

Disposition Reporting: The Challenge of Matching Disposition Data to Arrest Records

By Owen Greenspan, Becki Goggins, and Mark Perbix

Introduction	1
Criminal History Record Quality and Dispositions	1
What is a Disposition?	3
Drivers for Record Completeness	4
The National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS)	4
Non-Criminal Justice Related Criminal History Background Checks.....	5
The Challenge: Linking Arrest and Disposition Data	5
Case Matching versus Charge Matching: Two Approaches	7
Case Matching.....	7
Charge Matching.....	7
Other Factors Complicating Record Completeness	8
Cite and Release.....	8
Cases Not Referred or Prosecuted.....	8
Disposition Suspense Files	9
Proven and Promising Practices	9
Routinely evaluate the suspense file for possible matches.....	9
Live scan in the courthouse	9
A standardized approach to report and display criminal history information	9
Conclusion	10
Appendix A: Charge Matching and Case Matching Examples	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Appendix B: Author Biographies	11

Introduction

Complete and accurate criminal history information is vitally important to the criminal justice system and the broader community. A wide range of justice stakeholders use this information every day to make important decisions:

- officers rely on criminal history information when making a traffic stop to determine the risk posed by the subject of the stop;
- prosecutors weigh criminal history information when evaluating cases for prosecution;
- pretrial services officials rely on criminal history information to advise judges of an offender's bail eligibility;
- judges may take criminal history information into consideration when determining sentences.

In the broader community, employers are increasingly required to evaluate the criminal background of potential employees for positions of trust, such as teachers and care givers. Certain criminal convictions prohibit an individual from purchasing or receiving a firearm or explosives. Criminal history background checks for civil purposes now exceed the number of criminal checks performed throughout the criminal justice system. In 2014, there were 24.5 criminal and 30.6 million civil fingerprints processed by the FBI.¹ Because of this growing reliance on criminal history information, it is critical that these records be accurate and complete.

A significant challenge to criminal history record completeness and accuracy is matching **dispositions**—key outcomes in a particular individual's criminal history record—to the appropriate arrest in that record. This report examines this issue, and related issues such as drivers for record completeness, linking arrest and disposition data, differing disposition-linking approaches (case vs. charge), and promising practices in disposition reporting.

Criminal History Record Quality and Dispositions

Criminal history data are maintained by state agencies and the FBI, and are typically referred to as “repositories”. Criminal histories are highly accurate and reliable because they are based on a biometric identifier—typically a fingerprint. Records are only added to a criminal history when repositories can establish or verify this biometric link. Criminal history records are typically created as the result of an arrest and fingerprinting event. Additional records are added to this initial record as the individual progresses through the criminal justice process. Each “arrest” is referred to as a “cycle” and each cycle consists of up to four “segments” that correspond to the justice process: 1) arrest, 2) prosecution, 3) disposition, and 4) supervision. However, because the justice process does not strictly follow this sequential process, criminal history records for a given criminal event can consist of one or more segments. When an “arrest” segment is matched with a “disposition” segment, the minimum data are available to constitute a complete record for a given criminal event.

The most common problem facing officials responsible for collecting criminal history information is linking official records maintained by those actors within the criminal justice system that do not capture

¹ Source: Information supplied by FBI NICS Division. March 30, 2015.

biometrically-based personal identifiers in the normal course of their business. While law enforcement routinely captures biometric identifiers of arrested individuals, other key actors—especially prosecutors and courts—typically do not. Consequently, criminal history system records custodians face a constant challenge to match non-biometrically based data from other criminal justice systems to their own, biometrically-based data.

The most frequent circumstance where this occurs is when officials attempt to accurately link arrest records from law enforcement with case disposition records from the courts. This challenge also arises when officials attempt to track arrested subjects throughout the entire criminal justice process, including the decision to file by prosecutors. Court dispositions are especially critical because many related uses of criminal history data for civil purposes—such as employment decisions—require proof of *conviction* of a crime and not just an *arrest* for a crime. Arrest records without a court disposition create the problem of the unknown, as illustrated in Table 1:

Lack of a Court Disposition on Arrest Record Raises Questions and Issues	
Question	Issue
<i>Was the arrest legitimately “closed” without being prosecuted?</i>	The person arrested has the right in many cases to not be affected by the unprosecuted arrest.
<i>Was the defendant prosecuted and convicted without having a court disposition matched to the underlying arrest in the criminal history?</i>	The entire system—both civil and criminal—is put at risk because valid conviction data are not recorded or reflected on that individual’s criminal history.

Table 1: Problem of the Unknown: What Is the Outcome of the Arrest?

Case disposition information that is missing from criminal history records is a significant problem at the state and federal levels of government. Complete and accurate disposition reporting remains a plaguing problem—despite the existence of laws in at least 39 states² that address disposition reporting to the criminal history repository, as well as significant investments in time, money, technology, and cooperation in an effort to improve disposition reporting. Just 18 states, representing 42% of the individual offenders in the nation’s criminal history records systems, report that 80% or more arrests within the past 5 years have final dispositions recorded in the criminal history repository.³ Only six states exceed the 90% threshold.⁴ The assumption that felony dispositions are more easily and readily reported is not borne out. Only 20 states, along with Guam, report that 80% or more felony charges have a final disposition recorded in their criminal history repository.⁵

² Owen M. Greenspan and Dennis DeBacco, *Survey of State Criminal History Information Systems, 2012*. U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Statistics: Washington D.C., January 2014, at Table 8b. Hereafter, 2012 Survey. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bjs/grants/244563.pdf>

³ Ibid at p. 2. The 5-year period cited ended December 12, 2012.

⁴ Ibid at Table 1.

⁵ Ibid at p. 3.

What is a Disposition?

A comprehensive definition of *Disposition* is found in 28 CFR §20.3 (i), which states:

“*Disposition* means information disclosing that criminal proceedings have been concluded and the nature of the termination, including information disclosing that the police have elected not to refer a matter to a prosecutor or that a prosecutor has elected not to commence criminal proceedings; or disclosing that proceedings have been indefinitely postponed and the reason for such postponement. Dispositions shall include, but shall not be limited to, acquittal, acquittal by reason of insanity, acquittal by reason of mental incompetence, case continued without finding, charge dismissed, charge dismissed due to insanity, charge dismissed due to mental incompetency, charge still pending due to insanity, charge still pending due to mental incompetency, guilty plea, nolle prosequi, no paper, nolo contendere plea, convicted, youthful offender determination, deceased, deferred disposition, dismissed-civil action, found insane, found mentally incompetent, pardoned, probation before conviction, sentence commuted, adjudication withheld, mistrial-defendant discharged, executive clemency, placed on probation, paroled, or released from correction supervision.”⁶

The *federal* definition refers to both cases and charges. It covers the breadth of the criminal justice system. However, while this definition describes the many different types of dispositions that can occur, it is difficult to apply in practice. State definitions tend to be simpler (Table 2).

	State Definition	Analysis
Texas	“Disposition means an action that results in the termination, transfer to another jurisdiction, or indeterminate suspension of the prosecution of a criminal charge.” ⁷	While much simpler than the Code of Federal Regulations, it leaves a lot open to further determination and hence is also difficult to count and measure in disposition reporting.
Delaware	“Disposition shall include, but not be limited to, trial verdicts of guilty or not guilty, nolle prosequis, Attorney General probations, pleas of guilty or nolo contendere, dismissals, incompetence to stand trial, finding of delinquency or nondelinquency and initiation and completion of appellate proceeding.” ⁸	While a fairly comprehensive definition on the surface, the weakness here is a failure to recognize that some arrests may not make it to the courthouse.
Idaho	Disposition means the formal or informal conclusion of a criminal proceeding at whatever stage it occurs in the justice system.” ⁹	As definitions go, it is both simple and comprehensive. If there is a weakness it is the lack of a specific reference to the capturing of information on specific charges. As such, it is a definition oriented to the <i>case level</i> rather than the <i>charge level</i> , although it does not preclude the collecting of information at the charge level.

⁶ <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CFR-2002-title28-vol1/pdf/CFR-2002-title28-vol1-sec20-3.pdf>

⁷ Texas Code of Criminal Procedure, Title1, Chapter 60, Article 60.1 (8).

⁸ Delaware State Code, Title 11, Chapter 85.

⁹ Idaho Title 67, Chapter 30.

Table 2: Sample State Definitions of “Disposition”

In the late 1990s, a national task force examined hundreds of state disposition terms and their meanings, consolidated those terms, and modified the criminal history standard to include the following twenty dispositions terms:

- Convicted
- Acquitted
- Dismissed
- Charges Dropped
- Not Prosecuted
- Mental Health Adjudication
- Diversion
- Conditional
- Juvenile Adjudication
- Revocation
- Extradited
- Transferred
- Deported
- Deceased
- Consolidated
- Bail/Bond Forfeiture
- Deferred
- Unavailable
- Destroyed
- Other

This list illustrates the fact that there are a plethora of events and actions that constitute the conclusion of a criminal case. A case may end when it exits the criminal justice system shortly after arrest based on a law enforcement decision, or the decision of a prosecutor who opts not to file charges. Those circumstances are no less important than the outcome of a jury trial.

Drivers for Record Completeness

The National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS)

The most recent and visible driver to improve criminal history records is the need for accurate and timely background checks for firearms purchases. The Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act of 1993¹⁰ required the U.S. Attorney General to establish the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) to determine whether the transfer of a firearm would violate state or federal law. While the NICS is often thought of as a federal system, *states* actually conduct the majority of the NICS checks. States have the option to conduct their own background checks or rely on the FBI to do so. Those states opting to do their own background checks are called “Point of Contact” states¹¹. Since its beginning in November 1998 through December 2013, the NICS has processed more than 181 million background checks—of which nearly 53% were processed by NICS Point of Contact states.¹²

There are 11 federal disqualification categories that prohibit the sale or transfer of a firearm.¹³ Five of these depend on criminal history information including: 1) pending or active indictments, 2) felony convictions, 3) subjects of misdemeanor and felony criminal warrants, 4) convictions for misdemeanor crimes of domestic violence, and 5) offenses indicative of drug use—with the most common disqualifier being a felony-level conviction. When a disqualifying determination cannot be made immediately during

¹⁰ PL 103-159: http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Public_Law_103-159

¹¹ Insert a list of the point of contact states.

¹² <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/nics/reports/2013-operations-report>

¹³ <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/nics/general-information/fact-sheet>

a NICS check, the law allows for a period of three business days to resolve the uncertainty, or the firearm must transfer.

*The most common cause of delay in reaching an eligibility determination is criminal history records that show arrests that would prevent the transfer of a firearm—but that do not have a disposition recorded.*¹⁴ To resolve an “open” arrest record—one without a disposition—requires that either the FBI NICS staff or state program staff for Point of Contact (POC) states check court records in the hope of retrieving information about the outcome of the arrest. For a variety of reasons, critical final disposition information may not be made available. The reasons range from a lack of resources to respond to these requests to archived or destroyed records. Since the program’s inception, NICS staff has updated nearly 900,000 final dispositions as a result of this supplemental research. Where applicable, NICS staff shares this information with states—which has resulted in more than 200,000 final dispositions being added to state criminal history records.¹⁵

In addition to the importance of *complete and accurate* criminal history information, disposition information must be reported to a state’s criminal history repository in a *timely* manner. As mentioned, a 72-hour delay or “hold” may be placed on a firearms purchase transaction if a felony arrest record lacks a disposition. If the record cannot be updated within this timeframe, a “proceed” notification is issued to the firearms dealer and the transaction may proceed.

Non-Criminal Justice Related Criminal History Background Checks

Public Law 92-544 provides the legal authority for the Attorney General to recognize state statutes for the purpose of conducting national criminal background checks for non-criminal justice purposes. These background checks include individuals who work with children, the elderly, and the infirm. They cover an array of licensed occupations and professions, including (but not limited to) teachers, medical personnel, barbers, tattoo parlor operators, taxi drivers, mortgage brokers, and attorneys. Other state and federal statutes also authorize national criminal history background checks for non-employment related reasons. For example, applicants for public housing may be required to provide their fingerprints for a criminal history background check.¹⁶

The Challenge: Linking Arrest and Disposition Data

The most difficult data quality problem repositories face is how to properly link reported data to the appropriate **individual, case and charge**.¹⁷ Repositories are challenged with ensuring that reported arrest, prosecution, and court data are linked to the appropriate offender (individual) record and to the

¹⁴ <http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/nics/reports/2013-operations-report>

¹⁵ NICS staff presentation to South Carolina CJIS, August 2013.

¹⁶ Maggie McCarty, Randy Alison Aussenburg, Gene Falk, David H. Carpenter (September 17, 2013), “Drug Testing and Crime Related Restrictions in TANF, SNAP and Housing Assistance.” Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42394.pdf>

¹⁷ The source for much of the discussion of arrest and disposition data is Robert R. Belair, Paul A. Woodard, and Eric C. Johnson, *Use and Management of Criminal History Record Information: A Comprehensive Report, 2001 Update*, Criminal Justice Information Policy Series, NCJ 187670 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, December 2001).

appropriate arrest event (case) on that record. Some states also attempt to link disposition data to each charge in the arrest segment, but this is not a required practice.

Individual	Case 1	Charge 1	A particular <i>individual</i> can have multiple cases, and multiple charges within each case. The challenge: Link arrest, prosecution, and court data to the proper <i>offender</i> record and <i>arrest event</i> on that record.
		Charge 2	
		Charge 3	
	Case 2	Charge 1	
		Charge 2	
		Charge 3	

The criminal history record has built-in mechanisms to ensure that the person and related arrests are accurately identified. For example:

- Identifying Numbers:** Each state and the FBI assign unique numbers to identify individual criminal offenders. These numbers—FBI numbers and State identification (SID) numbers—are assigned upon an individual’s first arrest,¹⁸ during which the individual is fingerprinted in connection with that arrest. These numbers are used thereafter to identify the individual throughout his or her criminal career and to ensure that all criminal cases in which he or she is involved are included on a single comprehensive criminal history record.
- Fingerprint Automation:** In the past, duplicate records for the same individual were sometimes created because of the use of false names and identifiers by arrested persons or because of clerical errors. Today, this occurrence is a rarity due to the common use of electronic fingerprint capture at booking stations, electronic transmission of fingerprints to state-operated automated fingerprint identification systems (AFIS), and the electronic forwarding of arrest fingerprint information to the FBI.
- Cycle Tracking:** Within an individual’s criminal history, each fingerprint record starts a new record “cycle” that tracks the individual through that particular criminal history event. Each cycle is uniquely identified by the agency that submits the record. Typically, this is based on the arresting agency’s case number (which may include a sequence number for multiple offender incidents), or a unique number may be generated when the offender is fingerprinted. While offenders can be uniquely identified using biometric data (typically fingerprints), there is no similar way to ensure that the *cycle* identifier can be guaranteed to be unique. This creates some challenges when trying to associate other cycle segments—such as adjudication data—to the arrest. There are numerous strategies to solve this challenge that rely on sharing pertinent data between all of the key actors in the criminal justice process—law enforcement, prosecutors, courts and corrections. The best or proven practices for solving this problem are discussed below.

¹⁸ The state repository will assign a new SID number to a first offender and report the arrest to the FBI; an FBI number will be assigned and transmitted back to the state repository so that the FBI number can be associated on the offender’s record at both the state and federal levels.

Case Matching versus Charge Matching: Two Approaches

Within each criminal history event “cycle,” repositories must match “segment” data following one of two approaches:

- match records based solely on the cycle identifier—the Originating Case Agency number (OCA), an approach known as **case matching**, or
- match individual charges within the arrest segment to the individual arrest charges as they move through the justice process—an approach known as **charge matching**.

The FBI supports both approaches, and there are advantages and disadvantages to each. Following the charge matching methodology creates significant data matching challenges due to the very nature of the criminal justice process itself. In essence, charges can change throughout the lifecycle of the criminal justice process. When an individual is initially fingerprinted at arrest, “arrest charges” are documented based on the information known at that time. From this point forward, the charges can change. They may change as the result of subsequent investigation by the law enforcement agency; they may change after review by the prosecutor; they may change during the course of the adjudication process, when charges may be amended or changed as the result of a plea negotiation; they may change as the result of a trial, when lesser included charges are determined by a judge or jury. Because charges are fluid and evolve throughout the judicial process, it can be very challenging to match the final “charge at disposition” with the original “arrest charge.”

Case Matching

Because of this systemic challenge, some states have chosen to forgo reconciling disposition charges to arrest charges and are only concerned that the complete and accurate disposition charges are associated with the original criminal/arrest *event*. This approach is referred to a “case matching.”

A criticism of the case matching approach is that the criminal history record may appear ambiguous as to whether the disposition data are complete and accurate because there is no direct means to associate the original arrest charges and the final disposition charges. For instance, Subject A is arrested on 01/01/2014 for Burglary 2nd Degree, Theft 1st Degree, and Theft of Property 2nd Degree. On 04/30/2014, Subject A enters a guilty plea for Receiving Stolen Property 2nd Degree resulting from the arrest that occurred on 01/01/2014. However, the court record only lists charges at arrest and charges at conviction. It does not specify which arrest charge(s) corresponds to the conviction offense.

Charge Matching

The alternative to case matching is charge matching, in which arrest charges are reconciled to the disposition charges. Some repositories, working collaboratively with law enforcement, courts, and prosecutors, have successfully implemented data-linking mechanisms that connect disposition charges to the arrest charges—whether the case is disposed of by law enforcement, the prosecutor, or a court proceeding.

Following this approach, each charge reported to the repository in a particular case is assigned a sequence number (01, 02, 03, for example). These numbers, in combination with the cycle number for

the case, are used to identify individual charges throughout the life cycle of the case and can be used for reporting and linking disposition charges to the repository. If, for example, a charge is dropped or modified by the prosecutor, the action is reported to the repository by charge number and shown on the criminal history record. If the prosecutor or grand jury adds new charges, the charges are assigned new numbers and the information is reported to the repository. Court disposition information is then reported by cycle number and charge number, and a disposition is reported and recorded for each charge.

At least 29 states implemented some form of charge tracking for updating changes that occur between arrest and final disposition.¹⁹ States that do not have the ability to link records in prosecutor and court systems to a common charge numbering system may follow the case matching method. Regardless of the approach, the goal is to add dispositions to an arrest record as long as the events are associated—even if there is an inability to make one to one matches between charges at arrest and disposition.

Other Factors Complicating Record Completeness

Cite and Release

Another justice process that further complicates the disposition matching process is when a court case is initiated and the subsequent disposition segment is sent to the repository where no initial arrest segment (or cycle) exists. This occurs frequently because many minor offenses do not require the offender to be fingerprinted at arrest—the point at which the initial arrest segment is generated. Instead, the offender is given a citation and ordered to appear in court. This process is often referred to as “cite and release.” When this happens, any of the downstream criminal history record segments can be sent to the repository without any identification information, including both the offender ID (SID/FBI Number) and the cycle identifier. This results in an unlinked record at the repository and recommendations for resolving this issue are offered below.

Cases Not Referred or Prosecuted

Two other situations contribute to the problem of incomplete criminal history records: cases never referred for prosecution and cases never filed by the prosecutor with the court.

Not referred for prosecution. There are occasions when an arrest is never forwarded to the prosecutor for filing. This step in the criminal justice process is referred to as “case referral.” In these instances, law enforcement may not substantiate the charges after further investigation, and the case is closed with no further action. Few states have mechanisms in place to send an update to the criminal history repository to report this outcome. This can result in an arrest segment in the criminal history record containing no further outcome information.

No prosecution/Nolo prosequi. Prosecutors have an ethical obligation to only file criminal charges against an individual where there is a likely probability of conviction. When a case is referred by law enforcement that fails to meet this standard, the prosecutor will decline to file charges resulting in a “no file” or nolo prosequi outcome, which is a disposition that should be reported to the repository as

¹⁹ 2012 Survey, at Table 8b.

either dropped, never filed, or otherwise closed. Most states have a mechanism for prosecutors to supply this information, but many prosecutors fail to do so. This also results in an arrest segment in the criminal history record with no further disposition information.

Disposition Suspense Files

When a criminal history repository receives disposition data that it cannot match to an arrest, the repository typically stores the disposition in a “suspense file.” This commonly occurs in two situations: 1) when a criminal case is initiated where no arrest and fingerprinting occurred, and 2) when the court (or other) disposition data do not include the data elements required to match the disposition to the arrest. The repository retains this file and routinely reviews it to determine if an arrest segment record is subsequently received. Some state repositories make a non-biometric match with an offender record and display the suspense file information along with the biometrically-based criminal history record. When this occurs, a clear disclaimer is provided stating that the provided information is not guaranteed to match the other data. In other states, this information is not made available on the criminal history record because it cannot be biometrically confirmed.

Proven and Promising Practices

Routinely evaluate the suspense file for possible matches

All data submitted to the repository that cannot be immediately matched to a criminal history record should be retained in a suspense file that is regularly compared to the criminal history repository data to determine if subsequent data has been received that matches the suspense file data. As a matter of course, all new arrest records should be compared against the suspense file to determine if a matching record exists.

Live scan in the courthouse

Several states are beginning to capture fingerprints at the time of case disposition by placing livescan fingerprint devices into the courthouse.²⁰ This allows defendants to be biometrically identified when they appear in court²¹. Once identified, the defendant’s SID is entered into his case record and the subsequent disposition data sent to the repository will include this critical information. This approach holds much promise to enable repositories to accurately match court dispositions, at least at the person-matching level. Some of these states are also using the livescan devices as a means to capture fingerprints (“arrest” records) to support the direct creation or revision of a criminal history record.

A standardized approach to report and display criminal history information

Adopting a uniform criminal history record—commonly referred to as a RAP Sheet (Record of Arrest and Prosecution)—has never been made mandatory. Nor have mandatory guidelines regarding the content of criminal history records ever been promulgated. However, a *de facto* standard providing a

²⁰ Arizona, California, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Utah reported using livescan fingerprint capture devices. 2012 Survey, at Table 17.

²¹ Historically courts have relied upon the adversarial process to provide sufficient accuracy in the identification of the individuals appearing before them. However, more courts are recognizing their obligation to ensure that the individual being adjudicated is positively identified through biometrics to ensure that justice is served.

presentation format for the RAP Sheet information has emerged based on the pioneering work of the National Task Force on Increasing the Utility of the Criminal History Record,²² and subsequent establishment of a Joint Task Force (JTF) on Rap Sheet Standardization.²³ The JTF oversees the specification that addresses both presentation and transmission of rap sheet information using eXtensible Markup Language (XML) that conforms with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM). Originally intended to facilitate exchange of criminal history information between states and between states and the FBI, the specification is being employed for both interstate and intrastate purposes.

Conclusion

Matching case dispositions to arrest records continues to be a challenge. However, it is critical that state and federal repositories continue their efforts to increase the number of dispositions included within the criminal history record. Whether it is through implementing arrest charge tracking numbers that follow a subject through the criminal justice process to help automate the disposition matching process or by devoting staff time to manually researching dispositions contained in suspense files, there are both technical and non-technical solutions to solving the problem of missing disposition information. Additionally, it is imperative that all participants in the criminal justice system – law enforcement, prosecutors, courts, and probation, parole and corrections officials – do their part to ensure that all disposition information is reported to the appropriate state criminal history repository. It is only through the full participation and commitment of everyone involved in creating history records that the problem of incomplete information can be solved.

²² The task force published its report in December 1995. SEARCH Group, Incorporated, *Increasing the Utility of the Criminal History Record: Report of the National Task Force*, NCJ 156922 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, December 1995). The task force recommended the creation of a standard transmission format for the interstate sharing of criminal history information, and formation of a Joint Task Force on Rap Sheet Standardization (JTF).

²³ The current membership of the JTF includes representation from the FBI's Criminal Justice Information Services Division (CJIS), the CJIS Advisory Policy Board, the National Crime Prevention and Privacy Compact Council, the International Justice and Public Safety Network (Nlets), the National Center for State Courts, SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and state criminal record repositories.

Appendix B: Author Biographies

Mr. Owen M. Greenspan retired as Director of Law and Policy for SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, in September 2014, following 19 years of service to SEARCH. In this capacity, he worked with state criminal record repositories to improve criminal history records. He is a former member of the Joint Task Force on Rap Sheet Standardization and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Criminal Justice Information Services Division, Advisory Policy Board Disposition Task Force.

Mr. Greenspan joined SEARCH in 1995 as a Justice Information Services Specialist where he provided technical assistance to state and local justice agencies and courts, in support of their efforts to employ information and identification technologies consistent with law, prudent policy, operational objectives and program goals. On the national level, he was SEARCH's liaison with the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the Interstate Identification Index and standardized criminal history record. Mr. Greenspan was also SEARCH's lead investigator for biometrics applications. He has served as member and staff to numerous advisory groups and task forces, including the National Task Force on the Criminal Record Backgrounding of America, the National Task Force on the Role of the Private Sector in the Use and Management of Justice Information, and the National Task Force on Court Automation and Integration.

Prior to joining SEARCH, Mr. Greenspan held several positions with the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. As Deputy Commissioner for Identification and Data Systems, he was responsible for New York's criminal history record repository and associated data processing services for more than 3,000 agencies across New York and beyond. As Deputy Commissioner for Municipal Police, he was responsible for certification of police training and accreditation programs. He was also New York's governor-appointed to the SEARCH Membership Group, and served as Vice Chair of the Membership Group and Board of Directors. He is retired from the New York City Police Department, where he held patrol, investigative, administrative and supervisory positions. His last assignment was Commanding Officer of the Identification Section, NYPD's central criminal records unit.

Mr. Greenspan holds a master of professional services (MPS) in Criminal Justice from C.W. Post College of Long Island University and a bachelor's degree in Social Science from Fordham University, New York.

Ms. Becki R. Goggins is Director of Law and Policy for SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics. She oversees SEARCH's consulting practice in the areas of criminal history records, development of laws and policies concerning the use of justice information and protection of privacy, implementation of evidence-based practices, and the use of technology to improve justice information sharing. She manages a specialist team that researches and writes about issues that impact justice information management and policy, organizes conferences and workshops, establishes and supports national task forces, conducts surveys on issues pertinent to criminal record managers, provides policy assistance to justice stakeholders, and works collaboratively with governmental entities and other organizations to improve the quality of justice and public safety.

Before joining SEARCH in 2014, Ms. Goggins worked in the office of Alabama Governor Robert Bentley on a statewide effort to reduce recidivism through improved information exchange between corrections agencies and mental health providers. She also led efforts at Alabama's health insurance exchange to develop privacy and security policies governing sharing of sensitive health data, and oversaw efforts to implement interagency information exchanges across the state.

Ms. Goggins also served as Division Manager for Alabama's Uniform Crime Reporting Division and Statistical Analysis Center, where she managed the state's criminal history repository, crime reporting responsibilities, statistical analysis and research projects, and participated in national data-exchange initiatives, including N-DEx and the CONNECT project. Ms. Goggins frequently served as a peer technical assistance provider and consultant to information sharing projects across the country, sharing lessons learned from solving the same challenges in Alabama.

Prior to Ms. Goggins' state government service, which began in 2004, she worked for 10 years as Research Director for The Sentencing Institute at Auburn University.

Ms. Goggins has a bachelor's degree in English and a Master of Public Administration, both from Auburn University.

Mr. Mark Perbix is Director of Information Sharing Programs for SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, where he oversees SEARCH's initiatives to support justice and public safety information sharing nationwide. These initiatives focus on providing direct assistance to federal, state, local, and tribal organizations to improve their use of technology, information sharing, and communications interoperability in mission-critical projects. Initiatives include consulting and facilitation, strategic planning for information sharing and technology deployment, architecture development, business process modeling and analysis, service specification development, performance management, voice and data integration planning, application of technology standards, and developing effective governance and funding models.

Mr. Perbix assumed his position in 2012, after serving for a year as Director of Systems and Technology. Before that, he was a Justice Information Systems Specialist for SEARCH for more than 5 years, working on the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM[®]) project and providing training, technical assistance, and research on strategic planning, architecture development, and justice information sharing to state, local, and tribal jurisdictions, and building exchange specifications using the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) and the Global Justice XML Data Model (GJXDM). He led major projects, such as an offender reentry best practices project for the U.S. Department of Justice Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Mr. Perbix has contributed to national workgroups such as the Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (GISWG), and is a founding member of the Global Strategic Solutions Working Group (GSSWG). He has served as a leader in the National Association for Justice Information Systems (NAJIS) and other practitioner organizations.

Prior to joining SEARCH, Mr. Perbix worked for the Colorado Department of Public Safety's Division of Criminal Justice, where he was lead grant manager for federally funded IT projects. He had also worked with the Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (CICJIS) program to develop a Web portal to their integrated information system, which provides a single method of accessing criminal justice data and records from the state's five principal criminal justice databases: the criminal history repository, state courts, prosecutors, and adult and juvenile corrections. Mr. Perbix served as CIO for CICJIS and was responsible for managing operations and achieving program goals, including implementing a statewide automated warrants process that provided real-time electronic exchange and management of all warrants issued by the state courts to local law enforcement and improving disposition matching of court and arrest records.

Mr. Perbix earned a bachelor's degree in Political Science and Sociology from the University of California, Santa Barbara, and a master's degree in Judicial Administration from the University of Denver College of Law. He is a Certified Computing Professional through the Institute for the Certification of Computing Professionals.