



Benchmarking the 2024 Q4 Vintage of the Criminal Justice Administrative Records System’s Data Infrastructure

Jordan Papp and Michael Mueller-Smith

University of Michigan

Abstract

The goal of the Criminal Justice Administrative Records System (CJARS) is to build a data infrastructure to support individual-level research and administration of the U.S. criminal justice system. Achieving this goal requires validation of the data collected and processed by CJARS against other reliable sources of data. The purpose of this report is to convey the findings of a series of exercises that were conducted to benchmark the CJARS data infrastructure against other widely-used sources of data on justice-involved populations (i.e., Uniform Crime Report, State Court Processing Statistics, National Prisoners Statistics Program, National Corrections Reporting Program, Annual Probation Survey, and Annual Parole Survey). This involved comparing counts of events and caseload characteristics reported in these data series to similar estimates produced using CJARS. Results indicated that there was a high degree of alignment between the counts of events and caseload characteristics that were estimated using CJARS as compared to the data series that were used for benchmarking. The findings reviewed in this report provide a substantial amount of evidence in support of the efficacy of the CJARS data infrastructure.



1 Introduction

The Criminal Justice Administrative Records System (CJARS) is a data collection effort and dissemination platform, founded in 2016, aiming to modernize research and statistical reporting on the criminal justice system and to strengthen capacity for evidence-based policy making in the U.S. The data infrastructure is a partnership between the University of Michigan and U.S. Census Bureau.

CJARS collects, harmonizes, and integrates administrative data across five primary domains of the U.S. justice system, which parallels the organizational structure of its relational database architecture: arrest, adjudication, incarceration, probation, and parole. Currently, CJARS is built off of over 3.7 billion lines of raw data, covering over 47 million individuals, 227 million criminal justice events, occurring in 33 states. The depth of historical data coverage varies by jurisdiction, but many states include series that extend back to the 1980s, some even earlier.

In contrast to prior data collection efforts, CJARS produces and curates individual-level criminal histories, linking the evolution of a single criminal episode across the stages of the justice system, and tracking individuals across space and time to fully capture the sum total of their contact with the justice system. CJARS can then be linked at the individual-level with a range of socio-economic data held in the Census Bureau's Federal Statistical Research Data Center (FSRDC) network, including self-reported demographic characteristics, evolving family composition and place of residence, employment and earnings behavior, take-up of public benefit programs, and mortality.¹

The U.S. lacks uniform rules across state and local jurisdictions on the privacy afforded to justice-involved individuals and what criminal justice contact is deemed public information. Likewise, there is substantial heterogeneity in the development of data access mechanisms for researchers across the country. Lacking authority to compel data provision, CJARS relies on multiple strategies for opportunistic data acquisition. These include data use agreements, public records requests, web scraping, bulk data downloads, and data donations.² Data arrives in provider-specified formats and structures, which then have to be reconciled by staff at the University of Michigan.

The nature of CJARS data collection provides the project flexibility and agility in response to changing legal and regulatory environments for criminal justice data across jurisdictions and over time. But, it also creates a number of serious challenges, including: (1) numerous distinct native data layouts, (2) inconsistent value codes or free entry fields for categorical variables, (3) inadequate unique identifiers for individuals across data providers, and (4) potential duplicative coverage of individual criminal justice events when receiving data from multiple providers with overlapping jurisdiction or when receiving multiple rounds of data over time from the same agency.

CJARS has endeavored to tackle these challenges head-on, developing innovative solutions that enhance the data product and strengthen the research community overall. All data goes through an extensive harmonization process, bringing local data structures into a common national schema, to facilitate integration of records across jurisdictions.³ Offense fields are processed through a novel hierarchical machine learning model that our team has pioneered to translate 4.9 million unique descriptions into 271 distinct offense types. Personally identifying information is compared across records, using our own newly developed random forest algorithm trained on biometrically linked data to determine which records from the hundreds of jurisdiction we cover belong to the same person.⁴ Finally, we employ an extensive deduplication process in our harmonization algorithm to ensure that individual events are not represented multiple times when sourced from multiple agencies with overlapping data coverage.⁵

Due to the variation in data collection methods and the numerous creative solutions required to coherently process the data, there is a fundamental need to benchmark CJARS against other available data series, mainly published by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, to both validate the strengths of CJARS and to highlight its potential weaknesses. Researchers should have a resource to gauge the credibility and reliability of CJARS, especially when alternative forms of aggregate statistical reporting already exist.

¹A list of restricted-use U.S. Census Bureau data that can be linked to CJARS records is provided here: <https://www2.census.gov/about/linkage/data-file-inventory.pdf>.

²More details about data collection and data documentation can be found on the CJARS website: <https://cjars.org/>.

³More information on this process can be found in the CJARS data documentation: <https://cjars.org/data-documentation-download/>.

⁴Findings from algorithm development and validation efforts can be found here: <https://cjars.org/entity-resolution-download/>.

⁵More information on deduplication can be found in the CJARS data documentation: <https://cjars.org/data-documentation-download/>.

In this report, we will compare CJARS-based statistics to other widely used statistical series on the U.S. criminal justice system. We evaluate CJARS against the following data collection efforts: Uniform Crime Report (UCR), State Court Processing Statistics (SCPS), National Prisoners Statistics (NPS) Program, National Corrections Reporting Program (NCRP), Annual Probation Survey, and Annual Parole Survey. These federal data series provide common reference across states and localities included in the CJARS data infrastructure, and considerable historical data to assess changing data quality over time. Our focus is on benchmarking the CJARS data at the state-level rather than aggregating across all CJARS states whenever possible because the U.S. criminal justice system is a largely decentralized system. This is reflected in CJARS data collection practices and harmonization efforts.

Our analysis focuses on reproducing caseload count and flow estimates (e.g., yearly entries into prison as measured in the NPS), as well as caseload characteristics and outcomes (e.g., demographic traits of defendants in SCPS data) in CJARS-covered jurisdictions. While no statistical reporting should ever be viewed as inherently indefectible, CJARS-based estimates that closely corroborate existing federal estimates provide important evidence on the quality and accuracy of our nascent data infrastructure endeavor and the non-sampled, linkable micro-data that the CJARS-based estimates are built off of.

The remainder of this report is organized as follows. Sections 2 through 6 respectively address benchmarking performance on arrest, adjudication, incarceration, probation, and parole statistics. Section 7 provides a discussion and conclusion. Finally, it should be noted that this benchmarking reporting will remain a living document, updated on a periodic basis as CJARS refines its data processing algorithms and new states are added to the platform.⁶

1.1 Citation

Papp, J., & Mueller-Smith, M. (2024). *Benchmarking the 2024 Q4 Vintage of the Criminal Justice Administrative Records System's Data Infrastructure*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan. <https://cjars.org/benchmarking-report-download/>

⁶Readers with data for additional validation exercises are encouraged to contact us at cjars-staff@umich.edu.

2 CJARS Arrests and the UCR

Arrest and booking information in CJARS is constructed primarily from data collected from law enforcement agencies such as police departments and sheriff's offices. This database is recorded at the arresting/booking charge-level and contains information on arrest/booking dates and offense type. To evaluate the accuracy of these records, we rely on the UCR.

The focus of the exercises conducted here was to compare records of arrest in CJARS to arrests reported to the UCR. It is also worth mentioning that there is a substantial amount of data on bookings covered by CJARS. However, this data on bookings was not compared to the UCR arrest counts because differences in the nature of the two types of events prevents meaningful comparisons.

2.1 Uniform Crime Reports (UCR)

The UCR program collects information from law enforcement agencies on arrests, clearances, trends, and law enforcement employee data. Data are collected from about 18,000 law enforcement agencies. These include city, university and college, county, state, tribal, and federal law enforcement agencies.

The UCR program collects data on the incidence of arrests and classifies counts of reported arrests into a pre-defined offense classification schema. Agencies are asked to report offense information on the most serious arresting offense (if there were multiple) using the UCR program's hierarchy rule.⁷ Part I offenses are classified into a number of categories, including: criminal homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft (except motor vehicle theft), motor vehicle theft, and arson. The FBI publishes a wide range of crime statistics each year using UCR data.⁸

The FBI has several systems in place to ensure quality and accuracy of the data submitted by the different agencies. First, the FBI provides these agencies with training and education opportunities on participation in the UCR program. Second, the FBI has a system called Quality Assurance Review that assesses data quality and accuracy. Third, the FBI publishes extensive user manuals that provide agencies with a significant amount of information regarding participation in the UCR program.

2.2 Comparing CJARS Arrests to the UCR

The count of arrests by offense type that occur in a county can be estimated using both CJARS and the UCR, providing a useful source of external validation for CJARS arrest data. It is important to note that there is no expectation that arrest records in CJARS will cover all arrests in a given county where data has been collected because CJARS collects arrest data from individual policing agencies that have jurisdiction over a city/township (e.g., Los Angeles Police Department). This means that the counts of arrests within the CJARS data for a given county will not reach those reported in the UCR because CJARS data does not cover all jurisdictions within the county. For example, while the Los Angeles Police Department represents a substantial proportion of the arrests that occur in the county, there are many arrests that occur within the county that are not conducted by the Los Angeles Police Department.

Figure 1 documents the yearly percentage of arrests in CJARS relative to the aggregated county-level counts reported by the FBI using UCR program data.⁹ Each line represents a different Part I offense, including an overall measure for any type of offense (which excludes traffic offenses as per UCR data collection practices). For example, a point on a graph falling at 20% means that the count of arrests observed in CJARS are 20% of those reported in the UCR (e.g., 1,000 arrests in CJARS versus 5,000 arrests in the UCR). Each panel focuses on a county where CJARS has collected data from a policing agency or agencies.


⁷More details about the hierarchy rule can be found in this UCR user manual: <https://www.fbi.gov/file-repository/ucr-ucr-srs-user-manual-v1.pdf/view>

⁸For an example of the *Arrests* table, see: <https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2015/crime-in-the-u.s.-2015/tables/table-69>


⁹In conformance with UCR practice, the charge-level CJARS arrest records are deduplicated to retain only the most serious offense associated with a given arrest.

Figure 1: Percentage of Arrests Reported to the UCR Covered by CJARS


(a) Cherokee County, South Carolina



(b) Collin County, Texas



(c) Douglas County, Nebraska



(d) Kern County, California






Figure 1: Percentage of Arrests Reported to the UCR Covered by CJARS (continued)


(e) Los Angeles County, California



(f) Riverside County, California



(g) San Bernardino County, California



(h) San Diego County, California






Figure 1: Percentage of Arrests Reported to the UCR Covered by CJARS (continued)

(i) San Joaquin County, California



(j) Tarrant County, Texas



3 CJARS Adjudication and SCPS

The adjudication information in CJARS is constructed primarily by data collected from court systems. Data are recorded at the charge-level and include information on numerous types of event dates (e.g., offense, charge, disposition, sentencing), offense description, disposition outcomes, and types of sentences imposed. To assess accuracy of these records, we use SCPS data.

3.1 State Court Processing Series (SCPS)

Data collection for SCPS began in 1990 and occurred during even numbered years through 2006 and then occurred one additional time in 2009. SCPS was a Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) program. BJS decided to end data collection in 2009 due to limited utility of the data produced by the project.

The scope of SCPS data coverage was limited to the 75 most populous counties in the United States, but data was only actually collected in 40 of the counties. This data collection strategy was chosen because the 75 most populous counties in the United States account for an estimated half of all reported crimes. Two other limitations of SCPS data are that (1) only information on felony cases is collected and (2) only information on cases that were filed in the month of May of each year of data collection is included.¹⁰

SCPS includes information regarding charges at the time of arrest, defendant demographic characteristics, defendant criminal history, pretrial release and detention, disposition, and types of sentences. Data collected as part of SCPS was reported in the BJS publication series titled *Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties*.¹¹

3.2 Comparing CJARS Adjudication and SCPS

Various characteristics of caseload composition and case processing metrics can be calculated using both CJARS and SCPS which provides the opportunity to benchmark the CJARS adjudication data. It is also important to explain that the scope of the CJARS adjudication data has coverage far beyond what is covered in SCPS, and so there is no appropriate data points to benchmark much of the CJARS data. For this reason, we cannot benchmark a large majority of the CJARS adjudication data because they either are not from major metro areas, are not from the sampled years from SCPS, or they are not for felony cases, all which define the SCPS sampling design. As a result, our focus is on validating the subset of CJARS data that overlaps with the definition of the scope of SCPS. This still provides useful information on gauging the quality of the algorithms applied to all of our data.

Figure 2 provides scatter plots where comparable SCPS and CJARS statistics (e.g., average age of felony defendants) are plotted onto the y and x-axes, respectively. The color/shape of a point in a scatter plot represents a specific year. Note that each year might have multiple data points on the graph, for example in the racial composition graph there is one data point for each race/ethnicity. These are not distinguished between each other, but the expectation is that the plotted points will cluster around the reference line which has a slope equal to one. Clustering around the line indicates that the statistics generated using CJARS and SCPS are comparable. Scatter plots in Figure 2 are provided for comparisons made between average defendant age (years), racial composition of defendants (proportion by race/ethnicity), composition of defendants by gender/sex (proportion by gender/sex), disposition outcome (proportion by type of outcome), time between disposition and sentencing or "adjudication duration" (proportion by binned time category), average incarceration sentence length (months), average probation sentence length (months), and offense type (proportion by offense type category).

There are several examples where the statistics estimated using CJARS very closely match the same estimate from SCPS data. A good example is the graph for the composition of defendants by gender/sex. In this graph, the proportion of defendants in each gender/sex group are plotted for CJARS and SCPS on the x and y-axis, respectively. As can be seen from this graph in Figure 2, there is a high degree of clustering of points on the reference line. The two separate clusters are caused by the wide gap in the percentage of male versus female defendants. The cluster of points on the lower end of the graph are the yearly female percentages while the cluster of points on the higher end of the graphs are the yearly male percentages. These clusters are labeled in the graph.

¹⁰These same exclusionary criteria were applied to the CJARS adjudication data to create comparable SCPS and CJARS samples of data.



¹¹The *Felony Defendants in Large Urban Counties* reports are available here: <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbse&sid=27>

The next figure, Figure 3, provides a combined graph with all data points that were plotted in each of the graphs from Figure 2. All of the data points from the graphs in Figure 2 were standardized so that they could be plotted onto a single graph. The color/shape of the point indicates which type of outcome it represents (e.g., offense type). Inspecting the graph shows that there is a high degree of clustering of points very near to the reference line. Some deviation exists as would be expected based on the results from the individual graphs in Figure 2. But taken as a whole, this graph shows that there is strong correspondence between CJARS and SCPS.

Figure 2: Correspondence Between CJARS and SCPS by Outcome

(a) Age

(b) Race/Ethnicity



(c) Gender/Sex

(d) Disposition Type








Figure 2: Correspondence Between CJARS and SCPS by Outcome (continued)
 (e) Adjudication Duration (f) Incarceration Length



(g) Probation Length



(h) Offense Type





Figure 3: Correspondence Between CJARS and SCPS for all Outcomes Combined and Standardized



4 CJARS Incarceration and NPS/NCRP

Incarceration information in CJARS is constructed primarily from data collected from departments of corrections, but also other types of agencies that track this information such as departments of public safety. These data are recorded at the incarceration term-level and contain information on incarceration entry and exit dates, entry and exit descriptions, and type of facility information. We assess the accuracy of these records using two sources of data: the NPS and NCRP. The advantage of these exercises is that triangulation of results provides strong support for the efficacy of the CJARS incarceration data.

4.1 National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) program

The NPS program began in 1926 in response to a congressional mandate that required agencies to collect information on individuals incarcerated in state and federal prisons. The responsibility of data collection has shifted over time, but is currently under the U.S. Census Bureau.

The NPS program is an aggregate-level data series which provides information on yearly prison population counts, admissions, and releases at the state and federal level. Data are collected from numerous agencies, including the 50 state departments of corrections, Federal Bureau of Prisons, and the District of Columbia's detention facilities.

Data is collected for the NPS program through surveys that are sent to an identified contact person at each agency. The survey collects information on several aspects about the population of inmates under an agency's jurisdiction. These include: year-end population counts, admission/release counts in the specified year, system capacity, and questions about special populations of inmates. The survey also asks for further break downs of certain data by sex and race/ethnicity. Notably, all of these are aggregate counts, no individual-level data is collected.

Data from the NPS program are used in the BJS annual *Prisoners* publication.¹² The data is also used in the BJS *Corrections Statistical Analysis Tool (CSAT)*.¹³

4.2 Comparing CJARS Incarceration to the NPS and NCRP

The incarceration information in CJARS provides information that can be compared to similar data from the NPS and NCRP which provides the opportunity to benchmark CJARS against multiple data series. All three data sources contain information that can be used to estimate yearly entry and exit counts as well as yearly incarcerated populations.

Entry counts. Figure 4 provides a comparison of yearly entry counts as reported in the NPS, NCRP, and CJARS. A separate graph is given for each state that CJARS has historical data holdings from. In each graph, the blue line with circles represents CJARS, gray with triangles is the NPS, and black with diamonds is the NCRP.

There are several key findings apparent from the series of graphs in Figure 4. One observation is that the yearly counts seen in the CJARS data align exceptionally well in most cases with either the NCRP, NPS, or both. For example, Nebraska shows considerable alignment between CJARS, NPS, and NCRP across all years of the graph for this state.

In other states, CJARS aligns better with either the NPS or NCRP, but not both. This occurs due to substantial differences between the NPS and NCRP within a state. An example of this is in North Carolina. As can be seen from North Carolina's graph, CJARS and the NCRP align very closely across most years observed. However, the NPS reports much lower entry counts beginning in the late 1990s.

Exit counts. Moving to Figure 5 provides a similar set of graphs as those in Figure 4, but for yearly incarceration exit counts. The key takeaway from this series of graphs is that the same state-level patterns observed for incarceration entries counts are also seen for exit counts. For example, the states where CJARS, NPS, and NCRP show substantial alignment present similar patterns for exit counts.

¹²The *Prisoners* reports are available here: <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbse&sid=40>


¹³The CSAT tools can be used here: <https://www.bjs.gov/probation/> or <https://www.bjs.gov/parole/>

Population counts. The last figure in this section, Figure 6 provides the annual year-end inmate population counts for each state. Notably, the comparison being made is between CJARS and the NPS because there is not enough information available in the public version of the NCRP to produce the statistics presented in Figures 6.


These results show that there is a high degree of similarity between population counts in several states. Other states show a high degree of alignment across some years, but not all. It is worth noting there were several instances when observing entry and exit counts where CJARS fell into better alignment with the NCRP than the NPS. An example is North Carolina where the largest difference exists when examining population counts reported in CJARS and the NPS. This suggests that if these statistics were producible using the NCRP, CJARS would align better with the NCRP.

Figure 4: Yearly Incarceration Entry Counts by State


(a) Arizona




(b) California




(c) Colorado



(d) Connecticut



(e) Florida



(f) Georgia






Figure 4: Yearly Incarceration Entry Counts by State (continued)


(g) Idaho




(h) Illinois




(i) Indiana



(j) Iowa



(k) Kansas



(l) Michigan






Figure 4: Yearly Incarceration Entry Counts by State (continued)


(m) Minnesota




(n) Montana




(o) Nebraska



(p) Nevada



(q) New Mexico



(r) New York






Figure 4: Yearly Incarceration Entry Counts by State (continued)


(s) North Carolina




(t) North Dakota




(u) Oklahoma



(v) Pennsylvania



(w) Texas



(x) Utah






Figure 4: Yearly Incarceration Entry Counts by State (continued)

(y) Vermont



(z) Washington



(aa) Wisconsin






Figure 5: Yearly Incarceration Exit Counts by State


(a) Arizona




(b) California




(c) Colorado



(d) Connecticut



(e) Florida



(f) Georgia






Figure 5: Yearly Incarceration Exit Counts by State (continued)


(g) Idaho




(h) Illinois




(i) Indiana



(j) Iowa



(k) Kansas



(l) Michigan






Figure 5: Yearly Incarceration Exit Counts by State (continued)


(m) Minnesota




(n) Montana




(o) Nebraska



(p) Nevada



(q) New Mexico



(r) New York






Figure 5: Yearly Incarceration Exit Counts by State (continued)


(s) North Carolina




(t) North Dakota




(u) Oklahoma



(v) Pennsylvania



(w) Texas



(x) Utah






Figure 5: Yearly Incarceration Exit Counts by State (continued)

(y) Vermont



(z) Washington



(aa) Wisconsin






Figure 6: Annual Year-end Incarcerated Population Counts by State


(a) Arizona




(b) California




(c) Colorado



(d) Connecticut



(e) Florida



(f) Georgia






Figure 6: Annual Year-end Incarcerated Population Counts by State (continued)


(g) Idaho




(h) Illinois




(i) Indiana



(j) Iowa



(k) Kansas



(l) Michigan






Figure 6: Annual Year-end Incarcerated Population Counts by State (continued)


(m) Minnesota




(n) Montana




(o) Nebraska



(p) Nevada



(q) New Mexico



(r) New York






Figure 6: Annual Year-end Incarcerated Population Counts by State (continued)


(s) North Carolina




(t) North Dakota




(u) Oklahoma



(v) Pennsylvania



(w) Texas



(x) Utah






Figure 6: Annual Year-end Incarcerated Population Counts by State (continued)


(y) Vermont



(z) Washington



(aa) Wisconsin



5 CJARS Probation and Annual Probation Survey

Probation information in CJARS is constructed from data collected from departments of corrections, court systems with the responsibility of supervising probationers, and other community corrections agencies. These data are recorded at the probation term-level and include information on entry and exit dates, entry and exit status, and probation conditions when available. The accuracy of these records are evaluated using the Annual Probation Survey.

5.1 Annual Probation Survey

BJS began data collection of the Annual Probation Survey in 1980 and has conducted the survey annually since. BJS relies on voluntary participation from participating agencies. Because community supervision is not always a centralized process, BJS works with a variety of agencies for data collection that span state departments of corrections, county community supervision agencies, and court systems. Data is collected from these agencies by use of a survey that is sent to the identified contact at each agency.¹⁴

Data from agencies is collected at the aggregate-level. Information is collected about year-end population counts and admission/release counts in the specified year. The information collected from these surveys is used by BJS for publications such as *Correctional Populations in the United States* and *Probation and Parole in the United States*.¹⁵ The data is also used in the BJS *Corrections Statistical Analysis Tool (CSAT)*.

5.2 Comparing CJARS Probation to the Annual Probation Survey

The probation information in CJARS provides information that can be compared to similar data from the Annual Probation Survey. Both CJARS and the Annual Probation Survey can be used to estimate yearly entry and exit counts as well as yearly probationer populations.

Entry counts. Figure 7 shows a comparison between probation entry counts observed in CJARS as compared to the Annual Probation Survey for each state where CJARS has historical data holdings. The graphs show substantial alignment in some states, while others appear to show substantial differences when comparing CJARS to the Annual Probation Survey. Variation between data sources can be caused by a number of factors. One common example is that the data source feeding CJARS is a state department of corrections. In these cases, CJARS covers probationers supervised by the department of corrections, which may not supervise the entire population of probationers in the state.

Exit counts. Moving to Figure 8 provides yearly probation exit counts by state. Notably, similar patterns are seen when comparing the probation exit count graphs to the entry count graphs.


Population counts. The last figure in this section, Figure 9 provides the annual year-end probationer population counts for each state. The patterns seen in the graphs can be explained when considering the patterns observed for the graphs presented for probation entry and exit counts in Figures 7 and 8. For example, states where low entry and exit counts are observed in CJARS as compared to the Annual Probation Survey, population counts also tend to be relatively low.

¹⁴An example survey can be found here: https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cj8_2018.pdf


¹⁵These reports can be downloaded here: <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=271>

Figure 7: Yearly Probation Entry Counts by State


(a) Idaho




(b) Iowa




(c) Michigan



(d) Minnesota



(e) Montana



(f) New Mexico






Figure 7: Yearly Probation Entry Counts by State (continued)


(g) North Carolina




(h) North Dakota




(i) Texas



(j) Utah



(k) Washington



(l) Wisconsin






Figure 8: Yearly Probation Exit Counts by State


(a) Idaho




(b) Iowa




(c) Michigan



(d) Montana



(e) New Mexico



(f) North Dakota






Figure 8: Yearly Probation Exit Counts by State (continued)


(g) Texas



(h) Utah



(i) Washington



(j) Wisconsin




Figure 9: Annual Year-end Probationer Population Counts by State






Figure 9: Annual Year-end Probationer Population Counts by State (continued)


(g) Texas




(h) Utah



(i) Washington



(j) Wisconsin



6 CJARS Parole and Annual Parole Survey

Parole information in CJARS is constructed primarily from data collected from departments of corrections, but also other types of agencies that track this information such as departments of public safety. Parole data are recorded at the parole term-level and contain information on parole entry /exit date and exit description. We assess the accuracy of these records using the Annual Parole Survey.

6.1 Annual Parole Survey

Data collection for the Annual Parole Survey occurs in tandem with the Annual Probation survey and employs the same data collection strategy. See the above description on the Annual Probation Survey for further details on the data collection efforts for the Annual Parole Survey.

6.2 Comparing CJARS Parole to the Annual Parole Survey

The parole information in CJARS provides information that can be compared against the same types of information gathered as part of the Annual Parole Survey. Both sources of parole data can be used to estimate yearly entry and exit counts as well as yearly parolee populations.

Entry counts. Figure 10 shows a comparison between parole entry counts observed in CJARS as compared to the Annual Parole Survey for each state where CJARS has historical data holdings. As can be seen in this figure, entry counts in CJARS and the Annual Parole Survey line up exceptionally well in almost all states, with some minor exceptions to this rule.

Exit counts. Moving to Figure 11 provides yearly parole exit counts by state. Similar to the favorable findings observed for parole entry counts, consistent trends are seen in parole exit counts when comparing CJARS to the Annual Parole Survey.

Population counts. The last figure in this section, Figure 12 provides the annual year-end parolee population counts for each state. In most cases, there is a high degree of alignment between CJARS and the Annual Parole Survey.

6.3 Comparing CJARS Parole to the Annual Parole Survey

Figure 10: Yearly Parole Entry Counts by State






Figure 10: Yearly Parole Entry Counts by State (continued)


(g) Idaho




(h) Illinois




(i) Iowa



(j) Kansas



(k) Michigan



(l) Minnesota






Figure 10: Yearly Parole Entry Counts by State (continued)


(m) Montana




(n) Nebraska




(o) New Mexico



(p) New York



(q) North Carolina



(r) North Dakota






Figure 10: Yearly Parole Entry Counts by State (continued)

(s) Oklahoma



(t) Texas



(u) Utah




Figure 11: Yearly Parole Exit Counts by State






Figure 11: Yearly Parole Exit Counts by State (continued)


(g) Illinois




(h) Iowa




(i) Kansas



(j) Michigan



(k) Minnesota



(l) Montana






Figure 11: Yearly Parole Exit Counts by State (continued)


(m) Nebraska




(n) New Mexico




(o) New York



(p) North Carolina



(q) North Dakota



(r) Texas




Figure 11: Yearly Parole Exit Counts by State (continued)
(s) Utah






Figure 12: Annual Year-end Parolee Population Counts by State


(a) California




(b) Colorado




(c) Connecticut



(d) Florida



(e) Georgia



(f) Idaho






Figure 12: Annual Year-end Parolee Population Counts by State (continued)


(g) Illinois




(h) Iowa




(i) Kansas



(j) Michigan



(k) Minnesota



(l) Montana






Figure 12: Annual Year-end Parolee Population Counts by State (continued)


(m) Nebraska




(n) New Mexico




(o) New York



(p) North Carolina



(q) North Dakota



(r) Texas





Figure 12: Annual Year-end Parolee Population Counts by State (continued)
(s) Utah



7 Discussion

The purpose of this report was to assess the efficacy of the CJARS data infrastructure. The validation exercises conducted in this report were necessary for several reasons. First, CJARS collects data using numerous strategies (e.g., data use agreements, web scraping). There is inherently variation in the nature of data collected using different opportunistic strategies. Second, the data CJARS collects comes from a multitude of agencies, each with its own unique way of storing and managing its data. The lack of uniform rules across state and local jurisdictions creates nearly endless variation in disparate sources of data. Third, the significant variation in the way data is stored and managed by agencies has caused CJARS to implement creative strategies to process and harmonize the data it collects. These strategies were developed to overcome the various data layouts encountered, inconsistencies in value codes and free entry fields, lack of unique identifiers across data providers, and duplicative record coverage across overlapping jurisdictions. Each of these processes creates a great deal of complexity which CJARS must surmount in order to create a valid and reliable source of micro-level data on the U.S. justice system. Since these complexities are inherent to the structure of the U.S. justice system, CJARS will continue to periodically update this report as data is continually collected and harmonized.

Validation exercises are presented in this report which compare CJARS to other widely used data series that are publicly available and contain information that could be used as points of comparison for benchmarking purposes. The data series that were used for benchmarking included the UCR, SCPS, NPS, NCRP, and Annual Probation and Parole Surveys. Comparisons included the following: CJARS arrests to the UCR, CJARS adjudication to SCPS, CJARS incarceration to both the NPS and NCRP, CJARS probation to the Annual Probation Survey, and CJARS parole to the Annual Parole Survey. These data series provided the opportunity to benchmark various event counts and other caseload characteristics that can be estimated using CJARS. The comparisons that were conducted provided evidence in support of the efficacy of the CJARS data infrastructure.

Benchmarking CJARS arrest data involved comparing the counts of arresting events observed in CJARS to similar counts of events reported in the UCR. This was done for FBI Part I offenses. Due to the decentralized nature of record collection and storage by law enforcement agencies, CJARS has relied on collecting arrest and booking records from individual agencies, such as police departments and sheriff's offices. For this reason, there was no expectation that counts of arrests in CJARS would cover all arrests reported in the county-level UCR data. With this in mind, the counts of arrests observed in CJARS covered a substantial amount of arrests reported to the UCR in the counties where CJARS has coverage of arrests.

The CJARS adjudication data was benchmarked against SCPS by comparing characteristics of caseloads and case processing statistics. Overall, the statistics that have been reported in publications using SCPS were re-created using CJARS and show alignment between SCPS and CJARS-produced statistics in a number of ways. For instance, plotting the various characteristics of court caseloads (e.g., sex and age of defendants) in SCPS against CJARS resulted in similar distributions seen across all years examined. Consistency also existed when comparing various aspects of case processing and case outcomes. The differences that were seen can be explained by the differences in sampling between CJARS and SCPS. For example, differences in racial composition of defendants is likely a result of the differences between the counties that comprised the CJARS and SCPS samples. Differences in geographic coverage are more likely to impact racial composition of a caseload than other caseload characteristics that were examined (e.g., composition of defendants by sex). This explains the similarities seen for the distribution of defendants by sex, but the variation that was seen for the distribution of defendants by race.

Benchmarking CJARS incarceration data involved comparing counts of entries/exits and population counts in CJARS, NPS, and NCRP. The advantage of this set of benchmarking exercises was having two data series that could be used for comparison purposes. Triangulation of results provides even stronger evidence for data accuracy, especially given the fact that the two data series that CJARS were benchmarked against use different ways of collecting and reporting data (surveys to collect aggregate statistics versus the collection of individual-level data). In fact, the results elucidated some differences seen between the NPS and NCRP. These differences have also been observed in other past research using these two data series. Regardless of the difficulties in the interpretation of findings that arose due to differences between the NPS and NCRP, there was still evidence to support the efficacy of CJARS incarceration data. For instance, many states showed similarities between CJARS and both the NPS and NCRP. In cases where the NPS and NCRP provided divergent event counts, CJARS was typically in alignment with at least one of these data series.

Finally, benchmarking CJARS probation and parole data involved comparing counts of entries/exits and population counts in CJARS to those reported in the Annual Probation and Parole surveys, respectively. Similarities in the Annual Probation and Parole surveys and benchmarking exercises using these two data series facilitates discussing results together. Comparisons made to benchmark probation events showed misalignment in some states between the event/population counts between CJARS and the Annual Probation Survey (explainable because of the strategies used to collection CJARS probation data). In contrast, there was more consistency between the event/population counts observed in the CJARS parole data and those reported in the Annual Parole Survey.

All of the findings reviewed in this report provide evidence in support of the fidelity of the CJARS data infrastructure. This supports the methods that CJARS uses to process and harmonizes the data that it collects. These results are important given the overall complexity of the process and the numerous steps taken between data collection and the final data product that CJARS makes available for researchers to request through the Census Bureau's FSRDC network. This situates CJARS as a premier source of linkable micro-data that researchers can merge at the person-level to socio-economic records and leverage to conduct research on the justice system. It also suggests that CJARS can be used as a source of data for statistical reporting that can be used for policy-making and administration of the justice system. Researchers should use this report to help gauge whether CJARS is the best-suited data platform to conduct their research and analysis, and can be cited as evidence in support of the credibility of their CJARS-based empirical work.

Bibliography

- Gross, Matthew, and Michael Mueller-Smith. 2020. *Modernizing Person-Level Entity Resolution with Biometrically Linked Records*. Unpublished.
- Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Bureau of Justice Statistics., United States Department of. 1991-2020. *National Corrections Reporting Program*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2022-11-28. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR38492.v1>.
- . 1990-2009. *State Court Processing Statistics*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-06-24. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR02038.v5>.
- . 1978-2022. *National Prisoner Statistics*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2024-01-10. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR38871.v1>.
- . 1994a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2012-09-25. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29662.v1>.
- . 1994b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2012-12-10. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29668.v2>.
- . 1995a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2012-09-25. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29663.v1>.
- . 1995b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-14. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29669.v2>.
- . 1996a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2012-09-25. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29664.v1>.
- . 1996b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-14. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29670.v2>.
- . 1997a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2012-09-25. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29665.v1>.
- . 1997b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-14. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29671.v2>.
- . 1998a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2012-09-25. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29666.v1>.
- . 1998b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-14. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29672.v2>.
- . 1999a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2012-09-25. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29667.v1>.
- . 1999b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-14. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR29673.v2>.
- . 2000a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-07. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31325.v1>.
- . 2000b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-26. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR28361.v1>.
- . 2001a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-08. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31326.v1>.
- . 2001b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-26. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR28362.v1>.

- Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Bureau of Justice Statistics., United States Department of. 2002a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-10. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31327.v1>.
- . 2002b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-26. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR28363.v1>.
- . 2003a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-10. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31328.v1>.
- . 2003b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-02-26. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR28364.v1>.
- . 2004a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-16. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31329.v1>.
- . 2004b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-03-06. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR28365.v1>.
- . 2005a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-15. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31330.v1>.
- . 2005b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-03-06. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR28366.v1>.
- . 2006a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-16. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31331.v1>.
- . 2006b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-03-08. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31323.v1>.
- . 2007a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-24. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31332.v1>.
- . 2007b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-03-08. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR31324.v1>.
- . 2008a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-31. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34380.v1>.
- . 2008b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-03-22. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34319.v1>.
- . 2009a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34381.v1>.
- . 2009b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-03-21. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34320.v1>.
- . 2010a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-05-31. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34382.v1>.
- . 2010b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-03-27. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34321.v1>.
- . 2011a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-10-28. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34718.v1>.
- . 2011b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2013-10-31. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34717.v1>.
- . 2012a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-10-29. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR35257.v1>.

- Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Bureau of Justice Statistics., United States Department of. 2012b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-09-12. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR35256.v1>.
- . 2013a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-12-19. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR35629.v1>.
- . 2013b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2015-01-07. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR35631.v1>.
- . 2014a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2015-12-02. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36320.v1>.
- . 2014b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2015-12-02. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36343.v1>.
- . 2015a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2016-12-22. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36619.v1>.
- . 2015b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2016-12-22. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36618.v1>.
- . 2016a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2020-04-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR37441.v1>.
- . 2016b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2020-04-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR37459.v1>.
- . 2017a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2020-09-09. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR37471.v1>.
- . 2017b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2020-09-09. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR37482.v1>.
- . 2018a. *Annual Parole Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2020-10-28. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR38058.v1>.
- . 2018b. *Annual Probation Survey*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2021-10-28. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR38057.v1>.
- Kaeble, Danielle, and Mariel Alper. 2019. Probation and Parole in the United States, 2019.
- . 2020. Probation and Parole in the United States, 2020.
- . 2021a. Probation and Parole in the United States, 2021.
- . 2021b. Probation and Parole in the United States, 2021.
- Maltz, Michael D, and Joseph Targonski. 2002. A note on the use of county-level UCR data. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 18 (3): 297–318.
- Pfaff, John F. 2010. The Durability of Prison Populations. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*: 73–115.
- United States Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Federal Bureau of Investigation. 1994. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-01-12. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR06669.v3>.
- . 1995. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-03-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR06850.v2>.

- United States Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Federal Bureau of Investigation. 1996. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-03-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR02389.v3>.
- . 1997. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-03-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR02764.v2>.
- . 1998. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-03-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR02910.v2>.
- . 1999. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-03-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR03167.v4>.
- . 2000. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-03-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR03451.v4>.
- . 2001. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-03-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR03721.v2>.
- . 2002. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-03-30. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR04009.v2>.
- . 2003. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-01-31. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR04360.v2>.
- . 2004. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2006-07-26. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR04466.v1>.
- . 2005. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2007-07-24. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR04717.v1>.
- . 2006. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2008-12-12. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR23780.v1>.
- . 2007. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2009-08-20. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR25114.v1>.
- . 2008. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2011-04-21. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR27644.v1>.
- . 2009. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-06-16. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR30763.v2>.
- . 2010. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-06-16. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR33523.v2>.

- United States Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2011. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-06-13. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR34582.v2>.
- . 2012. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2014-06-12. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR35019.v1>.
- . 2013. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2017-09-12. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36117.v2>.
- . 2014. *Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data: County-Level Detailed Arrest and Offense Data, United States*. Data retrieved from Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2017-09-12. <https://doi.org/10.3886/ICPSR36399.v2>.
- Wagner, Deborah, Mary Lane, et al. 2014. *The person identification validation system (PVS): applying the Center for Administrative Records Research and Applications' (CARRA) record linkage software*. Technical report. Center for Economic Studies, US Census Bureau.