Law Enforcement	1
Police Pak	1
Police Track	1
Police-Pak / Southern Software	1
OSI/Smith Data	1
RMS = (Public Safety Suite)	1
RMS by Interact	1
Set Form	1
Smith Data	1
Smith Data Currently testing Police Central	1
Smith Data LawSys	1
VisionAir (RMS)	1
Vision	1
Vision Air - Records Management System (Public Safety Suite)	1
Vision Aire Records Management Systems	1
Vision RMS	1
Vision Software - DOS Version	1
Vision Software PCI Base	1
VisionAir	1
VisionAir RMS	1
Visionair Public Safety Suite	1
Visionair RMS (Record Management System)	1
Visionaire RMS	1
Windows NT	1
Don't know	1
In Pursuit Denali Solutions	1

Of those agencies who are “Very Satisfied” with their software package (n=52), the following is a listing of their vendors:

Vendor Name	Frequency
Missing	2
BDS - Business Data Systems	1
Bernie Harris	1
DCS, Inc.	1
Denali Solutions	1
Digitorque Inc.	1
Don't Know	1
Enterpol	1
HTE	1
HTEx	2
IPTM	1
InterAct	1
Interact	2
New World	1
New World Systems	1
Nicholson Bus. System, Inc	1
Nicholson Business Support	1
Nicholson Business System	1
Nicholson Business Systems	3
Nicholson's Business	1
Nicholson's Business	1
Police Central	1
Police Central, Inc.	1
QSI/Smith Data	1
Smith Data	1
Smith Data Processing	4
Smith Data and Police Central	1
Southern Software	2
VisionAir	1
Vision	2
Vision Aire	1
Vision Software	1
VisionAir	5
Visionair	3
Visionaire	1
Don't know	1

Of those agencies who are “Not Satisfied” or were “Somewhat Satisfied” with their software package (n=41), the following is a listing of their software packages:

Software Name	Frequency
Missing	2
"Pro Cop"	1
ASG/Developer 2000	1
Advance Solutions Crime Software 5.441	1
Cisco	1
Cisco Software/10.0	1
Crimes - HTE Vender	1
CrimesHTE	1
DSD > used to be Lucent > Paladium	1
Dataforce	1
GEAC	1
Genesis Law Enforcement Suite 2.0	1
H. T. E.	1
H. T. E. PUBLIC SAFETY PRODUTS	1
HTE	1
In house mainframe	1
Keystone Public Safety	1
Lawsys	1
NT 4.0	1
New World Systems	2
Omni-Form 4.01	1
Oracle	1
Personal designed Trakit (Access based)	1
Police Trak - IPTM - Older DOS based program with no current support	1
QSI	1
QSI	1
RMS	1

Software Name (con't)	Frequency
RMS (VisionAir)	1
RMS - Paperless Reporting (VisionAir)	1
Smith Data	2
Smith Data - Compaq	1
Smith Data - old	1
Smith Data QS1	1
Vision Record Management System	1
Visionair RMS	1
Visionair RMS & "Paperless"	1
Visions	1
Visions RMS	1

Of those agencies who are “Not Satisfied” or were “Somewhat Satisfied” with their software package (n=41), the following is a listing of their vendors:

Vendor Name	Frequency
Missing	5
ASG	1
ASG/University of SC	1
CSB Specialty Software Scott Bruder	1
Cisco Software	1
DSD	1
GEAC	1
Genesis	1
H. T. E.	1
H. T. E. purchased through Greenville County	1
HTE	2
IPTM	1
Jesse Mendeola	1
Keystone	1
New World	1
New World Systems	1
Smith Data	8
Smith Data Processing	1
University of South Carolina	1
Vision	1
VisionAir	2
Visionair	3
Visionaire	1
Visions	2
Visions (VisionAir)	1

21. If you are somewhat or not satisfied, please explain.

Explain	Frequency
Missing	10
9A above	1
Agency would like to replace/update software, but cannot afford a new program/software.	1
Can't update, correct, not user friendly	1
Difficult to achieve a finale report	1
IBASE report takes too long to validate any generate the report (hours).	1
If there is a problem there is no tech support	1
Overall program has room for improvement in user friendly areas.	1
Question 9	1
Requests have been made to the vendor regarding a particular months submissions. Vendor advised they could not re-create the file format for that month. This is unacceptable practice.	1
Sometimes there are problems with the system.	1
Tech support does not always understand our problems	1
Time consuming may be better with 3.0 version	1
Too many different steps to follow.	1
Vendor response to problems with submissions to SLED.	1
Visions software seems to be designed to serve too many agencies and functions. Simplification would be good.	1
We send hard copies	1
Working on small SCIBRS Problems	1
Error codes, system lock ups, will not allow the use of the same "UCR" more than once, per report.	1

Explain	Frequency
Its easier than doing it by hand - but the process is very difficult	1
Complex	1
Not compliant with SLED - Data fields not complied just for SC - Etc.	1
Our system doesn't generate data for SLED reporting purposes	1
Problems with software, and training issues of personnel	1
Programming changes not made in a timely fashion	1
Programming needs are not met on a timely basis	1
Software does not work properly	1
The closeface system that we currently have, or experienced numerous problem during query process	1
The reports generated sometimes do not catch all errors.	1
The software program is not user friendly. It is old and in my opinion not efficiently at all.	1
There are still some validation errors that are not being caught before downloading that need to be corrected by Visionair	1
Unable to generate Ibase filer due to training error that resulted in 18 mths of data being entered incorrectly.	1
We are trying to get the software SLED compatible	1

22. Are there plans to purchase another system?

Plans?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	18	15.13
No	73	61.34
Yes	28	23.53
Total	119	100.00

23. If you have data entry personnel, are they trained in SCIBRS?

Data Entry Personnel Trained?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	13	10.92
Don't Know	2	1.68
No	26	21.85
Some Are	12	10.08
Yes	66	55.46
Total	119	100.00

24. If officers enter their own incident reports into the computer, are they trained in SCIBRS?

Officers Trained?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	38	31.93
Don't Know	1	0.84
No	40	33.61
Some Are	16	13.45
Yes	24	20.17
Total	119	100.00

25. Do you have plans to send your incident reports to SLED electronically?

Plans?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	33	17.37
No	46	24.21
Yes	111	58.42
Total	190	100.00

26. If NO to Question 25, why not?

Explain

Because we cannot afford the software
Can not afford the program
Cost of equipment and software approximately 1/5 of annual budget to establish.
Cost of updating system
Cost prohibitive for our volume of incident reports
Do not have an automated system
Do not have the personnel, or th software to do this with
Don't have money to purchase software or automated system
Due to our department size and budget, I don't see it in the near future.
No software practice
Problem with training
The cheapest system I have found to automate would cost \$12,000 and then about \$150.00 per month to maintain. I don't have this money.
Town can't afford the system
We are a small department with a small budget and do not know if we will have the funds to purchase necessary equipment.
We don't have the system to send these nor the funds.
We generate so few report, expense is prohibitive
We have no computer system and have requested one for years from City Government but are always turned down.
We need the equipment
We will have to code sheets for a while.
At the time of survey 5-17-02 we hope to send to SLED electronically if we had money to purchase software X. Can give no timetable at this time X.
At this time no, cost of software? No funds.
At this time Lake View Police Department is not automated. Lack of funds at this time.
Budget restraints
Can't afford software at this time
Cost of software and size of agency
Dept has only 3 officers and town has limited funds to purchase computer and software for electronic record keeping and filing economic needs.
Expense
Funds available to purchase software and equipment
No computer system at this time
Not at this time
Not at this time. No funds in our budget to hire person or buy software
Not until funds are available for purchase of program/software
Our computer is out dated, and will not except any of the new programs
Small department can't afford software
Small town funds
Software
This is a small town and a very limited budget. At this time there are no computer in house or money for software
We do not have the capabilities
Agency too small

27. If YES to Question 25, please describe your plans and timetable.

Describe

Already done
Already live
Approx 1 year
As soon as I can get my City Council to see how important it is. I really need someone to meet with my council to explain this matter from SLED level.
By October 2002
Currently doing
Currently looking at software. Hope to be on line by Oct 2002
Currently putting in place necessary data to transmit test within 45 days.
Currently submitting 2001 Data and 2002 Data
Doing so now
Financing system changes a problem. As soon as we can - we will - we send info on disk
Greenville County (PD and SO) were the first agencies in the state to submit data on SCIBRS/NIBRS as they were part of the FBI pilot project in 1990. Began sending live data electronically in 1991.
Hope to introduce automated system within 6 months to 1 year
Hopefully witin the next 3 months.

Describe (con't)

I am trying to get a computer and software needed to send them electronically
I am unable to determine timetable due to short falls within the budget @ this time.
I hope to have in place within next two years. Have trouble getting money for program.
I hope to have it in place by 1 Nov 02
I need to have the personel trained and have the proper software loaded.
I would like to know what we could do to be able to send electronically?
If funds are located to provide for new software program
In process of correcting data and expect to be xxxxx by summer of 2002.
In the planning stages
January 2005
Limit of budget and availability of grants will dictate time frame, 2-3 years is a hopeful projection.
Need help or advise on getting set up for this matter
Negotiable a suitable program for both NIBR and SCIR
No time set.
October 2002
Plan on starting live testing within a couple of weeks and hopefully be certified by Sept 1, '02
Plan to begin testing with May 2002 data.
Plan to tie into Colleton County Sheriff's Office computer. Unknown timetable.
Prior to deadline, provided that I can be trained to do it correctly
Sheriff Pack by August of 2002
Sometime after July of 2003
Straighten out problems with software. By October 30, 2002 complete testing and certification process.
Tentative xxxxx to begin test data submissions by fall 2002.
Testing with SLED - Timetable is 6 months
The department is considering another software at this time. No later than the end of July, the department should have a new software.
The town budget for the police department is being looked at to cover cost of computer.
To meet with the new Mayor after the November election and try to have it in place by Jan 2003.
Updating computers
Vendor writing software program to become compliant with SLED requirements
We are currently working with Southern Software Ref. Their coming and getting us started
We are sending by disk now and as soon as we are approved by SLED
We have a Smith Data System, but we are unable to keep the system working (maintenance problems). We plan to purchase the new system within the next year.
We have applied for grant funding to purchase software. Hopefully we will know something this summer, if grant was approved.
We have put this in the budget and is planning on this year or at the latest next year.
We just began entering data into our new system in May, 2002, and are not sure when we will be ready to send the IT to SLED electronically
We plan to contact SLED next week to do a test run.
We plan to have system in place by SLED deadline.
We will know more July 1 when we install the new system
When mandated - Our council will not give us money to purchase equipment and software.
When we get the money to buy a system
Already automated
Already do
Already doing this
Already on line
Already sending "live" data by email
Already submitting
Already transmitting
By SLED deadline or sooner. Currently working to pass beyond the testing phase.
By email
Currently transmitting through Smith Data. Testing with Police Central
Don't know
E-mail again
Electronic submission will be conducted upon acquisition of required hardware/software. Financially prohibited at this point. (12-18 month implantation)
Have already contacted several vendors for quotes and info. Timetable is as soon as possible.
Hopefully in the next 6 months
If the cost will work. Pawleys is a 2 man department with one part-time.
Our budget is from tourist accommodation tax.
New 911 and records management system to be purchased by December (hopefully)
New software from another company by October 2002
Not before deadline by SLED. Budget funding is not available for us to be compliant.

Describe (con't)

Only if state supp. agency or finds funds to assist in purchase of software.
 Presently, local funds unavailable.
 Our plan is to be online 7/10/02 we are including sheriff's pack with Southern
 Software cad
 Our plans are to purchase the automated systems to do so
 Planning to purchase database system within the next six months
 Purchasing new equipment and software to allow reports to be sent electronically.
 By the end of 2002.
 Scheduling training with the vendor to start
 searching for a tech grant to purchase hardware and software 2002 fiscal year.
 Talking with SLED at this time
 Testing
 Testing email by October
 The plan is to get a new system with the new budget year July 2002 and have the
 system ready to transmit late Aug.
 Try to purchase software up coming budget year in July
 Upgrade software and comply with SLED requirements
 Waiting for more information, within next six months
 We are currently looking at some software systems but do not have a set time frame
 We are sending electronically
 We plan to have a compatible system installed before Fall, '03
 We submit by email attachment
 Will begin testing after upgrade - July 2002
 Within the next two years
 Within the next year, hopefully
 Within then next 6 months if the patch for the CAD is written
 Working on, no timetable

28. If you do NOT have an automated system, are there plans to purchase one?

<u>Purchase?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	58	30.53
Don't Know	28	14.74
No	26	13.68
Not Applicable	43	22.63
Yes	35	18.42
Total	190	100.00

(Note: Of the 72 agencies that answered 'No' to Question 1, 24 said that they do have plans to purchase a system; 19 said they do not have plans; 22 stated they didn't know; and, 7 were missing or 'not applicable'.)

The following is a listing of those agencies that stated that they plan to purchase an automated system:

- Agency Name
- 1 Allendale County Sheriff's Office
 - 2 Andrews Police Department
 - 3 Atlantic Beach Police Department
 - 4 Bluffton Police Department
 - 5 Burnetttown Police Department
 - 6 Campobello Police Department
 - 7 Central Police Department
 - 8 Charleston Police Department
 - 9 Chesterfield Sheriff's Office
 - 10 Clio Police Department
 - 11 Darlington County Sheriff's Department
 - 12 Eastover Police Department
 - 13 Elloree Police Department
 - 14 Estill Police Department
 - 15 Forest Acres Police Department
 - 16 Greeleyville Police Department
 - 17 Inman Police Department
 - 18 Johnsonville Police Department
 - 19 Kingstree Police Department
 - 20 Landrum Police Department
 - 21 Liberty Police Department
 - 22 McCormick City Police Department
 - 23 Pageland Police Department
 - 24 Pickens County Sheriffs Department
 - 25 Pinewood Police Department
 - 26 Ridgeland Police Department

	<u>Agency Name</u>
27	Saluda County Sheriff Office
28	Spartanburg Sheriff's Office
29	St. George Police Department
30	Tega Cay Police Department
31	Varnville Police Department
32	Wagener Police Department
33	West Union Police Department
34	Williamston Police Department
35	Williston Police Department

29. Does your agency have an automated mapping program/system?

<u>GIS?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	6	3.16
No	157	82.63
Yes	27	14.21
Total	190	100.00

30. If yes, what software do you use?

<u>What Software?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Missing	167
Arc Info	1
Arc View w/Crime View Ext.	1
ArcGIS	1
ArcView	1
ArcView	1
Arcview	4
Arcview GIS 3.2a	1
Arcview will be online in the near future.	1
Cisco	1
ESRI Arcview	1
ESRT - GIS	1
H. T. E.	1
InfoCop: Information Management and Analysis for Community Oriented Policing.	1
Interact Public Safety Systems	1
Map Info	1
New World	1
New World Systems and unknown system	1
Unknown	1
Vision	1
We have made arrangements to "piggy-back" off Beaufort County's system.	1

31. If your agency does not have a mapping system, are there plans to purchase one?

<u>Purchase GIS?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	28	14.74
Don't Know	53	27.89
No	86	45.26
Yes	23	12.11
Total	190	100.00

32. If you have plans to purchase a mapping system, what is your timetable and what type of system are you planning to purchase?

Timetable	Frequency
Missing	152
12-18 mo	1
2 months	1
2 to 3 years. Arcview. We have Arcinfo in our utility dept.	1
3-6 months - NT based system	1
6 mos-1 year GIS	1
ARCVIEW GIS	1
Approximately 6 years. System will be determined.	1
ArchView/GIS Mapping	1
Arcview and/or related partners app.	1
By September 2002	1
Don't know	1
Don't know, we need to get our CAD, RMS, etc. problems worked out first.	1
I'm not sure at this time.	1
Plans are being made at the present time. Software will be Arcview and Crimeview	1
This is McCormick City and the County is planning to purchase the system. The city will be mapped in it.	1
Unknown at this time	1
We do want to purchase in the next 2 years, however we don't have a system determined	1
We have purchased one and are waiting for install	1
We plan to purchase a mapping system within the next year. We are unsure of the type of system.	1
Approx. 6 months. Type of system unknown.	1
At this time we do not plan to purchase a mapping system.	1
Don't know as of yet	1
Don't know	1
No timeline set, will purchase through Police Central	1
No timetable	1
None	1
Not sure at this time	1
Only if state finds funds to assist in purchase of software. Presently, local funds unavailable.	1
Our plan is to be online 7/10/02 we are including sheriff's pack with Southern Software cad	1
See 14 & 15	1
1	
Should be purchased with CAD and RMS by Dec. County as mapping system, ESRI runs on ARCInfo. S/O does not have access to mapping at this time.	1
1	
The city and county are working towards the purchase of a mapping system as part of the improvements to the 911/central dispatch - CAD update	1
This software may come with new RMS software we are currently looking for timetable - 2 to 3 years.	
Have not determined what system we would use yet.	1
Unknown	2
Unsure	1
With the current arrangement we hope to be online with the county system prior to 2003 (Jan)	1

PART II

SURVEY RESULTS

PART II
SLED SURVEY RESULTS
Other Law Enforcement Agencies

1. Is your incident reporting system automated?

Automated?	Frequency	Percent
No	16	53.33
Yes - All Info Entered	11	36.67
Yes - Most Info Entered	1	3.33
Yes - Some Info Entered	2	6.67
Total	30	100.00

(Note: The 16 agencies that indicated they were NOT automated were instructed to skip to Question 12 of the survey, which is Question 24 in this section of the report.)

2. Is your software SCIBRS compliant?

SCIBRS Compliant?	Frequency	Percent
Dont Know	2	14.28
No	4	28.57
Yes	8	57.14
Total	14	100.00

The two (2) agencies that “Don’t Know” if their software is SCIBRS compliant are:

	Agency Name
1	Furman University Public Safety
2	Winthrop University Public Safety

Of the 11 agencies that stated that their incident reporting system was automated and that they entered all the information into their system, the following table indicates whether or not they are SCIBRS compliant:

Is your software SCIBRS compliant?	Frequency	Percent
Dont Know	2	18.18
No	2	18.18
Yes	7	63.64
Total	11	100.00

3. Who enters the incident report data into the computer? (Can have multiple responses.)

Who Enters the Data?	Frequency	Percent
Data Entry Staff	3	17.65
Other Staff	3	17.65
Reporting Officer	6	35.29
Vendors	0	0.00
Other	5	29.41
Total	17	100.00

Other:

Chief of Police
 Day shift supervisor who doubles as the admin. Officer
 Telecommunications officers (i.e., dispatchers) and/or administrative assts.
 The records clerk and her assistants.
 The Captain or Lt. Input to the databases

4. **Approximately how many incident reports are entered into the computer on a weekly basis?**

Number of Incident Reports	Frequency	Percent
0-10	5	38.46
11-20	3	23.08
21-50	4	30.77
More than 50	1	7.69
Total	13	100.00

5. **Approximately how many person-hours does it take, on a weekly basis, to enter these incident reports?**

Number of Person-Hours	Frequency	Percent
1	4	30.77
4	1	7.69
5	1	7.69
7	1	7.69
8	2	15.38
15	1	7.69
30	1	7.69
32	1	7.69
56	1	7.69

6. **How quickly are the incident reports entered into the computer?**

How Quickly Entered?	Frequency	Percent
No Set Time - Depends	2	15.38
Within 2-3 Days	2	15.38
Within 24 Hrs	9	69.23
Total	13	100.00

7. **How is the incident report information sent to SLED?**

How Sent to SLED?	Frequency	Percent
Computer Disk/Tape	4	30.77
Paper by Mail	8	61.54
Testing with SLED	1	7.69
Total	13	100.00

Of those agencies that stated they were SCIBRS compliant (Question 2), the following table indicates how these agencies sent their incident reports to SLED:

How Sent to SLED?	Frequency	Percent
Computer Disk/Tape	4	50.00
Paper by Mail	3	37.50
Testing with SLED	1	12.50
Total	8	100.00

The following table shows the agencies that are SCIBRS compliant, yet sent their incident reports to SLED through the mail in paper form:

	Agency Name
1	Columbia Police Department Metropolitan Airport
2	Trident Tech College Public Safety
3	Wackenhut Savannah River Site

Of the 11 agencies that stated that their incident reporting system was automated *and* that they entered *all* the information into their system (Question 1), the following table indicates how these agencies sent their incident reports to SLED:

How Sent to SLED?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	1	9.09
Computer Disk/Tape	4	36.36
Paper by Mail	5	45.45
Testing with SLED	1	9.09
Total	11	100.00

8. If you send paper incident reports to SLED, why are they not sent electronically?

Why Not Sent?	Frequency	Percent
Software can NOT transmit electronically	4	30.77
Software can NOT output the data in a format that SLED can read	1	7.69
Software can NOT output the data in ANY format	1	7.69
Software can NOT perform the edits as required by SLED	1	7.69
Don't know how - need technical support	2	15.38
Other	4	30.77
Total	13	100.00

OTHER:

DDSN is a state agency with what I believe to be an excellent computer system. However, a meeting with someone from your dept. and our computer tech could help speed up the process here.
 SPA Information Technology can design a program for reporting to SLED, has not been a priority.
 Currently in the process to upgrade our software by buying from vendor.
 We could probably edit our software to the SLED compliant but would need Help. We could edit we just need SLED to tell us what they need

The following are the two agencies (from Question 8 above) that sent incident reports to SLED by mail *and* who need technical support:

1	Wackenhut Savannah River Site
2	Whitten Center of Public Safety

9. If the data are entered into a computer by your agency's staff or officers, is the computer that the incident data are entered into a "stand-alone" computer or is it connected to a network of computers, to a mainframe computer, a server, or some other device?

	Frequency	Percent
Mainframe	2	14.29
Other	2	14.29
PC Network	8	57.14
Stand Alone PC	2	14.29
Total	14	100.00

10. What is your operating system?

<u>Operating System</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Missing	4
DOS	1
Don't know	1
Microsoft Windows	1
Windows 98	1
Windows 98 2nd edition	1
Windows NT	2
Windows NT '98	1
Windows NT and/or 2000	1
Windows NT v4.0	1

11. What is the name(s) of the software that your staff uses, or your vendor uses, to enter the data into the computer?

<u>Software Name</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
ARMS Automated Reports Maintenance System	1
ASG	1
End-2-End (ARMS)	1
In House Paradox Program	1
Jetform Filler Pro (FR's) Microsoft Access (Databases)	1
Microsoft Access	1
Microsoft Access and key form	1
Microsoft Excel	1
Microsoft Word, Microsoft Office	1
Visionair	2
Visionair RMS	1
Visions	1
VisionAir RMS	1

12. If you have purchased software from a vendor, what is the name of the vendor(s)?

<u>Vendor Name</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Missing	2
Don't know	1
End-2-End (ARMS)	1
End-toEnd E-To-E	1
N/A	1
NA	2
VisionAir	1
Visionair	3
Visions	1
In the process	1

13. If you have purchased software from a vendor, do you have an ongoing contract with them for technical support, training, or upgrades?

<u>Vendor Support</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	2	14.29
No	3	21.43
Other	1	7.14
Yes - Full Support	7	50.00
Yes - Limited Support	1	7.14
Total	14	100.00

Explain Other

SPA Information Technology Department provides technical support.

14. If you have purchased software from a vendor, can you or your staff? (Can have multiple responses.)

	Frequency	Percent
Generate reports on an 'as needed' basis?	8	44.44
Change or modify data entry screens to add or remove data elements?	3	16.67
Modify data entry screens to improve data entry efficiency?	0	0.00
Output the data, or create a data file, in a variety of formats?	3	16.67
None of the above - the vendor must make all modifications to the software.	1	5.56
Other	3	16.67
Total	18	100.00

Of the three (3) agencies that stated that they could “Output the data, or create a data file, in a variety of formats,” the following table indicates how these agencies sent their incident reports to SLED:

How Sent to SLED?	Frequency
Computer Disk/Tape	2
Paper by Mail	1

15. Other (from Question 14 above)? Explain:

Other	Frequency
It would depend on the software and permissions granted to change it.	1
Tracks training, Equipment Issue, etc	1
na	1

16. How satisfied are you with the software package that you are using for your agency’s internal purposes?

How Satisfied?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	1	7.14
Not Satisfied	1	7.14
Somewhat Satisfied	7	50.00
Very Satisfied	5	35.71
Total	14	100.00

Of those agencies who are “Very Satisfied” with their software package (n=5), the following is a listing of their software packages:

Software Name	Frequency
ASG	1
End-2-End (ARMS)	1
Microsoft Access	1
Visionair	1
VisionAir RMS	1
Total	5

Of those agencies who are “Very Satisfied” with their software package (n=5), the following is a listing of their vendors:

<u>Vendor Name</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Missing	1
End-2-End (ARMS)	1
NA	1
Visi onAir	1
Visi onair	1
Total	5

Of those agencies who are “Not Satisfied” with their software package (n=1), the following is a listing of their software packages:

<u>Software Name</u>
Microsoft Excel

Of those agencies who are “Not Satisfied” with their software package (n=1), the following is a listing of their vendors:

<u>Vendor Name</u>
Don't know

17. If you are somewhat or not satisfied with your software package, please explain.

Explain
 Missing
 Have been trying to update our system for some time. Keep running into lack of interest. System update out of my hands.
 Problems w/pulldown menus no way to download to SLED. Useful for printing legible reports only.
 There is always room for improvement. We build our CAD system and it works for our needs.
 Too many "bugs" in the system
 Unable to search records in timely manner or transmit to SLED
 Working on upgrading to networked windows based software-DOS version is limited in generating reports for data collection and analysis

18. Are there plans to purchase another system?

<u>Plans</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	1	7.14
No	8	57.14
Yes	5	35.71
Total	14	100.00

19. How satisfied are you with the software package that you are using for the purpose of generating data for SLED reporting purposes?

<u>How satisfied?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	1	7.14
Not Applicable	5	35.71
Not Satisfied	1	7.14
Somewhat Satisfied	4	28.57
Very Satisfied	3	21.43
Total	14	100.00

Of those agencies who are “Very Satisfied” with their software package (n=3), the following is a listing of their software packages:

Software Name	Frequency
ASG	1
Vi si onai r	2

Of those agencies who are “Very Satisfied” with their software package (n=3), the following is a listing of their vendors:

Vendor Name	Frequency
Mi ssi ng	1
Vi si onai r	2

Of those agencies who are “Not Satisfied” or were “Somewhat Satisfied” with their software package (n=5), the following is a listing of their software packages:

Software Name	Frequency
In House Paradox Program	1
Microsoft Access and key form	1
Vi si onai r RMS	1
Vi si ons	1
Vsi onAi r RMS	1

Of those agencies who are “Not Satisfied” or were “Somewhat Satisfied” with their software package (n=5), the following is a listing of their vendors:

Vendor Name	Frequency
Mi ssi ng	1
Vi si onAi r	1
Vi si onai r	1
Vi si ons	1
In the process	1

20. If you are somewhat or not satisfied, please explain.

Explain

Need to speed up correction to software
 Too many "bugs"
 Still have to print and send by mail to SLED
 Submitting paper reports has created very little problems
 We don't use our software to generate data for SLED - would like to though.

21. Are there plans to purchase another system?

Plans?	Frequency	Percent
Mi ssi ng	5	35.71
No	6	42.86
Yes	3	21.43
Total	14	100.00

22. If you have data entry personnel, are they trained in SCIBRS?

<u>Data Entry Personnel Trained?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	5	35.71
No	4	28.57
Some Are	2	14.29
Yes	3	21.43
Total	14	100.00

23. If officers enter their own incident reports into the computer, are they trained in SCIBRS?

<u>Officers Trained?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	3	21.43
No	6	42.86
Some Are	2	14.29
Yes	3	21.43
Total	14	100.00

24. Do you have plans to send your incident reports to SLED electronically?

<u>Plans?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Missing	3	10.00
No	14	46.67
Yes	13	43.33
Total	30	100.00

25. If NO to Question 24, why not?

Explain
 Missing
 As a private university we have not been requested to send data to SLED.
 Cant afford the cost of changing to new software and conversion cost (data)
 Do not have the funds at this time.
 Due to budgetary restraints
 Lack of funds
 Plan are forthcoming to automate my entire department's reporting
 documentation when funds are made available next year by the administration
 Small agency, average 3-5 reports a month
 We do not generate enough incident reports to justify the cost for the
 software. (Small budget)
 We were told our IR which is tailored to our type of environment is not
 Budgetary constraints
 Not necessary since SLED receives the necessary info from reports via
 computer disk.
 Not sure yet. Need to research to see what we need. Volume of reports
 Sent to SLED each year is minimal.
 The number of reports that I file do not justify the cost of the equipment
 needed

26. If YES to Question 25, please describe your plans and timetable.

Describe
 Missing
 Columbia College PD has informed the College Administration of the budgetary need to implement this system. The Department will be in compliance by the December 31, 2003 deadline.
 Due to budgetary constraints
 Have been since 1995
 Have submitted info from SLED mandating compliance by Dec. 2003 along with vendor info. Have not had any feed back about this info.
 NLT August to procure software, complete testing and certification NLT Oct 30, 2002.
 Will include cost estimates for fiscal year budget (FY02-02)
 Anticipate new software and testing with SLED to complete by the end of 2002.
 Currently testing
 Have been working on this for years and will hopefully test w/in next few months
 Not sure
 We only average 7-15 reportable incidents a year and it would not be cost effective to purchase and maintains the software and its components
 We want to do this but are under a budget crunch > which affect when we can do this. It also depends on price of vendor software. Also, we may try to program existing software to be SLED compliant
 Would like to send data by 10/1/02 but need to understand exact format that SLED can read

27. If you do NOT have an automated system, are there plans to purchase one?

Purchase?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	4	13.33
Don't Know	6	20.00
No	6	20.00
Not Applicable	5	16.67
Yes	8	26.67
na	1	3.33
Total	30	100.00

The following is a listing of those agencies that stated that they plan to purchase an automated system:

	Agency Name
1	Benedict College Public Safety
2	Charleston County Aviation Authority
3	Columbia College Police Department
4	Columbia Police Department Metropolitan Airport
5	Lander University Public Safety
6	Presbyterian College of Public Safety
7	SC State Transport Police
8	USC Spartanburg Public Safety

28. Does your agency have an automated mapping program/system?

GIS?	Frequency	Percent
Missing	1	3.33
No	28	93.33
Yes	1	3.33
Total	30	100.00

29. If yes, what software do you use?

What Software?	Frequency
Missing	29
Don't know	1

30. If your agency does not have a mapping system, are there plans to purchase one?

<u>Purchase GIS?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Don't Know	8	26.67
No	19	63.33
Yes	3	10.00
Total	30	100.00

31. If you have plans to purchase a mapping system, what is your timetable and what type of system are you planning to purchase?

Timetable

Missing

End of 2002 - still looking at systems.

I realize electronically sending incident reports, have an automated system, and an automated mapping program/system would be a great asset and tool for my department but it would be difficult showing

Our agency does not have plans to purchase a mapping system.

Purchase plan is schedule for the April-May 2003 timeframe. Will receive (3) bids from vendors.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I
AUTOMATED INCIDENT-REPORTING SURVEY

The Office of Research and Statistics of the S.C. Budget and Control Board has been requested by the State Law Enforcement Division (SLED) to assist them in trying to determine the degree of automation of your agency's incident reporting system. Your office or agency may have referred to this reporting system as "SCIBRS." SLED is primarily interested in knowing what types of incident records your agency maintains, how these records are maintained, automated or not, who receives this information and how is it sent to them, and how your agency uses this information. SLED is also interested in knowing if you are satisfied with the system you are currently using and whether or not you would welcome further automation of your incident-reporting system.

SLED is interested only in systems that collect incident and arrest information. They are not interested in jail management systems or court systems.

PLEASE MAIL YOUR COMPLETED SURVEY TO:

Diana M. Tester
Incident Survey
Office of Research and Statistics
Health and Demographics
1919 Blanding Street
Columbia, SC 29201

OR FAX to

803-898-9972

If there are any questions regarding this survey, please call **803-898-9940**.

AUTOMATED INCIDENT-REPORTING SURVEY

1. Is your incident-reporting system automated, i.e., is any or all of the information from the incident report entered into a computer?

- YES, ALL of the information on the incident report is entered into a computer
- YES, MOST of the information on the incident report is entered into a computer
- YES, SOME of the information on the incident report is entered into a computer
- NO, the information on the incident report is NOT entered into a computer

If you checked 'YES' , please proceed with the following questions; if 'NO' , skip to **Question 12.**

2. Is your computer software compliant with all of the requirements of: SCIBRS (SC Incident Based Reporting System) – which includes all of NIBRS – National Incident Based Reporting System)

- YES
- NO
- DON'T KNOW

3a. Who enters the incident report data into the computer? (Check all that apply.)

- Data entry staff
- Other staff
- Vendors are paid to enter the data
- The reporting officer
- Other Explain:

3b. Approximately how many incident reports are entered into the computer on a weekly basis?

3c. Approximately how many person-hours does it take, on an average weekly basis, to enter these incident reports?

4. How quickly are the incident reports entered into the computer?

Within 24 hours

Within 2 or 3 days

More than 3 days

No set time – depends on the volume

5. How is the incident report information sent to SLED?

A computer disk or tape

An email attachment

Currently testing with SLED to send electronically

Copies of the paper incident reports are sent via mail

Other. Please describe:

6. If you send paper incident reports to SLED, why are they NOT sent electronically? (Please check all that apply and elaborate):

Software can NOT transmit electronically

Software can NOT output the data in a format that SLED can read

___ Software can NOT output the data in ANY format

___ Software can NOT perform the edits as required by SLED

___ Don't know how - need technical support

___ Other, Please explain

7. If the data are entered into a computer by your agency's staff or officers, is the computer that the incident data are entered into a "stand-alone" computer or is it connected to a network of computers, to a mainframe computer, a server, or some other device?

_____ Stand-alone "personal" computer

_____ Network of "personal" computers

_____ Mainframe computer

_____ Some other device. Please describe: _____

_____ Don't know

What is your operating system? _____

8. A. What is the name(s) of the software that your staff uses, or your vendor uses, to enter the data into the computer?

B. If you have purchased software from a Vendor, what is the name of the vendor(s)?

C. If you have purchased software from a Vendor, do you have an ongoing contract with them for technical support, training, or upgrades?

___ YES, ongoing contract for technical support, training, and upgrades

YES, have a limited ongoing contract that provides some support services

NO ongoing contract with a vendor

Other, Please explain

D. If you purchased software from a Vendor, can you or your staff:

Generate reports on an “as needed” basis?

Change or modify data entry screens to add or remove data elements?

Modify data entry screens to improve data entry efficiency?

Output the data, or create a data file, in a variety of formats?

None of the above – the Vendor must make all modifications to the software.

Other? Explain:

9a. How satisfied are you with the software package that you are using for your agency’s internal purposes?

Very Satisfied

Somewhat Satisfied

Not Satisfied

If you are somewhat or not satisfied, please explain _____

Are there plans to purchase another system?

Yes No

9b. How satisfied are you with the software package that you are using for the purpose of generating data for SLED reporting purposes?

Very Satisfied

Somewhat Satisfied

Not Satisfied

Not Applicable

If you are somewhat or not satisfied, please explain _____

Are there plans to purchase another system?

Yes No

10. If you have data entry personnel, are they trained in SCIBRS?

YES NO Some are Don't Know

11. If officers enter their own incident reports into the computer, are they trained in SCIBRS?

YES NO Some are Don't Know

12. Do you have plans to send your incident reports to SLED electronically?

Yes No If yes, please describe your plans and timetable:

If NO, why not? _____

13. If you do NOT have an automated system, are there plans to purchase one?

Yes No Don't know Not Applicable

14. Does your agency have an automated mapping program/system?

Yes No If yes, what software do you use? _____

15. If your agency does not have a mapping system, are there plans to purchase one?

Yes No Don't know

16. If you have plans to purchase a mapping system, what is your timetable and what type of system are you planning to purchase?

Name of Agency: _____

Name and telephone number of person completing survey:

Name and telephone number of contact person, if different from above:

Appendix II
Comments (Paraphrased) from Local Law Enforcement Officials
During Field Interviews

- Cost of equipment, software, and hiring qualified staff are serious problems for many agencies.
- We have problems with our vendor (Visionaire). We were DOS-based and went to Network-based. We experienced backups – had problems and got behind in one year.
- We would love to scan the data in. Take the incident report, scan it in, reformat the data, then edit.
- There is the appearance that SLED wants to transfer inputting to the field.
- Currently, we input the data and then email it to SLED.
- SLED could act as a regulatory agency especially with vendors. SLED can mandate that the vendor or the software must comply with SLED reporting requirements.
- SLED should impose a deadline for vendors. In order for vendors to be on SLED’s “approved” list, the vendor must comply with certain requirements.
- Ultimately, we would like the officer to input the data. It would improve quality assurance, but there is a big training issue. Need a component that speaks to training.
- We have data ports already set up in squad room so that the officers can input the data, when computers, etc., installed.
- If the data are importable from the CAD system to the records mgt. System – this must be worked out with the vendor – Visionaire (currently a problem).
- Dispatchers, officers, records mgt – all fill out parts of the incident report. The records manager would check for UCR compatibility. Dispatchers do the dates, times, etc.; officers do the narrative and other parts; records mgt. Check for UCR compatibility and codes, etc.
- Officers might need data entry at Basic Officer Training.
- Arc Info and Arc View – mapping coming next week. Still must enter the data.
- If put data in two weeks late – doesn’t do much good.
- SLED should review - is there anything they DON’T need?

- Need serious technical support for Windows NT/Windows 2000. Visionaire is built on a NT platform – many people don't have capability/background.
- Servers, backups, firewalls pose additional issues.
- Vendor trap: vendor really can't convert the data to be able to print incident report in a new system.
- Paid for ongoing technical support from the vendor. Should have ongoing training. Only one week of training. To come back, training price doubles.
- Some of SLED's requirements may not work for the agency, such as reports.
- SLED should advise agencies: "Even if a vendor says it can be done – should actually see it done."
- It appears that SLED was only interested in what was sent to them. SLED should be interested more in the bigger picture – helping smaller agencies getting reports out, transferring data, etc.
- Don't have anyone to help with mapping.
- Since 1994, in contract with Unisys. No system developed – may have to sue.
- Trying a city-coordinated approach. Every time we get a new IT director, have to start from scratch.
- Communications Center not part of city PD – really part of city/county, so E911 is city/county. Not a police function but a city function. It is working but any solutions must be city-coordinated.
- In contract with Visions and Unisys. Unisys tried to develop software for one unified system – "Case Record" approach. Procedure: initial call, officers retrieve, incident report, supervisor approved, to go back to the officer – bi-directional.
- Unisys CAD sold to "Cross Current" – new vendor. Cross Current updated, but info was lost.
- Case number that CAD generated – Visions doesn't capture Case No. that the CAD system generates.
- Visions is a turnkey reporting system that works with laptops and had modules that do crime analysis.
- City sent a letter to Unisys to perform/finish contract in good faith. Paid money up front for a CAD system, reporting system, laptops, etc. Now they have to settle for less.

- Answers for a small agency work for a small agency.
- Visions had systems running for other states, but not for South Carolina.
- Does SLED have anyone to research this system? Jerry is closest and does more on the receiving end. Set up a state approved or recommended system.
- If PD or Sheriff buying equipment/software, might be helpful to tie into state-approved vendors.
- Could SLED “ease-up” on requirements? Is everything we send actually needed?
- If FED mandated, then not SLED’s fault. Just want to make sure it’s used.
- Sent a team to SLED, then made aware of the new requirements that SLED has now.
- New requirements are the forms. Concern is who is going to pay for this?
- Would send them more data if it was truly needed.
- Could there be a vendor-preferred list?
- Vendors wrote the software and left – no ongoing contracts for support services.

Appendix III Summary of Telephone Survey

Q1. Under what circumstances are incident reports filled out?

By and large these reports are produced when an officer arrives on the scene and finds that a potential crime has been committed, the situation is likely to require later visits (repeat dispatches to the location, and domestic disputes are the most common reasons here), or the citizens request that a report be made. Thus, the incident reports include “situations” as well as crimes. Completeness generally depends on the amount of information available to the officer(s) at that time.

While the reports contain non-crimes, they also omit potential crimes. Fraudulent checks are a notable example. In these cases, the process is likely to begin with civil action rather than criminal law enforcement, but can evolve into a criminal matter. The key here is that law enforcement acts at the behest of the court.

Q2. What happens to an incident report after its filled out?

While there may be some differences in processing, there are some common elements to how reports are handled. They are reviewed by law enforcement supervisors (watch commanders, Capt.s, etc.). And one copy is filed (hence the assertion that all information is collected). A copy will be forwarded to SLED in one form or another, and the forwarded information will be as complete as the report allows. Beyond these common points, there seem to be three basic approaches to processing.

- a) Some agencies enter the entire report into their computer systems. This is typically the case when electronic transfer is used. This allows for full compliance with SLED, as well as maximum potential for local uses.
- b) Other agencies enter only parts of the report into the system, with the narrative being the most likely omission. This approach attempts to cut down on entry time, and retains only the elements deemed “important” for local use. Full compliance with SLED is ensured by the submission of complete paper reports.
- c) The remaining agencies are paper only. Again, compliance with SLED is ensured by the submission of complete copies of the reports themselves. There are common complaints regarding difficulty in using the information locally.

Automation appears to be an advantage both locally and at the State level; however, partial measures do nothing to reduce the entry workload at SLED. The chief disincentive seems to be additional data entry time, rather than equipment/software (e.g. some agencies have the hardware

and software, but simply choose not to enter everything and send to SLED electronically; cost doesn't seem to be prohibitive because small agencies seem able to afford and use fully automated processing).

Q3 What is your agency using the reports for?

Virtually all agencies engage in some form of reporting and statistical summation based on these reports. The quality and quantity of these activities increases with the amount of automation. This appears to be the most popular use of the reports.

Q4 What are the major problems with the incident reports?

They are time consuming. There are also complaints about SLED's backlog. These complaints seem to go down with full automation.

**APPENDIX IV
AGENCIES THAT DID NOT RESPOND TO THE SURVEY**

<p>ALLENDALE POLICE DEPARTMENT BARNWELL POLICE DEPARTMENT BATESBURG LEESVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT BETHUNE POLICE DEPARTMENT BRIARCLIFFE ACRES POLICE DEPARTMENT BRUNSON POLICE DEPARTMENT BUREAU PROTECTIVE SERVICES CAMERON POLICE DEPARTMENT CITY VIEW POLICE DEPARTMENT CLARENDON SHERIFF'S OFFICE COWPENS POLICE DEPARTMENT DENMARK TEC. COLLEGE PUBLIC SAFETY DEPT. OF MENTAL HEALTH PUBLIC SAFETY DONALDS POLICE DEPARTMENT DUNCAN POLICE DEPARTMENT EASLEY POLICE DEPARTMENT EDGEFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT ENOREE POLICE DEPARTMENT GAFFNEY POLICE DEPARTMENT GASTON POLICE DEPARTMENT GIFFORD POLICE DEPARTMENT GRAY COURT POLICE DEPARTMENT GREENVILLE-SPARTANBURG AIRPORT PD HAMPTON SHERIFF'S OFFICE HEATH SPRINGS POLICE DEPARTMENT HODGES POLICE DEPARTMENT JACKSON POLICE DEPARTMENT JASPER SHERIFF'S OFFICE JONESVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT KERSHAW POLICE DEPARTMENT LAKE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT LEE COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE LYMAN POLICE DEPARTMENT LYNCHBURG POLICE DEPARTMENT MANNING POLICE DEPARTMENT MARION SHERIFF'S OFFICE MARLBORO SHERIFF'S OFFICE MAYESVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT MCBEE POLICE DEPARTMENT NEW ELLENTON POLICE DEPARTMENT NICHOLS POLICE DEPARTMENT NORRIS POLICE DEPARTMENT OCONEE SHERIFF'S OFFICE OLAR POLICE DEPARTMENT PAMPLICO POLICE DEPARTMENT PELZER POLICE DEPARTMENT PIEDMONT POLICE DEPARTMENT</p>	<p>PORT ROYAL POLICE DEPARTMENT PROSPERITY POLICE DEPARTMENT QUINBY POLICE DEPARTMENT RAVENEL POLICE DEPARTMENT RICHLAND CO. DETENTION CENTER RIDGEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT S.C. FORESTRY COMMISSION S.C. HIGHWAY PATROL SELLERS POLICE DEPARTMENT SOCIETY HILL POLICE DEPARTMENT SPRINGFIELD POLICE DEPARTMENT STARR POLICE DEPARTMENT SUMMERTON POLICE DEPARTMENT SWANSEA POLICE DEPARTMENT TRENTON POLICE DEPARTMENT TURBEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT WARE SHOALS POLICE DEPARTMENT WEST PELZER POLICE DEPARTMENT WHITMIRE POLICE DEPARTMENT WILLIAMSBURG SHERIFF'S OFFICE WOODRUFF POLICE DEPARTMENT</p>
--	---

**APPENDIX V
PART I RESPONDENTS
POLICE AND SHERIFF DEPARTMENTS**

1	Abbeville County Sheriff's Office	96	Inman Police Department
2	Abbeville Police	97	Irmo Police Department
3	Aiken Department of Public Safety	98	Isle of Palms Police Department
4	Aiken Sheriff's Office	99	Iva Police Department
5	Allendale County Sheriff's Office	100	Jamestown Police Department
6	Anderson County Sheriff's Office	101	Jefferson Police Department
7	Anderson Police Department	102	Johnsonville Police Department
8	Andrews Police Department	103	Kershaw County Sheriff
9	Atlantic Beach Police Department	104	Kingstree Police Department
10	Aynor Police Department	105	Lake View Police Department
11	Bamberg County Sheriff's Office	106	Lamar Police Department
12	Bamberg Police Department	107	Lancaster County Sheriffs Office
13	Barnwell County Sheriff's Department	108	Lancaster Police Department
14	Beaufort City Police Department	109	Landrum Police Department
15	Beaufort County Sheriff's Office	110	Lane Police Department
16	Belton Police Department	111	Latta Police Department
17	Bennettsville Police Department	112	Laurens County Sheriff's Department
18	Berkeley County Sheriff's Office	113	Laurens Police Department
19	Bishopville Police Department	114	Lexington Police Department
20	Blacksburg Police Department	115	Lexington Sheriff's Office
21	Blackville Police Department	116	Liberty Police Department
22	Bluffton Police Department	117	Lincolnton Police Department
23	Bonneau Police Department	118	Loris Police Department
24	Bowman Police Department	119	Mari on Police Department
25	Branchville Police Department	120	Mauldin Police Department
26	Burnettown Police Department	121	McColl Police Department
27	Calhoun Falls Police Department	122	McCormick City Police Department
28	Calhoun Sheriff's Office	123	McCormick Sheriff's Department
29	Camden Police Department	124	Monks Corner Police Department
30	Campobello Police Department	125	Mt. Pleasant Police Department
31	Cayce Department of Public Safety	126	Mullins Police Department
32	Central Police Department	127	Myrtle Beach Police Department
33	Chapin Police Department	128	Newberry County Sheriff's Department
34	Charleston County Sheriff's Office	129	Newberry Police Department
35	Charleston Police Department	130	Ninety Six Police Department
36	Cheraw Police Department	131	North Augusta Dept of Public Safety
37	Cherokee County Sheriff's Office	132	North Charleston Police Department
38	Chesnee Police Department	133	North Myrtle Beach Public Safety
39	Chester County Sheriffs Office	134	North Police Department
40	Chester Police Department	135	Norway Police Department
41	Chesterfield Police Department	136	Olan ta Police Department
42	Chesterfield Sheriff's Office	137	Orangeburg County Sheriffs Office
43	City of Columbia	138	Orangeburg Police Department
44	Clemson Police Department	139	Pacolet Police Department
45	Clinton Police Department	140	Pageland Police Department
46	Clio Police Department	141	Pawleys Island Police Department
47	Clover Police Department	142	Pendleton Police Department
48	Colleton Sheriff's Office	143	Pickens County Sheriffs Department
49	Conway Police Department	144	Pickens Police Department
50	Cottageville Police Department	145	Pineridge Police Department
51	Coward Police Department	146	Pinewood Police Department
52	Darlington County Sheriff's Depart	147	Richland County Sheriff's Department
53	Darlington Police Department	148	Ridge Springs Police Department
54	Denmark Police Department	149	Ridgeland Police Department
55	Dillon County Sheriff's Department	150	Ridgeway Police Department
56	Dillon Police Department	151	Rock Hill Police Department
57	Dorchester Sheriff's Office	152	Salem Police Department
58	Due West Police Department	153	Salley Police Department
59	Eastover Police Department	154	Saluda County Sheriff Office
60	Edgefield County Sheriff's Office	155	Saluda Police Department
61	Edisto Police Department	156	Santee Police Department
62	Ehrhardt Police Department	157	Scranton Police Department
63	Elgin Police Department	158	Seneca Police Department
64	Elloree Police Department	159	Simpsonville Police Department
65	Estill Police Department	160	Spartanburg Public Safety Department
66	Eutawville Police Department	161	Spartanburg Sheriff's Office
67	Fairfax Police Department	162	Springdale Police Department
68	Fairfield Sheriff's Office	163	St. George Police Department
69	Florence County Sheriff's Office	164	St. Matthews Police Department
70	Florence Police Department	165	St. Stephens Police Department
71	Folly Beach Police Department	166	Sullivan's Island Police Department

72	Forest Acres Police Department	167	Summerville Police Department
73	Fort Mill Police Department	168	Sumter Police Department
74	Fountain Inn Police Department	169	Surfside Beach Police Department
75	Ft. Lawn Police Department	170	Tega Cay Police Department
76	Georgetown County Sheriff Department	171	Timmonsville Police Department
77	Georgetown Police Department	172	Town of Johnston
78	Goose Creek Police Department	173	Town of South Congaree
79	Great Falls Police	174	Traveler's Rest Police Department
80	Grealeyville Police Department	175	Union County Sheriff's Office
81	Greenville Police Department	176	Union Public Safety
82	Greenville Sheriff's Office	177	Vance Police Department
83	Greenwood Police Department	178	Varnville Police Department
84	Greenwood Sheriff's Office	179	Wagener Police Department
85	Greer Police Department	180	Walhalla Police Department
86	Hampton Police Department	181	Walterboro Police Department
87	Hanahan Police Department	182	Wellford Police Department
88	Hardeeville Police Department	183	West Columbia Police Department
89	Harleyville Police Department	184	West Union Police Department
90	Hartsville Police Department	185	Westminster Police Department
91	Hemingway Police Department	186	Williamston Police Department
92	Holly Hill Police Department	187	Williston Police Department
93	Honea Path Police Department	188	Windsboro Police Department
94	Horry County Police Department	189	Yemassee Police Department
95	Horry County Sheriff	190	York County Sheriff's Office
		191	York Police Department

APPENDIX VI
PART II RESPONDENTS
UNIVERSITIES AND OTHERS

- 1 Aiken Technical College Public Safety
- 2 Benedict College Public Safety
- 3 Bob Jones University
- 4 Charleston County Aviation Authority
- 5 Citadel
- 6 Clemson University Police
- 7 Coastal Carolina University of Public Safety
- 8 College of Charleston Public Safety
- 9 Columbia College Police Department
- 10 Columbia Police Department Metropolitan Airport
- 11 Department of Natural Resources
- 12 Employment Security Commission
- 13 Erskine College Public Safety
- 14 Francis Marion Public Safety
- 15 Furman University Public Safety
- 16 Lander University Public Safety
- 17 Medical University Public Safety
- 18 Presbyterian College of Public Safety
- 19 S.C. State Ports Authority
- 20 SC State Transport Police
- 21 SC State University Police Department
- 22 State Museum Public Safety
- 23 Trident Tech College Public Safety
- 24 USC Aiken Public Safety
- 25 USC Spartanburg Public Safety
- 26 University of SC Police Department
- 27 Wackenhut Savannah River Site
- 28 Whitten Center of Public Safety
- 29 Wil Lou Gray Department of Public Safety
- 30 Winthrop University Public Safety

**APPENDIX VII
PART I AGENCIES
WHICH ARE NOT AUTOMATED**

1	Allendale County Sheriff's Office	38	Jefferson Police Department
2	Atlantic Beach Police Department	39	Johnsonville Police Department
3	Bishopville Police Department	40	Lake View Police Department
4	Blacksburg Police Department	41	Lane Police Department
5	Blackville Police Department	42	Latta Police Department
6	Bluffton Police Department	43	Lincolnton Police Department
7	Bowman Police Department	44	McColl Police Department
8	Branchville Police Department	45	McCormick City Police Department
9	Burnettown Police Department	46	McCormick Sheriff's Department
10	Calhoun Falls Police Department	47	North Police Department
11	Campobello Police Department	48	Norway Police Department
12	Central Police Department	49	Olanta Police Department
13	Chesterfield Police Department	50	Pacolet Police Department
14	Clio Police Department	51	Pageland Police Department
15	Cottageville Police Department	52	Pawleys Island Police Department
16	Coward Police Department	53	Pinewood Police Department
17	Denmark Police Department	54	Ridge Springs Police Department
18	Due West Police Department	55	Ridgeland Police Department
19	Eastover Police Department	56	Ridgeway Police Department
20	Edisto Police Department	57	Riveridge Police Department
21	Ehrhardt Police Department	58	Salem Police Department
22	Elgin Police Department	59	Salley Police Department
23	Elloree Police Department	60	Saluda County Sheriff Office
24	Estill Police Department	61	Scranton Police Department
25	Eutawville Police Department	62	St. George Police Department
26	Fairfax Police Department	63	St. Matthews Police Department
27	Forest Acres Police Department	64	St. Stephens Police Department
28	Ft. Lawn Police Department	65	Surfside Beach Police Department
29	Great Falls Police	66	Town of Johnston
30	Greeleyville Police Department	67	Vance Police Department
31	Harleyville Police Department	68	Varnville Police Department
32	Hemingway Police Department	69	Wagener Police Department
33	Holly Hill Police Department	70	West Union Police Department
34	Honea Path Police Department	71	Williston Police Department
35	Horry County Sheriff	72	Yemassee Police Department
36	Inman Police Department		
37	Jamestown Police Department		

**APPENDIX VIII
PART II AGENCIES
WHICH ARE NOT AUTOMATED**

- 1 Aiken Technical College Public Safety
- 2 Benedict College Public Safety
- 3 Bob Jones University
- 4 Charleston County Aviation Authority
- 5 Columbia College Police Department
- 6 Department of Natural Resources
- 7 Employment Security Commission
- 8 Erskine College Public Safety
- 9 Lander University Public Safety
- 10 Presbyterian College of Public Safety
- 11 SC State Transport Police
- 12 SC State University Police Department
- 13 State Museum Public Safety
- 14 USC Aiken Public Safety
- 15 USC Spartanburg Public Safety
- 16 Wil Lou Gray Department of Public Safety