



Fourth Annual Conference on Evaluating Crime and Drug Control Initiatives

Summary of the Proceedings

Sponsored by:

National Institute of Justice
in conjunction with the
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice

June 28-30, 1993
Washington, D.C.



148463

U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice
Bureau of Justice Assistance

U.S. Department of Justice
Janet Reno

Attorney General

Office of Justice Programs
Laurie Robinson

Acting Assistant Attorney General

National Institute of Justice
Michael J. Russell

Acting Director

Bureau of Justice Assistance
Jack A. Nadol

Acting Director

NIJ Professional Conference Series
John Thomas

Program Manager

This document was prepared by the Institute for Law and Justice for the Professional Conference Series of the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Contract Number OJP-91-C-005. The points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the various contributors. They do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

148463

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/OJP/BJA
U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the following program offices and bureaus: The Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Institute of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

**Fourth Annual Conference
on
Evaluating Crime and
Drug Control Initiatives**

Summary of the Proceedings

NCJRS

OCT 4 1994

ACQUISITIONS

Sponsored by:

**National Institute of Justice
in conjunction with the
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice**

**June 28-30, 1993
Washington, D.C.**

Table of Contents

Keynote Speakers

Michael J. Russell

Acting Director, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice 1

Elliott A. Brown

Deputy Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice 5

The Honorable Janet Reno

Attorney General of the United States..... 7

The Honorable Lee P. Brown

Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President 13

Evaluation Activities and NIJ Long-Range Goals..... 19

Panel Sessions..... 27

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1993

Plenary Panel: Assessing the Effectiveness of Criminal

Justice Programs 27

Evaluating Community Policing 35

Drug Testing: Tools and Applications..... 39

Intensive Supervision Programs 41

Evaluation of Innovative Prosecution Strategies..... 43

Drug Treatment..... 47

Interventions with High Risk Youth and Families..... 51

Correctional Options Demonstration Programs 53

Evaluation of Crime Prevention Programs..... 57

Gang Violence and Delinquent Networks 59

Assessing Rural Enforcement Efforts..... 61

Evaluating the Impact of Changes in the Criminal Justice System 63

Narcotics Enforcement..... 67

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1993

Drug Market Analysis and Problem-Oriented Policing 69

Evaluation of School-Based Programs 71

Boot Camps 73

Court Responses to Drug Cases 75

Evaluating Law Enforcement Technologies	79
Evaluation of Drug Courts	81
Responses to Prison Crowding	83
Evaluation of Anti-Crime Public Awareness Programs	87
Developing Cost-Effective Drug Testing Strategies	89
New Links Between the Public Health and Criminal Justice Sectors:	
Recent Evaluation Efforts	91
Evaluation of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Enforcement Task Forces	95
Drug Testing: Program Impacts (A)	99
Environmental Crime	101
Building Evaluation Capacities in the States	103
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1993	
Evaluation of Weed and Seed Programs	105
Responses to Gangs	109
Evaluation of Family Violence Programs	113
Drug Testing: Program Impacts (B)	115
Evaluating Strategies to Combat Violent Crime	117
Managing Specific Populations in Correctional Settings	119
Using Criminalistics Identification Techniques in the Courts	121
Related Workshops	123
Assessing the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Programs	123
Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act	123
Enhancing the Effectiveness of Narcotics Task Forces	124
Conducting Evaluations in Prison Settings	124
Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs	124
Evaluating Boot Camps	125
Evaluation of the 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act	125
Differentiated Case Management	125
Surveys for Assessments and Evaluations	126
Strategic Planning for Clandestine Laboratory Enforcement	126
Building Evaluation Capacities in the States	127
APPENDIX	i-xvi

Fourth Annual Conference on Evaluating Crime and Drug Control Initiatives

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

**Michael J. Russell, Acting Director
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice**

Good morning, and welcome to the fourth annual Evaluation Conference, sponsored by the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Assistance. This conference is an integral part of the mission of the National Institute of Justice. Criminal justice today faces challenges that require solid information about what works and why. Evaluation is a critical link to putting usable and reliable information—programs that we know are working well—into the hands of those who directly need it, to combat drugs and violent crime. The National

Evaluation is a critical link to putting usable and reliable information—programs that we know are working well—into the hands of those who directly need it, to combat drugs and violent crime.

Institute of Justice, as the principal research, development, and evaluation arm of the Justice Department, supports research and demonstration projects that will have maximum impact in preventing and reducing crime and improving the criminal justice system. This mission has been expanded over the years

in amendments to legislation such as the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, and the Crime Control Act of 1990. NIJ and BJA are two of the five bureaus that make up the Office of Justice Programs, whose mission is to assist states and localities in making their communities safer. The other three bureaus

with which we work are the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

In the field of evaluation, all of us here today are *Searching For Answers*, the title of NIJ's annual evaluation report. Congress has directed the Institute to compile this report and transmit it to the President, the Attorney General, and Congress. Transmittal of this year's report occurred just last week. Therefore, it is our pleasure to release this report this morning, and I urge you to pick up a copy. This fourth annual report represents a shared venture with many of you here today. It reflects the continued growth in our knowledge, and contains many more findings than in previous reports. Even more important, many of the insights presented are bolstered by the results of multiple studies.

This year, NIJ is celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary—25 years of working with federal, state, and local governments and criminal justice agencies. Let me note just a few areas of NIJ's ongoing programs:

- **Gangs.** Their involvement in violent crime and drug-related crime are a major priority area for NIJ. Not a day goes by when one does not see a news article about gang incursions into our smaller cities. Gang migration is one of the areas NIJ is

exploring in its comprehensive gang research initiative. The Institute is supporting projects to develop national data on gangs and to identify promising anti-gang strategies and programs.

- **Community Policing.** We know that a great many communities are investing in this promising concept of partnerships between the police and the community. We need to know what is working best. Some of the areas NIJ is exploring are case studies of community policing, recruitment of patrol officers, and how to measure performance in this type of work.
- **NIJ's Drug Use Forecasting Program.** The Office of National Drug Control Policy identified this as one of the nation's eight leading drug indicators. It has been expanded to 24 cities, most of the major metropolitan areas. DUF tests booked arrestees for illicit drugs; and the findings are used not only by the Federal government, but also local agencies and treatment providers.
- **Science and Technology.** NIJ's Science and Technology Division works in such areas as forensics, DNA typing to help link suspects with evidence, and new nonlethal technologies for law enforcement and safer communities.
- Many agencies are working to comply with the requirements of the new **Americans with Disabilities Act**. NIJ is providing reports, training workshops, and technical assistance to help criminal justice agencies respond to the Act.
- **The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).** NCJRS—a national and international clearinghouse—is one of the major avenues NIJ uses to communicate research and evaluation results.

This year, the Institute has launched three important new initiatives to reflect the needs of the field and Department of Justice priorities:

- NIJ is reaching beyond the traditional scope of criminal justice and has formed a **health and justice** task force to focus on ways in which crime, drugs, and violence are linked with health issues. This initiative both

formalizes and expands a number of NIJ programs spanning health and justice issues, such as health care fraud, human development and criminal behavior, correctional health care (AIDS and tuberculosis, for example), family violence and child abuse, mental health in corrections, and job-related health issues facing police and sheriffs.

- NIJ is identifying those issues that the criminal justice community will face in the **21st century** in order to best target our resources today. A series of 21st century focus groups in policing, prosecution, courts, probation and parole, and corrections will be convened. Recently, NIJ brought together newly appointed police chiefs from around the country to offer insights into the needs of American police in the 21st century. We benefit from these diverse ideas and new perspectives.
- NIJ receives numerous requests from criminal justice agencies seeking information about **technological advances** and the availability of new equipment. The Institute is exploring the establishment of a centralized location for information on new technologies and equipment—a Technology Resource Center. NIJ is also working on transfer of technology information to law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies.

Evaluation has been a core function of the Institute since its establishment in 1968. These efforts were increased when Congress passed the Crime Control Act of 1973 directing NIJ to evaluate Federally funded programs in the field. In 1976, 1988, and 1990 (with the corrections options program) Congress assigned additional evaluation responsibilities to NIJ. The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 directed NIJ, in the words of Congress, to "evaluate a reasonable number of programs" funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance based on the following four considerations:

- Whether the program establishes or demonstrates a new and innovative approach to drug or crime control
- The cost of the program to be evaluated and the number of similar programs funded by BJA

- Whether the program has a high potential to be replicated in other jurisdictions
- Whether there is substantial public awareness and community involvement in the program

To respond to the new congressional mandates and the growing needs of the field, last year the Institute created a new Evaluation Division and increased the evaluation staff to focus more specifically on approaches that are successful and worthy of replication and on issues that require clarification. Since 1989, NIJ has awarded nearly 50 grants, totaling some \$16 million, for evaluation of state and local drug control programs. These projects are supporting policymakers and practitioners in the areas of drug enforcement, community policing, community anti-drug initiatives, the prosecution of drug cases, drug testing across the criminal justice system, and drug treatment.

In 1993, NIJ is funding evaluations of programs such as school-based crime prevention, drug and crime prevention in public housing, and community-based prosecution, to mention a few. In addition, NIJ is working with the states to improve evaluation capacity. With BJA, NIJ is now developing a series of coordinated, state-based evaluations and technical assistance for state and local agencies on the evaluation process.

In 1993, NIJ is funding evaluations of programs such as school-based crime prevention, drug and crime prevention in public housing, and community-based prosecution, to mention a few. In addition, NIJ is working with the states to improve evaluation capacity.

In gatherings such as this, criminal justice professionals can continue the exchange of information and ideas so essential in our pursuit of success in the war on drugs. The input NIJ receives from you opens new avenues for significant advances toward our common goal. We identify together emerging issues such as:

- How can boot camp programs be structured so offenders retain the valuable lessons they

learned once they return to the community, or

- Which policing strategies work in interrupting open drug trafficking on city streets, or
- How can courts deal fairly and efficiently with the increasing volume of drug cases before them, or
- What makes community-based initiatives successful?

The information that evaluations provide on the effectiveness of criminal justice programs is essential to states and localities. It enables them to develop budgets that allocate funds most wisely for useful efforts and shape policy to deal efficiently with problems posed by the effects of drugs and crime. NIJ reports on its evaluation efforts in the form of periodic evaluation bulletins and *Searching For Answers*, the annual report to the President and the Congress. Meetings such as this conference keep the field apprised of the Institute's work and the gains made in developing programs that work. We appreciate your being here, and thank you in advance for your active participation.

Elliott A. Brown, Deputy Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice

As one who had the opportunity to help craft the 1986 and 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Acts, I would like to share with you some thoughts on this effort to combat drug trafficking, drug abuse, and violent crime, and on how you can perform a vital role in that effort.

The 1986 and 1988 statutes provided comprehensive authority and funding to help combat narcotics trafficking and drug abuse. For the first time, efforts to reduce the demand for and the supply of illicit drugs were placed under one legislative umbrella. Eradicating the illicit production of drugs at their international sources, interdicting the flow of narcotics domestically, treating and rehabilitating those who are addicted to drugs, and educating our citizens on the dangers of narcotics trafficking and drug abuse became a multi-departmental endeavor with a "drug czar" formulating a comprehensive national anti-crime drug strategy.

That was the philosophy behind the legislation. Five years later, we are at a critical point for examining the impact of those initiatives. From BJA's perspective, these statutes are critical to assisting state and local governments and the nonprofit private sector to improve the criminal justice system and combat drug trafficking, drug abuse, and violent crime.

We can have the best designed, crafted, and funded statutes, but in the final analysis, the salient issue is one of evaluation. Are the anti-crime programs working, and if so, why? One of the purposes of this conference is to answer that question. That is why your input is vital, not only for the anti-crime programs, but also for our communities to learn what programs are working and how we can be more effective in combatting this insidious violence that is plaguing not only our nation, but nations throughout the world.

A day does not go by that we can not pick up a newspaper and see the human tragedy caused by violent crime that is taking place throughout America and the decay that is occurring in our communities. Whether we focus on the metropolitan communities, the suburbs, or the rural communities; whether it is in our inner cities or the outer cities; whether it is in the North, South, East, or West—it makes no difference. The cost in lost lives and shattered dreams is staggering.

The program before us today is exciting and examines some of the issues I have mentioned. In my opinion, this evaluation conference presents one of the best formulations of topics for your discussion. Your views, thoughts, suggestions, experiences, and wisdom are now, more than ever before, vital to all who are in the trenches combatting drug trafficking, drug abuse, and violent crime.

We are also at a critical period for programmatic evaluations; and we need to think about not only what works and why, but how to market and communicate the research. It is not enough to have the research published in professional journals or to discuss it at professional meetings. It is unproductive effort if the research merely gathers dust on our bookshelves.

What concerns me at this juncture is the court of public opinion. We must get our message out to the public. The public must be informed about our research and findings. The public must understand what programs are working and why they are working—and if they are not working; why they are failing to work.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), BJA's predecessor agency, had an amazing history with tremendous fluctuations in its annual appropriations. BJA, in the last several years, has been very fortunate: We have been able to have stable appropriations for the Formula Grant Program at the consistent level of \$423 million per year. If BJA were to take a cut in its discretionary grant programs, what kind of message would that send to the public? I am concerned about the broader implications that a reduced appropriation would have; not only for BJA, the Byrne Memorial Fund, and discretionary grant programs; but for all efforts to combat drug trafficking, drug abuse, and violent crime. That is why your participation in this conference is so critical. The public demands to know what programs are working and why they are working. And it is up to all of us to help respond to that demand.

Keynote Speakers • 6

Now is the time to think about marketing and communicating the research and the evaluations. That is the challenge I leave with you. I welcome your thoughts and suggestions as to how we can get the message out to the public so they can better understand and support anti-crime proposals and funding.

*It is not enough to have the
research published in
professional journals or to
discuss it at professional
meetings. . . .The public
must be informed about our
research and
our findings.*

The Honorable Janet Reno, Attorney General of the United States

Thank you so very much. I see familiar faces, and it is a great pleasure to be here with people from around the country who have worked so hard. It is wonderful to be with people who are dedicated to public service and to trying to make things work. That is a very difficult thing to do in this day and time, with one force being brought to bear on another, impacted by different initiatives. When people keep on and continue to try to figure out how to make things work better, government becomes very exciting. This is a time that this nation has got to approach its problems with that passion for trying to make things work; but with a cool commitment to common sense, to rational discussion, to the elimination of politics from the issue of crime and drugs, and a thoughtful approach as to how we do it right with the limited dollars we have.

Having been on the receiving end for 15 years, I know what it's like when the federal government comes in and says, "We have this wonderful grant, but you have to do it this way." Maybe your state or local agency doesn't need the grant just that particular way because it already has something else; so you end up without the help.

This is a time that this nation has got to approach its problems with that passion for trying to make things work; but with a cool commitment to common sense, to rational discussion, to the elimination of politics from the issue of crime and drugs, and a thoughtful approach as to how we do it right with the limited dollars we have.

I know what it's like to get marvelous federal publications that are two years outdated because they have been in the process of being refined, vetted, and discussed. There are tremendous information and resources. We will only be effective, though, if we look at the whole criminal justice and prevention issue as one continuum to see how we best spend our dollars in the most efficient manner possible.

In modern-day criminal justice, I have heard there is "too much Federalizing." Congress wants to pass more laws to meet other demands and crises. I think it's time, first of all, that the National District Attorneys Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, the U.S. Attorneys and the Department of Justice got together and determined, in a reasoned, thoughtful way, what should be charged federally, and what should be charged statewide, so that we understand how to use our limited resources best.

I had a very comfortable declination understanding with U.S. Attorney in the Southern District of Florida. So I was amazed to find out that it was not consistent with declination policies in other parts of the country. The objective of sentencing guidelines in the federal system is diminished by these different charging and declination policies, and I think we have to understand how they work together. We've got to approach it both from the point of view of Federalism, and with the understanding that, in different localities, there are different problems that dictate principal policy decisions on charging.

One of the issues that has long dictated charging in some jurisdictions, including my old jurisdiction, is the lack of available prison space in state court systems. Some cases are brought to Federal Court because of a chance of a longer prison sentence since there are more prison cells to house people for the length of time the judges are sentencing them. I think that should not be the reason that dictates charging. We should look at our prison resources and see how we use those best and how we can develop means of allocating them to focus on violent crime, violent recidivists, major traffickers, major distributors, and the white collar thugs who rip off a whole industry or prey on people who are too fragile to protect themselves. Those

seem to me to be legitimate objectives to focus upon. We make sure that, working together with both the state and federal systems as a partnership, we come up with a collective use of prison cells that makes sense.

Then we've got to look at who is in the American prisons today. I'm appalled to see that in

We should look at our prison resources and see how to best use those and develop means of allocating them to focus on violent crime, violent recidivists, major traffickers, major distributors, and the white collar thugs who rip off a whole industry or prey on people who are too fragile to protect themselves.

many federal prisons we have non-violent first offenders, charged with drug crimes. A first offender, in many state systems, wouldn't get much jail time at all. That doesn't make sense as we try to develop a partnership between the federal and state systems to use the limited resources as wisely as possible. So we really need to develop comprehensive mechanisms for determining who is in federal prison, who is in state prison, how it's working, and how we can use the resources in the best way possible.

I am convinced, and I have read enough reports now, that we must focus on the career criminal, the violent recidivist, and get them incapacitated for the length of their crime producing life. That means we need to free up some prison cells. How do we do it? We should point out that most offenders are likely to be out of prison sooner rather than later. When we start evaluating and telling the American people why it's cost effective to develop alternative sanctions, we have to be very careful about the result. If we evaluate an alternative sanction project that promises to free up prison cells and also to provide quick reintegration of an offender into the community, we have to look at what that means.

Too often, I have seen evaluations done of one segment that will provide job training, placement, and a reduced prison sentence; but it doesn't provide aftercare, follow-up, or random drug testing if drug testing was necessary. I think that is one of the problems with the federal approach: Too often, funding has been for just one program or for one grant that deals with only one facet of the

continuum of alternative sanctions to be considered. If alternative sanctions are going to work, both as a means of reintegration of people into the community in an effective way, and of diminishing the need for prison cells, we've got to consider what alternative sanctions mean.

If a person has a drug problem and is sentenced to three years, let's provide detoxification programs in the prison, get the person stabilized, and then move them out into residential non-secure facilities which are a lot less costly. But, let's not do only that and nothing more. Let's provide random drug testing as a check on what we're doing; and, in selling it to the American people and evaluating what works, let's evaluate the cost. It's a lot less expensive to provide residential non-secure programs, with random drug testing, than it is to pay for three years of prison. Let's put it in dollars and cents terms that people will understand.

This, by itself, is not enough. If we don't have job training and placement, what are we going to do when we get them out into the community? If we provide job training, what are we going to tell the employer who says, "All right, but I've got a whole

If we don't have job training and placement, what are we going to do when we get them out into the community? If we provide job training, what are we going to tell the employer who says, "All right, but I've got a whole work force over here that has been let go by a company that's folded because of the recession. Why should I employ that person, who has a prior record and a drug problem, when I've got three wonderful workers out here that I could hire tomorrow?" We have got to think about alternatives such as national service programs, so that we can truly evaluate what does or does not work.

work force over here that has been let go by a company that's folded because of the recession. Why should I employ that person, who has a prior record and a drug problem, when I've got three wonderful workers out here that I could hire tomorrow?" We have got to think about alternatives such as national service programs, so that we can truly evaluate what does or does not work.

Even if we develop alternative sanctions, it doesn't make much sense to send a person who has succeeded thus far back to the apartment building near the open-air drug market because we can't provide any opportunity for alternative housing. If they go back to the apartment by the open-air drug market, guess what they start doing pretty soon?

Evaluators have to be very careful, not only to evaluate the specific program, but to make suggestions as to what could be done to expand it and make it more effective. On the receiving end, if something critical is said about a program, it's just constructive comment as to what could make the program better. Those who are being examined by evaluators have got to understand that the evaluator is there not to knock the program, but to figure out what can make the program work as soundly as possible in order to get the best return on our dollars.

As we evaluate what works and what doesn't work, we also must sell the ideas as realities to the American people. Evaluators have got to go beyond the specific programs on which they are working. There is a great tendency on the part of newspaper reporters to say, "But, Ms. Reno, if you are advocating the review of minimum mandatories, won't Americans think you're soft on crime?" The real answer is, if I can get those dangerous offenders put away and kept away; if I can coordinate and develop a partnership between state and federal governments where the federal government isn't constantly telling the state what to do; if I can also make effective use of prison cells to get the major traffickers and distributors put away; we're going to have an impact. But, we have to show it in terms that the American people can understand.

I think it's also imperative that we do far more than we have in the domestic and family violence areas. Evaluations of family violence programs have been awfully helpful to me in the past. Back in the late Seventies, we did a study of who had been killed in Dade County, using the medical examiner's office, where they had a wealth of material. The same medical examiner had been there for a long period of time. I was shocked at the time to find that 40 percent of the people who had been killed in Dade County in the last 25 years had been killed as a result of some kind of domestic

dispute. We developed a domestic intervention program using LEAA money. People came and evaluated that program and said it was a model program. I took that label "model program" to the state legislature, to the county, and to judges. Over the last number of years, we have sold the concept more and more. Evaluation can make a difference if it's done right and done thoughtfully. Those people were constructive and pointed out how the program could be improved. Those of us who have pet programs can't be too jealous of them. We've got to understand how they can be improved and how we can explain them in terms the American people are going to buy. And we need to do that far more in the family violence area than we have to date. We have to develop research capability as well as evaluative capability to show that the programs can diminish crime and give outcomes that will affect the process. The bottom line is, if we tell it as an anecdote rather than in evaluative terms, the child who watches his father beat his mother is going to be the child who accepts violence as a way of life. We need statistics and evaluations to support that concept. In that way, we're going to make sense of the whole crime and drug problem in America today.

One of the things that we tend to do in America, is to evaluate separate categories of non-violent first offenders. Clearly, some need a lot more intervention and comprehensive treatment than others. We are failing to best use limited dollars by treating all first offenders the same. We think we can always have another try. If people entering the criminal justice system were given a comprehensive treatment as first offenders, we could make a difference. But we don't have enough statistics, evaluations, and information to sell this approach to local public officials in ways that show how important that first step is.

If people entering the criminal justice system were given a comprehensive treatment as first offenders, we could make a difference. But we don't have enough statistics, evaluations, and information to sell this approach to local public officials in ways that show how important that first step is.

Juvenile justice programs, also raise hard questions. The system is so fragmented we cannot, because of confidentiality issues, address many of the problems. This hampers funding efforts for juvenile

justice programs throughout the country. I would urge all practitioners in the criminal justice and juvenile justice systems to join together. Let us develop some comprehensive, humane, thoughtful, rational policy with respect to confidentiality; because, at every meeting I attend on juveniles, the confidentiality issue raises its head. We have to deal with that issue in order to have appropriate evaluations and use our limited dollars in the wisest way possible.

We also must not lose perspective on what the caseloads are. Often, the caseload of somebody handling 16- and 17-year-old serious offenders includes programs that might have been satisfactory for these offenders when they were 15 or 16, with perhaps one prior record. By this time, however, they are so confirmed in the seriousness of their offending that it's going to be very difficult to change them. We can make a significant difference by pointing out in our evaluations that intervention with these programs at an earlier date could produce a better return on the dollar.

In short, we're all too narrowly focused. Practitioners in the communities are too focused on their narrow program. The person skilled in getting a grant is too focused on how to preserve that funding and provide jobs for everybody currently employed in the program. The prosecutor is too focused on keeping the level of the prosecutor's offices steady. The public defender is more interested in his office; and the judges are more interested in the courts and correctional systems. It is time we all come together as a collective partnership, state and federal, prosecutors and public defenders, social workers and counselors, correctional officials and police officers, to use the limited resources of America in the wisest way possible.

***It is time we all come together
as a collective partnership,
state and federal, prosecutors
and public defenders, social
workers and counselors,
correctional officials and
police officers, to use the
limited resources of America
in the wisest way possible.***

This will require courage on our part. It's going to require common sense and willingness to speak out. It's going to require an approach that combines both punishment and prevention. One of the greatest single failings of the criminal justice practitioner, in my experience, is that we all get

labelled too often. Somebody wants to lock them all up and throw away the key. That's "Mr. Hardnose." Another person comes in as the great and shining knight of rehabilitation and wants to rehabilitate everybody. Anybody who ever raised children knows that you have to punish them sometimes. Punishment must fit the crime; it must be fair, reasonable, and humane; but punishment and discipline alone are not sufficient to raise a child. You have to provide a nurturing, constructive environment where that child can grow as a strong and healthy human being. We have got to get rid of our labels, of being for rehabilitation or for punishment. Anyone would want to punish the three-time armed robber who continues to commit crime. Anyone I know would really rather see that crime prevented. Anyone I know, if they knew of a rehabilitation program that worked, would want to try to get the person into it. But we get mixed up in labels, rhetoric, and political terms. We have to talk about the problems in simple, common sense terms, with the best facts we can get, and without being prideful of what we have done to the extent that it will prevent us from seeing how we can do it better.

To that end, criminal justice and juvenile professionals, people engaged in programs directed at drug abuse, have all got to understand that we are the end of the line. We are where people end up when other institutions, including schools, families, and neighborhoods, have failed. Everybody who is

***We have to talk about the problems
in simple, common sense terms,
with the best facts we can get, and
without being prideful of what we
have done to the extent that it will
prevent us from seeing how we can
do it better.***

involved in evaluations will see a whole continuum of human life if they look beyond the statistics and dollar figures. They can see what happened to this child or adult who came through the system. All of us have a special obligation to speak out. The time has come to evaluate needs, not only between prison and alternative sanctions, but also between the wisdom of investment in the adult system as opposed to the juvenile system. We have got to send a message throughout America to evaluate all the institutions of government as well as private institutions to see where we can get the best return on our dollars to make life work, particularly for the children of America.

We face the single greatest problem in American history since World War II. Far too often,

in the last 30 years, America has forgotten and neglected its children. Too often we claim it is somebody else's responsibility, not mine. Too often, we put vast amounts of money into prisons, negative monuments in a landscape. Prisons are not an investment in our future or anything that will produce a really constructive human being. Prisons are meant to incapacitate the dangerous offenders and to keep them off the streets as long as we possibly can. All those who are criminal justice experts have got to start looking at the whole continuum and see how we can invest the ever more limited dollars most wisely.

One point that has impressed me is that the most formative time in a person's life is zero to three. Now, why should criminal justice professionals be worried about that? Because child development has taught that 50 percent of all learned human response is learned in the first year of life. If it hasn't been learned then, what can be done in terms of rehabilitation and nurturing at 18 and 25? During zero to three, the concept of reward and punishment is learned, and a child develops a conscience. If we don't teach a child what punishment is all about, what difference will it make to build prisons 18 years from now? When we look at that 14-year-old that has just put a gun to some motorist's head and pulled the trigger, and shows absolutely no remorse at all, too many of us have not looked back to that age of zero to three to see what difference we could have made.

***During zero to three, the
concept of reward and
punishment is learned, and a
child develops a conscience.
If we don't teach a child
what punishment is all
about, what difference will it
make to build prisons 18
years from now?***

As we look at what works and what doesn't work, evaluators have got to understand the whole continuum. Oftentimes, evaluators work on what the norm in society should be, and not what has been done in terms of creating children at risk. Our responsibility as evaluators goes beyond the criminal justice programs we evaluate. It includes recommending to government and to the private sector the best investment of dollars to truly achieve a law abiding society. It is a daunting challenge, but it is an extraordinarily exciting one.

***Our responsibility as evaluators
goes beyond the criminal justice
programs we evaluate. It
includes recommending to
government and to the private
sector the best investment of
dollars to truly achieve a law
abiding society.***

In these last four months, I started to talk, in Washington and throughout this country, about things I had said in Dade County. I strongly believe in investing in our future and our children. Ladies and gentlemen, at every level throughout America, in the public and private sectors, in mayors' offices, county commission offices, and, most importantly, in progressive policing throughout this nation, there is a commitment to children. Everywhere I turn people share this feeling. Those in criminal justice and juvenile justice, who evaluate and who operate, who imprison and who prosecute, who take care of that juvenile offender for the first time, can all join together with the mayors, police officers, and all those who care about an ordered society, to provide a society where children can grow as strong and constructive human beings. The time has come to provide that balance, to make an investment in our children, and to make an investment in a criminal justice system that works and makes sense. Thank you for all you have done.

The Honorable Lee P. Brown, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy, Executive Office of the President

This is my first appearance before a national criminal justice organization since I was sworn in as director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy last Monday. But as someone who has devoted his entire career to shuttling between different worlds, law enforcement, academia, and now a parallel world that is the federal government, it is altogether fitting that I address this distinguished group of researchers and practitioners under the auspices of the National Institute of Justice.

Let me take just a minute and give my praise and recognition to NIJ. I don't think there is any organization that has done as much to advance the state of our knowledge in the area of criminal justice, both strategies and programs, as NIJ. Nor has any organization done more to develop and put forth the principles of community policing. Community policing is very close to my heart. NIJ has supported it, and there have been rigorous evaluations in field experiments, testing models of community policing across the country. NIJ has provided technical assistance to localities interested in implementing community policing, and has developed training curricula, guidelines and policies. NIJ brought together the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Police Executive Research Forum, the Police Foundation, and researchers from both Harvard and Michigan State Universities, to form what I think is a very important entity: the Community Policing Working Group.

Were it not for the vision and leadership of the National Institute of Justice, the concept of community policing might not have gained widespread acceptance throughout this country. That would have been tragic. Because community policing works. My experience shows that it can indeed reduce crime. It helps make our citizens feel more secure on the streets of our cities. In doing so,

My experience shows that [community policing] can indeed reduce crime. It helps make our citizens feel more secure on the streets of our cities. In doing so, it can begin to mend the torn social fabric of our crime-stricken communities.

it can begin to mend the torn social fabric of our crime-stricken communities.

Community policing can do all this because it focuses on problem solving. It focuses on bringing people together to work together to solve problems that impact the quality of life. It looks at such things as homicides and assaults as not just problems for the police or the criminal justice system, but also for our public health workers. It calls upon the services of not just the police, but other agencies of government, the people themselves, and public and private agencies, in order to do something that will make a difference. Research and evaluation do matter, especially in the realm of law enforcement, where I spent my career. They also matter in crime control and the area of drugs, where the lives of our citizens and viability of our neighborhoods hang in the balance. We must act on the basis of what is true, not what may be fashionable or expedient.

In enacting the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, the Congress mandated that my office, the Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), submit by February 1 of each year a national drug control strategy. This strategy must include comprehensive, research-based, short- and long-range goals for reducing drug use in America. This was a bold and, at least in my estimation, a far-sighted step. It was an attempt to move the drug issue out of the realm of overheated political rhetoric and onto the much firmer ground of objective measurements of accomplishment. The trouble is, as I see it, that the longitudinal data sets just aren't good enough, or don't measure the right things. As frequently happens, we are left to measure what's measurable.

Take, for example, the household survey which is the gold standard of drug use surveys in this country and the primary data set on which past strategies have been based. These strategies have based their measurements of performance objectives on something incomplete. The household survey counts only people in households. Many drug users, as we know, as I know, don't live in households. They're homeless, they're incarcerated, or they reside in shelters. Thus, this survey misses a significant portion of the drug-using population. To adequately address this problem will probably require an entirely new survey. Unless we make that effort, we'll never

get a handle on the size and characteristics of the hardcore drug-using population.

This is where we think the greatest problem lies, and will lie, in the years ahead as casual drug use continues to decline. So there is a need for a national survey that will provide us with information on hardcore drug use, similar to what we get from the household survey on the casual drug user.

When the Congress created my office, they gave us two additional research responsibilities. They authorized the creation of a Counter-drug Technology Assistance Center. This center is headed by a Chief Scientist who serves as the Federal government's central counter-drug research and development coordinator. Over the past two fiscal years, \$36 million has been appropriated for the center's research and development projects, including advanced surveillance, tracking and radar imaging measures, electronic support measures, communications and advanced computer systems to facilitate the exchange of counter-drug intelligence.

The other responsibility given to ONDCP by the Congress was to conduct performance audits and evaluations of the effectiveness of Federal drug control programs. Quite frankly, I do not believe that the Office has done enough of this kind of work in the past. It will be my objective, my responsibility, and my intention to do that, to change this trend to place more emphasis on determining the effectiveness of what we do in our battle against drugs.

Returning for a moment to my own experience, I'd like to offer some observations to you on how research and the NIJ have helped my efforts to develop and implement community policing in Houston, Texas. I might add that we had the same kind of support in New York City, where we implemented community policing citywide. We also had some very impressive results in New York City. We found that, in 1991, after one year of implementing the concept, crime went down in every index category for the first time in the history of that city.

We will talk briefly about Houston. Over a period of several years in that city, we implemented a number of initiatives to strengthen the relationship between the citizens of Houston, Texas, and its police department. We have, for example, the fear reduction project funded by NIJ. It was designed to determine how the police could effectively reduce the fear of crime, reduce disorder, improve the quality of police services, and thereby generate greater citizen satisfaction. We had what we called the directed area responsibility teams, known by the acronym DART.

The trouble is, as I see it, that the longitudinal data sets just aren't good enough, or don't measure the right things. As frequently happens, we are left to measure what's measurable. . . . The household survey counts only people in households. Many drug users, as we know, as I know, don't live in households. They're homeless, they're incarcerated, or they reside in shelters. Thus, this survey misses a significant portion of the drug-using population. To adequately address this problem will probably require an entirely new survey.

That was the experiment where we attempted to provide the police department with a process of altering how we delivered services to the city. Services were to be delivered in a manner that was consistent with the needs of the neighborhood. We did not assume that everybody in every neighborhood had the same problems.

We geared the delivery of services to the unique characteristics of the neighborhoods. We also had project OASIS. This was a problem-solving program that involved a systematic analysis of neighborhood problems and a rigorous assessment of results. We had the positive interaction program (PIP) as well. This was a formal method of facilitating the exchange of information between the officers and the people who live in the various neighborhoods of the city.

All of these initiatives and their results, as well as the research findings of other activities in other communities, undertaken elsewhere throughout the county, were reviewed by members of the police department, some 28 people who came together in what we called an executive session. They were asked to answer the question, "What should the future of policing be in Houston, Texas?" The answer was community policing. This answer was predicated on research, on evaluation, on what worked, and not just on what we felt would be the best way of delivering services.

In my new capacity as Director of ONDCP, I remain committed to the idea that public policy, whether at the local or national level, is best designed with the aid of empirical data and policy-oriented research. Combining that, I think, makes a difference, and allows us the opportunity to make better decisions. We thereby better serve the people for whom we're responsible.

My office is supposed to coordinate the efforts of dozens of different federal agencies, ranging from the Fish and Wildlife Service to the Drug Enforcement Administration to the Department of Education. We orchestrate their unique contributions guided by the national drug control strategy. But coordinating is a dry and lifeless word, conveying no sense of what really is involved in that initiative. As an example of the effort that goes into coordinating drug policy, let's take just a few minutes and talk about heroin. Despite the good news about the decline in overall drug use in the general population and especially among our young people, there is continuing controversy about whether the United States is experiencing an upsurge in heroin use. If we are, as some have argued, then our nation's drug problem has taken on a new dimension. The current data on availability and use of heroin show a mixed and ambiguous picture. For example, we know that the heroin supply in this country is increasingly pure, affordable, and readily available. In fact, you can scarcely pick up a newspaper or turn on your television news without reading or hearing about an increasing number of heroin seizures and arrests. Some newspapers are even warning that we are on the verge of, or may already be in the middle of, a heroin epidemic.

Yet, the current indicators do not show a clear upward national trend in heroin use. If we were at the onset of a heroin epidemic, we would expect to see certain things like a substantial increase in the number of heroin users. Especially, we would see an increase in the number of young people using heroin with little or no prior drug experience. We see, instead, a relatively stable heroin addict population. Although we are seeing a few new people, particularly young people, using heroin, most are current users of other drugs who are adding heroin to their drug use repertoire.

How do we coordinate drug policy when the intelligence or research is inconclusive or contradictory? I'm not dismissing the signals we're getting. This country was caught largely unaware of the cocaine epidemic, particularly crack cocaine. In fact, we didn't even see newspaper reports about crack cocaine until late 1985, more than five years after smoking base cocaine had become popular. We

As policymakers, however, we must determine the seriousness of the problem in order to respond in an effective manner. In that regard, our most fundamental concern is accurately determining the scale of heroin use. We need to measure how many are using heroin, with what frequency, in what quantities, and how much they spend to purchase it.

can't afford to repeat the mistake with heroin. We must take the threat seriously. As policymakers, however, we must determine the seriousness of the problem in order to respond in an effective manner. In that regard, our most fundamental concern is accurately determining the scale of heroin use. We need to measure how many are using heroin, with what frequency, in what quantities, and how much they spend to purchase it.

The National Household Survey on drug abuse and the High School Senior Survey are now the most reliable instruments for measuring the dimensions of drug use by the American public. These, however, do not provide detailed information about the heroin problem because we generally don't find heroin addicts in the household or in our schools. We must turn to other sources for our information and piece together a mosaic that tells the whole story. The gravity of this threat suggests the need for more intensive monitoring efforts so we're ready to address the heroin problem as it continues to grow in this country. Accordingly, there are a number of steps we are taking.

First, I and members of my staff will be working closely with treatment providers, corrections and criminal justice experts, intelligence analysts, people who are out there on the streets, police officers, and others across the country. I know what the reports and newspapers say, but I want first-hand information about the state and local jurisdictions. What are they experiencing? As a former police chief, I know these kinds of problems are best understood block-by-block and neighborhood-by-neighborhood. You get a far different and more realistic picture from individuals on the streets than what we're seeing at this point in time.

Second, my office has contracted with the private sector to produce a national heroin situation analysis and to monitor the situation to better determine the size and the scope of the domestic heroin problem. We want to know particularly about the number of heroin users and their social and

economic characteristics. Are they using just heroin, or are they using other drugs along with heroin? Are they new people in the heroin use market? If so, that would give us some signal about the beginning of an epidemic. Are treatment centers seeing more users? Is the heroin supply increasing? Has there been a growth in the number of retail distribution channels? How much search time is required for an addict to buy drugs? Since the crack cocaine market is shrinking, are we seeing more under-employed retail drug sellers who are available to handle heroin sales? All of these are important questions to help us learn more about user characteristics as well as the market structure.

Third, we have put into place a monitoring system that will provide quick-hitting spot checks in various areas of the country to give us an early warning about heroin use trends, nationally, regionally, or from some particular demographic group.

Fourth, as part of our ongoing project, my office tracks the demand for and supply of illegal drugs, including heroin, in this country; and then we estimate how much Americans spend on illegal drugs. Such information helps to better understand the dynamics of drug trade. Finally, we're developing a market structure analysis that we hope will tell us about the economics of the heroin market. Is it a monopoly or a competitive market? How are profit margins established? Knowing more about the heroin market structure will enable us to develop strategies to attack the problem. Perhaps we can reduce profit margins so that drug dealers will find their business less lucrative.

I believe this kind of research and evaluation must play an increasingly important role in our national drug control strategy in the years ahead. The President is requesting over \$13 billion for fiscal year 1994. As federal drug control budgets have grown, so too has the public and congressional skepticism grown, over what these huge expenditures are buying. Such skepticism is altogether proper in my estimation, and we should welcome rather than resist it. The President is responding to the public's demand for more accountability in all areas of government spending. Under the Vice President's leadership, the National Performance Review is conducting a broad performance audit of all federal agencies and recommending ways to improve the delivery of service while reducing costs and needless inefficiencies. In my office, we're developing a plan to reorganize the agency along slimmer, more efficient lines.

The bottom line, and I can't emphasize this enough, is that the country can no longer afford to

measure its commitment to fighting drugs by how much money is thrown at the problem. Make no mistake: an effective drug control strategy will continue to claim a significant amount of resources, federal as well as state, local, and private. But, as important as the drug problem is, in an era of tight federal budgets, we should assume that the Congress will continue to ask tough questions. We've got to show results, not only at the federal level, but at the state and local levels as well. In the end, how much we spend will mean little if we cannot make a difference at the community level. To do that, we need to develop more and better indicators of program effectiveness.

The bottom line, and I can't emphasize this enough, is that the country can no longer afford to measure its commitment to fighting drugs by how much money is thrown at the problem.

This is why program evaluation is so very important. We need more and better data as well as research, more and better output measures for all drug control programs. On the supply side, one of my top priorities is to conduct a performance review of our interdiction programs and methods. We know we succeed in keeping tons of cocaine, heroin, and other dangerous drugs from crossing our borders. What we now must do is determine if our efforts to keep drugs out of the country are cost effective. Since 1988, we increased interdiction funding by sevenfold. It's time we made sure that the results of our interdiction programs are commensurate with the substantial investment we've made in that area.

Demand reduction programs should be subjected to the same level of scrutiny. We're spending over \$4 billion annually on treatment and prevention programs. I don't think that amount of money is adequate. We need much more to address the problem, as I see it; and the President is seeking major increases in funding in that area. But along with more money, we've got to increase our efforts to make the treatment more effective. That means, in my estimation, more research on what makes treatment effective; and it means developing standards of quality for the treatment community.

A particularly urgent problem, and one in which I have a personal interest, is the need to provide more and better treatment for persons under the supervision of the criminal justice system. The Attorney General has been a leader in developing innovative linkages between the drug treatment and criminal justice systems, and I intend to work closely with her on this.

Our cooperative drug control programs with other nations have received a great deal of criticism in the media, in the Congress, and elsewhere. I also do not view such criticism as improper. I share many of their concerns about whether these programs, especially those with Latin American countries, are achieving their stated objectives. I'm concerned, however, about a proposal by a committee of our House of Representatives, to make cuts in funding for international drug programs well below those requested by the President. I'm further concerned about reports that the House Appropriations Committee has voted to slash funding for the cornerstones of our demand reduction strategy, treatment, and school-based prevention programs. Such reductions would be unwise, inadvisable, and ill-timed.

In the end, how much we spend will mean little if we cannot make a difference at the community level. To do that, we need to develop more and better indicators of program effectiveness. This is why program evaluation is so very important.

Let me close by thanking each of you for your important contribution to expanding the base of our knowledge about what works in drug control programs. Your efforts have been and will continue to be indispensable to the development of a consolidated federal response to the drug problem and effective national drug control strategy. In the long run, we must all work together to address this problem, not only the federal, state, and local governments, but also the private sector. As I see it, the drug problem continues to be one of the major domestic problems confronting America.

Evaluation Activities and Long-Range Goals

In the wealth of presentations and discussions by experienced criminal justice leaders who took part in this year's Fourth Annual Conference on Evaluating Crime and Drug Control Initiatives, a clear emphasis on *connecting* different programs and people emerged. Partnership responses were sought in order to bring about more effective working relationships between federal and state programs, researchers and practitioners, police and communities. In the National Institute of Justice's *1993 Program Plan*, a number of long-range goals are delineated to show current efforts to meet the needs of the criminal justice field. In keeping with the need to integrate efforts and coordinate information in the numerous studies and demonstration programs covered in the conference, the following exhibit offers a guide to the goal areas served by the presented studies.

National Institute of Justice Long-Range Goals

- Reduce violent crimes and their consequences.
- Reduce drug-related crimes.
- Reduce the consequences of crimes for individuals, households, organizations, and communities.
- Develop household, school, business, workplace, and community crime prevention programs.
- Improve the effectiveness of law enforcement, criminal justice, correctional, and service systems' responses to offenses, offending, and victimization.
- Develop and evaluate information for criminal justice responses to changing and emerging crime patterns and for utilization of new technologies.

<i>PANEL/STUDY TITLE</i>	<i>REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE DRUG CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE COMMUNITY CONSEQUENCES</i>	<i>DEVELOP CRIME PREVENTION</i>	<i>IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS</i>	<i>DEVELOP INFORMATION FOR CHANGE</i>
<i>EVALUATING COMMUNITY POLICING</i>						
Community Policing and Drugs		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
72nd Precinct Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Evaluation of the INOP Program		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>DRUG TESTING</i>						
Drug Testing: Tools and Applications		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Hair Testing of Criminal Justice Arrestees		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Orleans Parish (LA) District Attorney Diversionary Program		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Use of Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) Results to Inform and Shape Weed and Seed Efforts		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAMS</i>						
Minnesota's Intensive Community Supervision (ICS) Program: Effects on Offender Reintegration, Public Safety, and System Costs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Assessing the Effectiveness of Intensive Supervision Probation in Delaware					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Development of an Intermediate Sanctions System Model			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>PANEL/STUDY TITLE</i>	<i>REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE DRUG CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE COMMUNITY CONSEQUENCES</i>	<i>DEVELOP CRIME PREVENTION</i>	<i>IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS</i>	<i>DEVELOP INFORMATION FOR CHANGE</i>
<i>EVALUATION OF INNOVATIVE PROSECUTION STRATEGIES</i>						
Complex Drug Cases		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Assessing the Impact of Community Policing on the Criminal Justice System			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
National Assessment of Drug Cases		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>DRUG TREATMENT</i>						
Evaluation of Drug Offender Treatment in Local Corrections		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation of Correctional Boot Camp Drug Treatment and Aftercare		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fresh Start Post Incarceration Services for Ex-Offenders		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Coordinating Drug Treatment for Offenders		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>INTERVENTIONS WITH HIGH RISK YOUTH AND FAMILIES</i>						
Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth Program (SIHRY)				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Longitudinal Impact Evaluation for SIHRY				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>CORRECTIONAL OPTIONS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS</i>						
Evaluation of Correctional Options Demonstration Sites			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bradenton Drug Treatment Community		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Profile of the Bridge and Bypass Programs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EVALUATION OF CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS</i>						
Impact Evaluation of Community Responses to Drug Abuse		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
National Assessment of Community-Based Drug Prevention Programs		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Randomization: A Poor Evaluation Design						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT</i>						
Americans with Disabilities Act and Criminal Justice					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

PANEL/STUDY TITLE	REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME	REDUCE DRUG CRIME	REDUCE COMMUNITY CONSEQUENCES	DEVELOP CRIME PREVENTION	IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS	DEVELOP INFORMATION FOR CHANGE
GANG VIOLENCE AND DELINQUENT NETWORKS						
Evaluation of Gang Interventions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Jurisdictions Unified for Drug Gang Enforcement (JUDGE)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Gangs and Organized Crime	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ASSESSING RURAL ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS						
Rural Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) Evaluation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Policing in Rural Areas			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Rural Drug Task Forces in Arizona		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
EVALUATING IMPACT OF CHANGES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM						
Impact of Drug Laws on Criminal Justice		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Using Offender Based Transaction System (OBTS) to Measure Drug Control Impact		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Concepts of Change					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation of State Criminal History Systems						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT						
Drugs and Crime in Public Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Baltimore County Community-Oriented Drug Enforcement		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Evaluating Police/Community Partnership in Combating Drug Crime in New York State		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Microeconomic Means to Combat Drugs in Public Housing; Performance of Illegal Drug Markets		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DRUG MARKET ANALYSIS AND PROBLEM-ORIENTED POLICING						
Drug Market Analysis Program (DMAP) in Jersey City		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Pittsburgh DMAP		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Overview of DMAP		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
EVALUATION OF SCHOOL-BASED PROGRAMS						
SMART Program for Safe Drug-Free Schools		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SMART in Norfolk Public Schools		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
BOOT CAMPS						
Evaluation of Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
National Standards for Adult and Juvenile Correctional Boot Camps					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>PANEL/STUDY TITLE</i>	<i>REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE DRUG CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE COMMUNITY CONSEQUENCES</i>	<i>DEVELOP CRIME PREVENTION</i>	<i>IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS</i>	<i>DEVELOP INFORMATION FOR CHANGE</i>
<i>COURT RESPONSES TO DRUG CASES</i>						
Processing of Drug Cases in Limited Jurisdictions		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Improving Court Response to Drug Cases		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation of Structured Fines					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Heavy Drug Case Loads		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
New Technologies for Criminal Justice			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Use of Less-than-Lethal Force in Law Enforcement			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EVALUATION OF DRUG COURTS</i>						
Miami Drug Court		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Assessing the Dade County (Miami) Drug Court		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Portland's Sanction Treatment Opportunity Progress (STOP) Program		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>RESPONSES TO PRISON CROWDING</i>						
Ohio's Response to Prison Crowding			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Post-Occupancy Evaluation of Correctional Facilities			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Washington State Work-Release Program			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Intermediate Sanctions and Interchangeability: A Survey of Correctional Professionals			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EVALUATION OF ANTI-CRIME PUBLIC AWARENESS PROGRAMS</i>						
Social Impact of National Citizens' Crime Prevention Campaign				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Texas City Action Plan (T-CAP)				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Developing Cost-Effective Drug Testing Strategies Using Acceptance Sampling		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>DEVELOPING COST-EFFECTIVE DRUG TESTING STRATEGIES</i>						
Effects of Partial Drug Testing on Drug Use Behavior and Self-Disclosure Validity		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>PANEL/STUDY TITLE</i>	<i>REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE DRUG CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE COMMUNITY CONSEQUENCES</i>	<i>DEVELOP CRIME PREVENTION</i>	<i>IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS</i>	<i>DEVELOP INFORMATION FOR CHANGE</i>
<i>NEW LINKS BETWEEN THE PUBLIC HEALTH AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE SECTORS: RECENT EVALUATION EFFORTS</i>						
Advances in Treatment Services and Outcome Evaluation Research		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Drug Procurement Practices of Chronic Drug Abusers		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Update on State of the Science of Hair Testing in Forensic Applications		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Challenge of TB and HIV/AIDS for Criminal Justice		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EVALUATION OF MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCES</i>						
Evaluation of Multijurisdictional Drug Enforcement Task Forces		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Task Force Commanders' Survey Project: Studying Change in Task Force Structure and Operations		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Minnesota's Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Enforcement Task Forces		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
North Carolina's Multijurisdictional Task Force Commanders' Survey		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>DRUG TESTING: PROGRAM IMPACTS</i>						
Study of Impacts in the States of Implementing Drug Testing		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Drug Testing with Chicago's Focused Offender Disposition Program		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Drug Testing throughout the Criminal Justice System		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Using a Serious Drug Abuse Typology for Referrals to Drug Treatment		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>ENVIRONMENTAL CRIME</i>						
Profiles of Environmental Offense Prosecution			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Environmental Crimes			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EVALUATION OF WEED AND SEED PROGRAMS</i>						
National Weed and Seed Program	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Prosecution Management Tracking System					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>PANEL/STUDY TITLE</i>	<i>REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE DRUG CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE COMMUNITY CONSEQUENCES</i>	<i>DEVELOP CRIME PREVENTION</i>	<i>IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS</i>	<i>DEVELOP INFORMATION FOR CHANGE</i>
<i>RESPONSES TO GANGS</i>						
National Assessment of Law Enforcement Anti-Gang Information Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Gangs in Correctional Facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Role of Probation and Parole in Gang Prevention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prosecuting Gang Crime			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>EVALUATION OF FAMILY VIOLENCE PROGRAMS</i>						
Evaluation of Family Violence Prevention and Services Act	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Review of Research and Evaluation Related to Family Violence Funded by the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The Indianapolis Domestic Violence Prosecution Experiment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
National Assessment of the Drug Control and Systems Improvement Grant Program		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>DRUG TESTING: PROGRAM IMPACTS</i>						
Drug Testing for Youthful Offenders on Parole		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Evaluation of Drug Testing and Interventions for Probationers in Maricopa County		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Drug Testing and Pretrial Risk Prediction		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>EVALUATING STRATEGIES TO COMBAT VIOLENT CRIME</i>						
Delaware Statistical Analysis Center's Information on Domestic Violence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Implementation and Impact Assessment of North Carolina's Violent Crime Initiative	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
New York City's Violence Prevention Programs in Middle Schools	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<i>PANEL/STUDY TITLE</i>	<i>REDUCE VIOLENT CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE DRUG CRIME</i>	<i>REDUCE COMMUNITY CONSEQUENCES</i>	<i>DEVELOP CRIME PREVENTION</i>	<i>IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS</i>	<i>DEVELOP INFORMATION FOR CHANGE</i>
<i>MANAGING SPECIFIC POPULATIONS IN CORRECTIONAL SETTINGS</i>						
Management of Special Populations in Correctional Settings			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Identifying Effective Strategies of Managing Female Offenders			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Managing Sex Offenders in Community Settings			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<i>USING CRIMINALISTICS IDENTIFICATION TECHNIQUES IN COURT</i>						
FBI Laboratory Support of Drug Investigations and Prosecutions		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Imaging of Firearms Evidence	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Strategic Planning for Clandestine Laboratory Enforcement		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

PANEL SESSIONS

MONDAY, JUNE 28, 1993

Plenary Panel: Assessing the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Programs

Sally T. Hillsman, Vice President of Research, National Center for State Courts

All of us involved in criminal justice evaluation and in policy development are very pleased with the opportunity that NIJ and BJA have given us the last few years to do the research that we hope will feed policy development and to provide this kind of forum in which we can review and discuss that research; where it has taken us to this point in time and where hopefully it will go in the future.

It seems appropriate that we should begin this fourth in a series of annual conferences on evaluating federal, state, and local initiatives by taking a broad look at the effects drug offenders have had both on our communities and on our criminal justice system during the past five years—since the peak of the current drug epidemic, about 1988 or 1989. As many commentators noticed, and most recently Marcia Chaiken wrote in an NIJ *Research In Brief*, crack-cocaine did not appear out of nowhere in the mid 1980s, we just were not paying close enough collective and comprehensive attention to the patterns emerging in our communities. It took the mutually devastating effects of crack and the deterioration of our cities, as well as catalytic events such as the brutal murder of police officer Edward Byrne in New York City in February 1988, to impel us toward significant action. And when we did respond, we did so in force and the drug arrests that resulted have nearly

swamped our courts and capsized our correctional systems. As the National Center for State Courts caseload statistics reveal, the last five years have seen one of the largest increases in cases ever experienced in the state courts: 100 million new cases in 1990, and nearly an equal number of new cases in 1991. And the greatest increase in both trial and appellate courts has been in criminal cases. Felonies and criminal appeals have been increasing faster than the rest of the caseload. Total felonies increased by an average of 50 percent since 1985 and criminal appeals over 21 percent since 1987. These are not only the types of cases that require most judicial attention and resources, but their numbers alone are also impeding progress in handling civil and juvenile caseloads, which include domestic cases involving our most troubled and needy families and children.

This criminal justice response continues although illicit drug use appears to be abating somewhat. Drug arrests continue to rise and imprisonment for drug offenses continues to rise faster than other types of arrests. While illicit drug use is not primarily a phenomenon among minorities, drug arrests between 1986 and 1991 rose 57 percent for minorities, compared to six percent for non-minorities.

Yet there are signs of evolution and change in our responses to drug offenders. Law enforcement is shifting toward community-oriented policing strategies, integrating the street-level crackdowns of the last five years into broader policies of problem solving rooted in the

communities that police serve. Courts are becoming more proactive, seeking to find innovative ways to move from "one size fits all sentence" to community-based drug treatment, to closer judicial follow-up on drug offenders who are returning to the community, and slowly to moving courts themselves into the communities they serve.

Many drug programs that were not comfortable with individual user needs a few years ago, are now recognizing the needs in the population that are linked to employment, housing, and general health services. What we seem to be slowly recognizing is that illicit drug use is not a plague to be stamped out quickly. With less than two percent of the world's population, the U.S. uses 60 percent of the world's illicit drugs. Our country, therefore, has a systemic and chronic problem that requires long-term and multifaceted solutions.

Our panel this morning has agreed to tackle a challenging set of issues in a short time period. Each panelist has had a long and distinguished career on behalf of our communities, criminal justice system, and pursuit of policy relevant knowledge. Drawing on their extensive experience, each of our panelists will offer some reflections on what the effects of drug offenders have been on our communities and on our criminal justice system over the last five years, what they view as being the key responses, and what they think we've learned that can guide us into the future.

Nancy J. Nowak, Director, Maryland Division of Parole and Probation

I'll start by simply stating the obvious—that the criminal justice system's response to the drug crisis has been fragmented, to some degree ill-conceived, and politicized. In my 16 years, I have had the unique opportunity to serve as prison warden for about eight years, and have also been involved in criminal justice policymaking and planning. So it's very interesting now again to be working in an operational role, where I am forced to live with a lot of the policies that I was instrumental in getting implemented, especially in Maryland. Since the 1986 Act, and subsequently the 1988 Act, we have done many things that I think have been very effective, primarily in the law enforcement arena. However, by the time that Congress actually passed these acts and allocated

funds to the states and local jurisdictions, we unfortunately were many days late and many dollars short. We were already a nation devastated by the pervasiveness of drugs and the insidious nature of this creature that had an amoebae-like effect—enveloping everything around it, enticing both young and old, and cutting across all social strata. While this enemy wound its way through every aspect of our society, it took some very vulnerable hostages, primarily our urban areas and our youth, just to name a couple.

Law enforcement, the first to respond aggressively with the deployment of more resources, created special narcotics units and various other kinds of policing operations. However, despite the great amount of resources oriented towards drug enforcement, arrest rates continue to spiral. Prosecution in the courts burgeoned with drug cases, and every spare resource was pulled to attend to the criminal docket, leaving our civil justice system virtually defunct. State and local government, in response, cried out for dollars and direction. Congress responded with entitlement grants to states with required pass-through dollars to local governments. And then a series of events happened, and I'll consolidate many years in these next few comments.

Federal governments, based on meetings with broad representation from all possible agency representatives that had anything to do with this crisis, wrote plans. States followed and wrote plans. Local government did the same and wrote plans. It seemed that every unit of government, from small townships to larger urban centers, formed task forces to examine their unique problems and develop a multi-faceted approach to this problem acknowledging that law enforcement cannot do it alone. Through the guidance of the Office of Justice Programs, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, and NIJ, many good programs cropped up; for example, multi-jurisdictional narcotics task forces, differentiated case management, clandestine lab investigations, gang enforcement, public housing enforcement, technical assistance in training, and I could name many others.

However, there was still the rest of the system. To capture that mysterious deterrent to crime, lawmakers responded by enacting new punitive statutes which carried mandatory and nonconcurrent sentences. Many of these laws were

very creative and innovative; yet in my world, the correctional world, the response was not as creative. The daily intake list increased by some 200 percent and corrections again became the usual dumping ground for all the societal ills. Corrections was simply not postured to manage this population explosion. Nationally, prison population, between the years 1980 and 1992, increased by some 95 percent. Jail population also increased by 115 percent. Probation caseloads increased by 120 percent and parole caseloads increased by about 90 percent. By 1990, almost four million adults in this country were under some form of correctional supervision. The prison population has grown over ten times that of the general population during the same period.

In the 1980's, in response to this increase, was the "spend-and-build" frenzy. More edifices of bricks and mortar began peppering the national landscape wherever communities would allow it, and, at the same time, community supervision caseloads expanded proportionally. In most jurisdictions today, the corrections budgets constitute the largest single agency expenditures in the state budgets. The costs of construction and operation of these facilities are overwhelming. Yet despite all this building, at least 30 percent of all jurisdictions in this country are under a court order to limit the number of persons confined in institutions. Most of these facilities are grossly overcrowded.

I believe we have finally recognized that we will never build our way out of this problem. Arrest rates and violence on our streets is forever spiraling upwards. Many corrections professionals have long acknowledged that prison cells, and those who fill those cells, should be carefully scrutinized. They should clearly be used for dangerous, violent, and career criminals.

Most jurisdictions are seeking viable alternatives to the "spend-and-build" mode by developing programs that weigh the delicate balance of population control, offender accountability, and public safety. It's long been clear that the two ends of the spectrum, prison and probation, have been overused and misused and that a range of sanctions must be designed to address the individual offender needs, and, at the same time, make community-based supervision less difficult. Attendant to this must be the development of rational sentencing policies and

massive public education because none of these reforms will be successful until we truly change the public's opinion about the handling of offenders and what realistically needs to be done to safeguard the quality of life in our communities. We must dispute any image that we are being soft, and market our programs to be tough on crime. There are certain tools that will make the community-based supervision more palatable to the public and hold those offenders more accountable than they are today. We must develop a continuum of sanctions—the ability to move individuals up and down a system from least restrictive to most restrictive before we resort to incarceration. The money that is now spent on bricks, mortar, and operating costs, must be used for community-based supervision so that we are actually able to manage caseloads. In Maryland, our average caseloads are one agent to over 200-215 cases. We set these people up to do an impossible job. We must design community supervision with maximum accountability for the offender, to make time outside tougher than time inside, and this must be designed through individual case plans that address long-term treatment, education, vocational, and life skills needs.

We must deliver swift and meaningful punishment when noncompliance occurs. This does not necessarily mean incarceration; it may mean more stringent sanctions and adjustment to a higher level of supervision. We must also rely on sharing resources. We can no longer afford to duplicate each other. We must empower communities to accept this problem as theirs. This is important for community-based supervision to succeed. We need to provide specialized training to staff and provide for greater safety for our staff who go into high crime areas, where police officers will not go unless they have backups. In Maryland, our staff go unarmed, without any communication devices, into these very same neighborhoods to do essentially some of the same jobs. We must also provide treatment on demand. The waiting list for treatment is astronomical. In Baltimore, there is an 8-week waiting period from the time of disposition in court to get treatment. We should not close our minds to new techniques such as acupuncture, which is new in Maryland. And I believe we need to expand our use of drug recognition techniques so we won't always resort to drug testing.

We need to start talking about what has worked, take the cumulative program data, and

share it with other jurisdictions. Unfortunately, in the corrections area, there have not been a lot of innovative programs or evaluative data. This is something that I hope changes as we see more funding go into correctional programs. But there's no stock solution. We do need the partnership of government, the private sector, and the community. This problem has not occurred overnight and we cannot resolve it overnight. But it is an intergovernmental problem and an inter-community problem that needs the response of government and the community together.

Garry A. Mendez, Jr., Executive Director, The National Trust for the Development of African-American Men

In the late Sixties, I worked for the New York State Narcotics Addiction Control Commission as a drug counselor, and they were doing group therapy for people who used drugs. I questioned why we were doing that because I knew that back in the Forties in Lexington, Kentucky, they did group therapy for people who used drugs; and it did not work. It's not working now. Why are we continuing to do that? It really concerns me because I work in a prison in upstate New York and they are doing group therapy for drugs. Now the guys who go through group therapy have been going through that nonsense for so long that now they run group therapy. The prison turns it over to them. Wherever you go, we talk about how to solve the drug problem with group therapy. I'm going to plead to stop the group therapy; just knock that out. It does not work. Why continue that stuff? The other thing is locking them up. If incarceration worked for drug addiction, the safest communities of the United States would be African communities. You know that's not true; so why do you continue all that? Because you don't know what else to do. You keep following processes and you've been caught up in "process." It has no relationship to results.

We say treatment: We're going to put them through treatment. Then I say, "Well, how many people did we cure?" No one talks about how many people stopped using drugs. We say, "well, that's not the measure we want to use right now." Then researchers bring out some other measurements. I'm not going to tell everyone else what they need to do. I will just use the African

people as an example. If it makes sense to you, then you should do it in another community. If it doesn't make sense, then you don't have to do it.

Here's what I think African folks should do. First, we have to back up and analyze the situation for ourselves. What is going wrong? Why are so many people caught up in this? I would suggest to you that it's an issue of values. If I have a system that says it's not wrong to be involved with drugs; my value system tells me that, and I act that out. You can have all the laws you want, do all the incarceration you want, and do all the group therapy you want; it will make absolutely no difference because people are driven by their value system. From your culture, you get your values; from your values, you develop life styles; and from your life styles, you develop behavior patterns. If you want to alter the behavior of people, you must deal with the value system that they use. If you are not aware of the value system they are using, you make mistakes. That's why people say, "lock them up, lock Africans up."

In my value system, there is nothing negative about being locked up. As a matter of fact, it's kind of cool. Enough of my friends are there, and enough goes on in the prison that is consistent with my value system, that I don't care if you put me in jail. Now, if I don't care if you put me in jail, what kind of sanction is that when you threaten to put me in jail?

Another thing people want to talk about is the death penalty for people who do certain kinds of things in the street. There is already a death penalty on the street. The system's death penalty is a jive one; because you are going to take me to jail and go through this long process of appeal to execute me—it will take about ten years. On the street, we have a very different kind of death penalty. It says that I will give you this package (worth about five thousand dollars); you go out and bring me back four [thousand]. Take this pistol with you; if anybody messes with you, kill them. Now, when I send you out there, if you come back with three [thousand], or you don't come back, I don't discuss that with you—I kill you. And the people who are in the game understand that. The people in the game say he must have wanted to get killed, or he would have given the man his money. Simple as that.

In talking about a death penalty, you are not thinking about the value system that people are using on the street. You think of your own value system and say: "If I'm afraid to go to jail, they must be afraid of going to jail. If I'm afraid of the death penalty, they must be afraid of the death penalty." We impose our values on other people and don't understand what's going on. We make mistakes working on the problem in that way.

So we argue about it. We must, instead, work on the value system of our people; we must teach a certain kind of value system. What happens now in our community is that the elders, people like me, do not teach the value system, and the young people create a value system of their own. We have young people creating value systems because no one has given them a value system. No one taught them: "Here is how we are going to live. This is appropriate behavior. That is inappropriate behavior. That can't be defined by you [young people]. You understand that, don't you?"

From an African perspective, the African community has to determine what is appropriate or inappropriate. If you know anything about the history of crime, you will know that Africans got heavily involved in crime in the late 50s. We had unemployment, poor education, poor housing, and racism. But we didn't get involved in crime until the late 50s, and then we went absolutely nuts and got fully involved in it. That means it has only been about 40 years that we have been involved in crime. What changed? I'll tell you what changed. At one time my folks told this young man right here to behave. The community took responsibility and said, "This is appropriate; this is inappropriate."

Appropriate or inappropriate behavior has to be defined by the community. It cannot be defined by outside sources. It's not the responsibility of the public schools. It's not the responsibility of the church, unless the church is the community's church. You have to respect yourself, your family, and your community. You need a special respect for elders because they pass on the history, culture, and values. I'll tell you something we used to say: "Don't go out of the house with raggedy underwear on; because you might be in an accident, and they could take you to the hospital, take off your clothes and say, 'Look at him with that raggedy underwear; his parents sent him out like that.'" That's a value system. That teaches

you respect. You represent the family. We talk about responsibility for yourself, your family, your community, and sexual responsibility. Some people say that being responsible in your sexual life means wearing a condom so you won't catch AIDS. That's not responsible. But it is responsible to teach self-development in school. You have to value your health; drug addiction involves your health; so don't use drugs. We explain how you take care of your body in order to be here for a long time. You have to eat properly, rest properly, and exercise properly. We teach that in schools. We teach that in juvenile facilities. We go into prisons, teach the same thing, and find that people respond to us. If I give you the right information, you'll make the right decision. If I give you the right vision, you'll do the right thing. Give them the proper information and the people respond properly.

Some people may say we don't have to get anything from the formal system. I say, "Yes, you do." The system needs to support us when we come and talk about what we need in our community. Don't start arguing, "Well, I don't think that's what you need to do. Here's what we think." You understand what I'm saying? We don't need you to think about our problem anymore. We need you to support us. We did the thinking, and we want your support.

**Peter Greenwood, Senior
Researcher, RAND Corporation**

I'm here to represent the researchers and the evaluators. I get to talk from different perspectives. One, a number of my colleagues at RAND, Susan Turner, who's in the audience, Terry Dunworth, Joan Petersilia, Peter Rueter, and others, all get to work with a variety of communities and agencies through this drug problem. We get to see what's going on with them and what their day-to-day issues and concerns are. At times, we are asked to do some assessments of a particular local jurisdiction or a state, and we see how the numbers are developing and what's going on. That gives us some kind of picture of where we've been. Finally, to see what's coming in the future, we have something at RAND that many of you may not know about. We've got a drug policy game—like a military simulation game—where we have the luxury of taking a strategy into a community and sitting down with a group of policy makers who

have been dealing with drugs in that community. We can say, "Okay, we're going to fight the next two or three years of the drug war like this, and find out what would happen." I'm going to try and argue for three principal theses about what's going on in the drug war.

Number one, when the criminal justice system looks at a new problem it doesn't do what criminologists would tell it to do. I think it decides to get tough. The first tool in the toolbox, the biggest one on top, is the hammer. I think that's what we did with the drug problem.

Number two, eventually the system learns that toughness all by itself does not work, and it begins to look around for some other kinds of approaches.

Number three, you will find that the people who discover this first are those who are closest to the problem. That's usually the police and the corrections people, who have the day-to-day contact with the offenders. The issue is not: what will happen but where we are in the cycle and on the various phases.

I'll give you a couple of snapshots about where we are in the war on drugs. It began in the early- to mid-1980's. We went out, arrested people, and built up. We focused on the law enforcement approach. The total number of arrests between 1981 and 1991, for all kinds of crimes, went up by about 40 percent from 10 million to 14 million; but drug arrests practically doubled in that time. Another interesting thing happened, and I think it bears out the law enforcement focus. We shifted, rather dramatically, the percentage of arrests that were for sale versus possession. In 1981, 20 percent of all drug arrests were for sale; it was up to 33 percent in 1991. The focus of law enforcement is not on-the-street possession, but the results of buy-and-bust and other kinds of techniques to try to get the dealers.

When we did our first study of drugs in the Washington, D.C., area, we found that drug arrests were up. The question is, what happens with the people who are arrested when drug arrests were up? The amount of treatment dollars available was down to about a third of what it had been in the mid-1970's. We had lots of people coming into the system who were getting arrested but we didn't have the treatment dollars out there to

deal with them. In the late 1980s, all the debate was about what law enforcement should do. We actually had a team of dealers plotting interesting strategies for law enforcement to confront. The whole battle was law enforcement; nobody particularly cared about what happened with treatment.

At the same time, while law enforcement was getting busy, prosecutors and judges got to work. As you can see, these are figures from California. Our arrests more than doubled, from 40,000 to 84,000 in 1990, and the number of convictions, as a percent of arrests, went from 45 to 63 percent. We were convicting more of the people arrested for drugs. The number who went to state prison, as a percent of those convicted, went from 5 percent up to 20 percent. This was not just the war on drugs; we were getting tough across the board: homicide, robbery, etc. Lots of those offenders turn out to have drug problems in addition to any other problems they might have.

I'm sure many of you, in your own state, get to see a picture like California's. We started out, in 1980, with between 20,000 and 30,000 people in prison; it was up to 106,000 earlier this year. Nobody could imagine that we would increase by a factor of three the number of people going to prison. This is a big experiment; this is a big demonstration to find out results. In the percent change in prison population, California went up 245 percent in that decade.

We don't know what would have happened in California if we had not built so many prison cells, but other states had a much lower increase in incarceration rate, and none of them seem to have the great increase (300 percent) in crime rate. In California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and other places that built big prison systems over the last ten years, people are beginning now to scratch their chins and wonder if it was worth it. Did we really solve anything, did we just delay things, or did we even, perhaps, make things worse in terms of people who are coming out on the street?

When I assess where we are in the battle with drugs—making a kind of a mid-course damage assessment—I see that by 1991, we had discovered what the police could do. The police no longer thought that arresting people or putting them in prison was a deterrent; but, at least, the police could

break up the drug markets. They could break up the things that bothered citizens, they could move the markets around, and that may have some effect. That kind of process may make it harder for the less motivated offenders to find their drugs. If they are not out there on the street corner, they've got to go into a building or somewhere else to find them.

The data now shows that drugs are still as available. Marijuana has become a little bit more expensive. Cocaine and heroin are as available, as cheap, and as pure as they have ever been; so the massive investment in crack eradication and interdiction, and all those other things that we've done, have not particularly dented the supply. So where do we move to effect more change? We moved into the treatment system. The Federal government has now begun to spend a lot of additional money on treatment. In 1991, the focus on treatment found that communities were really dealing with alternative strategies, trying to bring in the hard-to-reach drug user, the woman with children, the adolescents, those who were resistant to treatment. How do you keep them in the program? Keep them from dropping out? The whole movement in policy has been away from law enforcement to the improvement of treatment.

In Dade County, the City of Miami, we found an interesting kind of result. For those of you who know Miami, it's a jurisdiction that's been out in front in its struggle with drug problems. The Miami Coalition for a Drug-Free Community brought us in and organized the effort. We sat them down and had them deal, not with Miami's problem but with this mythical community of New Elsinore in the game. Their first response to the problem was to do everything we've done in Miami. We got a drug court, task forces, and other kinds of things. After the first move, we agreed to find the next move. Then we diverted a few more offenders out of the drug court. Anybody arrested for a drug offense was now moved out of the criminal justice system, and into the treatment system. After they looked at the impact if you moved just 10 percent of the offenders, there was no dramatic effect on the criminal justice system. Miami, like many other communities, has realized that putting drug offenders into the criminal justice system is more or less a bottomless pit. The new direction down there was to get drug offenders out of the court and into some other place. That's where the system is moving. We're going to see more placement into treatment. We are not going

to cure them right away. We didn't develop this problem yesterday, a week ago, or a year ago. It has developed over a number of years and will take years to solve.

The final plan the Miami Drug Coalition ended up with, was a prevention program—a community-based, full-service school that was open 24 hours per day, with police officers, housing people, and service providers. This is beginning to look like a model city rather than a drug program, but it is very different from the model cities programs of the 1970's. The police, law enforcement, and the prosecutors, were out in front in that game. Recognizing that they no longer could do anything with "lock them up and put them away," they really had to get involved in community-based prevention.

Charles W. Bennett, Jr., Deputy Chief, Division of Patrol Operations, Richmond, Virginia, Bureau of Police

Richmond, Virginia, is a city of slightly over 200,000 people, and it has many of the same problems that any urban center has. Drugs have devastated our community by devastating our people. The number of people who have been murdered in Richmond, Virginia, in my 25-year career is astronomical. It's worse than Northern Ireland, where there is a country at war; yet, in Richmond, it's business as usual. Unfortunately, nobody gets excited about that. I'd just like you to think about a couple of things as this conference goes on.

There is, I think, a very surprising agreement among people on the panels of very divergent disciplines. One of the greatest things from the law enforcement perspective that's happened in the last couple of years, is the fact that drugs have stopped being a police problem. They are now a community problem. Although people sometimes don't want to call the police, in our area that's their very first response. If there's a problem in their community, in the past, they wanted to call the police and have government solve it for them. Their response has been, "Hey, I pay taxes. Let them fix the problem." And what did we do in law enforcement? We trained the people to react that way. What do we say? "Dial 911; we'll come. We'll solve your problem for you. All you have to

do is be our eyes and ears, and we'll fix your problem." What a monster we created there!

Now we're trying to untrain people. I want you to think about a couple of things. What has success been for the police over the past 25 years? Number of arrests. If you had a good program, you locked up a whole bunch of people. We got real innovative at that. We did drug reverses, we used videos, and we locked up a lot of people. Well, let me tell you something. It's not success. Now, we know, from law enforcement perspective, that unless we reduce the demand for drugs as part of our enforcement strategy; it isn't going to work. In the last two years, in Richmond, Virginia, with 200,000 people, we've made 10,000 arrests for drug possession with intent to distribute, distribution, or allied offenses. That does not mean 10,000 individuals, because we've locked up the same people a whole bunch of times. But think about it. We ask people, "Are there fewer drug dealers on the corner now than there were before we locked up these 10,000 people?" The answer is "No." It is probably worse in many areas because there are still people demanding drugs. They still want to buy them. It's still lucrative, and people are out there buying them. The demand is still high. Mr. Mendez said it is a value issue, and he's exactly right. We're out there now with the DARE Program, with drug awareness programs, and, unfortunately, it will take years to see the results.

Throughout this somewhat negative talk I'm giving, I want you to think about the fact that we have been successful in our society in a couple of areas. Look at what has been done with drinking and driving. I can remember that when I first joined the police department, drunk driving was a joke. Nobody made arrests for it. Why? Because the judges, the prosecutors, and everybody involved, who had probably been drinking and driving the night before, didn't take people who were drinking and driving seriously. Now it's socially unacceptable. Our values are that it isn't okay to drink and drive. Consider cigarettes: there's another health problem. Many of you can remember when everybody smoked cigarettes. You were an odd ball if you didn't. Now, you're kind of an odd ball if you do. In California, you can't even smoke in the restaurants anymore. So we can change values, but we have to do it together.

Something that came as a shock both to law enforcement and the community, was that if we locked up a drug dealer they didn't vanish. Many people thought if you arrest the drug dealers, they'll never come back. But what happens? They are back. And what do we see now? Younger and younger drug dealers. The people who are managing the open air drug markets know that if your point-of-sale person is a juvenile, they do not go to jail or post bond. For our community policing program, that's a real problem; because we have told people in the community to take charge of your community, get involved, work with the system, take your community back, and make it safer. But what do they see on a daily basis? Police come in; run a big sophisticated operation, many times involving the citizens' homes to alert them to the activity; we lock up a bunch of people; and that evening all the 13-year-old drug dealers are back on the street selling drugs again. People say the system doesn't work. Why should we get involved? It's sometimes awfully hard to answer that question.

It will come as no surprise to anybody that heroin is back. Remember heroin? When I joined the police department, that was the only hard drug there was. It was so bad that even the heroin addicts said, "Wow, this stuff is rotten; it's terrible. We've got to get something safe like cocaine." We've got a whole new generation that has no resistance. They've never seen heroin or what it does. They've never seen anybody who doesn't have a septum anymore or had all their veins collapse, or running sores, or all the other horror shows. They haven't had any experience. It's like a brand new disease. My point here is not only that heroin is back; but that, just as we evolve strategies to combat the drug problem, the drug problem evolves on its own. We do need evaluation to see what works. It has got to be done in the communities. We've done too much talking and not enough listening. If we're really going to make a difference, change the values, get people involved, we've got to form a partnership. Partnership is more than inviting people to a meeting. It is really sitting down and listening, and making the citizens who live in the community part of the solution. We have to listen to what they say. We need to form those partnerships that will make a difference in the next years to address the problem in our streets, in our families, and in our communities.

Evaluating Community Policing

Richard J. Harris, Research Specialist, Delaware Statistical Analysis Center

Community Policing and Drugs. The purpose of the Eastside Substance Abuse Awareness Program (ESAAP) was to reduce illicit drug activity in Wilmington's Eastside neighborhood through (1) enhanced law enforcement efforts with emphasis on the use of community policing, (2) community organization, and (3) increased social, educational, and rehabilitative services. The evaluation design includes three major components: a quasi-experimental comparison group analysis of quantitative outcomes (call-ins and arrests comparing the Eastside with other Wilmington neighborhoods); a performance evaluation focused on the implementation of the project; and a qualitative study based on interviews with people involved in the project, as well as observation of the Eastside and surrounding neighborhoods. The evaluation has been completed.

The quantitative data show that after community policing was implemented in 1989, the number of drug related call-ins increased from 243 to 434, and the number of arrests increased from 151 to 216. In 1990, drug-related call-ins increased slightly, but arrests decreased from 216 to 176 as a result of community policing strategies. However, both call-ins and arrests again increased in 1991. Some of the displaced drug markets reopened, and it appears that the supply and availability of drugs increased throughout the city.

Both interviews and documents verify that law enforcement efforts on the Eastside have changed significantly through the implementation of a community policing unit. The walking patrol officers know and interact with community members; they function as street patrol officers rather than 911 officers; they teach community members how to organize to protect their streets; and they form partnerships with them to fight the drug dealers. As a result of the organizing, neighborhood people became less fearful of calling the police, and 911 calls increased. As a result of better information and the partnerships with community members, arrests increased. Thus

community policing, effectively implemented, may temporarily increase call-in and arrests in the process of changing policing strategies and organizing the community to protect itself.

Although the data reflect the continuing seriousness of the illicit drug trade in Wilmington and on the Eastside, this evaluation finds that community policing can change the direction of the illicit drug problem. The gains, however, must be protected as the illicit drug traders attempt to regain their hold on the neighborhood. The reclaiming of a neighborhood from the illicit drug trade is a pull and tug that can take years, but as described in the qualitative study, the gains created by the partnership between the community police and people in the Eastside create a reservoir of strength that neighborhood residents can tap in their fight for their community.

Mary Mande, Director, MJM Consulting Services

Community Policing and Drugs. Ms. Mande conducted the qualitative evaluation of the Wilmington, Delaware, Eastside Substance Abuse Awareness Program (ESAAP). Her presentation focused on the conditions that need to change before community policing can occur. Police officers must give up anonymity in favor of direct engagement. They must move from being reactive to taking a proactive stance, must focus on crime prevention, and will need to use problem solving techniques. Police officers will also need to customize their work within neighborhoods. Since officers will have more authority, accountability measures should be in place. Finally, police must be prepared to work with citizens as full partners. In the Eastside area, community police officers developed their own schedules and tasks. Their activities included a meeting with absentee landlords, a foot patrol beat, and basketball games with neighborhood children.

Ms. Mande reported some of the ways in which Eastside citizens demonstrated their support for police efforts. They organized a protest when they heard two community policing officers were to be transferred, and the department allowed the officers to stay. They formed citizen patrols.

Eighty-five residents came to one community meeting. Elderly residents were seen walking through the neighborhood again.

***Antony Pate, Director of Research,
Police Foundation***

72nd Precinct Study. The New York City Police Department is committed to implementing community oriented policing throughout the city. The department began the process in 1984 in Brooklyn's 72nd precinct. More recently, it selected the 72nd precinct as a "model precinct" in which the strategy would be implemented with the full staffing levels it requires. The Police Foundation, with funding from the National Institute of Justice, is evaluating that effort.

The Vera Institute of Justice and the police department formed a planning team, which recommended changes in organizational structure, information systems, training, participation by all units, beat configuration, and other areas. The team determined that 210 sworn officers were needed to serve approximately 100,000 people. Overall, there was a 26 percent increase in personnel, and the precinct at its highest staffing levels had 204 sworn, although this was later reduced to 187. All officers received a two-day overview of community policing. Among the new processes implemented were staff meetings; precinct team meetings involving commanders and two citizens; crime mapping; and the development of alternative responses to low priority calls. The goal was to reduce the utilization rate to 60 percent, and at one point the rate was as low as 35 percent, although the rate had begun to go back up by the end of 1992. The evaluation did not involve a citizen survey; however, citizen complaints about the police declined.

***Susan Sadd, Project Director, Vera
Institute of Justice***

Evaluation of the INOP Program. The Vera Institute of Justice recently completed an evaluation of the eight BJA-funded Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) programs in Houston, TX; Portland, OR; Norfolk, VA; Prince George's County, MD; New York City; and Tempe, AZ. The purpose of the INOP programs was to implement community policing approaches to drug demand reduction. The eight programs

were widely diverse, with police departments ranging in size from about 155 officers to 27,000 officers; and covering anywhere from one-half square mile to an entire city. Each site received approximately \$200,000 in BJA funds the first year, and all but Houston were awarded additional funds.

NIJ awarded the evaluation grant to Vera nine months after the INOP programs started. The research relied primarily upon qualitative data collected during a series of three-week visits per site. The data were gathered through individual and focus group interviews with police personnel, staff from government and private agencies involved in the local programs, and residents and business people in the INOP communities. Most interviews were taped, transcribed, and analyzed using a relational database program.

Overall, the effects of the INOP programs were limited. Drugs were displaced, either geographically or temporally, or they became less visible in the targeted neighborhoods. No general improvement in police/community relations was determined, although many of the community policing officers were well liked by citizens. Many of the people interviewed in Tempe, Norfolk, Portland, and Prince George's County believed their projects did have an effect on crime, and in these same sites, fear of crime was reduced.

***Randolph M. Grinc, Senior Research
Associate, Vera Institute of Justice***

Evaluation of the INOP Program.

Because the structure of the INOP programs was so diverse, it was difficult to establish cross-site linkages in the data. However, in the process of the data analysis, a number of common threads were discovered. These commonalities were "universal" problems encountered in implementing community policing. Some examples of these include: a general lack of acceptance of the program by police personnel; a general lack of knowledge among police officers of the concepts of community policing; failure to organize partnerships with the community members of the INOP program; and a lack of inter-agency cooperation beyond that which existed before the INOP program was developed.

Neither patrol officers nor residents received much training in community policing; two

or three hours was typical. Regular patrol officers resented the special status of community police officers, particularly when they did not answer calls. Few sites did problem solving in any systematic way. The lack of resident involvement was sometimes due to fear of retaliation by drug dealers. In addition, the INOP neighborhoods usually had a history of poor police/community relations, and residents tended to distrust the police. Like the officers, residents suspected community policing would come and go like so many other police programs.

This identification of problems does not mean that the INOP programs were without successes. It does mean, however, that there was no "model" program, only successfully implemented components.

Drug Testing: Tools and Applications

**Robert L. DuPont, M.D., President,
Institute for Behavior and Health**

Drug Testing: Tools and Applications.

Drug tests provide objective identification of illicit drug use. Widespread and universal drug testing in the criminal justice system is the most hopeful strategy for reducing drug use and serious crime in the country today. In addition, drug tests may help to cut the staggering costs of the criminal justice system tomorrow.

Alternative sentencing is being contemplated for offenders arrested on non-violent felony drug charges. Drug testing programs are being implemented as a monitoring tool for intensively supervised community release programs. Criminal justice drug testing programs are in a unique position to identify effective program elements.

This project identifies, through surveys and site visits, seven elements of urine drug testing that could be adopted more widely in DUF jurisdictions and in other communities. Preliminary surveys were sent to the DUF program coordinators in each of the 24 DUF cities that conduct urine drug testing and to other communities. Twenty-three criminal justice agencies with drug testing programs responded to the survey. Information was collected on the numbers of offenders tested and the frequency of testing. A follow-up questionnaire determined the relative strength of each of the seven elements by self-report. The final report will be available in February 1994.

The focus on drug testing in community corrections programs has strong implications for the recent interest in alternative sentencing and graduated sanctions. Criminal justice practitioners and policy-makers can make use of this information to build more effective drug testing programs, one element at a time.

**Thomas Mieczkowski, Scientific
Collaborator, Operation PAR**

Hair Testing of Criminal Justice Arrestees.

Data was presented from a DUF-style drug

monitoring program in Pinellas County, Florida, which utilizes hair assays, urine testing, and compiled self-reports of drug use. The data show that hair assays are effective identifiers of cocaine under-reporting by arrestees, even more so than urinalysis.

It is harder to evade detection of drug traces using hair testing rather than urinalysis. It also has been good in maintenance programs. It is less septic; there's no risk of contamination; and it is easier to store, not needing refrigeration. Any body hair can be used, but head hair was used in their voluntary study. Marijuana concentrates poorly in hair (lingers longer in urine). Cocaine is also harder to detect if it is a sample from a new user. A regular user will show the cocaine usage in a hair analysis better than in a urinalysis, which may be manipulated.

**Rosemary Mumm, Principal
Investigator, NIJ Diversionary
Program, Orleans Parish**

Orleans Parish (LA) District Attorney Diversionary Program. The District Attorney in New Orleans was recently funded by NIJ to develop and implement a diversionary program for first-time offenders with drug problems utilizing hair and urine assays. This presentation covered the applications of drug testing as well as the overall program design for diverting substance abusers into treatment.

The study has been operating for four and one-half months. Early results indicate:

- Alcohol seems to be more related to violent crime, whereas drug crimes are more property-related
- There is resistance to the program, both from the participants, who do not want to volunteer, and from the criminal justice practitioners, who consider diversion programs too soft on criminals
- Cross training in testing methods is vital

Another issue is that although there is money to treat offenders, there is none for the victims. There is a desire to stop repeat offenders.

Ms. Mumm prefers to use both urinalysis and hair analysis. If someone misses a urine test they use random tests. Hair testing is done at intake and every two months. Urinalysis offers more immediate information.

The program is expected to be completed in December 1994; and comparisons of hair and urine results will be reported along with data on program retention, recidivism, and other outcome results.

Susan Pennell, Director, Criminal Justice Research Division, San Diego Association of Governments

Use of Drug Use Forecasting Results to Inform and Shape Weed and Seed Efforts. The drug and crime literature suggest that offenders should be primary targets for treatment due to the harm they cause themselves and others. This NIJ-funded study examines the treatment needs of the offender population and assesses the value of arrest location as an indicator of areas in which treatment services should be located. The research is taking place in the San Diego DUF site, with emphasis on the geographical location designated as a Weed and Seed area by the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

To effectively develop programs and policies for reducing drug abuse, the treatment needs of the target population are being assessed through an enhancement of the current DUF interview. Questions focus on types of treatment received, treatment needed for abusing drugs, and opinions about what works to prevent and reduce drug abuse. Responses will be analyzed in conjunction with other DUF data, including drug testing results, self-report information about drug use patterns, injection behavior, and sociodemographic information on participants. Data will be collected on over 1,500 respondents.

This presentation provides preliminary results from interviews conducted with men and women during the first quarter of 1993. The focus is on treatment history, cessation of drug use, need for treatment and other assistance, and opinions regarding drug use.

The information provided from this research should be useful to other DUF sites that want to maximize DUF results for policy making. Other Weed and Seed sites may want to assess drug use in specific neighborhoods and as a barometer for measuring the success of their efforts. Finally, the results of this effort may provide valuable information about shaping treatment services to meet the needs of the drug-abusing criminal offender.

Intensive Supervision Programs

**Susan Turner, Project Manager,
RAND**

Minnesota's Intensive Community Supervision (ICS) Program: Effects on Offender Reintegration, Public Safety, and System Costs. RAND is conducting an experimental evaluation of Minnesota's intensive community supervision (ICS) program, which is used for both prison-diversion and supervised release. Minnesota's ICS program provides maximum community surveillance and supervision in a four-phase process with a lengthy period of home detention and close contact by specially trained agents with small caseloads. At the core of the program are weekly drug testing and mandatory work and/or training program participation.

The evaluation, which began in 1990, is focusing on three key dimensions: the effects on public safety, offender reintegration, and justice system costs. The sample for the study of prison diversion consists of 127 persons who were randomly assigned to the experimental program or to the control group and remained in prison to serve their imposed prison term. Half of the 186 persons randomly assigned to supervised release are in the ICS program, the other half remain on regular supervised release following their prison term. Data are being collected from various sources, including: official record data, program implementation data, criminal justice system cost data, and personal interviews. Data collection and analysis are still underway; preliminary results will be available in the summer of 1994.

To measure perceptions of the severity of ICS in comparison to other more traditional sanctions and the perceived difficulty of complying with various conditions of supervision, we conducted interviews both with inmates eligible for the ICS program and correctional staff. Information on the types of offenders assigned to ICS, and on how well the ICS program is implemented, were gathered to determine if ICS is a viable alternative to prison, and whether it is better than regular supervision. In the summer of 1992, we conducted interviews with a sample of 48 inmates randomly selected from the two receiving facilities, Stillwater and St. Cloud. Similar

interviews were conducted with a sample of 38 correctional staff during the spring of 1993. Three rating tasks were developed from the interviews: (1) ranking the order of sanctions by severity; (2) assigning weights to legal sanctions by magnitude scaling; and (3) rating the conditions. Preliminary analyses of the data collected in these interviews suggest that while staff and inmates generally give similar ratings to the various sanctions in terms of the severity of probation as compared to prison, they have different perceptions of the severity of individual sanctions and of supervision conditions. Different sanction issues, such as employment and marital status, were emphasized by offender profiles.

**Emily Reed, Management Analyst,
Delaware Criminal Justice Council**

Assessing the Effectiveness of Intensive Supervision Probation in Delaware. Dr. Reed presented two evaluations of intensive supervision in Delaware (also called Level III Probation) which she completed in 1992. Intensive supervision is part of a five-level sentencing system. The levels are, in order of increasing supervision: (1) unsupervised probation; (2) regular probation, less than one hour a day of supervision; (3) ISP, supervision at least one hour a day, but no more than eight; (4) parallel intensive supervision, over eight hours, but less than 24, through electronic monitoring and half-way houses; (5) prison, 24-hour supervision. The first study, the "Process Evaluation," assesses the quality and effectiveness of ISP as a process and as an alternative to incarceration by comparing it to internal and external standards.

The second evaluation, the "Statistical or Impact Assessment," addresses the issue of whether the offenders sentenced to intensive supervision are appropriately serious criminals who would be incarcerated if it were not for this program. The differences in criminal histories of intensive probationers and regular probationers, along with the difficulty of finding matching regular probationers, confirm that level III clients are appropriately serious offenders and that ISP is not "widening the net," nor assigning inappropriate, non-serious offenders to ISP. The report identifies

to what extent ISP rehabilitates offenders in comparison to regular probation and incarceration. It compares several ISP subgroups, including drug offenders and non-drug, violent and non-violent, first and repeat offenders, in terms of recidivism. The findings indicate that rearrest rates were the same for drug and alcohol abusers and non-abusers. Level III supervision was determined to be better, measured in lower recidivism rates, than Level V, prison. Also, technical violations were high in Level III, due to close case scrutiny. The evaluation also develops a model of what kinds of offenders are not good risks for ISP.

***Kim English, Research Director,
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice***

Intensive Supervision Probation in Colorado. The purpose of this study was to determine for the state legislature whether ISP is an effective policy for Colorado to divert offenders from prison and at the same time present no greater risk to society. The following research questions will be answered through the assessment: (1) Does ISP divert offenders from prison or community corrections? (2) Does ISP protect the public? and (3) Which probation components impact offenders?

The first question is based on criminal history score, a composite index of sanction severity rating. Preliminary results indicate that ISP does divert offenders from prison. The rearrest records of offenders completing the program were no worse than offenders from the prison group, indicating that ISP does protect the public. Preliminary findings also indicate that successful probation components are treatment, job programs, and job development. The assessment contained an evaluation of treatment and related activities performed by offenders. Generally, those who held full-time jobs, regardless of education and training, performed better, measured in recidivism, than those who did not hold jobs. The important element was full-time activity. In addition, completing the program is a key element for success. A report of the findings will be completed at the end of summer 1993.

***Helen G. Corrothers, Executive
Committee, American Correctional
Association***

Development of an Intermediate Sanctions System Model. This study began in January 1993 and is scheduled for completion in June 1994. It was designed to examine issues in intermediate sanctions to identify appropriate punishments and to determine the best combination of sanctions for an effective intermediate punishment system model. The model, emphasizing public safety, is suitable for adaptation by state, local, and federal agencies.

A comprehensive review of the literature to include completed program evaluations, questionnaires soliciting opinions, and program information from judges, correctional administrators, probation department officials, and other criminal justice practitioners, along with site visits, is expected to provide essential information concerning the current status of punishment in communities across the nation. Issues relative to costs, community satisfaction/benefits, and improvements that program operators would consider desirable will be explored. Public safety concerns will be examined, such as probation officer caseloads, restrictions on movement, control, accountability, and responsibility pertaining to offenders. Additionally, careful attention will be provided to eligibility criteria, types of offenses, and characteristics of targeted offenders.

Evaluation of Innovative Prosecution Strategies

Heike Gramckow, Research Associate, Jefferson Institute for Justice Studies

Complex Drug Cases. Complex drug cases are cases that involve drug conspiracies, RICO, money laundering, or cases that are based on complex investigative techniques such as wire taps, financial investigation, asset forfeiture, link analysis, or other sophisticated forms of electronic surveillance.

They are different from routine drug prosecutions because they involve multiple defendants connected through more or less complex networks, or a complicated set of consecutive illegal (and legal) activities that are difficult to trace. They usually require special resources and skills, different prosecutorial tactics and strategies that can conflict with general office and agency policies or even sentencing guidelines.

The complexity calls for a variety of strategies, such as multi-jurisdictional task forces, financial investigations, asset forfeiture, link analysis, and the use of advanced technologies, such as expert systems or geo-based information systems.

The purpose of this study is to describe and assess investigative and prosecutorial programs and strategies used for complex drug programs and prosecutions conducted on the state and local level, for use by other prosecutors.

This program assessment focuses on all State Attorney General offices, all metropolitan jurisdictions with populations over 750,000, and a sample of jurisdictions with populations between 250,000 and 750,000.

The assessment is based on (1) review of the literature and interviews with professionals and experts in the field; (2) an initial telephone survey and (3) a follow-up mail survey of local prosecutors and Attorneys General offices.

Findings provide a strong justification for local prosecutors' involvement in complex drug cases. They argue that the local prosecutor has a

special responsibility to the community and plays a vital role in developing informants and closing the gap to federal prosecutions. The assessment identified some of the problems prosecutors are confronted with when they embark on these types of cases. In many instances the issues and problems arising from complex drug prosecutions are comparable to those related to organized crime prosecutions. Also the techniques used by prosecutors to overcome these problems are similar. These are longer investigations, requiring long term staff commitments, and strategic planning. There are low caseloads for staff, a maximum of 10 cases per year.

Police-prosecutor roles are different, and involve joint police-prosecutor operations where investigation drives management. Multiple forum litigation issues require advanced attorney training and use complex evidence. It is difficult for these projects to demonstrate success, as the number of convictions is poor measure given the extra resources allocated to the unit. The structures used by prosecutors in complex drug cases can also be used in other types of cases, such as those for organized crime, environmental crime, consumer fraud, and white collar crime.

The implications of this assessment are that further studies are needed into organized crime prosecutions as they apply to complex drug cases. The final assessment report and executive summary was developed and submitted for review.

Joan E. Jacoby, Executive Director, Jefferson Institute for Justice Studies

Assessing the Impact of Community Policing on the Criminal Justice System. The purpose of this assessment is to describe the changes in prosecutors' offices and other parts of the criminal justice system that have resulted from the implementation of various types of community policing programs in the U.S.; to note where new relationships have been established; and to explore the various roles that prosecutors may play to support or expand community policing activities. The study will be based on a combination of on-site appraisals in four jurisdictions supplemented by

selective interviews with prosecutors and police in jurisdictions that have adopted a community-oriented philosophy of policing.

Four sites were chosen for field study: Montgomery County, MD, with a population of 579,000, 803 officers, and 40 prosecutors; Tucson, AZ, with 370,000 population and 80 prosecutors; Portland OR, with 368,000 population 897 officers, and 80 prosecutors; and Colorado-Springs, CO, with a population of 215,000, 472 officers, and 42 prosecutors.

The types of community policing used in these jurisdictions vary. In Montgomery County, they are implementing a problem solving approach. In Tucson, they have had a department-wide philosophy for 12 years. In Portland and in Colorado Springs, the departments are problem-oriented.

The role of the prosecutor in relation to the change to community policing varies in the four sites. In Montgomery County, it is a pro-active leadership role. In Tucson, the prosecutor is essentially neutral towards change to community policing. In both Portland and Colorado Springs, the prosecutor has taken a partnership role. In a fifth site, Philadelphia, PA, based on information from a study advisory board member, the prosecutor has stationed his assistants in precincts, where they deal directly with community problems.

Some preliminary findings from the study are that the primary impacts of community policing are on juvenile justice, prosecution, and the courts. Secondary effects are upon pretrial release, probation, and the public defender. Factors affecting the impact of community policing include:

Environment: Regulatory and ordinance "quality of life" crimes, such as loitering and vandalism. Where these laws are in place, community policing results in increased enforcement.

Policy: Community policing changes prosecutor priorities. For example, solicitation cases may not have been a serious priority, but in some local areas, it is a major problem. Juvenile cases become more important under community policing initiatives.

Organizational structure: Community policing requires decentralization of prosecutor office. In Montgomery County this has resulted in adoption of team prosecutors assigned to an area (precinct).

Procedures/Operation: Prosecutors become more active in dispute resolution and mediation. The idea of Neighborhood Justice Centers, promoted in earlier years, may come back into favor.

Coordination. The issue of communication with constituents is key to this. Some further examples of agency change include

- Court mobilization of volunteers (New Brunswick drug court)
- Probation outstation of officers
- Agency changing of rules to "avoid crime."

Beyond its immediate impact on law enforcement operations and the community, community policing has the potential to produce long-term, structural, and procedural changes in criminal justice relationships. Indeed, it may affect the broad scope of activities assumed by many agencies, including the courts, prosecution, and public defender systems. This study is designed to explore the dimensions of the community policing philosophy from a non-law enforcement perspective as it exists now and may exist in the future.

***Kenneth R. Coyle, Research Analyst,
American Prosecutors Research
Institute, and Donald Rebovich,
Director, American Prosecutors
Research Institute***

National Assessment of Drug Cases. The American Prosecutors Research Institute (APRI) received funding from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to examine drug prosecution methods in local prosecutors' offices. The Prosecution of Drug Cases National Assessment will provide local prosecutors with substantive examples of successful drug prosecution techniques which are amenable to implementation in other jurisdictions. The results of the study will also identify and explain common impediments to effective drug prosecution and

offer recommendations to overcome these roadblocks. Drug prosecution mechanisms will be studied and their implementation processes will be documented specifically for dissemination to other prosecutors. System wide considerations and broad-based policy issues influenced by prosecution activities will also be addressed for criminal justice practitioners and policy-makers at the federal, state, and local levels.

anticipates completion of grant activities and the final report in September 1993.

Data collection activities involve a national survey of a sample of local prosecutors to identify current "effective drug case prosecution mechanisms," a series of brief follow-up telephone interviews to clarify information and gather additional data, and on-site interviews with drug prosecution personnel in eight jurisdictions. The interviews are designed to gather detailed information assessing and documenting the creation, implementation, and impact of effective drug case prosecution mechanisms; to identify and describe current "impediments" to effective drug prosecution and areas where additional innovative approaches are needed; and to determine the need for new strategies, practices, and programs to enhance drug trafficking prosecution efforts.

The prosecution stages where discretion exists that affects the efficiency and quality of prosecutions include: investigation/arrest, screening, information review, arraignment, omnibus hearing, trial, sentencing, or post-conviction.

Prosecutors were asked to rate differing strategies at each prosecution stage for their effect on efficiency and quality of the prosecution case. Specialized drug unit prosecution was rated by 91 percent of respondents as affecting both efficiency and quality of case. Other factors included attorney knowledge of search and seizure law through availability of school zone laws. Jurisdictional specific innovations included the Florida bail source law requiring the source of bail moneys to be provided, limiting the use of drug profits for this purpose.

Survey analysis and site visit results will be disseminated to drug prosecutors and federal, state, and local policy-makers through a comprehensive final report and executive summary. To date, the survey administration and preliminary data analysis phases are complete, and research staff have initiated city visit activities. APRI

Drug Treatment

Sandra L. Tunis, National Council on Crime and Delinquency

Evaluation of Drug Offender Treatment in Local Corrections. Although drug arrests are a major factor in recent increases in jail and prison populations, most available information on drug treatment in correctional settings is based on therapeutic communities in prisons. There is less information about drug treatment in jails, with lengths of stay typically much shorter. There are also few thorough descriptions of jail treatment programs detailing who participates in and completes them; what services are provided; how much these programs cost; and whether or not they are safe.

This NIJ study was funded in December 1991 as a multi-site description and assessment of drug treatment programs in five jails, two in New York and three in California. It was designed to assess program completion rates as well as 12-month post-release recidivism for participants versus matched controls. This will determine the impact of several program components alone, and in interaction with offender characteristics. This, in turn, will allow us to comment on elements important for successful program implementation.

To provide comparable descriptions of programs, standardized information regarding program and offender variables was obtained from program staff, records, etc. Topics included: a) program overview, b) screening and intake, c) program participants, d) services provided, e) program environment, f) organization and staffing, and g) program funding and costs.

For our sample of over 700 offenders in drug treatment, almost two-thirds (65.2%) were male. Almost one-third (32.1%) were Caucasian, 36.7% were African American, and 25.6% were Hispanic. The average age was 32 years, and almost half (45.0%) reported having participated in some form of prior drug treatment. Patterns of drug use varied widely across sites, with 59 percent reporting the use of alcohol, 61 percent cocaine, and 25 percent heroin.

To examine factors related to treatment retention, we compare offenders terminated from the program or voluntarily withdrawn with offenders completing the program. Subjects were compared with respect to a number of variables including sex, race, homelessness, employment, history of mental illness, age, prior drug treatment, offense, and type of substance abuse. Significant differences were found for race, history of mental illness, and age. Significantly fewer Caucasians than either African Americans or Hispanics terminated treatment. Those in the younger age group were more likely to withdraw from treatment or be terminated, as were those reporting a history of mental illness. Twelve-month follow-up data collection is currently in progress.

Ernest L. Cowles, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections

An Evaluation of Correctional Boot Camp Drug Treatment and Aftercare: Initial Findings. The rapid expansion and development of correctional shock incarceration programs, better known as "boot camps," has far exceeded research efforts to evaluate the nature and effectiveness of these programs. As a result, correctional policymakers and those interested in implementing this alternative to traditional imprisonment frequently have little information upon which to base program content or treatment strategies. This lack of information is particularly critical to boot camp programming, since offenders with substance abuse histories comprise a large proportion of the nation's correctional boot camp population, and many states have legislated mandatory substance abuse treatment as part of the boot camp regime.

This presentation reviews some of the initial survey findings of an 18-month NIJ-sponsored evaluation that focuses on substance abuse programming in boot camp environments. The study employs a series of surveys designed to identify the nature and scope of substance abuse treatment and education in correctional boot camps across the country; and to identify substance abuse programming goals, objectives, and program elements in each program. Preliminary findings indicate that most facilities include substance abuse

treatment, education, or both in the boot camp program. However, specific assessment techniques, intervention approaches, treatment modalities, and length of treatment differ widely. Results to date suggest that there is increasing emphasis on the provision of drug treatment programming, but confusion exists over what constitutes treatment in boot camp facilities.

The research also includes a comparison of the evolution of boot camp programs. Results from survey administrators are included to illustrate the change in the programs. Boot camp programs are compared from two time frames: 1980-1987 and 1988- onward. The results from survey administrators and program staff found that drug treatment is more likely to be included in the programming, and that administrators and staff since 1988 found drug treatment to be critical to the boot camp curriculum.

In addition to findings reported in the presentation, an additional survey of aftercare providers is currently under way. The results of these combined surveys will be linked with any available existing outcome/effectiveness information to select two or three boot camp programs with particularly effective or innovative boot camp substance abuse programming for an in-depth review. The final results of the study, along with program recommendations for correctional decisionmakers should be available at the end of 1993.

Jody Adams Weisbrod, Program Coordinator, Division of Program Demonstration, Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, Columbia University

Fresh Start Post Incarceration Services for Ex-Offenders. The Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University has received planning support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the Commonwealth Fund, and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to plan a national multi-site demonstration program of case-managed, integrated services for drug abusing felony offenders returning to their communities from jail or prison. The program targets convicted offenders who have received drug treatment while incarcerated and who are released to poor, urban communities under parole or probation supervision.

Through case managers located in local community organizations working with designated parole or probation officers, the program would provide drug treatment and other supportive services designed to minimize relapse and recidivism. The goal is to build on incarceration-based treatment by providing a coordinated package of after-care services to sustain treatment gains and achieve a positive reintegration into the community.

The theory underlying the program design is that ex-offenders, who have reduced their drug use through treatment, are more likely to sustain success with a coherent plan that includes aftercare drug treatment. The treatment would include other supports, particularly employment and training, health and mental health services, drug-free housing, and parenting/family skills training to provide the essential skills for family and community life. The plan intends to operate in each community organization for a three-year period. An individual's program participation will be a minimum of one year and a maximum of two years, depending on the length of probation or parole. The Johnson Foundation, NIJ, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance are considering a proposal at a level of several million dollars to support a full scale demonstration at six to eight sites and research initiative over a four-year period. Potential operating sites have been identified in California, Florida, Missouri, and New York.

The research will include three components: program documentation, outcome evaluation, and cost-benefit analysis. The research plan will be designed to assess the extent to which a post-treatment intervention for released ex-offenders compensates for some of the debilitating effects of poverty and stress associated with return to the community.

Gregory P. Falkin, National Development and Research Institutes, Inc.

Coordinating Drug Treatment for Offenders. This paper describes the efforts of officials in three state and local sites to develop comprehensive treatment systems for offenders. The sites are: Jefferson County (Birmingham), Alabama; Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon; and King's County (Brooklyn), New York. The paper focus on linkages between criminal justice

agencies and drug treatment agencies and providers in terms of how they created and developed programs for offenders in the following stages: pretrial, TASC, probation, jail, prison, and parole. A model for drug treatment coordination with community agencies is presented. The model includes developing program linkages across agencies and organizations. The paper summarizes the strategies that were used, including monitoring and evaluating drug treatment efforts.

Interventions with High Risk Youth and Families

Janice Hirota, Documentation Specialist, Center for Addiction and Substance Abuse

Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth Program. The Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth (SIHRY) program is a joint undertaking of the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA). SIHRY is an innovative substance abuse prevention program aimed at youths between 11 and 13 and their families, living in urban communities marked by poverty and crime. It is a program of many parts: It aims to serve both youth and their families with a range of social services; it aims to join both community-centered social and criminal justice services; and, as a demonstration-research project, it supports a strong research component comprised of a longitudinal impact study and a documentation study of program implementation and operations. The program enjoys public and private funding, with the support of the Annie E. Casey, Ford, Prudential, Rockefeller, and Ronald McDonald Foundations, and the Pew Charitable Trusts, as well as matching funds from BJA, OJJDP, and NIJ.

In late Fall 1992, four local SIHRY programs began operations: Austin, Texas; Bridgeport, Connecticut; Memphis, Tennessee; and Seattle, Washington. These original sites were joined in Spring, 1993, by programs in Newark, New Jersey and Savannah, Georgia. The documentation study mainly focuses on the structure and meaning of collaboration in providing social services.

There are several differences among projects. Memphis and Newark are administered by community based organizations, and Seattle and Austin by municipal agencies. Bridgeport and Savannah are also Annie Casey New Futures sites. Target populations are primarily African American in Memphis, Newark, and Savannah; Hispanic (60 percent) and African American (40 percent) in Austin; and primarily Hispanic with some Cambodian, Laotian, and Korean residents in Bridgeport. In Bridgeport, police and social services have been co-located at mini-stations. In

Savannah, two officers are on site at the target school.

Some preliminary findings have been made. Collaboration requires a strong leader who can negotiate, broker services, and hold participants accountable. A lead agency that does not provide direct services appears best for encouraging collaboration. Team building activities are important, and both administrative and line collaboration are needed. SIHRY can liberate employees to some extent from the constraints of their home agencies.

Several key issues have emerged. Confidentiality is an issue at all sites, particularly as it relates to sharing information across service providers. Schools have been the most difficult institution to involve in the project. Finally, there are some difficulties with role blurring (e.g., police and social worker, recreation worker and counselor).

Dennis Campa, Director, Department of Youth Services, Austin, Texas

Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth. The Strategic Interventions with High Risk Youth program in Austin is administered by the city's health and human services department. Austin received a \$25,000 planning grant to develop the program. Austin is attempting service integration, not simply co-location. After a 60-day start-up period, the program began serving 50 families (about 200 individuals). "Safe passage corridors" and two drug-free zones have been established. One of the main issues the program is facing is how to promote self-reliance among the families being served.

Adele Harrell, Senior Research Associate, Urban Institute

Longitudinal Impact Evaluation of the Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth. For the SIHRY impact evaluation, youth were randomly assigned to experimental and control groups, and comparison neighborhoods were selected. Of the families approached about the program, 89 percent

agreed to participate, and 96 percent completed baseline interviews.

Because the SIHRY programs are explicitly designed to meet local needs, there is some diversity across sites in service provision. However, all SIHRY programs include:

Community Policing/Enhanced Enforcement. All SIHRY programs include direct participation of police officers. Additional community law enforcement activities include police in schools and neighborhoods to ensure order and to maintain and enhance relationships with community groups. Increased supervision and sanctioning of drug offenders is used to reduce their influence in the target neighborhoods.

Criminal Justice Intervention. SIHRY case managers work with juvenile court personnel to provide community service opportunities and enhanced supervision of youth in the justice system.

Case Management. Caseworkers make a service plan for all household members and follow up on referrals to a wide variety of services. Intensive efforts, usually for 3-4 months, are followed by on-going case management during the period of program participation.

Family Services. The family services provided by SIHRY include intensive family counseling (both individual and group), parenting skills training, stress/coping skills, and substance abuse and health care provision. Services may also include referrals to education and training programs, job search skills and employment services, and income and social support services.

Education Services. All SIHRY participants receive tutoring or homework assistance, educational testing, and provision of or referral to remedial classes or other specialized coursework aimed at reducing academic failure, as needed.

After-School and Summer Activities. All SIHRY youth participate in recreational programs, life-skill/leadership development activities, and training or education.

Mentoring. Each SIHRY program has arrangements with local organizations to provide

mentors for youth in need of a caring relationship with an adult.

Incentives. Gifts and special events are used at SIHRY sites as incentives to build morale and attachment to the prosocial goals of the program. Stipends for community service during summer programs are provided.

Correctional Options Demonstration Programs

**James Austin, Executive Vice
President, National Council on Crime
and Delinquency**

*Evaluation of Correctional Options
Demonstration Sites.* In 1992, the Bureau of
Justice Assistance awarded funds to four
jurisdictions to develop and implement innovative
and cost effective programs that could serve as
alternatives to traditional forms of incarceration
without jeopardizing public safety (New Hampshire
Department of Corrections, Maryland Department
of Corrections, Florida Department of Corrections,
and Alameda County Adult Probation Department).
These sites are now beginning to provide a diverse
array of drug treatment, vocational training,
educational services, health care, and intensified
forms of community supervision to offenders who
otherwise would have been incarcerated.

To determine the effectiveness of these
four pilot projects, the National Institute of Justice
(NIJ) awarded a contract to the National Council on
Crime and Delinquency (NCCD) to conduct a
process and impact evaluation of each site's
activities. The process evaluation documents the
number and types of offenders screened and
accepted by the programs, the range of services and
activities provided, program completion rates, and
the costs of these various services.

The impact evaluation will be based upon
experimental and quasi-experimental designs
established at each site to permit a rigorous testing
of what would have happened to offenders admitted
to the correctional options programs had they not
been funded. Specifically, experimental and
control cases will be tracked to answer the
following questions:

1. To what extent did the correctional
options (CO) programs divert
offenders from incarceration or
reduce their length of stay?
2. To what extent did the CO programs
impact the likelihood of recidivism?
3. Which interventions were most
effective with which offenders?

4. To what extent did the CO programs
impact public safety?
5. To what extent did the CO programs
represent a less costly form of
correctional intervention?

This presentation provides information on
the specific evaluation designs being implemented
and an analysis of issues each site has had to
overcome in designing and implementing their
programs.

**Diane G. Thompson, Program
Director, Bradenton Drug Treatment
Community**

Bradenton Drug Treatment Community.
The Florida Department of Corrections, Probation
and Parole Services, received a federal Bureau of
Justice Assistance grant for \$2.47 million to initiate
an 18-month, three-phase, drug treatment program
for offenders aged 24 and under who, without
intervention and treatment, would likely continue a
career in crime and be sentenced to prison. The
program area includes 14 Florida counties,
including: Pasco, Pinellas, Hillsborough, Polk,
Manatee, Hardee, DeSoto, Highlands, Sarasota,
Charlotte, Glades, Lee, Hendry, and Collier.

Underlying the Bradenton Drug Treatment
Community are the basic assumptions that drug
abuse is a major health and social problem in
Florida; that crime in Florida and its social costs are
unacceptably severe; that drug abuse exacerbates
the crime problem; that treatment of substance
abuse can be effective; and that treatment of drug-
dependent youthful offenders is a crucial part of the
solution to the drug and crime problem in Florida.

The program will be evaluated by the
National Council on Crime and Delinquency by
collecting data to determine the program's
effectiveness in reducing criminal recidivism, its
cost-effectiveness, and a study of the social and
personal adjustment of program participants. The
program will serve as a valuable model for
statewide implementation of the program based on
the Drug Punishment Act, passed by the Florida
legislature in 1990, but not funded due to the fiscal
crisis.

The treatment program consists of:

Phase I. Six months of intensive residential treatment in a modified therapeutic community located at a former work release center. The facility houses up to 90 probationers, with 74 males and 16 females.

Phase II. Three months of job development, employment experience, or full-time education in a community residential re-entry setting at a Florida Department of Corrections non-secure drug treatment facility. Continued random and regular drug testing and continued substance abuse programming are included as well as supervision by specially trained probation officers with reduced caseloads.

Phase III. Nine months of intensive supervision, job development, educational or vocational training, transitional housing programming, and continued outpatient substance abuse treatment that decreases in intensity as a reward for probationers as they respond to treatment and become established in the community.

The Bradenton Drug Treatment Community's effectiveness is seen as dependent on program intensity, program length, and program size. The program offers the following goals:

1. Reduction of criminal recidivism.
2. Reduction of substance abuse (with abstinence as the goal for each individual offender).
3. Development of employment skills and attainment of employment by offenders.
4. Development of a positive peer support network and on-going participation in services to maintain treatment gains.
5. Enhancement of education, self-care, and parenting skills to improve role functioning as employee, spouse, or parent.
6. Provision of more appropriate intervention for *youthful* offenders, who are not career criminals, but who, without such intervention, are likely to become career criminals or more serious offenders.

7. To provide the degree of security and discipline appropriate for the offender involved.
8. To provide diagnosis, treatment, and services (including counseling, substance abuse treatment, education, job training and placement assistance while under correctional supervision, and linkage to similar outside services), that will enable the offender to pursue a course of lawful and productive conduct after release from legal restraint.

***Daniel Ellison, New Hampshire
Department of Corrections***

Profile of the Bridge Program. Located at the Lakes Region Facility, the Bridge Program is a new pre-release program for male and female minimum custody offenders. Referrals are made from the following sources within the Department of Corrections:

1. Summit House
2. Bypass Program
3. Shock Incarceration
4. Minimum Security
5. General Population, recommended by classification

The Bridge Program has a planned average capacity of 60 men and women with the capacity to expand to 100 male and female offenders. The typical length of stay will vary between 3 to 4 ½ months, depending on individual needs. Programming includes:

1. A continuation of drug and alcohol abuse treatment.
2. Intensive focus on education to include the 4 ½-month "Transformations" vocational program.
3. Job readiness and job-seeking classes.
4. Pre-release programming, including filing motions to court and petitioning for early parole.

The selection criteria for the Bridge Program is as follows:

1. Nonviolent, and no history of violence.
2. Minimum custody status.
3. Within one year of minimum release date.

Release from the Bridge Program includes a number of supervision options:

1. High intensity surveillance.
2. Administrative home confinement.
3. Halfway house and parole.
4. Early release to standard probation/parole.

Profile of the Bypass Program. Located at the Lakes Region Facility, the Bypass Program is a new alternative path for male and female medium security offenders. Entry into the program is voluntary, but with no age or physical limitations imposed on those applying for the program. A review is conducted by the classification office, and includes assessing each offender using the following criteria:

- a. At least one year remaining on the minimum sentence.
- b. A non-violent crime, and no history of violence, including statutory rape.

The Bypass Program has a planned average capacity of fifty men and women with the average length of stay projected at 8 ½ months. However, the program is designed to be flexible, allowing shorter or longer stays based on the needs and achievements of each offender. The program is scheduled to become operational September 1, 1993, and will admit approximately 100 male and female offenders over a 12-month period.

The program is divided into three phases. The first phase is 60 days and referred to as "Modified Shock." The emphasis is on physical fitness and stress management, character

development, remedial education, and substance abuse issues.

The second phase lasts two months and emphasizes work and remedial education, with continued substance abuse programming. The offender will also participate in any remedial education he or she may need in order to participate in the "Transformations" curriculum. All offenders will be expected to improve their basic educational skills with a minimum goal of obtaining a G.E.D.

The third phase covers approximately 4 ½ months and is education-intensive. Vocational and educational skills will be taught in a "Transformations" curriculum which requires seven hours per day, five days per week (plus additional study). Traditional courses will also be offered.

Additionally, job readiness, job search skills, and the introduction to job placement services will be offered during this phase as preparation for moving to the Bridge Program.

Evaluation of Crime Prevention Programs

**Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Director,
Center for Research in Law and
Justice, University of Illinois at
Chicago**

Impact Evaluation of Community Responses to Drug Abuse. The Community Responses to Drug Abuse National Demonstration Program was funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) to create and test "effective community-wide strategies that local groups can implement to reduce drug abuse and fear and to improve the quality of life" in neighborhoods across the country. The National Institute of Justice funded a process and impact evaluation of this demonstration program, conducted by the University of Illinois at Chicago in conjunction with the Northwestern University Survey Laboratory. The process evaluation revealed that local community organizations, with technical assistance from the National Crime Prevention Council and the National Training and Information Center, were able to successfully develop and implement a wide variety of anti-drug activities with limited funding.

The impact evaluation is the focus of this presentation. Six sites were included in the impact assessment and three were the subject of a more intensive evaluation. A pretest-posttest design was used with all six sites, while a pretest-multiple posttest control group design was employed for three intensive sites. Telephone surveys were conducted with random samples of residents in the community-designated target areas.

The impact evaluation produced several encouraging findings in the "best case" programs. During the period of the evaluation, community organizations in the intensive sites were able to increase citizens' participation in anti-drug activities and increase their level of social interaction/social control in the neighborhood. These efforts (which often involved a collaborative partnership with the police) apparently yielded some positive changes: local residents gave significantly more positive evaluations of the police, reported greater satisfaction with their neighborhood as a place to live, and felt less inclined to move out of the area. However, fear of

crime, use of the neighborhood, and several crime prevention behaviors did not change, while crime reporting declined. Some individual differences between communities were noted. This presentation also includes a look at changes in all six neighborhoods over a 27-month period, where the results are more mixed.

**Janice A. Roehl, Senior Vice
President, Institute for Social
Analysis**

National Assessment of Community-Based Drug Prevention Programs. The Institute for Social Analysis is conducting a national assessment of community-based anti-drug efforts—what citizens and community groups are doing, often in concert with others, to fight neighborhood drug problems. The purpose of the assessment is to provide a national overview of the field, synthesize what is known about the nature and effectiveness of these efforts, and provide information to communities.

Following a comprehensive literature search, a national survey of community-based anti-drug efforts was conducted. The programs were identified through (1) identification by law enforcement agencies representing urban, suburban, and rural jurisdictions, (2) mailing lists of national organizations providing assistance and information to community crime and drug programs, and (3) direct mailings to known programs. Over 450 community-based programs replied to the survey, providing basic information on their organizational, community, and strategic characteristics.

A program taxonomy was developed to classify programs and select representative efforts for further study. Two of six potential dimensions were used for the taxonomy: the type of organization and nature of anti-drug activities. The community-based efforts were organized by individuals, loosely organized groups of citizens, neighborhood and block watch groups, grassroots community organizations, and large community-oriented organizations including umbrella groups. Efforts included confrontational approaches such as overt observation of drug dealing and reporting to the police, use of civil remedies to close drug

houses or evict dealers, education and prevention, assistance to families and youth, government agency monitoring, and others.

Relationships were found between the nature of the organization, anti-drug activities, and target area characteristics. Virtually all respondents claimed to work with local law enforcement. Nearly all (91 %) reported alcohol as a major community drug problem, and over 70 percent reported crack and cocaine as well. The majority of the targeted neighborhoods were reported as lower income neighborhoods, although the target areas ranged from small areas such as blocks to entire cities and counties. Two-thirds of the groups have paid staff and outside funding.

A follow-up survey to gather complete information on the project's objectives, history, substance abuse problems and strategies, neighborhood characteristics, citizen involvement, relationships with police and city agencies, and effectiveness is just beginning. The follow-up survey will involve 25 programs, 18 drawn from the taxonomy and 7 selected because they are of special interest. For example, they are among the small number of respondents who reported not working with the police or reported that their efforts were ineffective. Six exemplary programs will be visited to verify data and gather additional information.

The final products will include a report presenting a national picture of the nature and extent of community-based anti-drug efforts, case studies of potential models, and an executive summary. These are due to NIJ at the end of September 1993.

Keith Baker, Independent Evaluation Consultant

Randomization: A Poor Evaluation Design. Randomized designs are thought to be the ideal model for social program evaluations. This paper evaluates that belief, and finds that randomized designs with treatment and no treatment conditions, while desirable and useful as a theoretical model, are, in practice, a poor choice for social program evaluations. The major purported advantage of randomized designs is to control selection bias. However, what happens in randomized program evaluations is a trade-off of

one type of selection bias for another, creating the false perception that the selection bias problem is solved. Other problems of randomized evaluations are: *They are inherently invalid* for additional reasons. Both treatment providers and clients react to assignment to the experimental or control groups in ways that bias the outcome measure. Random assignment with people can only be a valid design when one of two conditions holds. Either the treatment is meaningless to the subjects, as in university psychology experiments, or double-blind conditions are met. Neither of these situations is ever likely to be found in a social service program. These problems are easily avoided in quasi-experimental designs. *Randomized evaluations have consistently failed* to produce either useful or valuable results; and *they are very costly*.

When the effects of treatment vs. no-treatment is at issue, well-designed, quasi-experimental designs are almost always superior to randomized designs. Randomized designs are possibly justified when there is randomization between alternative treatment conditions, but even then their superiority to quasi-experimental designs is not axiomatic.

Gang Violence and Delinquent Networks

Robert K. Yin, President, and June S. Sivilli, Project Director, COSMOS Corporation

Evaluation of Gang Interventions.

COSMOS Corporation is conducting a comprehensive process and impact evaluation of six gang prevention and early intervention strategies at three program sites. The evaluation emphasizes the roles of social service agencies, schools, families, peers, and community groups in the lives of high-risk youth. Gang prevention strategies target gang membership prevention, and early intervention strategies to reduce undesirable gang activities.

Methodology. The current COSMOS evaluation uses an innovative research design, bringing to the field of gang research the use of a more practical approach for evaluating complex, multi-strategy programs. The evaluation also will identify specific types of interventions which are effective for prevention and early intervention in gang involvement. The design strategy is based on the use of multiple comparisons of data to evaluate interventions. For each site, a design has been developed containing as many rival comparisons of data as possible. Certainty of the findings of the evaluation will increase with the number of comparisons used.

Each comparison will test a particular threat to validity, with the overall pattern of results leading to greater confidence in the evaluation results. For each comparison, a different source of evidence and different data categories can be used, providing flexibility for the evaluation's implementation.

The evaluation team will identify the logic underlying the interventions, collect data from multiple sources of information, use partial comparisons of claimed causal relationships, and test rival hypotheses to explain the success or failure of specific interventions. The evaluation includes the development of replication logic across sites, to produce a general theoretical explanation for successful gang membership prevention and early interventions.

Evaluation Timeframe. The project funded in October 1993 will conclude in the second quarter of FY 1994. The interventions are being monitored over an 18-month period for evidence of positive outcomes.

Status of the Project. NIJ approval for the evaluation design came in April 1993 and field work began in early June. Implementation of site-specific evaluation plans, site monitoring, and the preparation of conclusions and recommendations based on experiences within and across the sites commenced in June. Baseline data has been identified and is being monitored through December 1993 for evidence of positive outcomes.

Christine Curtis, Assistant Director, Criminal Justice Research Division, SANDAG

JUDGE Program. The San Diego County District Attorney's Office administers the Jurisdictions Unified for Drug Gang Enforcement program (JUDGE), which monitors and enforces probation conditions for drug- and gang-involved probationers. Task force members include prosecutors, probation officers, and law enforcement officers from seven municipal agencies. The program receives grant funding from the federal Bureau of Justice Assistance through the California Office of Criminal Justice Planning.

The prevalence of gangs and associated drug activity have escalated in recent years. Prior to implementation of the JUDGE program in 1988, gang and drug enforcement and prosecution efforts focused on new offenses, and not on enforcement of probation conditions for those already sentenced. The JUDGE program targets juvenile and adult street gang members on probation for narcotics offenses, and others involved in the use, sale, and distribution of narcotics. Task force law enforcement and probation officers enforce conditions of probation and drug laws. In addition, experienced JUDGE deputy district attorneys provide prosecution for probation violations and new offenses involving targeted offenders. The goal of the program is to provide real consequences for violations in order to reduce violence and related crimes.

With a research grant from NIJ, the SANDAG Criminal Justice Research Division is conducting a two-year study to examine the extent to which the JUDGE task force holds gang and drug-involved probationers accountable for their actions. It assesses the effects of the program on drug activity and other offenses committed by targeted probationers.

The evaluation includes a comparison of probation violations and offense rates for a sample of juvenile probationers targeted by JUDGE and a comparable group of juveniles on probation prior to the JUDGE program. Data are compiled on the juveniles' sociodemographic characteristics, gang affiliation, school attendance, employment, criminal history, offenses resulting in probation supervision, probation conditions, contacts by JUDGE officers, performance during probation, and new offenses after probation. In addition, interviews are conducted with JUDGE staff and criminal justice personnel in agencies that interact with JUDGE.

The presentation focuses on results of interviews with criminal justice personnel regarding the organizational structure and administrative procedures of the JUDGE program; operational activities; and issues critical to the successful operation of the task force, such as coordination among agencies, training, availability of resources, and staff morale.

***Deborah Lamm Weisel, Senior
Research Associate, Police
Executive Research Forum***

Gangs and Organized Crime Groups. Little is known about the relationships between criminal youth gangs and traditional or newly emerging organized crime groups. This presentation includes an overview of a 24-month project being conducted to identify and develop an understanding of the nature of these relationships. The presentation will highlight what is currently known about the nature of links between various crime groups and describe methods being used to conduct the study. These methods include an extensive review of the literature; a national mail survey to identify police perceptions of the nature of criminal group relationships; structured interviews with law enforcement and other officials in two cities impacted by chronic gang problems;

and field studies consisting of interviews with gang members about the nature of criminal gangs, their structure, and changes over time, such as their possible transition into groups that more closely resemble traditional organized crime.

Assessing Rural Enforcement Efforts

**Michael F. Cahn, President, Queues
Enforth Development**

Rural Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) Evaluation. Up to now, community policing experiments have been restricted to populous urban jurisdictions, served by large law enforcement agencies. These include the eight-site urban INOP initiatives funded in 1990 by BJA, and subsequently evaluated by the Vera Institute. The evaluations leave unanswered the question of how effective the INOP approach can be in rural jurisdictions. As an initial response to this knowledge gap, in 1992 BJA funded a four-site (Caldwell, ID; Fort Pierce, FL; Newton County, IN; and Richmond, ME) rural innovative neighborhood-oriented policing program; and Q.E.D. was awarded an NIJ grant to perform the evaluation. Evaluation results can be expected in the second quarter of 1994.

Information about rural programs has neither been widely documented nor disseminated. Not surprisingly, rural efforts have not been subjected to the types of evaluations described in the justice literature. This evaluation will address several research questions. First, what forms does INOP take when implemented in rural jurisdictions? Second, are such programs effective, and what particularly rural characteristics contribute to or detract from their success? Finally, how do rural INOP programs fit into the broader context of *all* community policing programs; and how do they compare with the *urban* INOP programs? Q.E.D. will assess a range of neighborhood-oriented policing research questions in the course of the evaluation. For example, a resident population that is small or cohesive enough to have many friends or relatives for neighbors might be expected to enhance the impact of a neighborhood-oriented policing program.

Q.E.D. will observe virtually the entire program implementation process and assess the program planning process, initial expectations, roles and resource commitments of the participants and stakeholders, and the process of selecting program target areas. Measuring the impacts of the program on neighborhood safety and quality of life will be more elusive. However, it should be

feasible to detect the presence or absence of critical neighborhood problems, and to assess program awareness, feelings of stakeholders toward their neighborhoods, and concerns about both crime and drugs.

Several issues have emerged with the projects to date. First, there were lengthy start-up delays, as the sites had difficulty conducting a needs assessment, and each site first conducted a survey. There are also data divergence problems. The target area matches reporting areas at only one site, and there is a mix of manual and computerized recordkeeping systems across the sites. Finally, the sites are attempting to resolve issues related to the use and roles of advisory groups.

**Ralph Weisheit, Professor of Criminal
Justice, Illinois State University**

Policing in Rural Areas. This study focuses on rural crime and rural policing, using multiple methods and multiple data sources. Running from October 1, 1992, through September 30, 1993, the study has three major tasks: (1) Locate and summarize the relevant literature. (2) Locate and catalog existing data sets that include measures of crime and of rurality, and conduct a secondary analysis on selected data sets. (3) Receive direct input from rural police regarding issues and concerns, utilizing focus groups, telephone interviews, and mail surveys. To date, much of the work on a comprehensive literature review has been completed, a number of data sets have been ordered through the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research, each of the 50 statistical analysis centers in the U.S. has been contacted about data on rural crime, some telephone interviews have been conducted, and a focus group with rural sheriffs has been conducted.

While the existing literature on rural crime is sparse compared with that on urban areas, a number of studies have included rural populations. Unfortunately, much of this information is fragmented, often presented only as an aside within the larger discussion. Throughout the study, attention is focused on how rural culture and geography shape crime and policing. This larger context ties together much of the scattered

information about rural crime and justice into a coherent whole.

The literature and research provide substantial evidence that rural culture and rural crime are distinct from urban crime and culture in significant ways. It is also clear that urban models for dealing with crime often make little sense in rural areas. In addition, the study has identified three false assumptions on which policy and research on rural crime are based. These are: (1) the Magnitude Assumption, which presumes that differences between rural and urban processes are essentially a matter of sizes, numbers or amounts—that rural and urban problems differ in quantity but not in quality; (2) the Homogeneity Assumption, which presumes that all rural areas are alike and that what is true of one rural area will be generally true of all rural areas; and (3) the Implicit Definition Assumption, which presumes that “rural” and “urban” are simple and familiar categories that need little explanation. It is presumed that everyone knows what “rural” means and that everyone defines it in pretty much the same terms. This study explains why these three assumptions are false, and the implications for policies regarding rural crime and rural police.

Several findings to date highlight the differences between rural and urban policing. Rural residents have high expectations that police will deal with youth. They also expect police services such as dealing with lockouts and barking dogs. Rural police and residents both emphasize crime prevention and are very supportive of the DARE program. Rural crime problems include hate crimes and posse comitatus; and alcohol and drug issues include drug production (marijuana, methamphetamine, designer drugs) and the use of rural areas as drug transshipment points. It is also important to find what can be learned from rural areas on issues related to guns and poverty.

Roy A. Holt, Sr., Director, Statistical Analysis Center, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

Rural Drug Task Forces in Arizona. By any definition, Arizona can be considered a rural state. With slightly over 4 million people living on 113,504 square miles, the state has an average population density of only 36 people per square mile. However, when one considers that nearly 75

percent of the population live within two counties, which make up only 16 percent of the total land area, the “ruralness” of the state in terms of population density becomes even more apparent. When these rural demographics are combined with the state’s diverse geographic profile, ranging from Sonoran desert to alpine, and its location on the Mexican border, one can immediately recognize the potential difficulties facing multi-jurisdictional drug task forces operating in the state.

For example, Cochise County (population 100,000), which borders Mexico and New Mexico, is a major cocaine transshipment area, and planes carrying drugs stop right at the Mexican border. The county is said to have four industries: ranching, farming, the military, and drug smuggling.

Law enforcement in Arizona has responded to these challenges by developing several different organizational and operational models for drug task forces, depending on the environmental factors that exist in the task force’s area of operation. The staff of the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission has developed an evaluation strategy which recognizes that each of the funded task forces operates in a relatively unique environment. The strategy takes this diversity into account. Although uniform quantitative data are collected from all task forces, the relative success of a task force is measured in more qualitative terms based on the ability of the task force to meet its individual goals and objectives as set out in its application for funding.

Evaluating the Impact of Changes in the Criminal Justice System

John "Jack" O'Connell, Director, Delaware Statistical Analysis Center, and Jorge Rodriguez, Research Specialist, Delaware Statistical Analysis Center

Impact of Drug Laws on the Criminal Justice System. This presentation centers on Delaware's drug trafficking statute. Research will be presented from a project finished in May 1993 on mandatory sentencing, from ongoing research on illicit drugs in Delaware, and on the impact that anti-drug legislation has had on Delaware's criminal justice system.

Drug trafficking, 16 Del. C. § 4753A, is a mandatory statute which has received considerable attention within the Delaware criminal justice system and from the press. Frequently the debate centers on a 1989 revision to § 4753A. On July 13, 1989, SB 142 lowered the weight ranges (thresholds used to determine whether the trafficker is sentenced to 3, 5, or 15 years) for drug trafficking. The lowered weight ranges have had the effect of increasing the pressure on DOC sentenced beds, while there was no noticeable decrease in illegal drug activity in the state.

Findings will be presented on empirical research on the impact of the illicit drug trade in Delaware, as well as the impact that drug trafficking mandatory sentences have had on the criminal justice system. The presentation will close with a discussion of the political implications brought about by an increasing sentenced drug offender population in the face of no noticeable decrease in illegal drug activity.

Max Schlueter, Director, Vermont Criminal Justice Center

Using Offender Based Transaction System (OBTS) Data to Measure Drug Control Program Impacts. Oftentimes analysts do not have the time or the resources to conduct detailed evaluations for projects which are designed to improve criminal justice procedures. Using drug task forces as an example, this presentation discusses a method by

which Offender Based Transaction System (OBTS) data can be used to provide preliminary program feedback, by monitoring changes in case flow for cases from arraignment to disposition. Though OBTS case outcome analysis cannot provide definitive conclusions about program impact, this presentation will demonstrate that it can be used to provide a rough diagnostic measure and to highlight areas which warrant further investigation. The types of variables required for case outcome analysis and methods to present the results of the analysis graphically are also discussed.

Allan R. Barnes, Director, Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit

Concepts of Change. The presentation focused on the concept of change in a research setting. Various approaches capture change at a practical level, using drug usage as an example.

The discussion of change begins with its meaning. The verb "change" can refer to such varying concepts as:

- Modify (minor change)
- Alter (partial and noticeable change)
- Transform (different form results, and thus, different function)
- Convert (different function)
- Vary (intermittent change)
- Replace (substitute)

Studying change depends upon one's point of view about how the world operates. If research views the world from a mechanical perspective, it will emphasize the search for causal law, collection of data, and positivism. If one takes a more ideographic view (i.e., no laws, reasons for specific instance), one looks for the creators of data: a classical perspective.

Research today approaches change from the perspective of a mechanical universe. This entails demonstrating relationship, establishing time order, eliminating rival causal factors. It also includes consideration of error, which may come

from: random error, poor use of good measuring device, good use of poor measuring device (e.g., UCR), time factors, such as differing units' size or unclear time order.

Research begins with development of a theory to explain change. Theories, as their general purpose:

- Describe what is different
- Classify (type of difference)
- Explain (how something occurred)
- Predict (factors associated with change)
- Control (prevent change)

A key issue in change research is its measurement. Measurement can be made of: the amount of change, change variance (e.g., sentencing), the rate of change, and the duration of change (time to do).

The final task is to empirically describe change. This can be done by statistical measurements or by using qualitative descriptors.

In sum, we need to focus on proper time intervals for change (how long it takes), operational definitions of change (enabling replication), and significant measures of change.

**Thomas F. Rich, Senior Analyst,
Queues Enforth Development**

Evaluation of State Criminal History Systems: Status Report on the Criminal History Records Improvement Evaluation and Guide Study. The United States Department of Justice has embarked on a multi-faceted effort to improve the quality of state criminal history records. A key component of this effort is a \$27 million, multi-year Criminal History Record Improvement (CHRI) program, administered by the Department's Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS). It is designed to fund data quality improvement projects at various state and local agencies responsible for collecting or contributing to criminal history files. More specifically, the three overall goals of the CHRI program are to: (1) enhance state criminal history records in order to accurately identify convicted

felons; (2) meet the new FBI/BJS voluntary reporting standards for identifying such individuals; and (3) improve the quality and timeliness of criminal history record information. All 50 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana islands are participating in the CHRI program.

Queues Enforth Development (Q.E.D.), Inc., is under contract to the BJA to conduct an overall impact evaluation of the CHRI program and to develop a guide that can assist states in improving data quality. The two-year study, which is entitled Criminal History Record Improvement Evaluation and Guide (CHRIEG), began in March 1992.

The history of this project begins with 1988 legislation requiring verification of firearm purchase eligibility. This resulted, in 1989, in a report on identifying felons purchasing guns. A 1990 report focused on identifying other ineligible. In 1990, a five-percent set aside program for funding record improvement was established. In 1991, the FBI issued voluntary reporting standards for the states. The same year BJS began the Data Quality Survey and BJA issued guidelines for improving data quality. In 1992, the evaluation grant was awarded.

At present, there have been 80 awards in all 50 states. The project strategy encompasses grants for planning and assessment studies, training, procedural improvements, automation, electronic data sharing, data entry/conversion, and felon identification.

The evaluation study involves telephone interviews, site visits to 12 states, intensive case studies in four states, and two reports: an evaluation report, and a guide to be completed in April 1994. The evaluation findings show that there are 200 strategies in place in the states, CHRI is leveraging state and other funds, and electronic data-sharing strategies can resolve systemic reporting problems. States' ability to identify felons varies significantly. Fingerprint card submissions to FBI are up 23 percent. Data entry conversion improves completeness of information, but does not resolve systemic reporting problems.

The states' focus is shifting to data accessibility and utility. Overall, the states have resolved most reporting problems. There is

increased awareness of the importance of data quality, and there is improved inter-agency cooperation, especially with the courts.

The project guide uses a data questionnaire to provide its focus. Specifically, this gives information on the relative importance of data quality issues and the relative effectiveness of improvement strategies.

To date, 42 states have responded. They have identified 36 data quality issues, identified the relative importance of each issue, and reported the degree to which each issue remains a problem. The respondents have also identified 35 problem resolution strategies, the relative utility of each strategy, and the degree to which each strategy has been implemented.

Narcotics Enforcement

**Terence Dunworth, Senior
Operations Research Specialist,
RAND**

Drugs and Crime in Public Housing. This presentation summarizes the results of our study which was completed in January 1993. This study provides quantitative estimates of crime rates in selected, large, conventional public housing developments in three cities: Los Angeles, CA, Phoenix, AZ, and Washington, D.C. The study also provides parallel estimates of crime rates for a set of "comparison areas" of private housing geographically close to, and with some demographic similarities to, public housing developments. Estimates for both housing developments and comparison areas are based on the geocoding and analysis of police department databases in each city.

Major findings of the study include:

In many major metropolitan areas, existing data maintained by police departments can be used to create estimates of crime rates in public housing. Such estimates can be prepared in cities where police maintain incident-based computerized records that describe the location, offense type, and date of each reported crime and arrest.

Rates of violent and drug offenses in the selected housing developments were very high. These rates were often multiples of the citywide rates, and were also higher than rates in nearby comparison areas.

Rates of reported property offenses were not substantially higher in the selected housing developments than in the comparison areas, nor were they substantially higher than the citywide rates.

There was substantial variation in crime rates among housing developments within each city.

Police activity, as measured by arrests, was roughly proportional to reported crime in public housing developments for most of the developments studied.

In addition to the implications of these findings, the presentation also discussed tools and techniques that RAND has developed to extend the geocoding methodologies used in this study, and their potential for informing future analyses of crime and crime control in public housing.

**David Hayeslip, Program Manager,
Evaluation Division, National
Institute of Justice**

Baltimore County Community Oriented Drug Enforcement. In 1990, the Baltimore County (MD) Police Department implemented an innovative approach to narcotics enforcement known as Community Oriented Drug Enforcement (CODE). As originally conceived, CODE was to combine traditional narcotics enforcement tactics with community focused programs that responded directly to local community input. This evaluation examined the implementation and evolution of this program over two distinct phases from 1990 through 1991. In addition, the evaluation examined potential impacts of this program included: quality of arrests, community resident attitudes and perceptions, crime, and drug market locations. It was found that this program, which received substantial support from all levels within the department, evolved from a decentralized innovative approach to a more traditional centralized enforcement program. The reasons for this change and the implications are discussed. In terms of impact, it appeared that CODE resulted in "good" arrests, crime decreased at disproportionate levels in the target areas as compared to precincts as a whole. There was also variation in citizen attitude over the two phases. Although positive changes were noted in areas receiving more community oriented strategies, the effect on drug market locations was decidedly mixed.

**Janet Rothacker, Associate Program
Analyst, New York State Division of
Criminal Justice Services**

Evaluating Police/Community Partnership in Combating Drug Crime in New York State. The purpose of this project is to examine the role of the community and law enforcement partnership in New York State's COMBAT program

(Coordinated, Omnibus, Municipally-based, Anti-drug Teams). COMBAT is a program currently in operation in thirteen sites in New York as part of the State's anti-drug strategy. One of the key components of the program is a partnership between the community and law enforcement agencies in identifying and addressing drug-crime issues in their communities. This project seeks to add to the available body of knowledge regarding the impact of implementing a community and law enforcement strategy to address drug crime.

The evaluation project, scheduled to begin in September 1993, is based on a generic COMBAT program model constructed by the state's Bureau of Research and Evaluation earlier this year. That model posts three components of the program: *rationale*, i.e., that a local approach, eradication of street level drug markets, holds the greatest promise in the short term of reducing drug crime; *strategy*, i.e., that a partnership between the community and law enforcement is effective in addressing drug crime; and *goals*, based on specific objectives in each of the thirteen sites. This evaluation project compares two sites which strongly embrace the partnership strategy, to two which do not embrace that strategy.

Over the course of the two-year project (scheduled for completion in September 1993), data reflecting implementation and impact results of the four sites' activities, objectives, strategies, and goal attainment were collected from official records and from a selected household survey. Comparative analyses of these data will assist in determining the role of the community and law enforcement partnership in reducing drug crime.

Severin L. Sorensen, President, Drug Control Policy Group

Microeconomics Means to Combat Drugs in Public Housing: Case Studies on the Structure, Conduct, and Performance of Illegal Drug Markets in U.S. Public Housing. Concepts of structure, conduct, and performance developed in microeconomics theory can provide many positive in-roads for proactive policy and procedural interventions for public housing authority administrators seeking to combat illegal drugs in public housing. Proactive policy and procedural measures can alter a drug market's structural composition and serve to disrupt, displace, and

destroy opportunities for drug markets within public housing. The specific performance outcome of a housing authority administrator's drug control plan depends largely on their conduct, which is an outcome of their initial (and revisited) assessment(s) of the structure of their site-specific drug markets. Poor assessments lead to poor conduct, and poor conduct leads to poor performance. Consequently, an observed need in the public housing arena is a tool or process to assist public housing authority administrators ascertain specific drug market structures in order to combat them.

When a public housing authority's illegal drug market structure is accurately identified, many methods are available to attack the structural composition of these vice markets. Recent case studies conducted by this researcher on housing authority practices to combat drugs in public housing have included: coordination – residents, community, police, school, and health liaison; drug enforcement—uniformed patrols, narcotics enforcement, historical investigations, surveillance, etc.; environmental design—crime prevention, defensible space, and other space utilization measures, etc.; identification—CCTV, resident I.D., and vehicle registration programs, etc.; physical measures—fencing, controlled entry/exits, and guard shacks, etc.; policy improvements—modifying housing applicant screening measures, lease, and grievance procedures, etc.; procedural improvements—changing maintenance operations and unit inspection processes, etc.; security measures—increased security personnel and safety measures, etc.; and symbolic measures—posting of housing authority notices, rules, and signs.

As a HUD technical assistance consultant, the researcher conducts situation assessments on the structure and conduct of drug markets operating on the premises of public housing in urban, suburban, and rural settings. Situation assessments conducted in 1993 have included work in Arkansas, Connecticut, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Washington. The immediate goal of this research activity is to help local housing authorities more effectively identify the structure of illegal drug markets in order to more successfully prepare a strategy to affect these markets. The overriding goal of this research is to improve local housing authorities' performance in fostering environments that promote resident health, safety, and general well-being.

TUESDAY, JUNE 29, 1993

Drug Market Analysis and Problem-Oriented Policing

Frank Gajewski, Captain, Jersey City, New Jersey, Police Department, and David Weisburd, Director, Center for Crime Prevention Studies, Rutgers University

The Drug Market Analysis Project in Jersey City. The Drug Market Analysis Project in Jersey City commenced in May 1990, and is presently in its final phase. The project sought to implement computer mapping technologies to create a systematic method for identifying and analyzing drug markets, and to develop and evaluate an innovative enforcement strategy under experimental conditions. The presenters discussed some of our key findings regarding the spatial distribution and nature of street level drug market activity in Jersey City, as well as implementation issues and problems that were encountered in their evaluation.

Jacqueline Cohen, Associate Director, Urban Systems Institute

Pittsburgh DMAP. The Pittsburgh DMAP project is a two pronged effort: on one hand, it develops new information technologies for police; and, on the other hand, it evaluates the effectiveness of specific enforcement strategies directed against drug trafficking activity. The technology development component involves producing advanced computer capabilities that will provide local police with means to more effectively utilize routinely collected police data on drug trafficking activities. The centerpiece of the system involves computer generated maps and accompanying reports that can trace drug activities over time and location. Traditional police "pin" maps display the location and volume of drug trafficking activities on street maps, and "area" maps compare activity levels across larger geographic units like neighborhoods and police patrol sectors.

The evaluation component makes use of these new capabilities in the implementation and assessment of law enforcement strategies targeted against local street-level drug sales. Two law enforcement strategies are being assessed in the evaluation component of the project: (1) a crackdown involving highly visible police presence over an extended period of time in one neighborhood plagued by drug trafficking and related violence; and (2) intensive enforcement, primarily through police raids, directed against drug trafficking in and around selected nuisance bars.

Preliminary analysis suggests marked reductions in drug trafficking in targeted areas. Sustained reduction in drug dealing is possible in areas characterized by relatively isolated markets. When other viable market areas are nearby, however, shutting down one market usually displaces the activity to other nearby locations. In these cases, the data retrieval and mapping capabilities of the Pittsburgh DMAP information system are particularly useful to the police by providing early detection capabilities for displaced activity.

Faye S. Taxman, Principal Associate, Institute for Law and Justice

Overview of the Drug Market Analysis Program. The Drug Market Analysis (DMA) Program is a major initiative by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to assist law enforcement agencies in developing and implementing drug mapping information systems to assist in street-level enforcement efforts. The five police departments participating in the program (San Diego, CA; Pittsburgh, PA; Jersey City, NJ; Hartford, CT; and Kansas City, MO) have made significant progress in developing drug mapping information systems and in employing the results to improve enforcement tactics. Each police department teamed with a research organization for assistance in development of the systems and in

implementing rigorous field tests to determine the effectiveness of different street-level enforcement tactics on drug trafficking.

The Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ) has been awarded a grant by NIJ to develop a series of publications synthesizing the experiences of the five sites with their DMA projects. ILJ's tasks include extensive interviews and surveys at all five sites, assessments of the role of DMA information systems in police departments, recommendations for training requirements for DMA systems, development of a clearinghouse for dissemination of information about mapping systems, and development of a distribution plan to transfer the DMA model to state and local agencies.

As of this date, all sites have been visited and information has been collected on the successes of the DMA projects. Preliminary findings indicate that the project has improved problem solving capabilities of police agencies. Technological tools have been developed to assist police agencies in visually displaying crime data. From this, police agencies can use the information to develop law enforcement strategies.

Evaluation of School-Based Programs

William Modzeleski, Director, Drug Planning, U.S. Department of Education

There is a great need for more and improved evaluations of school-based programs to prevent violence and drug use. The diversity among today's school-aged children must be considered. Many have two parents who work, or come from single parent families. Supervision and administrative problems are different today, with more verbal abuse of teachers, fights and assaults, and weapons in schools. The country's six national educational goals cannot be achieved without ensuring safety. Three million thefts and violent crimes occur each year on or near school grounds; 7 percent of school children have been injured with a weapon; there have been at least 30 deaths in or around schools; and 20 percent of children carry weapons, many of which enter the schools.

The Department of Education (DOE) is now trying to collect more data on weapons and incidents of violence in school, and has reached several conclusions. Currently, there is no system for measuring the extent of school crime and violence nationwide. The effects of crime and violence often extend beyond the victims and perpetrators to families, teachers, students, and the community. Comprehensive programs that address a variety of risk factors are needed. Conflict mediation and peer mediation program evaluations are inconclusive. Finally, the schools alone cannot address the problems of drugs and violence.

There are several things that can be done. In June 1993, legislation regarding school crime was introduced that would provide for data collection and program funding. The Clinton administration budget earmarks \$75 million for school crime programs, with two-thirds of the funds proposed for prevention and one-third for security. The DOE is encouraging schools to conduct evaluations, and an evaluation handbook is available from the DOE clearinghouse. The DOE is also cooperating with the Department of Justice (DOJ) through Project SMART, and schools located in the DOJ Weed and Seed sites are beginning to provide "safe havens" for youth by remaining open after 3:00 PM to provide

recreation, education, and services. DOE is also reviewing the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, and will recommend changes to make the Act more responsive to local and state needs.

Robert Long, Program Director, School Management and Resource Teams (SMART)

SMART Program. The goal of the SMART Program is to promote safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools in 20 new pilot sites during the 1992-93 school year. Materials will be published that provide implementation direction and assistance during Phase I and Phase II of the program. The SMART Program host sites will provide examples of successful strategies and programs designed to create safe and drug-free schools. SMART is funded by NIJ and the Department of Education.

The SMART Program is implemented in two phases. Phase I develops an information management system that contains data on school disruption patterns. School systems throughout the country collect behavior data in various ways. Most school districts in the country do not have a comprehensive database that contains accurate and complete discipline data. Discipline policies in school districts typically do not clearly distinguish between law violations and discipline offenses. It is extremely difficult to find comprehensive reports of school discipline data by numbers of incidents and types of incidents. Unreliable or unavailable data create a void in reporting trends of school violence and related discipline problems on a local, regional, and national basis. Without a systematic procedure for collecting, storing, and reporting discipline data, school systems are often unable to meet due process guidelines. Such a procedure begins with the identification and definitions of student misconduct incidents. The "Incident Profiling System (IPS)," an analytic tool adapted from crime analysis techniques for use in schools, becomes the core of the SMART Program.

The "SMART Program District Safety Self-Audit" completed by a school district provides direction for completing this task. A SMART Program representative assists the school district as

it selects and defines specific incidents to track. Initial steps in the development of an IPS involve classifying and profiling a full range of misbehaviors, separating discipline violations from law violations, and providing computerized records of incidents occurring in schools. This process takes a year in some schools. Further, it brings out areas where discipline has been applied inconsistently (e.g., with poor and minority students). School committees of administrators, teachers, parents, custodians, and others work through the process.

After schools have collected incident data, Phase II begins with the organization of the following:

- *School Teams:* Monthly meetings structured to address specific "profiled" problems and intervention strategies.
- *District Teams:* Analysis of incident data for recommended policy changes, in-service activities, and resource allocations.
- *Interagency Teams:* Cooperative efforts among education, law enforcement, and other community agencies serving youth for the purpose of developing coordinated policies.

The SMART Program creates a data system to help identify behavior problems and better evaluate district and local school intervention efforts. It focuses on the process, rather than the solutions to problems, since solutions vary with each school and from school district to school district. However, part of the SMART strategy is to encourage examination of and changes in school culture; outreach to community agencies, better staff deployment, and a more accurate assessment of in-service training needs. Anaheim, California, and Norfolk, Virginia, are serving as model resource sites.

Ann Madison, Director, Human Relations and Staff Development, Norfolk, Virginia, School District

SMART in Norfolk Public Schools. The implementation of the SMART process has required Norfolk Public Schools to change and modify certain disciplinary rules, regulations, policies, and procedures. Norfolk Public Schools now collects and reports discipline data in such a way that it allows a team to engage monthly in data analysis and strategic planning sessions, with a goal of incident reduction. The underlying belief is that discipline is everyone's responsibility and that schools are taking a proactive stand toward discipline by employing prevention and early intervention techniques and strategies to create and maintain safe, orderly, and drug free schools.

During the data analysis phase, Norfolk found an increase in middle school discipline problems (grades 6 through 8). Typically, 95 percent of the problems were related to behaviors that were not law violations. Middle schools usually had three times as many incidents as high schools. Implementation of SMART in eight pilot schools resulted in a decline in school suspensions, a rise in achievement, and an increase in the number of lesser incidents reported. One elementary school (Larchmont) saw a decrease in conflicts from 26 to 2 per month after one and one-half years. Program components now include the award of mini-grants to schools for efforts to increase esteem, encourage good behavior, and prevent conflict; rewards such as banners and pins for participating in SMART; the training of 4th and 5th graders as conflict managers; the incorporation of conflict resolution exercises into regular lessons; and changes in suspension policies. Other activities include the development of videotapes, the development of anger management strategies by university students; and the reporting of SMART data by school transportation personnel as well as teachers.

Boot Camps

Roberta Cronin, Principal Research Scientist, American Institutes for Research

Evaluation of Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders. This study evaluates the implementation and impact of three boot camp programs designed for juvenile offenders in Cleveland, OH; Mobile, AL; and Denver, CO. The study combines two methods. Case studies are being used to describe the origin of each program, organizational structure, staffing, military structure, and treatment components. An experimental design will randomly assign youth to boot camp and control programs (during the period from April 1992 through September 1993) and then be used to assess differential recidivism rates.

Individual and program-level data are being collected by a variety of instruments administered at different program stages: at intake, and at the completion of the three-month residential phase. Demographic characteristics, delinquency histories, educational attainment, and work experience of boot camp participants and their controls are also collected. Program-level measures include amount and quality of services delivered, shifts in program procedures, obstacles encountered, and costs.

Case study findings of the first year of program operation will be presented. This discussion will describe the backgrounds and characteristics of program participants, the range of treatment services provided by the programs, staffing levels and qualifications, how the boot camp programs are structured within the local criminal justice system, and lessons learned. The experimental design being used to assess program impact and the outcome measures used for the analyses also will be described. A final report is expected in Spring 1994.

W. Hardy Rauch, Director, Standards and Accreditation Division, American Correctional Association

National Standards for Adult and Juvenile Correctional Boot Camps. The ACA staff works

closely with the National Institute of Justice to ensure overall compliance with the project goal: to establish professional standards for both adult and juvenile correctional boot camps. ACA is accomplishing this goal by appointing an advisory board consisting of eight national leaders administering boot camp programs, to gain information not available to project staff; gathering information from existing adult and juvenile boot camp programs through structured questionnaires; and conducting periodic meetings to review project status and refine goals approved by NIJ.

During the first phase of this project, considerable time is spent on developing a clear understanding of the adult and juvenile boot camp programs; common denominators in each of the programs; differences and variations in each of the programs; program philosophy; basic components; evaluation criteria; and policies, procedures, and practices that are widely used in adult and juvenile boot camp programs.

ACA staff research and review existing literature, professional practices, and currently used operations manuals in various jurisdictions. In addition, information is collected from military "basic training" programs where boot camps originated.

During the second phase, draft formats and outlines for standards developed in the first stage are circulated to national correctional leaders, correctional professionals, and members of the ACA Standards Committee for review and critique. In addition, ACA will conduct a public hearing to obtain input from all concerned parties. Upon completion of the draft standards, five sites will be selected for field testing of state and local, adult and juvenile boot camp programs.

ACA received the grant award in October 1992. Since then, a mailing list of all existing adult and juvenile correctional boot camp programs has been updated. Letters were mailed out with a current list of boot camp (or similar) programs to corrections directors requesting current information on boot camp programs within their purview.

ACA received copies of current program descriptions, operations manuals, mission

statements, policies and procedures, and rules and regulations from the 28 boot camp programs. ACA is conducting a literature search of books, articles, research reports, evaluation reports, and monographs dealing with correctional boot camps. Based on ACA's research, there are 65 adult boot camp programs in 27 states, 19 juvenile boot camp (or similar) programs in eight states, and two federal boot camps in two states. From the information gathered, ACA will develop a comprehensive base to develop the standards. The project should be completed by July 31, 1994.

Court Responses to Drug Cases

H. Clifton Grandy, Senior Staff Attorney, National Center for State Courts

Processing of Drug Cases in Limited Jurisdiction Cases. Increasing numbers of courts of limited jurisdiction are now disposing of felony cases. This phenomenon is one way courts have responded to the dramatic rise in their criminal caseloads. The rationale behind this response is simple. Some felony cases clearly are ready to be disposed before they reach the later, traditional event in the general jurisdiction court. Most of these dispositions are guilty pleas. It follows that these cases can be disposed by plea long before they reach the general jurisdiction court. The resources of both the limited jurisdiction and the general jurisdiction court can be saved by having the limited jurisdiction court accept the felony plea, as well as by sentencing. This response is referred to as a "felony disposition program." A felony disposition program is a set of procedures whereby a limited jurisdiction court processes felony cases from filing to sentencing.

These modern limited jurisdiction courts are not bound by the conventions that distinguish the different levels and functions of trial courts and the judges who preside in them. These courts are active differentiators of their criminal cases—they are not leaving case differentiation solely to the prosecuting agency. The collateral benefits of a felony disposition program include, but are not limited to, budgetary savings.

This research was a further inquiry into a particular method used in limited jurisdiction courts to process felony cases. This method was examined in terms of process, structure, communication, support, and cooperation. The focus of this research was on the potential effect of a felony disposition program on the limited jurisdiction court.

What impact does processing and disposing felony cases in limited jurisdiction courts have on that court's handling of misdemeanor and other cases? What structure, process, and procedures are used by limited and general jurisdiction courts in a program to dispose felony cases in the limited jurisdiction court? In order for a limited jurisdiction court or judge to dispose felony cases, what changes must the participants in the justice system make? What is the impact of the felony disposition program on personnel, information systems, and facilities in

the two levels of trial court? Are there real or perceived problems in the quality of justice that result from shifting the responsibility for handling some felony cases from the general jurisdiction court to the limited jurisdiction court?

Drug cases in limited courts require coordination of alternatives, information sharing between courts, and structuring discovery to facilitate plea negotiation. Thus, speeding up the felony disposition process through limited courts requires information exchange, early case evaluation, certainty in sentencing, and commitment of both courts' judges and staff.

The study found three models of limited court roles in felony cases:

- Limited court judge who accepts felony plea and sentences.
- General court judge who acts as a limited court judge.
- Pleas are accepted by the limited court judge; sentencing occurs in general jurisdiction court.

Four jurisdictional examples of applications were presented: New York City, NY; San Diego, CA; Grand Rapids, MI; and Sacramento, CA. Each jurisdiction showed different program characteristics.

For the New York City Criminal Court, the drug court program implementation involved:

- Waiver of defendant right to indictment and jury trial
- Plea on information
- Cross-assignment of judge as Supreme Court judge
- Hearing of Queens County cases in Supreme Court in the afternoon, with different staff
- Hearing of Manhattan County cases in Supreme Court with both staff attending.

The drug court program in San Diego, California, involved court consolidation:

- Added readiness conference after arraignment

- Plea offering by DA, with judge indicating probable sentence
- Plea acceptance in the afternoon
- PSI required within 20 days
- Limited cross-assignment of judges to handle all case elements
- Experienced prosecutors

The Grand Rapids drug court program called for a certified plea. This was characterized by

- Telling the defendant the name of the sentencing judge before plea
- Cross-assigned district judge to take the plea
- Required PSIs

The Sacramento, California, drug court program was based upon assignment of a Superior Court judge to a limited court role. This was typified by

- Sending the case to Superior Court after arraignment (before preliminary hearing)
- Entering the plea
- Absence of continuance policy which may hold up transfer

Improving Court Response to Drug Cases: A Program Assessment. The project is making an assessment of the state court response to the drug caseload. Given the domination of drug cases among judicial workloads in most state courts, the literature on court response is surprisingly scarce. There has been ample documentation of the scale of the demand on the courts.

The volume of drug cases has prompted some courts to experiment with approaches to caseload management. Judicial officials have tested the use of differential case management. Close coordination between courts and other criminal justice components exists in a program titled Comprehensive Adjudication of Drug Arrestees (CADA). The use of limited jurisdiction courts to make early disposition of felony drug cases, specialized courts, and proceedings for drug cases. Courts have also experimented with similar techniques on their own initiative, for example, a specialized court proceeding for drug cases in New York City.

This assessment of the court response to drug cases is being conducted at a time when some state court officials have not been content to wring their hands over the drug problem, but have instead aggressively experimented with new approaches to managing their swollen caseloads.

Examination of other programs developed through local initiative will broaden the perspective to pretrial offender programs, diversion programs, and intermediate sanctions for post-conviction.

The research is being carried out in three parts. First, a major effort is being made to identify the full range of programs developed by courts to deal with drug cases. Second, information will be collected from the courts on the organization and operation of their programs. Third, the strengths and weaknesses of each type of program will be analyzed.

At this point, approximately 300 court programs that address drug caseload or the drug-involved offender, including court-based TASC programs, have been identified.

The next steps to be taken in the project are to verify information about each program through a written survey and to choose sites for intensive study.

It is intended that the results of this study will affect the way in which judicial policymakers and practitioners develop new programs and adjust old ones to respond appropriately and effectively to the drug crisis in the courts. While this program assessment is primarily descriptive, it must address the issue of the quality of the evidence in order to assess the effectiveness of the program. This assessment of the evidence will be important to the research community.

Susan Turner, Project Manager, RAND

Evaluation of Structured Fines. In 1991, the Bureau of Justice Assistance provided funding for a nationwide "Structured Fines Demonstration Project." The structured fine concept is an intermediate sanction that is based upon daily income. It is set by multiplying a scale penalty unit to the daily income. Structured fines tailor the amount of a fine imposed to be commensurate with the offender's ability to pay and the seriousness of the offense. Four jurisdictions were selected to participate: Des Moines, IA; Bridgeport, CT; Phoenix, AZ; and Marion, Malheur, Josephine, and

Coos counties in Oregon. RAND was selected by NIJ to be the evaluator of the demonstration project.

The RAND evaluation includes a process and outcome evaluation of the structured fines programs implemented in each site. Central to the process evaluation are case studies of each individual jurisdiction. The case studies will help identify how various contextual factors enhanced or impeded the implementation of the day fine project. Program records, memoranda, written policy and procedures manuals, training manuals, and semi-structured interviews with key program staff and those affected by the program will be utilized for this task.

The outcome evaluation will address the impact of the structured fines program on sentencing practices, fine payments, collection and enforcement activities, as well as the criminal behavior of offenders. In order to document the impact of these programs on sentencing practices, the study has obtained information on sentencing cohorts of offenders before and after the program. Analyses of these data will highlight whether fines are used more often, the variation in fines imposed, and the changes in the types of sentences imposed.

In Maricopa County, the probation department operates the day fine. It is applied to Superior Court felonies involving low-risk and limited-need offenders. Day fines are used for cases between routine and summary probation.

In Bridgeport, day fines are given to offenders convicted of B felonies to C misdemeanors. Lower misdemeanors are not eligible. The fine procedure is to sentence the defendant, vacate the sentence to pay the fine, then reimpose the sentence. Plea negotiations in Bridgeport include bargaining over penalty units.

In Oregon, day fines are applied to presumptive felonies and all misdemeanors. They can stand alone or be an enhancement. In Polk County, day fines are applied to aggravated and serious misdemeanors and to DWIs. They may also be applied alone or as an enhancement.

RAND is also examining where low income offenders obtain the money to pay the fine.

More intensive efforts will be directed to analyzing one-year follow-up outcomes for offenders who receive structured fines and a matched sample of similar offenders who did not receive structured fines. Analyses of these data will reveal whether structured fines offenders are more likely to pay their

fines; whether probation or the court respond differently in terms of enforcement and collection activities; whether day fine offenders are more or less likely to incur technical violations and arrests than offenders not subject to such fines; and whether the estimated costs of supervising structured fine offenders are greater. Data collection is still ongoing for the project. Final results are expected in early 1994.

Barbara Boland, Researcher, Urban Institute

Heavy Drug Caseloads. In recent years, management of heavy drug caseloads has become a challenge for all prosecutors, including many who are not in urban jurisdictions. While most prosecutors are no longer experiencing the dramatic increases in drug caseloads that were common at the end of the 1980s, drug prosecutions continue to dominate the caseloads of many offices. Successful management of drug cases has emerged as a critical component of the prosecutor's mission. In the District of Columbia, for example, drug prosecutions went from 200 in 1980 to 6000 in 1987. In Los Angeles, drug cases increased from 10,000 to 30,000.

Typically 50 percent of all felony referrals are not filed. In the study sites, all cases referred to the prosecutor are filed. UCR data for 1989 show that, for the 50 largest metro areas, 10 sites make up 50 percent of all local drug arrests. The hardest hit areas are clustered around import cities: New York, Los Angeles, Houston and Miami.

The methodology included 23 structured interviews with prosecutors. Process changes were the primary initial response to increased caseloads. These were needed to implement a "get tough" policy. Of these, only three prosecutors relaxed their responses.

Other changes included:

- Increased staff
- Special drug unit
- Reduced plea bargaining
- Developed expedited court process

The second stage response was to target offenders with specific programs for each target group. Community programs aimed at prevention and education. Full time staff conducted community liaison. Intensive case studies were done in Miami (import city), Oklahoma City (interior city), and Portland and Seattle (coastal cities).

Oklahoma City was chosen because it is located on several interstates and was targeted by LA gangs for crack distribution. In Oklahoma City, the prosecutor and the police focused on gang members. Two attorneys were assigned to drug search and seizure issues. Jury sentencing helped to gain stiffer sentences. Forfeiture money was used to enhance police response. The narcotics unit worked with eight attorneys. One attorney was assigned to the forfeiture unit and reviewed all cases. A multi-jurisdictional task force was established that included one assistant prosecutor.

The key to site success was police and prosecutor cooperation on a 24-hour basis (for warrants). This procedure also served to provide police with informal training on search and seizure issues, which, in turn, made them more aggressive. The prosecutor was also successful in getting a state RICO law and asset forfeiture based on net worth analysis.

One other innovation in this office was using informants to teach prosecutors about the drug culture and trade. The prosecutor also hired one staff member as a community person. For the first year, this staff member talked to the community for educational purposes. In the second year, a formal group was established. During the third year, the office targeted school delinquency and truancy. New legislation makes all police truant officers. They take the kids to special centers where parents are notified and told that they are responsible.

The role of the prosecutor was expanded to include civic activism and policymaking with respect to the entire drug problem in their communities. These offices sought to lighten drug caseloads by spearheading or cooperating in a proactive, multipronged attack on all aspects of the drug problem. They brought an array of anti-drug programs under their auspices, including school-based drug education, close cooperation with drug treatment programs and special drug courts, targeting repeat offenders for aggressive prosecution, and participation in multijurisdictional task forces to pursue high-level drug traffickers.

Evaluating Law Enforcement Technologies

David Boyd, Director, Science and Technology Division, National Institute of Justice

The problems facing law enforcement are twofold: finding appropriate technology and developing it. Mr. Boyd's organization is the only R&D facility for law enforcement, as local law enforcement agencies do not have funding for R&D. His division has to solve practical requirements for the local level agencies and courts.

Mr. Boyd described their mission as one of helping law enforcement to improve productivity. Improvement in law enforcement productivity could be quantified by considering that a one percent reduction in crime would mean 250 fewer murders per year, 1,000 fewer rapes, and 14,000 fewer serious crimes of other types. The Los Angeles riot alone cost \$1 billion and caused the loss of 42 lives. New York City law enforcement recently had to spend \$104 million in settlement of a tort arising out of a fleeing vehicle chase.

Together the elements of a one percent increase in productivity would mean an additional \$750 million for law enforcement needs. Even so, this would still be too little money for a major R&D effort.

Congress recently mandated that a specific percentage of federal R&D money be used for research on less-than-lethal (LTL) weapons technology. Since then, NIJ formed a LTL commission of various experienced criminal justice personnel; and they selected a special LTL panel, with background in military applications of technology that might be useful to law enforcement. These latter personnel were also in positions where they might be able to assist in declassifying such kinds of technology for general law enforcement use. They examine "dual use" technology.

These researchers use an integrated approach to the new technology, and they consider the user's requirements first:

- Must serve a real need
- Must improve on current practice
- Must work the first time
- Must not overburden the officer
- Must not be expensive
- Must not require extensive training
- Must not involve dedicated manpower
- Must involve manageable liability questions

In seeking to fulfill these requirements, NIJ looked first at off-the-shelf items that could be demonstrated to be useful "as is." The second priority went to items that could be useful to law enforcement with some low-cost modification. Development of technological aids "from scratch" was only worth considering if the applicability covered a very wide range of police activity.

Forensic areas of technological research include:

- DNA research
- Analysis of gunpowder residues
- Toxicological detection
- Analysis of trace elements
- Fingerprint reagents
- Wound ballistics

Mr. Boyd mentioned one particularly successful innovation in these areas: the cyanoacrylate wand, which allows investigating officers to lift fingerprints from almost any kind of item with relative ease.

The second major area of current technological research for law enforcement is the field of computer applications. These might include either management or investigative tools. A successful example of these types of advance is automated booking, which reduces time for booking an offender from one and a quarter hours to only 15 minutes.

Mr. Boyd discussed examples of LTL tools under research. Some of these are:

- pulsating light
- rubber bullets
- entanglement devices
- technology to stop fleeing vehicles
- sticky foam; or aqueous foam
- electronic means of incarceration
- robotics (miniature audio/video "spy bug")
- smart gun (usable only by assigned officer)

In all of these areas of research and technological advance, the single greatest problem in implementing the new technology is liability.

Mr. Boyd mentioned that some positive developments were emerging in connection with Congress's Defense Reinvestment Initiative. If a particular military technology could be shown to be of dual-use value for law enforcement (and meet their requirements), then smaller local law enforcement agencies would be able to utilize area National Guard facilities for low cost training.

***J. Thomas McEwen, Principal,
Institute for Law and Justice***

Use of Less Than Lethal Weapons. This study, which is funded by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), is designed to describe current police and correctional practices in the use of less than lethal weapons. To accomplish the study objectives, a national survey has been conducted of local police departments, sheriffs with law enforcement responsibilities, jail managers, and wardens. As part of this workshop, results from surveys sent to police and sheriffs were presented. The survey results show a variety of less than lethal weapons available to these agencies, including traditional weapons, such as batons, and more recently developed weapons, such as Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) mace sprays.

In total, ILJ mailed surveys to 370 police chiefs and 314 sheriffs across the country. Two hundred and twenty-eight police departments and 150 sheriffs' departments returned surveys (62 percent and 48 percent response rates, respectively). Survey results

showed that 51 percent of the departments issue conventional batons, 57 percent issue side-handle batons, 39 percent issue telescoping batons, and 35 issue heavy metal flashlights. With regard to chemical weapons, 33 departments have CN irritant sprays, 27 percent have CS irritant sprays, and 41 percent have OC sprays. The percentages for batons and sprays add to more than 100 percent because some departments have more than one type. Interestingly, 38 departments (10 percent) stated they do not purchase batons and 132 departments (35 percent) do not issue any type of chemical sprays.

The survey also identified other types of less than lethal weapons in these departments, including electronic stun weapons (16 percent of the departments), close-range electrical weapons (8 percent of the departments), and low-lethality projectile weapons (20 percent of the departments). These weapons are generally available only to specialized units for special situations, such as barricades and hostage situations.

Respondents were asked to rate each type of weapon on four dimensions of effectiveness: effectiveness in subduing suspects, potential for citizen complaints, officer safety, and public safety. The analysis shows that OC sprays received the most favorable average ratings, while flashlights received the lowest ratings. In addition, side-handle and telescoping batons were rated more effective than conventional batons; and OC sprays were rated more effective than CN or CS sprays.

Respondents were also asked to list any weapons discontinued during the last five years. The most frequently mentioned were chemical irritants, discontinued in 86 departments, followed by batons in 57 departments, flashlights in 24 departments, electronic weapons in 23 departments, and blackjacks in 22 departments. Virtually all the discontinued chemical weapons were CN and CS products, a result that coincides with the adoption of OC sprays, as many departments now favor OC sprays over CN or CS irritants.

Evaluation of Drug Courts

**John S. Goldkamp, Professor,
Temple University**

Assessing the Impact of the Dade County Drug Court. This presentation reviews the approach taken to assessing the impact of the Dade County Drug Court and highlights key findings. Because the program was well underway at the time the assessment was funded, an experimental approach was not feasible. Rather, a multi-sample comparison strategy was undertaken to permit comparison of outcomes associated with Drug Court defendants with other felony defendants processed by the Dade County court system. The assumptions and goals of the approach are discussed, and the implications of findings for further implementation of the Drug Court model in other jurisdictions are considered.

The evaluation reviewed both the program impacts upon clients and the criminal justice system and its broader impacts outside Miami. The principal system impacts included: fewer cases closed, fewer cases dropped, and fewer defendants incarcerated.

Participant outcomes were:

- 30%—Unfavorable (kicked out, failed to show)
- 45%—Favorable
- 25%—Other (e.g., charges dropped)

One-third of defendants in the program were in it for more than one year. Recidivism analysis showed:

- 67%—No rearrest
- 9%—Rearrest for drug possession
- 4%—Rearrest for drug sales
- 6%—Rearrest for serious personal crimes

In comparing recidivism for defendants arrested in prior years, program participants were delayed by at least 100 percent (twice as long to

recidivate). Program participants showed a higher rate of FTAs (Fail to Appear) as a result of more frequent court appearances. FTAs in the program, who have relapsed, are treated in the jail for two weeks in a special pod (96 males, 48 females).

Some operational issues included a judge-centered team of prosecution and defense counsel, improvement of MIS for drug treatment interface with criminal justice and treatment history, targeting of defendants' criteria, screening, classification at intake for treatment, and other issues, such as net-widening, role of drug testing, and meaning of FTAs.

**Michael D. Schrunk, District
Attorney, Multnomah County,
Oregon**

Portland STOP Program. Sanction Treatment Opportunity Progress (STOP) is a program of early drug intervention and case management in the Multnomah County Circuit Court, Oregon.

Mr. Schrunk's office has responsibilities for prosecution of all felonies and misdemeanors. The number of drug cases handled by his office went from 500 felonies to 3,400 from about 1989 to 1992. To handle these cases, he first tried differentiated case management. The judge asked him to divert cases, but Schrunk needed some program to which he could divert. The judge visited the Miami Drug Court and was convinced by his experience that Portland could do something similar.

STOP was started with \$400,000, including \$300,000 in block grant money. The funding went primarily for treatment costs. These include random and regular urinalysis, counseling and acupuncture. He estimates that the program saves substantial funds in public defense costs, grand jury costs, and overtime pay for two police officers at \$125 for each case.

The program criteria were set with the concurrence of the public defender. They include:

- Drug possession, if sole charge (regardless of prior record)
- No evidence of drug dealing (from police sources)
- No gang involvement
- No holds from other jurisdictions
- Cannot be a police informant while in program

His office reviews incoming cases and marks those that are program eligible. Defendants are asked if they are interested. A special judge hears these cases, including night court sessions.

Eligible defendants must stipulate the facts of the case but there is no formal plea. The public defender has 14 days within which to investigate whether the defendant would be better off having the criminal charges proceed. The program is 12 months in duration, divided into three phases. Status hearings are held monthly by the court in a night court session. At present, there are 1,200 defendants in the program.

The three program phases are:

- Phase I: Defendant attends 6 days each week for 3 weeks.
- Phase II: Defendant attends three days each week for 4 ½ to 6 months with random urine testing.
- Phase III: Assessment is made of defendant's amenability to enter Narcotics Anonymous or Alcoholics Anonymous.

Twenty percent of defendants dropped out of the program since its inception. Client success is measured by fewer dirty urines, rather than none. Unsuccessful participants are tried on the basis of the stipulated facts. If the defendant completes the program, the felony record is expunged. The program has improved the court calendar, reduced police overtime costs by \$180,000, and reducing public defender costs.

Defendants are assessed a \$300 fee for program costs; however it is only sporadically collected. A fee fund has been established and now contains \$40,000. Grant match is obtained from a drug forfeiture fund.

**Timothy J. Murray, Director,
Metro-Dade County, Florida,
Substance Abuse Control Office**

Miami Drug Court. Prior to the establishment of the Miami Drug Court, drug possession cases involving less than 5 kilos of drugs usually did not result in any jail time being imposed. The court felt that the most important caseload factor was defendant recidivism. But the court could not get treatment providers interested in their clients. At the same time, people cannot be threatened or punished to stop being addicts.

In setting up the drug court, a key concept is to expect relapse as a normal occurrence in treatment. Janet Reno's response to the drug court idea was to say that she simply wanted evidence that the rate of misbehavior had *slowed*.

Program entry criteria expanded from the initial limiting to first-time drug possession offenders, to drug possession with two other priors and no limit on other drug charges. For example, the program will accept defendants charged with auto theft or burglary of an unoccupied building, which often means crack smoking in an abandoned building. The program will also accept domestic violence cases. This change in criteria was due in part to the evaluation study findings and recommendations. Still unresolved is the program's availability to defendants charged with drug sales.

Program acceptance by the public defender required evidence that program failure will not result in greater punishment than if he or she had never entered the program. Defendants must enter a plea of guilty before entering the program. However, many defendants enter the program despite knowing that they would spend less jail time outside of the program. This shows evidence of their desire to stop being an addict.

Responses to Prison Crowding

Gary C. Mohr, Director, Ohio Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services, and Robert Swisher, Researcher, Ohio Statistical Analysis Center

Ohio's Responses to Prison Crowding.

Prison crowding is currently driving criminal justice policy formation in Ohio and, along with health care, has become a primary focus in efforts to control the state budget. Ohio currently has 38,000 prisoners in correctional facilities rated for 22,000 capacity. Juvenile institutions are similarly crowded. Three-fourths of the people in the juvenile and adult facilities are non-violent, third and fourth degree felons. The Ohio Prison Crowding Work Group and the Ohio Sentencing Commission are recommending that state statute be changed so that there is a presumption that non-violent third and fourth degree felons are eligible for community-based alternatives. This will allow the state to institute "truth in sentencing" for those sentenced to prison and longer sentences for violent offenses, particularly for repeat violent offenders.

These proposed changes have stimulated an attempt to institutionalize evaluation of criminal justice programs in Ohio. In effect, the evaluation format used for the Byrne Memorial sub-grants will be used for all projects funded through state subsidies administered by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction or by the Ohio Department of Youth Services. Common measures of project activities and project outcomes are being developed. Systematic collection of this information will enhance the state's ability to select what types of community alternatives should be supported through the enhanced subsidies.

Carole Sanchez Knapel, Visiting Fellow, National Institute of Justice

Post Occupancy Evaluation of Correctional Facilities. The nation's federal, state and local inmate populations continue to grow at rates faster than the capacity of jails and

prisons. Jail and prison administrators continue to identify crowding as one of their most significant problems. Projections indicate that this trend is likely to continue to the end of the decade.

In response to this inmate population growth, public officials have begun facility construction programs. In California alone, more than \$5.2 billion has been allocated for the construction of new jail and prison facilities. The National Institute of Justice has taken a leading role in collecting data on new facilities and distributing the information nationwide. The information available on design and construction has proven invaluable to officials planning to build new facilities.

Although officials have the floor plans and construction information, there has not been any systematic evaluation of the facilities which have been constructed. Facility safety, security, and cost effectiveness are critical requirements of all new facility construction; yet without a post-occupancy evaluation of the new facilities, others beginning the planning and design process cannot benefit from the efforts of earlier projects.

In addition, post-occupancy evaluation provides information to the administrator of the facility. The evaluation of facilities allows officials to measure how well the facility is operating in the context of the mission of the agency. In this way it allows for improved utilization of resources and refinement of operational policies.

This project evaluates correctional facilities in terms of safety, security, and cost effectiveness of the facility operation. The instruments are currently in draft form and will be pretested in August, 1993. The final instruments will be complete in October, 1993.

In addition, the work being completed on post-occupancy evaluation has benefited by work done by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC). NIC is completing two in-depth case studies of recently-completed jail facilities. By working jointly, the NIJ and NIC

projects have created compatible instruments and data formats. This joint effort will allow for the maximum utilization of data collected from evaluations of facilities nationwide.

***Susan Turner, Project Manager,
RAND***

Washington Work Release Program. In collaboration with the Washington Department of Corrections, RAND is conducting a three-stage evaluation of work release in Washington State. The first stage provides a statewide review of who participates in work release and how many successfully complete the program. The second involves a randomized field experiment that examines the impact of work release on offender recidivism by comparing offenders placed in work release with those who complete their terms in prison. A case study of the Pioneer Industries work program, a work release placement utilized by Seattle area work release participants, describes the Pioneer Industries program and the work release experiences of approximately 30 work releasees hired by Pioneer Industries and a matched sample of work releasees with other community employment.

The statewide review utilizes data from the Department of Corrections (DOC) Offender Based Transaction System (OBTS). For each offender released in 1990, the DOC has provided information on the releasees' demographic characteristics (age, race, sex, county of conviction); current conviction offense; prior record information; work release placement; institutional infractions; and length of stay. Results from these data show that almost half (48.8 %) of all male offenders apply for work release. Not all offenders who apply to work release are accepted: of those who apply, approximately 80 percent are accepted. Eventually, 39.4 percent of offenders are placed in work release facilities at some point during their sentence. Not all, however, successfully complete work release. Approximately 30 percent of offenders placed in work release facilities are returned to the institution, and are ultimately released to the community from the prison environment. Overall, 27.5 percent of inmates return to the community through a successful work release experience.

Data collection for the second and third studies is ongoing. For each offender in these studies, RAND onsite staff tracks program services and recidivism information for 12 months following study assignment. Data is collected from official records maintained on the OBTS system, work release, and Pioneer Industries files. Information on a "status" calendar (e.g., days spent in prison, work release, community supervision) filled out for each offender is used to estimate relative costs of prison and work release. Data collection will be completed in the Fall of 1993. Final results are expected in early 1994.

***Faye S. Taxman, Principal
Associate, Institute for Law and
Justice, and Randall Guynes,
Principal Associate, Institute for
Law and Justice***

Intermediate Sanctions and Interchangeability: A Survey of Correctional Professionals. Many jurisdictions are currently developing or considering the implementation of correctional programs that fall between probation and incarceration. These new programs, often referred to as intermediate sanctions, include boot camps, intensive supervision, day reporting centers, house arrest and home detention, day fines, other financial penalties, electronic monitoring, treatment programs, residential programs, drug testing, etc. Each program is generally designed to meet the objectives of a sentence: punish, rehabilitate, or incapacitate. Often, a program will meet several of the objectives of a sentence, based upon the requirements of a program. The purpose of expanding correctional programs is to offer a continuum of options to meet the varied needs of the sanctioning system.

One of the frequently encountered implementation issues is the exchange of one correctional option (such as incarceration) for intermediate sanction type programs. The basis for the exchange and the development of a system which provides a fair and equitable method for the exchange is of concern to many policy makers. This study was designed to examine the issues related to interchangeability and exchange of correctional programs. The purpose of the study was to obtain the

perspective of corrections and probation professionals on issues related to exchange among correctional options including incarceration and probation. The two concepts examined were the value of the time exchanged and the punishment ranking of different correctional options (ranging from probation through the new variety of intermediate sanctions to incarceration). The survey instrument was designed to obtain a punishment ranking for correctional programs and to determine the amount of time that is equivalent in the different programs.

The study will present the results of a survey of a convenience sample of approximately 200 probation and correctional professionals. Preliminary study results suggest that many correctional professionals tend to give intermediate sanctions programs a similar punishment ranking regardless of the nature of the correctional programs. That is, programs with more requirements are not considered as severe on a punishment scale as programs with fewer options. Further, none of the intermediate sanction programs were found to be as severe a punishment as options involving some amount of incarceration. Regarding time value for programs, many of the time values of the exchanges are limited in range and distribution, with correctional professionals not differentiating among the various types of programs. Preliminary results have significant implications for the development of a continuum of sanctions. Policies appear to be needed to facilitate the exchange among new correctional options and the more traditional incarceration-based options. Further, intermediate sanction programs need to target different types of offenders to provide a continuum of options. The reported findings should be available in January 1994.

Evaluation of Anti-Crime Public Awareness Programs

**Garrett J. O'Keefe, Professor,
Department of Agricultural
Journalism, University of
Wisconsin, Madison**

The Social Impact of the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Campaign. The use of mass media to promote more active citizen involvement in reducing crime and illicit drug abuse has emerged as a major component of criminal justice policy. This BJA-sponsored study evaluates the impact and cost effectiveness of the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Media Campaign's activities in producing and disseminating public service advertisements focusing on "McGruff" and using the "Take a Bite Out of Crime" theme. A primary goal is to make useful, objective and empirically based recommendations regarding the future conduct of such campaigns on crime and drug abuse prevention. Techniques involved the use of national probability surveys of citizens, prevention practitioners, and media managers; content analyses of campaign materials; and cost effectiveness analyses.

Overall findings suggest that a substantial majority of the public, media, and law enforcement communities have accepted the campaign and McGruff as positive and effective symbols of crime and drug abuse prevention. The campaign appears to have gained in popularity and impact over its 12-year span. Considerable variance in audience reach and response were found, many in keeping with campaign targeting goals. Among citizens interviewed, 80 percent recalled the campaign; 49 percent recalled the most recent public service announcement; 54 percent said they were more concerned about crime as a result; and 90 percent said they thought it increased children's awareness. The campaign also appears to have minimized costs while maximizing coverage and impact. In 1991, the NCPC budget for the campaign was \$600,000, compared to \$6 million in free advertising obtained. In addition, the Advertising Council produced the PSAs with no charge for the creative effort. Data from the citizen probability survey also indicate a decrease in fear of crime in the population since

a similar study in 1981, coupled with increases in many forms of preventive behavior, although these cannot be directly attributable to the campaign per se. Recommendations emphasize continuing the campaign's central themes, while being innovative in responding to changing crime and drug abuse situations, and in seeking new audiences. More collaboration with related campaign efforts may be explored, as well as experimentation with newer information technologies. The campaign may also benefit in the long run by setting more specific objectives, and establishing more measurable criteria for meeting those. The final report is in preparation.

**John A. Cocoros, President,
Cocoros Associates**

T-CAP Program. The Texas City Action Plan (T-CAP) is a 12-month initiative in eight Texas cities aimed at preventing crime and creating safer, more vital cities. The process prototype was developed by the National Crime Prevention Council.

The process in each city is conducted by a planning coalition. The coalition, established by the mayor, is made up of a representative cross section of the community. The coalition creates specialized task forces by appointing citizens whose experience and talents will best serve the work of each specific task force. The end result is a city-wide plan for both short-term and long-term action.

T-CAP goals in each city are: 1) to develop a workable plan to reduce significantly crime in the city; 2) to involve all relevant sectors in developing the plan; 3) to develop a long-term vehicle to address the issue of crime and to respond with short-term actions and long-term solutions to crime's many manifestations; and 4) to demonstrate that every resident can and must play a role in preventing crime. The T-CAP process has three phases:

Phase One (three months): leaders and coalitions are recruited; public enthusiasm is generated; coalition and mayor identify

immediate actions and undertake them; goals are established.

Phase Two (five months): coalition determines order of priority for goals; identifies and selects strategies to implement goals; produces draft plan and gets comments from groups and individuals throughout community; revises plan; identifies resource and actor needs; publishes revised plan.

Phase Three (four months): coalition develops blueprint for implementation of action plan; evaluation is concluded; participants are publicly recognized for efforts; coalition transmutes to long-term mechanism for addressing city-wide crime problems.

The methodology of evaluation is by personal observation; attendance at T-CAP meetings and events; interviews; reading reports, minutes, and other relevant documents; and by distribution of questionnaires to coalition and task force members.

The process evaluator came aboard in October 1992, when Phase One of the T-CAP process was getting underway. Phase Two is now winding down. The four T-CAP cities under evaluation (Arlington, Dallas, Corpus Christi, and Fort Worth) are generally operating within the prescribed time frame. It appears that at least three of the cities, and perhaps all, will conclude their projects as scheduled by the end of September.

Arlington appears to have made the most progress to date, with Corpus Christi also progressing well. Each of these cities has about 260,000 residents. In Arlington, the mayor has made concerted efforts to publicize the program; his appointed T-CAP representative is a senior police officer, and the lead agency is the police department. Dallas has established a 14-person coalition but is experiencing some difficulties related to changes in police department and coalition leadership. Ft. Worth has used T-CAP to enhance other related efforts, but it differs in many respects from the T-CAP model.

Developing Cost-Effective Drug Testing Strategies

Pamela K. Lattimore, Senior Researcher, National Institute of Justice; Joanna R. Baker, Professor, James Madison University; and Lance A. Matheson, Assistant Professor, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Developing Cost-Effective Drug Testing Strategies Using Acceptance Sampling. Drug testing has become an accepted strategy for controlling the drug use of individuals in the custody of the criminal justice system. Emphasis has been placed on testing those free in the community on pretrial release, probation, or parole. The drug-testing strategies for these populations identify whom and how often to test, and determine the response(s) to positive tests.

This presentation demonstrates the use of acceptance sampling, a traditional quality control technique, to identify cost-effective drug-testing plans. Acceptance sampling is used in manufacturing to determine the "acceptability" of a production run. A sample is drawn from the production run and tested. If less than a predetermined number fail the quality control test, the production run is accepted. However, if more than the predetermined number fail the quality control test, the run is rejected. In this case, the production run may be scrapped or the entire run may be inspected and the defective units repaired. In our application, we assume that failures are those who test positive for drugs and that they can be "repaired" through sanctions or treatment.

The acceptance sampling plans identify how many to test in any testing period, taking into account all of the costs of a testing strategy. The total costs of testing include not only the cost of the test but also the cost to society of failing to detect a drug-using offender and the costs of the response—sanction or treatment—to a positive test. Under other scenarios, however, lower total costs are achieved by adopting an acceptance sampling approach in which a random sample of individuals are tested.

Beginning this summer, the National Institute of Justice and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) are collaborating on a field experiment to test the effectiveness and usefulness of acceptance sampling for criminal justice drug testing programs.

Edwin Kennedy, Senior Research Analyst, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

The Effects of Partial Drug Testing on Drug Use Behavior and Self-Disclosure Validity. The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, a state research agency, examined the relationship between drug testing, drug use behavior, and self-disclosure validity in St. Clair County, Illinois, last year. A cohort of 63 intensive supervision probationers participated in the study. They were stratified by probation officer and program phase, and randomly assigned to either an experimental or control group. An experimental design (pretest-posttest control group) was used. The hypotheses were designed to test the assumptions that drug testing and feedback are necessary to: 1) deter drug use, and 2) strengthen self-disclosure validity. The experimental intervention was a reduction in the odds of testing collected specimens (100% in the control group, 33% in the experimental group). Participants were continually reminded of the odds of having a specimen tested.

The hypotheses were not supported. There was no evidence to support the proposition that drug testing and feedback are necessary to deter drug use, or that drug testing is necessary to strengthen self-disclosure validity. Plans are underway to replicate the study on a larger scale.

New Links Between the Public Health and Criminal Justice Sectors: Recent Evaluation Efforts

***Lana Harrison, Statistician,
National Institute on Drug Abuse***

Overall most drug use has been declining since 1979, according to NIDA's household survey. In the early 1980s, cocaine use began to decline. Sanctions have not caused this decline since it preceded the "Drug War." Changes in attitudes towards drugs also changed. Also, for future consideration, drug addicts come with a multitude of problems: employment, family problems, health, etc.

***Arnold R. Mills, Public Health
Advisor, National Institute on Drug
Abuse***

Drug Procurement Practices of Chronic Drug Abusers. This presentation highlighted findings from a recently completed study by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), entitled "Drug Procurement Practices of the Chronic Drug Abuser." The study was designed to examine the drug consumption patterns, procurement practices, and expenditure patterns for an out-of-treatment sample of 1,200 injection drug and crack users in ten cities across the nation. The population for the study has traditionally been difficult to reach, but nevertheless the subject is of considerable interest to researchers and public policy makers across the nation. Limited information has been available about drug consumption and expenditures for drugs among out-of-treatment chronic drug users. Much of the data that is available has been extracted from secondary data sources. The Drug Procurement Study, however, is based on information gathered from interviews with a street population of drug users who were not a part of the traditional household or involved with local institutions from which study samples of drug users are generally drawn. Participants in the study were recruited by outreach workers for a larger NIDA research study designed to evaluate the efficacy of an outreach intervention program and to monitor the spread of HIV infection among injection drug and crack users.

***Robert L. Stephenson, II, Special
Assistant to the Director, Division
of Workplace Programs,
Substance Abuse and Mental
Health Services Administration,
U.S. Department of Health and
Human Services***

Update on the State of the Science of Hair Testing in Forensic Applications: Lessons from Workplace Funded Research for the Criminal Justice System. Hair analysis is an evolving methodology still struggling with scientific aspects, instrumentation, and interpretation of results. The forensic implications and program consequences of broad-based use of hair analysis for drugs of abuse in the criminal justice system and workplace settings have yet to be determined. This presentation provided an overview of hair analysis, from known research to the development of consensus among forensic toxicologists.

***Alan I. Trachtenberg, Office of
Science Policy, Education and
Legislation, National Institute on
Drug Abuse***

The Challenge of TB and HIV/AIDS for the Criminal Justice System. The twin epidemics of HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis have forever changed the American approach to drug abuse and its treatment. Even further changes will be required in the years to come. A valuable lesson and opportunity was lost in the seventies, when the epidemic of hepatitis B among injection drug users (IDUs) should have shown the need for harm reduction of drugs. The latest development in the epidemic stage of disease among America's drug abusers is the resurgence of strains that threaten America's entire population. From a combination of the HIV epidemic and the infrastructure, this ancient disease, considered a medical rarity only ten years ago, has become a front page topic of concern for the general public. The public health system is rallying to address this epidemic. But it is also

timely for the field of corrections and the medical staff in jails and prisons to assume their necessary public health responsibilities. The case of the New York State Prison System MDR-TB outbreak demonstrates the need within the prison system itself.

In the 1970s, tuberculosis was a problem reported only in Chicago (Cook County jail) and in the Arkansas state prison. TB revival is linked to both drug addiction and AIDS. Addiction is a chronic relapsing condition. Detoxification is a revolving door without any impact on longterm course of the disease. Street interviews of drug users showed that of 24,000 interviewed, 10,000 had never had any treatment. The tuberculosis case rate has been increasing since 1980 in New York City, and in the United States as a whole, since 1985. Factors affecting the TB rate include: the HIV epidemic, social circumstances such as increased homelessness, poor ventilation, substance abuse involving use of crack in crack houses, and drug resistance of TB bacilli. Additionally, TB tests of persons affected with HIV will show false negative (body defenses against the disease do not produce reactions as they do in otherwise healthy individuals).

Some recent findings by CDC in selected cities show:

- 21% of Blacks in jail have TB infection
- 60% of Hispanics in jail have TB infection
- 12% of Whites in jail have TB infection
- 23% overall have TB infection
- Active TB rates vary by region

Some active TB disease rates (in % of total incarcerated) are:

- LA jail .07%
- Cook Cty. jail .1%
- Rikers Island .5%
(NY)

The CDC recommends that correctional staff be tested for TB every 12 months, using the skin test. Inmates in high prevalence areas

should be screened on admission with chest X-ray as well. X-ray tests cost \$2.41 each.

These findings on TB transmission from newly released inmates point out the dangers to the larger community unless this issue is specifically addressed. As difficult as TB control may be in prisons, the difficulties pale in comparison with those encountered in large urban jail systems, where the brevity of incarceration and hypermobility of inmates renders many of the current TB control measures unusable. New measures must be designed and evaluated. This will require a much closer working relationship between criminal justice, drug abuse treatment, and public health than has ever been the case in this country.

**Peter Delany, Social Science
Analyst, National Institute on Drug
Abuse**

*Advances in Treatment Services and
Outcome Evaluation Research.* This presentation focused on the current state of the field of treatment services and outcome evaluation research.

Addicted inmates have a higher risk of HIV infection and tuberculosis than non-addicted inmates. The percentage of inmates who are addicted to narcotic drugs are:

- 42% of 62,000 inmates held by U.S. Bureau of Prisons
- 74% of 600,000 inmates held by state departments of correction.

The federal NARA program, providing treatment for both criminally and civilly committed inmates, has only an 11 percent completion rate. Recidivism is high among this group. The California civil commitment program shows better results. Studies of this program show reduction in drug use, but no gain in employment. Prison therapeutic communities, experimented with in the 1970s, met with limited success. Integrity of treatment and continuity of care are the primary problems in correctional drug treatment.

Mike Denner, of the Research Triangle Institute, is undertaking a study of methadone maintenance. His findings show that addicts often have secondary personality problems. These may include depressive and anti-social personalities. Between 30 to 60 percent have criminal records. Illegal earnings exceed legal earnings by a two to one margin. Many cannot get jobs because of handicaps and medical conditions.

There are a number of experiments underway on linking employment services to drug treatment. Delaware is now testing whether inmates placed in work release are better served by a therapeutic community than a regular work release program. In another study of parole, it was found that the parolees are often unable to continue treatment due to prosecutor practices of reinstituting old criminal charges.

Therapeutic communities require adequate staffing with well trained staff, secure and segregated facilities, space for multiple activities, restriction of inmate eligibility to those nine months away from release, and availability of aftercare.

Evaluation of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Enforcement Task Forces

James R. "Chip" Coldren, Jr.,
*Deputy Site Director, Program on
Human Development and Criminal
Behavior, Harvard School of Public
Health*

Evaluation of Multijurisdictional Drug Enforcement Task Forces. The Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) conducted a multi-state survey of BJA formula-grant funded multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement task forces. The survey assessed developmental changes that have occurred in drug task force organization, objectives, targets, and population/area. It also queries task force commanders for their opinions regarding the reasons for any observed changes (e.g., fiscal constraints, change in task force leadership, or change in the nature of the drug problem). Performance indicator data (1988-1991) on the number of investigations, arrests, asset seizures, and drug seizures were also collected.

The panel presented the findings from the commanders' survey, focusing on a profile of BJA formula-grant funded task forces; changes that have taken place in task force goals, targets, and participating agencies; and a comparison of task forces operating in urban and rural areas.

**Michael Sabath, Director, Center
for Criminal Justice Research and
Information, Indiana Criminal
Justice Institute**

Task Force Commanders' Survey Project: Studying Change in Task Force Structure and Operations. Many of the multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement task forces created by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) formula grant program are changing. Four-year funding terms are ending; drug problems and drug strategies are changing; and task forces are maturing as organizations. A recent survey of over 500 commanders of BJA-funded task forces in 37 states revealed that approximately one-half of them have changed their goals or targets since their operations began. Such changes pose problems for task

force evaluators. Studying changes in drug task forces helps evaluators understand drug task force organizations, operations, and implementation processes. It also helps them interpret evaluation findings.

A profile of current BJA-funded task forces was presented. Differences between task forces operating in rural and urban environments are explored. A comparison is made between task force organization and operations at the time of the survey and at the time federal drug act funding began. Changes over time in task force goals, targets, and participants were described; and the implications of change in task force organizations for evaluation research were discussed.

Preliminary findings from the task force commanders' survey project to date included the following:

1. On average, task forces in the sample have been in operation for 3.6 years, ranging from 1 to 253 months.
2. The goals receiving high priority ranking most often by task force commanders include removal of drugs from local communities (96%), improvement in capacity to arrest drug offenders (96%), and enhanced coordination among drug enforcement agencies (92%).
3. Seizing the assets of drug offenders is the task force goal that has changed most over time: 67 percent of the commanders stated that asset seizure was a high priority goal. When federal drug act funding began, 78 percent stated it is a high priority.
4. The most commonly stated reason for change in task force goals was change in the resources available to the task force.

5. The highest priority offender targets for task forces are upper-level dealers and traffickers/distributors. Seventy-eight percent of the commanders stated that upper-level offenders were high priority targets when federal drug act funding began; and 90 percent currently rate upper-level offenders as high priority.
6. Changes in the nature and extent of the drug problem and in resources available to task forces were both commonly cited as reasons for changes in task force offender targets.

The task force commanders' survey data set will be made available via NIJ and NCJRS.

***Daniel Storkamp, Director,
Minnesota Criminal Justice
Statistical Analysis Center***

Minnesota's Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Enforcement Task Forces. Since 1987, Minnesota has funded multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement task forces through the Federal Anti-Drug Abuse Act. In 1990, the Minnesota Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center, in cooperation with the Minnesota Office of Drug Policy, incorporated the reporting forms into a narcotics task force manual. The report was created by combining the federal requirements, the state requirements and the local task force needs. After much discussion and many drafts the manual was completed and sent to all the task forces. The reporting manuals contain all the information that a task force would need to report, which includes forms, definitions, and names/numbers of individuals to call for help completing the forms.

For 1993, there are three reports that each task force needed to complete—yearly, quarterly and arrestee reports. The yearly report contains information about the task force itself; the quarterly and arrestee reports contain information about the task force itself, the quarterly reports contain financial and quarterly information; and the arrestee report contains information about each individual arrest.

Between 1988 and 1993, the Minnesota Criminal Justice Statistical Analysis Center also completed three surveys of the narcotic task forces. The 1991 survey found an increase in cooperation and communication between the task forces and local law enforcement agencies. In 1991, 84 percent indicated that they informed local law enforcement agencies "very often" when they would be working in their area; compared to 66 percent in 1990, and 51 percent in 1988. The survey also found an increased use of LSD in Minnesota, and a greater demand and availability of all drugs.

The 1992 Minnesota narcotics task force yearly, quarterly, and arrestee reports showed the following:

- The 29 narcotics task forces in Minnesota covered 98.5 percent of the state's population and 92.4 percent of the state's geographic area.
- Over 57,000 grams of cocaine, almost 2,000 pounds of marijuana, and over 7,000 dosage units of LSD were seized or purchased by the narcotics task forces during 1992.
- A total of 554 weapons were seized by the narcotics task forces during 1992, which included 252 hand guns, 152 rifles, and 11 machine guns.
- A total of 2,181 individuals were arrested by the narcotics task forces, of which 1,042 were for marijuana, and 767 for cocaine.

***Howard L. Davis, Jr., Director of
Evaluations, North Carolina
Governor's Crime Commission***

Results of the North Carolina Multijurisdictional Task Force Commanders' Survey. Since 1989, multijurisdictional task forces have been a major funding priority of the North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission. Approximately \$10 million in DCSI funds have been awarded to various law enforcement agencies to fund this initiative.

In 1982, the Crime Commission conducted a survey of all multijurisdictional task forces to assess how they have changed in structure and operation. To make North Carolina's results comparable with other states, the survey instrument provided by the Justice Research and Statistical Association was used. Task force commanders were mailed questionnaires concerning any changes in their objectives and activities from the time they were initially funded with DCSI funds. The Evaluation Section of the Governor's Crime Commission analyzed the results of this survey to get a composite picture of how task forces are changing over the years to respond to the drug problem in their communities.

The survey of the task force commanders is part of an overall evaluation of multijurisdictional task forces as a funding priority within the Governor's Crime Commission. Evaluators have compiled information on the profiles of drug offenders arrested, and the types of drugs being seized, to measure the impact of task forces on the drug problem in North Carolina.

Drug Testing: Program Impacts (A)

Gwen A. Holden, Executive Vice President, National Criminal Justice Association

Study of Impacts in the States of Implementing Drug Testing. The National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) has completed work on a research project to assess the fiscal and other impacts of drug testing among certain criminal justice populations in the states and localities.

The study focuses on drug testing of adult criminal justice populations in both state and substate programs, including arrestees (from pretrial detention, bail, or other pretrial release status to conviction); convicted incarcerated offenders (those in prisons, jails, or other correctional facilities); and convicted offenders on supervised release in the community (those on probation, parole, or other conditional release).

Funded under a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, the NCJA study has three main objectives: (1) to identify, describe, and analyze the costs and other impacts of drug testing criminal justice populations; (2) to gain insight into the status of drug testing programs currently in use by state and local jurisdictions; and (3) to provide guidance for government officials on costs involved in considering or implementing drug testing among criminal justice populations.

Research on the issues involved in the project has included an extensive literature search, interviews with individuals involved in the operation of drug testing programs in several jurisdictions, review of evolving legal issues, comprehensive national survey to gather conceptual information, and specific data on drug testing costs and consequences in the states.

John R. Hepburn, Professor, School of Justice Studies, Arizona State University

Drug Testing with Chicago's Focused Offender Disposition Program. The National

Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors (NASADAD), with funding from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, initiated the Focused Offender Disposition (FOD) Program in Chicago in 1990. A quasi-experimental program design was used to determine the extent to which probationers who receive only urinalysis monitoring differ in probation success from probationers who receive a treatment-based intervention. The program design also permits an evaluation of NASADAD's objective needs assessment instrument, the Offender Profile Index. Operated by Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC), 802 clients were assessed in Chicago over an eighteen-month period, of which 532 were considered eligible for the FOD program. The evaluation defines "failure on probation" in terms of two criteria: (1) a filed petition to revoke probation, and (2) a closed case, with either a revocation or a new conviction. The analysis explored probation success by estimating nonparametric and parametric survival models that allow identifying the relative effects of treatment compared to urinalysis alone, on time lapse to probation failure. In addition, the analysis looks at the effects of probationer's age, ethnicity, gender, education, offense type, and prior record on time to probation failure.

David P. Cavanagh, Research Fellow, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University

Drug Testing Throughout the Criminal Justice System. The Multnomah County Drug Testing and Evaluation (DTE) program is intended to help selected pre-trial arrestees and post-trial probationers and parolees to rid themselves of drug abusing behavior by providing random, weekly drug tests, and sanctioning those clients who fail to show or who test positive for drugs. The program supplements testing with client drug evaluations and treatment recommendations. Botec Analysis Corporation and the Urban Institute are currently completing an evaluation of Multnomah County's DTE program with support provided by

NIJ. The evaluation consists of both a process and impact evaluation. The process evaluation is nearly complete. Results of this evaluation suggest that, while overall the pre-trial component of DTE is working, it is hampered by several problems: (1) a failure to sanction FTAs and positive urinalyses; (2) the high percentage of pre-trial DTE clients who remain unevaluated for drug and other problems; (3) little use made of DTE evaluations and DTE clients are seldom referred to drug treatment and other support programs; (4) during the evaluation period nearly three-quarters of all clients failed to successfully complete the pre-trial program. On the other hand, the probation and parole component of DTE appears to work well and is highly regarded by probation and parole officers (POs). POs regard the DTE program as a valuable method of controlling and sanctioning their clients' behavior.

***Bruce D. Johnson, Director,
Special Populations Research,
National Development and
Research Institutes***

Using a Serious Drug Abuse Typology for Referrals to Drug Treatment. This study was designed to help criminal justice practitioners in all branches and agencies of the criminal justice system make informed decisions about whether specific criminal offenders are serious drug abusers. A secondary analysis of data from the Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program in Manhattan from 1987-1991 suggests that the vast majority of arrestees in New York City are serious abusers of heroin, cocaine, or crack. Moreover, the study identifies important subgroups of arrestees who have extremely high or very high probabilities of being cocaine or opiate positive at arrest; other arrestees are classified as having high, intermediate, or low probabilities (base rates).

The Serious Drug Abuser Scale is a user-friendly point score system which provides practitioners with an estimate of a given arrestee's probabilities of being cocaine or opiate positive. This may suggest a need for drug treatment. The report also provides a strong rationale for and review of the scientific literature about the importance of coercing cocaine and heroin abusers into drug treatment,

and the effectiveness of treatment in interrupting drug abuse and criminal careers. Use of these probabilities does not necessitate a urine test, its expense, chain of custody issues, or other limitations associated with actual drug testing.

The study provided ten policy recommendations for using base rates and scale scores at arrest, adjudication, sentencing, and supervision (within corrections or during probation). Case scenarios suggested how base rates and scale scores could be employed to set drug treatment mandates, regardless of case disposition, as well as sentence and supervise convicted offenders. The estimates (base rates and scale scores) corresponded to probabilities, not evidence of actual drug use or actual urine test results. Such estimates should not be used to determine guilt or innocence for a specific crime, nor to justify a more severe disposition. Decisions about drug treatment should be considered separately from decisions regarding legal and criminal justice determinations about guilt, sentence, or supervision of offenders. However, arrest provides a window of opportunity for reaching recalcitrant serious drug abusers and criminals in order to place them in drug treatment they would otherwise avoid.

Environmental Crime

*Richard T. Nixon, Director,
National Environmental Crime
Prosecution Center, and Donald
Rebovich, Director, American
Prosecutors Research Institute*

The data collected and analyzed from local prosecutors representing large jurisdictions supplies us with the foundation profiling characteristics of local prosecutors who prosecute environmental offenses. The information not only uncovers the extent to which local prosecutors proceed with these cases, but pinpoints types of decision making inherent in these extraordinary cases.

The following results synthesize information obtained from the offices in which the local prosecution of environmental offenses take place.

Most of the offices have seen a rise in environmental crime cases over the last 2 1/2 years (offices that had prosecuted no environmental offense cases in 1990 were much more likely to have done so by the first half of 1992). Few of the offices operate formal public awareness programs in environmental crime. Approximately half of the large jurisdiction prosecutors' offices operate special environmental prosecution units; while about half of the offices participate in environmental crime control task forces. Over half of the offices assign full-time prosecutors to environmental offenses and over three quarters assign part-time prosecutors to these cases. Only about one third of the offices assign part-time investigators to environmental crime cases, with the majority relying on outside sources for investigative support. Less than half of the offices have civil jurisdiction in environmental offense cases.

For local prosecutors within large jurisdictions, most prosecute environmental offenses vertically and are proactive in the sense that they are involved in early stages of the investigations. The most common environmental offenses prosecuted are those involving illegal disposal. The most common

substances involved in prosecuted environmental crimes are hazardous wastes.

Most believe that they receive support for environmental prosecutions from the DA's office, local government regulatory agencies and the community, but believe that they receive less support from local law enforcement and the local judiciary. However, referrals are as likely to come from local law enforcement as they are to come from environmental regulatory agencies.

The most important factors in deciding to prosecute environmental offenses are, by far, the degree of harm posed by the offense and the criminal intent of the offender. The most significant factor for rejecting the prosecution of environmental offenses is insufficient evidence, or the lack of ability to recognize appropriate evidence. Lack of resources was one of the least likely reasons for rejection.

Most believe that the appropriateness of alternative civil statutes is a significant factor in the decision to prosecute criminally. Most would be more likely to proceed civilly if the prosecution target were a corporation/business entity.

The vast majority believe they require additional financial support to operate more effectively. Most believe internal competition for funds affects the amount of resources earmarked for environmental prosecutions. Almost half believe that funds are insufficient for the satisfactory analysis of waste samples. Only one-third are permitted by state law to retain all or a portion of fines/penalties generated by environmental cases.

Almost all indicated a need for increased technical assistance and training to improve the performance of environmental prosecution unit personnel. Less than half believe that training is available now to adequately qualify personnel as experts in environmental investigation and prosecution.

More than three-quarters contend that expert witness testimony significantly affects environmental offense charging decisions and is

critical to the local prosecutor during trial. Almost all expressed a need for a national/regional list of experts in a multitude of environmental crime areas.

Only about one quarter believe that the courts are willing to impose custody sentences for environmental crime convictions. Over three quarters believe that environmental offenders' offers to remediate or make restitution impacts case disposition.

Dale P. Boll, Office of Criminal Enforcement, Environmental Protection Agency

The Pollution Prosecution Act of 1990 mandated three EPA investigators per state by 1996. Currently, there are 60 agents. The EPA needs more agents to work with local agencies to identify environmental crime and to take appropriate action.

Anthony J. Schembri, Police Commissioner, City of Rye, Westchester County, New York

Environmental Crimes. The International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) Environmental Committee has developed over the past two years several strong goals to which the IACP is committed:

1. To develop a resolution on crime and the environment for consideration by the membership at the annual conference.
2. To develop, endorse, and mandate a portion of Police Academy curriculum on environmental crime, in order to make new police officers more sensitive to this issue. The curriculum would emphasize recognition of environmental crimes in progress, and potential abusing agencies.
3. To conduct a workshop on environmental crime at our annual conferences, drawing speakers from the Environmental Protection

Agency and other organizations that have similar expertise.

4. To develop a manual on environmental crime to assist police agencies across the country and throughout the world in responding to environmental crimes and environmental crimes in progress.

The EPA was able to fund the IACP committee for a mid-year conference to be held in June in Colorado.

At the present time, the committee consists of 22 police chiefs from across the country, who have a deep concern and awareness of environmental crime. They are dedicated and committed to the future goals of this committee and IACP.

This committee is organizing and networking on behalf of local police chiefs to meet this crime area in a proactive manner.

At the present time, Mr. Schembri is working with the president of every state association of chiefs of police to cause them to develop committees on environmental crimes in their states.

Building Evaluation Capacities in the States

*Al Toczydlowski, Philadelphia,
Pennsylvania, District Attorney's
Office*

Mr. Toczydlowski emphasized the importance of considering evaluation results to improve prosecutors' operations. For example, Wolfgang's longitudinal study of juvenile offenders in Philadelphia showed that only a few juveniles commit the majority of crimes. The findings aided the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office in arranging for vertical prosecution of these juveniles. NIJ is now studying the criteria being used to select juveniles for vertical prosecution.

Most cases are lost because victims either do not show up, or do not stay with the criminal justice process. To deal with this problem, the Philadelphia DA's office set up a victim witness program. One component of the program involves the use of high school students to meet victims at court, bring coffee, see that they are seated comfortably, etc.

Evaluations are a part of the FAST and LINE prosecution efforts in Philadelphia. FAST targets career criminals arrested with guns and results in the processing of about 400 cases annually in federal court. A citizens' crime commission has been evaluating FAST for BJA with drug forfeiture funds. LINE involves street-level narcotics enforcement in targeted areas. It involves police/prosecutor collaboration for vertical prosecution and uses a MAPINFO database to analyze citizen complaints. When a crack house is shut down due to LINE operations, the district attorney sends the property owner a letter and a copy of the arrest report. The letter asks the owner to call the DA's office to discuss how to avoid forfeiture of the property in the future. A recent assessment shows that when these letters were sent, drug activity ceased at 27 of 30 properties, compared to only 17 of 30 where there were police raids alone. Drug property forfeitures are also publicized in the newspaper.

*Richard Freedman, Director,
Maryland Governor's Juvenile
Justice Advisory Council*

The Governor's Council administers OJJDP block grants in the state of Maryland. The Council agrees with Attorney General Reno on the importance of knowing what results are being achieved with current funding before deciding how to spend future funds. First, states must comply with the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act's requirements (e.g., removing juveniles from adult jails and lockups and addressing the over-representation of minorities in secure care).

Juvenile justice grants in Maryland range from \$1,500 to \$200,000. Recently, two professors from the University of Maryland conducted a retreat for Council members to discuss research, evaluation, and advice on what to look for in subgrantee applications. The retreat was not only an inexpensive source of assistance for the Council, but also helped get the university involved in community issues, and provided valuable experience for graduate students. The Council now requires literature reviews in each application, more specificity about how funds would be spent, and quarterly narrative reports on progress toward objectives, programmatic strengths, and weaknesses.

One dilemma involves giving the majority of funds to good grant writers and experienced managers. There is a continuing need to build the capacity of new service providers. Graduate students could be used more fully to assist with data analysis. Finally, subgrantees need to be encouraged to diversify their funding sources.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1993

Evaluation of Weed and Seed Programs

Pamela Swain, Director, Office for Weed and Seed, Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice

Weed and Seed Program: What Can We Learn? The most publicized segment of Weed and Seed Program has been the "Weed" aspect of the program. Ms. Swain concentrated on the "Seed" aspect of the program, which emphasizes education, prevention, and treatment; economic revitalization; and continued community involvement.

The Weed and Seed program targets neighborhoods that are hardest hit by crime, violence, and eroding social and economic stability. The Weed and Seed program is designed to rid these target areas of violent criminals; provide prevention, intervention, and treatment services for substance abuse and other social problems; and revitalize the community through housing and economic development.

The principal components of Weed and Seed are community involvement; coordination and concentration of resources in specific geographic areas; and private sector investment. Planning for and implementing the Weed and Seed strategy involves six planning steps:

Step 1. Organize and convene a Weed and Seed steering committee. It is important to involve the policy makers from the beginning. A series of policies, procedures and practices will be required to change the organizations involved in Weed and Seed. Effective Weed and Seed programs require both top-down and bottom-up approaches.

Step 2. Select the target neighborhood.

Step 3. Conduct a needs assessment of the target neighborhood which identifies the risk factors such as crime and disorder, inadequate public and private service, lack of transportation,

economic and employment conditions, education, religious, and cultural institutions, etc.

Step 4. Select existing resources and develop new resources. A major effort needs to be directed a redeployment of existing resources such as police. Any economic revitalization effort must be viewed from both short- and long-term perspectives.

Step 5. Identify goals, objectives, and implementation activities. Goals and objectives do not operate in isolation from one another. Goals dealing with prevention and community revitalization should work in conjunction with all the other goals.

Step 6. Develop an implementation schedule. The sequence in which activities are undertaken is critical. Most Weed and Seed sites have undertaken activities directed at suppression of violent crime through coordinated federal, state, and local law enforcement efforts. This activity will be followed by community policing, prevention, intervention, and treatment programs which must make it difficult for the neighborhood to slide back to its old condition.

Economic Revitalization. Economic revitalization efforts should include neighborhood and community businesses. Steps toward implementing economic revitalization should start with improving the community's physical conditions and making the neighborhood look better. The second step is restoring shopping and retail outlets and making the transportation services convenient and reliable. The third step is increasing business and job opportunities for the residents.

There need to be linkages with other Weed and Seed objectives, programs, and activities. For example there should be linkages between "Safe Havens" (bringing together education, community services, law enforcement, health, recreation, and other service providers in one community location

such as a school) and jobs in the area. Another example is the linkage between HUD, Labor, and DOJ in the "Step-Up Program" (an apprenticeship training program).

Future. Many jurisdictions are asking for formal Weed and Seed recognition. Twenty-two are receiving Weed and Seed funds. Over fifty jurisdictions are recognized, but are not receiving Weed and Seed funds. The Weed and Seed program has been given \$23 million to continue next year.

Some evaluation questions remain: How has the criminal justice delivery system been enhanced in the Weed and Seed neighborhood? What set of programs were implemented? How comprehensive were these programs? What is the relationship between the Weed and Seed strategic plan and the subsequent Weed and Seed operations? What is the interrelationship between organizational policies and procedures, practitioners, and residents? And, finally, what police and prosecutor policies, procedures, and practices have changed in response to the Weed and Seed program?

Janice A. Roehl, Senior Vice President, Institute for Social Analysis

National Weed and Seed Evaluation. The Institute for Social Analysis, Police Foundation, and American Prosecutors Research Institute are collaborating on the national evaluation of the Weed and Seed program. The 18-month process evaluation will document the implementation, costs, and operations of all nineteen demonstration programs. The information will be gathered via:

1. The collection and review of grant applications, quarterly reports, task force meeting minutes, and program materials.
2. Routinized reporting systems completed by Weed and Seed coordinators, which cover program structure, target area characteristics, weeding activities, arrest data, disposition data from local prosecutors and U.S.

Attorneys, community policing approaches, and the nature of seeding activities.

3. Site visits to interview staff, key task force members, police officials, and prosecutors; tour target areas, and collect program materials and documents.
4. Surveys and telephone interviews with U.S. Attorneys and community leaders.

The evaluation has been actively underway for just two months, with the major emphasis placed on gathering historical information on program formation and operations through 1992. The demonstration programs began between May and December 1992. The national evaluation is due to be completed in March 1994.

Donald Rebovich, Director, American Prosecutors Research Institute, and John Schaaf, Research Analyst, American Prosecutors Research Institute

Prosecution Management Tracking System. The American Prosecutors Research Institute (APRI) has been funded to develop a computerized data collection and reporting system for use in local prosecutors' offices that are participating in the Weed and Seed initiative. The system is intended to help prosecutors track prosecution activities resulting from the handling of Weed and Seed criminal cases, and facilitate the submission of such data to APRI for aggregation and analysis. The system design is also intended to allow local prosecutors to monitor the impact of Weed and Seed participation on their caseloads and resources through the generation of regular summary reports. In addition to offender and offense characteristics, the system will gather data on case-processing variables such as pre-trial detention, gang involvement, and sentencing dispositions.

The primary goal of this project is to accurately measure prosecution-related activities and impacts of Weed and Seed programs on

local prosecutors' offices in each of the nineteen sites through the design, development, and implementation of a computerized data collection system.

Activities proposed under this project are intended to answer several principal research questions. The proposed data elements (see Section II) address the following research questions:

- How have Weed and Seed enforcement activities impacted the local prosecutor's office, local law enforcement, and the courts?
- What types of prosecution activities are being conducted in conjunction with the Weed and Seed program?
- What is the local prosecutor's involvement level in Weed and Seed enforcement activities?

Research Design and Data Analysis

Methods. The proposed research design is oriented towards the development and eventual implementation of a computerized Weed and Seed database. It is envisioned that each Weed and Seed prosecutor's office will maintain a version of the software to enter prosecution activities data. These data are submitted to APRI for aggregation and analysis. As an end product of the research effort, development of the computerized database entails several ancillary research tasks: 1) conduct a "needs and capabilities" assessment of local Weed and Seed prosecutors; 2) develop an initial hardcopy format of the database that will allow APRI to finalize data elements and related definitions; 3) design and pre-test versions of the final database; and 4) produce summary or descriptive statistics for the cumulative database and individual Weed and Seed sites.

Ascertaining the needs and capabilities of the prosecutor's office is as important as a well designed and programmed information system requires accurate assessment of potential users' activities and capabilities, and anticipation of implementation obstacles. The proposed assessment will: (1) resolve which data items are germane to Weed and Seed prosecution

activities and should be included in the database; (2) determine the relative availability of data elements in each site; and (3) identify individual data collection/submission capabilities of the sites. Information derived from the stage two assessment will be incorporated into the computerized data collection and storage system, which will include, but may expand upon, data elements contained in the hardcopy data collection forms.

To date, APRI has completed needs assessment and design activities for the hardcopy and computerized data collection forms. Numerous Weed and Seed prosecutors' offices have been contacted and interviewed to solicit information to guide the design efforts for the database. The hardcopy and computerized formats have been reviewed by several different groups (e.g., local prosecutors, NIJ project staff, members of state and federal Weed and Seed agencies) and have undergone multiple revisions. APRI project staff are currently completing final programming revisions for the computerized database version.

Responses to Gangs

David Curry, Professor, West Virginia University

National Assessment of Law Enforcement Anti-Gang Information Resources. This National Assessment surveyed police departments in the 79 largest U.S. cities and smaller cities and county jurisdictions included in the 1988 OJJDP /University of Chicago national gang survey. Information compiled was limited to official departmental policies and annual statistics based on official records. Results indicate that perception of the presence of gang and gang-like problems is widespread. Nearly 100 percent (72) of departments in the largest cities report the presence of gangs involving youth and engaging in criminal activity within their jurisdictions. Three more departments (Baltimore, MD; Raleigh, NC; and Washington, DC) report no gang problem but do report the presence of groups, including youth and those involved in criminal activity for which they use some other label—specifically drug organization, posse, or crew.

Comparisons of 1992 data with previous studies of the national level gang problem, including those by Miller, Needle and Stapleton, and Spargel and Curry, reveal statistically significant increases in the number of city police departments reporting gang problems over time. An examination of how information is maintained and reported reveals major needs for technical assistance in information system management by local police departments. Although all 72 large cities reported the maintenance of records on gang activity (either manually or computerized), a majority were unable to generate the kinds of annual summary statistics needed to assess the level of gang problems. Such summaries produce annual tabulations of the number of gangs, the number of gang members, and the number of gang-related crimes for their jurisdictions. In the largest U.S. cities, local law enforcement agencies maintained records for 1991 on at least 3,876 gangs; 202,981 gang members; and 36,265 gang incidents. Adding reports from smaller cities and county jurisdictions (and adjusting for overlap between

Los Angeles city and county data) results in a total of 4,881 gangs; 249,324 gang members; and 46,359 gang incidents.

Major policy recommendations of this study are that technical assistance in support of local law enforcement information systems should: (1) encourage an awareness of the need to focus on accurate and routine reporting as well as record keeping of gang-related information; (2) place a greater emphasis on gang-related crime data in addition to gang and member data; (3) specify social demographic characteristics of gang offenders that are most relevant to policy, program planning, and decision-making; and (4) link management information system structures to routine and uniform standards of evaluation at the local and national levels.

Robert Levinson, Special Projects Manager, American Correctional Association

Gangs in Correctional Facilities. The project began in December 1991. ACA surveyed 125 correctional systems: the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the District of Columbia, 50 state departments of corrections, and 73 local jail systems. Follow-up visits were made to selected sites to amplify survey findings.

Three major goals were: (1) examine how correctional facilities manage gang activities; (2) assess innovative strategies for controlling prison gangs; and, (3) identify research needs for the future.

Instead of "gangs," which has both negative and surplus meanings, the project used the term "security threat group" (STG), defined as two (2) or more inmates, acting together, who pose a threat to the security or safety of staff inmates and/or are disruptive to programs and/or to the orderly management of the facility/system.

Comparing project data from all 52 state and federal jurisdictions with a 1985 study (Camp and Camp), the 1992 ACA study found an increase in STG activity. Based on the

available figures, 12,634 inmates (3% of the population), were identified as STG members in 1985. Currently, that number is 46,190 inmates (6%)—twice the 1985 percentage. In seven years, there was a 265 percent increase in absolute numbers. Of the 52 responses received from prison systems, only 29 percent indicated they have policy and procedures for STGs. For 46 jails, the percentage drops to 13 percent. Prison systems reported 762 different STGs at the time of the survey. Of that number, 50 (7%) were present in two or more systems. Four STGs were present in 42 percent or more of the jails and prisons—Bloods, Crips, Aryan Brotherhood, and Skinheads. The White Supremacy Group also reached this threshold for prisons.

Incidents of violence by all inmates tend to be higher for jails than for prisons (4% versus 1% toward staff, and 16% versus 4% toward inmates, respectively). The estimated proportion of violence attributed to STG members in both jails and prisons was virtually identical (19% versus 20% toward staff and 42% versus 40% toward inmates, respectively). Five control methods were available at a statistically significant greater frequency in prisons than in jails: within-state transfers, out-of-state transfers, urinalysis, telephone monitoring, and mail monitoring.

Potentially problematical STGs were better controlled in those systems that had policy and procedure statements for validating STG members, using segregation, within-state transfers, and protective custody.

Suggested follow-on research topics include: development of an STG validation instrument, paying greater attention to legal and classification issues, converting to automated systems, and providing more staff training in gang awareness. A proactive, rather than reactive response to STGs is strongly recommended. The final report is currently being reviewed by NIJ.

**Gwyn Smith Ingley, Adult Projects
Director, American Correctional
Association**

*Role of Probation and Parole in Gang
Prevention.* In 1991, the National Institute of

Justice (NIJ) placed the gang initiative as a top priority. In 1992, NIJ expanded this initiative through research on a variety of issues, including the role of probation and parole in gang prevention and control. This was a supplemental award to the NIJ/ACA project, "Gangs in Correctional Facilities: A National Assessment."

This initial study revealed evidence that street gangs are becoming the prison gangs of the future. Many of those being incarcerated already have an allegiance to a street gang and are simply transferring this involvement to prison. The scope of gang activity in the nation's correctional facilities has expanded during the past decade.

To fulfill the need for a national assessment of gang activity in the area of probation and parole, ACA is developing a resource which will supply probation and parole managers with state-of-the-art information regarding client gang activities. It will include policies and procedures that have been tested and have demonstrated their value in helping to control the negative behavior of client gang activities. This resource is being designed to meet the needs of probation and parole staff, as well as to aid communities, law enforcement agencies, and correctional policymakers in dealing more effectively with disruptive client behavior caused by gang activity.

The project is being conducted in four phases:

- Phase I — Project Start-up Activities
- Phase II — Literature Search
- Phase III — Data Gathering/Analysis
- Phase IV — Final Report Preparation

ACA is surveying 100 federal, state, and local jurisdictions across the country. In addition, on-site interviews will be held with knowledgeable individuals regarding their agencies' procedures for identifying, monitoring, tracking, and controlling negative client gang behavior.

The information collected through this project, coupled with the material from the current ACA/NIJ project, "Gangs in Correctional Facilities: A National Assessment," will provide correctional managers with a resource not

currently available. It will allow them to develop or modify policies and procedures based on examples that have proven to be effective for controlling and managing gang activities.

***Hugh Nugent, Principal Associate,
Institute for Law and Justice***

Prosecuting Gang Crime: A National Assessment. The Prosecuting Gang Crime study examines how state legislatures and prosecutors are dealing with street-gang violent crime. The assessment has three major components: legal review of state laws pertaining to gangs; a national survey of prosecutors; and site studies of selected gang prosecution units.

Fourteen states have enacted gang legislation, five of them in the form of Street Terrorism Enforcement and Prevention Acts. Few of the statutes have defined new crimes, choosing instead to enhance existing sentences for gang-related crimes. Even the Street Terrorism Acts incorporate existing criminal statutes by reference. The Street Terrorism Acts raise and resolve First Amendment issues of free association and expression. They clearly tie penalties for participating in gang activity to the commission of other serious crimes.

Other states apparently deem their existing criminal codes adequate to deal with gang crime, and the prosecutors responding to the survey generally agree. They use the full array of criminal law, including laws affixing criminal responsibility (aiding and abetting, acting as accomplices) and defining inchoate crimes (attempts, conspiracy). Prosecutors make little use of RICO statutes, which are designed to confront criminal organizations far more complicated and sophisticated than typical street gangs.

In response to the survey, 77 percent of the prosecutors indicated that gang-related violence had increased in their jurisdictions over the past three years. Assault, drug possession, and drug sales are the most frequent charge against gang members. Over one-third (44 of 118, or 37.3 percent) of the larger jurisdictions (population over 250,000) responding had formed special gang prosecution units. Two-thirds of the larger jurisdictions participated in

special gang enforcement initiatives with other agencies, and over half (56.8 percent) had access to a police computerized gang-member tracking system.

The most difficult problems facing prosecutors, according to both survey responses and site visit interviews, lie in getting victims and witnesses to testify. Gangs intimidate victims and witnesses outside their own circles. Within the gang subculture, the roles of perpetrator, victim, and witness rotate in a cycle of violence and retaliation. Today's perpetrator is tomorrow's victim as gangs pursue their own vengeance outside the criminal justice system. The facts of cases may be simple, but testimony proving the facts is hard to produce in court.

Evaluation of Family Violence Programs

Sally Flanzer, Child Welfare Program Specialist, National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect

A Review of Research and Evaluation Related to Family Violence Funded by the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect.
The National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN) funds activities to enhance national, state, and community efforts to prevent, identify, and treat child abuse and neglect. NCCAN is one of many federal offices that support research and evaluations of family violence programs. Most efforts to protect children from violence are funded through NCCAN. The programs that target family violence specifically are funded through the Office of Community Services. Many of the current funding efforts in both divisions are focusing on prevention.

The Administration for Children and Families has implemented several new programs and strategies. These include the creation of a research, demonstration, and evaluation branch; establishment of a funding group for community-based prevention services to evaluate programming for children at risk of abuse and neglect whose parents abuse substances; funding of 94 "Emergency Services" grantees who are required to evaluate their abuse prevention services; discretionary funding of field-initiated evaluation research; and the preparation of a pilot project to provide technical assistance for program evaluation.

The family violence field has reached the stage where evaluations must become part of every research and programming effort. For example, a high number of prisoners were abused as children, yet little has been done about this problem; and there have been few evaluations of effective treatments. ACYF's Division of Research and Evaluation is sponsoring 24 national evaluations, six of which relate to family violence. Issues involved include maltreatment of handicapped children, runaway and homeless youth from substance abusing families, causes of youth homelessness, and interagency reporting models. Through

NCCAN, nine models of community-based programs have been funded for five years. Other research and evaluation projects involve the Hawaii Healthy Start program, the "Don't Shake the Baby" Campaign, the effects of children witnessing family violence, treatment comparisons using cases from Families First in Chicago, and a Police Foundation study of system effects to determine which types of cases benefit from joint police and social services interventions.

David A. Ford, Associate Professor of Sociology, Indiana University at Indianapolis

The Indianapolis Domestic Violence Prosecution Experiment (IDVPE). This experiment evaluates policies meant to protect battered women from suspects brought to the prosecution process following either a police officer's warrantless, on-scene arrest, or a victim's complaint directly to the prosecutor. Based on randomized policy recommendations, prosecutors tracked cases toward one of three outcomes—pretrial diversion to rehabilitative counseling; adjudicated guilt with counseling as a condition of probation; and other sentencing, such as fines, probation, and jail time. Each track is normally pursued under a "no drop" policy. Victim complaint cases include a fourth track, allowing victims to drop charges after an initial hearing.

The IDVPE is actually two experiments implemented simultaneously and distinguished by the manner in which defendants enter the system. They include all men formally charged with a misdemeanor assault against a female conjugal partner in Indianapolis between June 1986, and July 1987, who met certain eligibility requirements (e.g., no previous conviction for felony violence). One, the On-scene Warrantless Arrest (OSA) Experiment, involves 198 suspects arrested at the scene of a violent domestic disturbance. Each OSA defendant was randomly assigned to one of three prosecutorial tracks under a "no drop" policy for subsequent processing toward adjudication. The other, the Victim-Initiated Complaint (VC) Experiment,

involves 480 suspects identified by victims' affidavits filed at the prosecutor's office. Each VC defendant was processed following random assignment to both an "entry" condition (summons or warrant) and one of four prosecutorial tracks.

Principal findings on the effectiveness of alternative policies are based on the prevalence of violence six months following case settlement, as reported in interviews with 106 OSA victims and 324 VC victims. In OSA cases, 75 percent of the defendants had battered their victims at least once in the six months before the violence resulting in their latest arrests. By six months following case settlement, 38 percent had battered again. There is little difference in this pattern according to the prosecutorial track pursued. Thus, given arrest with prosecution, one policy is no better than another in preventing new violence. In VC cases, 72 percent of the victims had been battered at least once prior to the incident on which they filed charges. Twenty-nine percent were battered again within six months following settlement. Overall, VC cases show little variation in the chance of new violence among diversion, probation with counseling, and other sentences in preventing further violence. However, when VC defendants are brought to court on a warrant, victims who are allowed to drop charges are less likely than others to experience new violence either during the process or within the six-month follow-up period. According to interview reports, none of the those victims were battered during the process; 13 percent were battered after settlement.

Of the warrant cases in which victims were permitted to drop charges, approximately half actually did drop and half pursued the case. Those who were permitted to drop, but elected to follow through, experienced less recidivism than any other category. An important factor here appears to be victim empowerment. These victims retained their ability to choose a course of action; at the same time they were in alliance with "a more powerful other" (the prosecutor), and could use prosecution as a bargaining tool.

Drug Testing: Program Impacts (B)

**Rudy Haapanen, Research
Manager, California Youth
Authority**

Drug Testing for Youthful Offenders on Parole: An Experimental Study. Drug testing clearly improves the parole agent's ability to detect drug use and/or to verify suspected drug use among parolees. Still unresolved, however, are who, how often, and under what circumstances to optimally test for drugs to provide the most cost-effective parole services. Drug testing takes time and money, both of which might better be spent on other services with more positive adjustment activities: placement, school, vocational training, counseling, and so on.

The study seeks to determine the relative benefits associated with different levels of testing, with the aim of determining the lowest practical level of routine unscheduled drug tests for offenders on parole supervision. A secondary research question involves the impact of drug testing frequency on parole supervision itself. At issue here are the factors other than potential effect on parolee outcomes that would bear on the value of limiting or imposing various levels of drug testing on parole agents.

A sample of 2,000 parolees will be randomly assigned to one of five testing levels. The study excludes those with limited jurisdiction or confinement time, those lacking parole conditions allowing testing, those with parole conditions which specify frequency of testing or specific response to testing, those released to Immigration, those committed to state prison but who served their time at a Youth Authority facility, those released to high-intensity or residential drug treatment programs, and those living in rural areas where drug testing is not feasible.

Data will be collected from four sources: the parolee's criminal history files, parole staff reports, the contract drug testing laboratory, and interviews with parole agents. Interviews with parole agents will elicit their perceptions and knowledge about drug testing

with parolee populations, the role of drug testing as part of their casework duties, and adaptations to the different levels of drug testing for the parolees on their caseloads.

As of June 15, 1993, a total of 1,650 parolees have been assigned to one of the five testing groups, and 630 have been excluded from the study. Preliminary analysis of drug testing data indicates that agents are complying with the testing restrictions. Slightly more than one-quarter of the Youth Authority's 148 case-carrying agents have been interviewed (n=39).

**Peter Greenwood, Senior
Researcher, RAND**

Evaluation of Drug Testing and Interventions for Probationers in Maricopa County. Over the past decade, the use of drug testing within the criminal justice system has increased considerably. While the primary purpose for drug testing is to monitor drug use, there is also an assumption that testing serves as a specific deterrent. To date, there has been little research regarding this assumption. The goal of RAND's Maricopa County Drug Testing Experiment is to evaluate the effects of alternative combinations of drug testing, treatment, and sanctions in reducing drug use among adult probationers.

In this experiment, 639 probationers convicted of first time drug offenses have been randomly assigned to the following four conditions: no drug testing; random testing once a month; scheduled testing twice a week; or participation in a court-supervised program of testing and treatment. This last condition is a new First Time Drug Offender (FTDO) program recently established by the Maricopa Adult Probation Department and the Superior Court. Under this program, probationers can reduce the length of their probation term (from three years to only six months) by complying with the conditions of a probation contract requiring their participation in specified drug education, counseling, and community service programs. Individual contracts are reviewed and adjusted every two months by a special Drug Court.

Prior drug use and criminal history measures are included in background data collection. Twelve-month follow-up process and outcome data being collected for the evaluation include program participation, recidivism and social adjustment. Program participation is measured in terms of the number of face-to-face or phone contacts with the probation officer, the number of drug tests ordered and taken, and the number of drug education and counseling sessions.

Preliminary results show the Drug Court participants to have lower rates of technical violations and arrests than the other three tracks. The Drug Court is being continued by the County after the grant period is over.

William Rhodes, Senior Research Scientist, Abt Associates

Drug Testing and Pretrial Risk

Prediction. If arrestees who test positive for recent drug use are more prone to commit crimes than those who test negative, then judges can take special steps to protect the community. However, drug testing is expensive for the court, and mandatory drug testing may encroach on Fourth Amendment protection against illegal searches and seizures.

Abt analyzed seven extant data sets that record pretrial misconduct for arrestees who were tested for recent drug use when booked into jail. A failure-time model was used to estimate the predictive power of urine testing for identifying people who would be rearrested during the period of pretrial release. We used a probit model to estimate the predictive power of urine testing for identifying people who would fail to appear for a scheduled court date. We used meta-analysis to combine results across the sites.

Arrestees who tested positive for recent drug use are more likely than those who tested negative to be rearrested during pretrial release. They are more likely to fail to appear for scheduled court dates. Once other factors (especially criminal history and community ties) are taken into account, however, no evidence indicates that drug users per se pose greater risks for pretrial misconduct. Nevertheless, evidence

supports the conclusion that those who test positive for heroin are more likely to be rearrested during pretrial release, and that those who test positive for cocaine are more likely to fail to appear for scheduled court dates.

Evaluating Strategies to Combat Violent Crime

Mary Ann Hughes, Research Analyst, Delaware Statistical Analysis Center

The Delaware Statistical Analysis Center (SAC) has received repeated requests for information about domestic violence. There are no domestic violence statutes in Delaware, although several bills are pending. In an effort to provide information on domestic violence, the Delaware SAC examined victim to offender relationships in the 1991 Uniform Crime Report. They then grouped the relationships into partner, relative, other known, stranger, and relationship unknown. The SAC produced a rough estimate of domestic violence, including homicide, rape, aggravated assault, simple assault, and other sex offenses.

Domestic violence accounts for half of reported violence cases in which offenders were known to victims. Victims knew assailants in nearly 70 percent of reported incidents of violence. Most domestic violence assaults involve partners by a ratio of 3:1.

Of the domestic violence homicides and assaults, one in ten was a domestic aggravated assault. Ten domestic violence homicides occurred in Delaware in 1991, more partner than relative homicides by a 3:2 ratio.

Nearly 2,000 sexual assaults were reported, including forcible rape and other sexual assaults. The offender was known by the victim in over 70 percent of the cases. Of cases when assailant was known, over one-third were domestic violence. Other findings are available in a Statistical Analysis Center report titled, *Looking at Domestic Violence: 1991 Victim to Offender Relationships for Selected Violent Crimes*. The Delaware State Police Department is now setting up a tracking system to determine the number of domestic violence calls for service to the police.

David E. Jones, Director, Criminal Justice Analysis Center, North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission

Implementation and Impact Assessment of North Carolina's Violent Crime Initiative. In 1990 and 1991, violent crime in North Carolina surged above U.S. and southern U.S. violent crime rates. The North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission has implemented a comprehensive effort to reduce the level of school violence as a major component of its overall violent crime initiative. A task force on school violence was established by Governor Hunt in February of 1993, and included the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Crime Control and Public Safety. It held hearings across the state in March and submitted a report to Governor Hunt on April 8th. Legislation has been introduced in the North Carolina General Assembly that would increase penalties for possessing a handgun on school property and for allowing a minor to take a weapon to school. Legislation has also been introduced to make possession of a handgun by anyone under the age of 21 a crime and to require safe storage of firearms in households. One million dollars is available in 1993 from the Crime Commission for school violence grants, and \$5 million was appropriated to establish alternative schools in areas with high school suspension rates.

A survey of all the local schools in the state was also conducted during this time to compile data on the number of weapons and violent incidents that occurred during the 1991-1992 school year. State law requires school principals to report to the police all violence that involves injury, sex offenses, or weapons. This information has been analyzed to assess the true extent of the problem and will serve as the baseline data to evaluate the effectiveness of school violence reduction initiatives.

The Governor's Crime Commission has implemented several juvenile and school violence projects with BJA funds and has established a Center for the Prevention of School

Violence to coordinate a statewide response. The Commission's Analysis Center has also conducted a preliminary impact assessment of one project in Robeson County, North Carolina, that has demonstrated considerable success in reducing school violence while at the same time increasing the number of youth diverted from the juvenile justice system. In Robeson County, school resource officers answer calls in addition to visiting youth in their homes and serving as tutors and "big brothers."

***Ellen Brickman, Director of
Research, Victim Services/
Travelers Aid, New York City***

Evaluation of Violence Prevention Programs in Middle Schools. This study evaluates a multifaceted violence prevention program being implemented in three middle schools in New York City. Amid growing attention to the problems of violence among youth, schools across the nation have begun to implement conflict resolution training programs (typically including curricular and peer mediation components), to educate students in non-violent conflict resolution and provide them with mechanisms for constructively resolving their own conflicts. While such programs can reduce conflict-related violence among students, much of the violence to which youth are exposed is not a function of their own conflict with others. Many students are either victims of or witnesses to family violence, community violence, physical, or sexual violence in their own romantic relationships. Many of these experiences have been demonstrated to be associated with later risk of either violent offending or victimization. Thus, a "traditional" violence prevention program which is limited to conflict resolution and does not address these other needs may be inadequate to counter the messages of violence that students are receiving in their lives.

This conflict resolution program includes curricular and peer mediation components, with a broader-based victimization curriculum, a counseling program for child victims of and witnesses to violence, and a schoolwide anti-violence campaign. The current evaluation study (now eight months into a two-year project) assesses the impact of these

programs, compared to the impact of a more traditional conflict resolution-focused program (Project STOP). Baseline data (n=1,300) on students' knowledge, attitudes and behaviors with respect to conflict and different forms of violence indicate both high levels of exposure to extreme violence, and strong endorsement of many attitudes supporting violence among peers. These self-reports indicate that weapons are easier to obtain in school than are alcohol and drugs. Data collection will be repeated twice over the next year to assess change in knowledge, attitudes, and behavior, as well as in indicators of school performance. The expected study completion date is September 30, 1994. In addition, the Victim Services Agency recently received funding from the Centers for Disease Control to replicate the study.

Managing Specific Populations in Correctional Settings

**Henry J. Steadman, President,
Policy Research Associates, Inc.**

Management of Special Populations in Correctional Settings. Policy Research Associates, Inc., in conjunction with the National Center for State Courts' Institute on Mental Disability and the Law (IMDL/NCSC), is conducting a 15-month assessment of information, programs, and practices on the management and supervision of offenders with mental illness or mental disabilities by the nation's jails. The project objectives are: (1) to collect information on current policies and practices for managing inmates with mental illness and mental disabilities in jails (including the systemic relationships of the jail with the various components of the law enforcement, judicial, mental health, and social service systems), with special attention to the allocation of resources and inmate supervision; (2) to identify policies and practices that have potential to improve the supervision and treatment of mentally disabled offenders in jails and to examine how these policies and practices fit with current theory and research findings; (3) to formulate a research agenda that can guide future research; and (4) to produce a report for publication by NIJ on current management and supervision policies and practices that can assist policymakers and professionals in the field.

A three-stage approach is being used to accomplish these objectives: (1) a mail survey of a stratified sample of four sizes of jails (20-50, 51-250, 251-1,000, and more than 1,000 beds); (2) follow-up telephone interviews of individuals associated with 100 jails rated as having very effective mental health programs; and (3) in-depth, on-site research in ten jails selected as exceptional in their management and supervision of offenders with mental illness and mental disabilities. To date, data collection for the mail survey data revealed that 150, or 14.3%, of the 1049 jails surveyed rated their overall jail mental health programs as "very effective." From this group, a stratified sample (n=100) was drawn for the telephone interviews.

Currently, the researchers are analyzing the telephone interview data to determine which jails will be included in site visits. Site visits will be conducted over the summer of 1993 followed by report writing and dissemination. Work on this project should be completed in January 1994.

**Timothy S. Bynum, Professor,
School of Criminal Justice,
Michigan State University**

Identifying Effective Strategies for Managing Female Offenders. Over the past decade, there has been a tremendous increase in the numbers of female offenders incarcerated in prisons and jails across the country. This dramatic increase has strained resources and posed significant management problems for correctional administrators. These management issues are concerned with not only how to house and manage these increasing numbers of female offenders, but how to address the programming needs unique to this special population. Women offenders are increasingly likely to have committed drug offenses or have substance abuse problems, are more likely than male offenders to have children living with them prior to incarceration, and are more likely to be unemployed.

This study seeks to understand how administrators are dealing with this growing segment of the correctional population and to describe innovative and effective programs that address the problems of female offenders. Particular attention will be focused upon programs involving intermediate sanctions that have promise for further evaluation and replication.

A multi-method approach will be employed, which will consist of a comprehensive review of existing material on female offenders, analysis of existing data, a national survey of state and local correctional administrators, and site visits to innovative programs. The methods used in this study include: (1) a mail survey of 50 persons and 50 local jails, (2) site visits to four or five

innovative programs for women offenders, and (3) a reanalysis of the Bureau of Justice Statistics' state census and offender surveys. Additionally, the study will attempt to document innovative programs for women offenders in community-based programs. The survey of programs (institutional and community-based) will identify the different types of programs developed for women offenders including classification and housing, parenting skills, mental health, medical care, substance abuse, and educational and vocational training.

***Kim English, Research Director,
Colorado Division of Criminal
Justice***

Managing Sex Offenders in Community Settings. Correctional programs are encountering an increase in the number of sex offenders in institutional and community-based programs. Sex offenders present special challenges for community correctional agencies because of their public safety risk and likelihood of recidivating. Further, since sex offenses are often difficult to uncover, community correctional agencies must use innovative strategies to safely monitor the sex offender in the community.

This project is designed to identify the current techniques to manage the sex offender in the community. The project uses various research strategies. A content analysis has been conducted in all 50 state statutes to identify the various definitions of sex offenders and associated legislative sanctions. A mail survey is being conducted of all probation and parole agencies and state analysis centers on strategies used to monitor the offender in the community. Finally, the project will conduct on-site assessments of four to five model programs, including implementation issues and the various strategies used to overcome these issues. A report of the project should be completed by May 1994.

Using Criminalistics Identification Techniques in the Courts

**Kent E. Paulin, Supervisory
Special Agent, Federal Bureau of
Investigation**

FBI Laboratory Support of Drug Investigations and Prosecutions. As a member of the Racketeering Records Analysis Unit, SSA Paulin conducts examinations of clandestine records and oral intercepts relating to drug, money laundering, and organized crime investigations.

He works with seized records involving vice, drug traffic, and gambling, such as bookmaking, numbers, gaming devices, and casinos. The types of evidence they examine include ledgers, address books, shredded paper, bank records, tape recordings, computer discs, and pocket calendars or notes.

Evidence they find may include: type and quantity of drugs involved, unit price and money flow/laundrying information, method of payment, dates, individual roles in transactions, profits, and asset forfeitures.

Document evidence often bolsters the credibility of government witnesses. From the examination of these types of submitted records, the organizational structure, type of illicit activity involved, and profits associated with that activity can be exposed. This information is used for probable cause, to support warrants, to corroborate cooperative witnesses, and to establish the size and scope of the illicit organization. Based on the examinations, agent examiners are available to provide expert testimony in federal, state, and local courts.

As law enforcement is tasked to do more with less, but is pushed to conduct complex, long-term investigations, this type of testimony has proven invaluable. In numerous forfeiture hearings, the criminalistic results have made the difference between returning the asset and forfeiting it to the government.

**Kenneth Nimmich, Assistant
Section Chief, Forensic Science
Research & Training Center,
Federal Bureau of Investigation
Academy**

Imaging of Firearms Evidence.

Firearms identification began in 1925 with the introduction of the "Ballistic Comparison Microscope," which allowed for the side-by-side comparison of the marks on either two bullets or two cartridge cases. There has been little progress in that field since then, other than improvements in the optics of the microscope. Firearms examiners have been limited to the simultaneous comparison of only two specimens at a time which are suspected of being fired by the same gun. Because of the manual nature of the comparison process, it is labor intensive, and limited in scope by the memory of the firearms examiner and the investigative information provided to him. Thus, two shootings by the same suspect, several months apart, most likely would not be connected by random laboratory examination. Some investigative information that the shootings are related is necessary for the examiner to know to compare the evidence in the separate shootings.

In recent years, large metropolitan areas have experienced an unprecedented growth in the number of gang- and drug-related shootings. Until this increase, local forensic firearms laboratories were generally able to keep up with the volume of work generated by shooting incidents, since it was possible for firearms examiners to examine the evidence in a timely manner and correlate evidence from previous shootings using traditional manual and visual comparison techniques. Beginning in approximately 1985, forensic firearms laboratories have been overwhelmed with shooting evidence; and, as a result, case backlogs have increased to the point where examiners are usually examining cases which are going to trial in the immediate future.

In response to this unprecedented rise in gang- and drug-related shootings, the FBI began a pilot project in the Washington, D.C., area to

aid the laboratories in identifying firearms and ammunition in serial shootings. This project is called DRUGFIRE. DRUGFIRE is a database system which will store forensic classification data from firearms-related evidence together with images of the microscopic marks on the fired ammunition components. The goal of the DRUGFIRE project is to increase the solution rate of drug-related shootings by associating the firearms evidence in multiple cases with each other and with guns recovered in investigations.

DRUGFIRE software was developed by a contractor to the FBI and allows the capture, annotation, enhancement, encryption, transmission, manipulation (zooming, rotating and panning), and storage of images in the databank. All images in the system can be called up into a split screen format to allow a side-by-side comparison of either a live video image of the evidence under examination with a stored image or the side-by-side comparison of two stored images.

The District of Columbia uses Polaroid photos to record bullet markings for visual comparisons. DRUGFIRE is being implemented in the Alexandria-Washington-Baltimore corridor with six law enforcement laboratories, including those of the FBI and ATF. This system is presently limited to shell casing comparisons. The shell casing tells what type of weapon could have been used. A second experiment will be established in the San Diego-LA corridor. The Washington-Baltimore corridor costs are only \$125,000; for a single laboratory to join this system costs \$65,000.

At present the identification system is dependent upon the angle of light and is photo-based. Digitalization is now in progress. The primary goal of this system is to reduce the number of comparisons required, rather than to identify matches. There are now 750 shootings in the database. They have produced 35 matches among the 750 cases. In other words 70 cases are associated; this is nearly 10 percent of total.

In a recent Baltimore case, a defendant was arrested for weapon possession after the gun was linked to three shootings. In Montgomery County, a weapon misfire in an attempted carjacking was linked to the murder of a D.C. cabdriver.

In the future, the FBI hopes to develop a scanner for computer input of three-dimensional digital descriptors.

Steven J. Roman, Lead OCDETF Attorney, U.S. Attorney's Office, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Roman reviewed the rules of evidence for expert testimony, including the recent Supreme Court decision affirming the new rules established by the Federal Rules of Evidence (Rule 702). He noted that pagers are now used to transmit coded information. The expert must be able to testify as to how the code was broken, based upon knowledge of trafficker practices. One result has been that the success of search and seizure raids is now measured by records seized rather than the amount of drugs, money, or guns.

Related Workshops

Assessing the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Programs

Robert A. Kirchner, Chief, Program Evaluation, Bureau of Justice Assistance; Ruth Ann Cardella, University of Wisconsin-Madison; and Roger K. Przybylski, Coordinator of Research, Chicago, Illinois, Police Department

Workshop on Assessing the Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Programs. This workshop was designed to aid criminal justice policy makers and program managers in assessing the effectiveness of their programs. An attempt was made to apply the concepts, principles, and techniques embodied in the diverse types of criminal justice programs being implemented across the nation.

First, the workshop proposed general criteria to identify program effectiveness and several questions designed to tell program managers to what extent their programs are effective. Second, the instructors described how to translate the general criteria into elements necessary for evaluation. Participants used specific program elements to measure the extent to which programs are achieving their objectives.

Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act

Paula N. Rubin, Visiting Fellow, National Institute of Justice

Workshop on Americans with Disabilities Act. NIJ has developed a number of specific objectives and projects to provide regional training to criminal justice professionals on the ADA. NIJ is conducting a series of regional "needs oriented" training programs that will include practical guidance on compliance with the ADA and information about how some criminal justice agencies are complying with the law.

To develop a dialog between the criminal justice community and disability rights advocacy groups, the Institute will convene a

working group in Washington, early in 1994, to bring together members of criminal justice organizations, government representatives, and disability rights advocacy groups to discuss ADA issues.

This workshop began with a discussion of what discretion (or bias) is permitted versus that which is prohibited by law. Permitted discrimination includes (1) that against non-protected class members, such as attorneys, and (2) where it is based upon a bone-fide occupational qualification. It was further noted that the ADA does not impose new requirements upon public agencies. Virtually all public agencies have been covered since 1973 with a requirement forbidding discrimination against the handicapped (Vocation Rehabilitation Amendments of 1973). The ADA simply raises the threshold of awareness. If agencies were in compliance with the 1973 law, they are probably in compliance today.

A key reminder for ADA is the term "EQUAL." This means:

- "E" for essential functions of the job
- "Q" for qualified individual with a disability
- "U" for undue burden or direct threat
- "A" for accommodation
- "L" for living with disability

Questions in a two-page survey served as the basis for workshop discussion. For example, the first question asked if criminal justice agencies are required to give preference to persons with disabilities? Other questions considered, for example, the legality of asking applicants about medical histories, either directly or indirectly.

Enhancing the Effectiveness of Narcotics Task Forces

**Donald Rebovich, Director,
American Prosecutors Research
Institute; and Terrence P. Farley,
Director, National Drug
Prosecution Center**

Local Enforcement, Prosecution, and the Community. The development of a local narcotics task force/unit that may be regional in nature, entailing the collaborative leadership of local enforcement agencies and locally elected/appointed prosecutors representing two or more jurisdictions, can present a formidable challenge to even the most effectively managed law enforcement/prosecution offices. Recent empirical research conducted by APRI (i.e., a national survey of prosecutor-led task forces and case studies of select task forces) has revealed that decision-making miscalculations or indifference to decision-making responsibility by task force leaders in the formative stages of these units can be more obstructive than negative external influences. Study results demonstrated a sequential and interlocking relationship of developmental phases that, depending on how well they are executed, can become key determinants to task force effectiveness.

Relevant data culled from this study, merged with findings from earlier task force studies, were the basis for a workshop on the effective development and enhancement of narcotics task forces, particularly those instituting community awareness/prevention programs into the task force concept. They concentrated on how study results can be used to improve effectiveness in four areas of task force development which were specifically discussed: *creation, implementation, operations, and evaluation.*

Conducting Evaluations in Prison Settings

**Julie Horney, Professor, University
of Nebraska at Omaha**

This workshop focused on the special methodological, practical, legal, and ethical issues confronted in conducting evaluations in prison settings. Design questions as well as

questions related to the actual conduct of such research were addressed.

Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs

**David Weisburd, Director, Center
for Crime Prevention Studies,
Rutgers University**

Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs. The primary task of evaluation research is to identify whether a program, treatment or intervention has an influence on factors such as crime, disorder and citizen fear. For example, in evaluating police crackdowns, we would want to know whether a proposed intervention succeeds in reducing the level of crime or incivilities in targeted areas. In non-experimental evaluation designs commonly employed in criminal justice, the effect of an intervention is isolated through multivariate statistics. Experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations provide alternative models for evaluation that rely on the design of a research program to isolate for the evaluator a program's impacts.

Experimental designs provide the most rigorous method of evaluation. They allow the evaluator to make an unambiguous link between causes and their effects. In contrast, non-experimental designs are always plagued by the possibility that some important confounding factor has not been taken into account. In a true experimental design, subjects or places are randomly assigned to a treatment and control condition. In a quasi-experimental design, the evaluator uses techniques which "mimic" true experimental designs.

In this workshop, experimental and quasi-experimental designs were discussed and defined. Advantages and disadvantages of these techniques of evaluation, as well as the practical difficulties that researchers and practitioners face in using these methods in the real world of criminal justice were explained.

Evaluating Boot Camps

David Hayeslip, Program Manager, Evaluation Division, National Institute of Justice; and Doris Layton MacKenzie, Research Scholar, Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, University of Maryland

Workshop on Adult Boot Camps. The workshop examined alternative boot camp programs from a variety of perspectives. Specifically, the recent rapid growth of these types of correctional programs was discussed, including what is known about the implementation of these programs and their effects. The role of adult boot camps within the broader range of correctional options was also discussed. An overview of current and planned evaluations of boot camps sponsored by the National Institute of Justice was also presented. Finally, workshop participants considered information concerning additional evaluation research questions which need to be answered in light of the limited amount of work which has been conducted in this area to date.

Evaluation of the 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act

Terence Dunworth, Senior Operations Research Specialist, RAND; Scott H. Green, Vice President, Government Affairs, Twenty-First Century Technologies, Inc.; and Peter Haynes, Research Associate, RAND

National Assessment of the Drug Control and Systems Improvement Grant Program. The Drug Control and Systems Improvement Grant Program is the major vehicle by which the federal government provides financial and technical assistance to state and local crime control efforts. The goal of the national assessment of the program is to analyze some of the effects of the program on the criminal justice systems at both state and local levels.

The assessment consists of three phases. Phase 1 uses data provided by the Bureau of Justice Assistance to provide a comprehensive picture of how federal grant funds have been used by state and localities through FY91. Topics covered include the distribution of funds across purpose areas and types of jurisdictions, compliance with legislative regulations, interstate variation in the use of funds, and the impact of discretionary grant awards on the overall pattern of funding.

Phase 2 is an analysis of the conceptual framework that underlies the program. The work of Phase 2 includes a comparison of the structures underlying the programs, both historical, such as through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), and other ongoing federal grant programs in the areas of criminal justice and drug control.

Phase 3 investigates the ways in which the program has affected the criminal justice system at both state and local levels. A range of possible effects on a variety of institutions, including changes in the capacity and structure of the criminal justice system, interagency coordination, and strategic planning were considered.

Differentiated Case Management

Caroline Cooper, Research Professor and Senior Staff Attorney, School of Public Affairs, American University; Charles Hollis, Bureau of Justice Assistance; Joan E. Jacoby, Jefferson Institute for Justice Studies; and Michael D. Schunk, District Attorney, Multnomah County, Oregon

Workshop on Differentiated Case Management. This workshop covered the use of differentiated case management in district and circuit courts in Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon, since 1987. Differentiated case management (DCM) tailors the disposition process to the type of case. It has been used to reduce disposition time on felony cases from six months to less than 120 days, and on misdemeanor cases to less than 130 days. Six

demonstration sites were funded by BJA. Three or four publications, including an implementation manual, have resulted from the program. This system provides a good basis for setting up a drug court procedure similar to what was done in the Miami area.

Sometimes the assignment of a case to an appropriate track is determined by its complexity. Other factors affecting assignment are nature of plea, diversion goals, and the criminal history involved. This method of case management improves not only the speed of case processing but also the communication and cooperation of different parts of the court. Failures to appear are reduced, and there is a savings in prisoner transport and police overtime.

The costs involved in implementing differentiated case management are mostly connected to the need for management information systems capabilities. These costs are outweighed by the savings. There are ten DCM programs in the country and about 15-20 similar kinds of programs being implemented.

For DCM, master calendar docketing is necessary. Information and record-keeping should ideally be done online. Cases where certainty in the determination is particularly important are put on a "slow track." A "theft track" for property crimes requires mandatory pretrial examination. Over 40 percent of drug cases also have mandatory pretrial examination. One of the great benefits of DCM is greater productivity on the part of the judges. DCM allows better management of defensive and prosecutorial resources as well.

Surveys for Assessments and Evaluations

**David Huizinga, Research Director,
Institute of Behavioral Science,
University of Colorado**

This session considered some of the practical advantages and disadvantages of using survey research in criminal justice program evaluation. The important issues of economical design, sample selection, instrument construction, and analytical strategies were considered in the context of different process

and outcome evaluations. Uses of surveys within experimental designs, embedding experimental designs within surveys, concerns about validity of survey data, ethical issues in conducting survey research, and current use of computer-assisted interviewing were discussed.

Strategic Planning for Clandestine Laboratory Enforcement

**Michael S. McCampbell, Project
Director, The Circle, Inc.; Anna T.
Laszlo, Group Director, The Circle,
Inc.; Michael Matlick, Lieutenant,
Investigative Assistance Division,
Washington State Patrol; and
Luke Galant, Program Manager,
Law Enforcement Branch, Bureau
of Justice Assistance**

Workshop on Strategic Planning for Clandestine Laboratory Enforcement.

Clandestine drug laboratories are found in a wide range of sites across the United States, from large, urban areas to remote, rural regions. "Taking down" such a laboratory mandates a strategically precise enforcement action, often involving federal, state and local law enforcement. Once seized, the lab remains as a possible hazardous waste site, often with large quantities of toxic chemicals, unknown corrosives, carcinogens, and combustibles.

Obstacles confronting jurisdictions that wish to establish a coordinated clandestine laboratory enforcement effort include the uniquely hazardous nature of the laboratories; lack of specific investigative expertise; the high costs of planning and executing investigations, cleanup, and prosecutions; liability issues surrounding Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations and corresponding state laws; and conflicting multi-agency mandates and responsibilities.

The Circle, Inc.'s recently completed project, *Clandestine Laboratory Model Enforcement Program: Technical Assistance and Model Development*, is designed to assist policymakers to overcome these obstacles through a comprehensive, multidisciplinary approach. To achieve this goal, The Circle, funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance

(BJA), U.S. Department of Justice, (1) identified the most effective strategies currently used for clandestine drug laboratory enforcement; and (2) developed a strategic planning monograph that will assist jurisdictions in implementing effective, coordinated, enforcement programs.

The monograph, *Developing a Strategy for a Multiagency Response to Clandestine Drug Laboratories*, designed for both policymakers and trainers, is based on information and recommendations provided by five demonstration sites funded by BJA to develop and implement clandestine laboratory enforcement programs requiring a multidisciplinary approach, with the expertise of narcotics enforcement/prosecution personnel, fire/hazardous materials (HAZMAT) teams, and health and environment officials.

The sites' experiences also demonstrated that a comprehensive clandestine laboratory enforcement program has a number of key components:

- strategic planning team
- interagency agreements
- personnel and training
- specialized safety equipment
- medical screening and surveillance
- precursor chemical monitoring
- clandestine laboratory cleanup
- community education and awareness

Building Evaluation Capacities in the States

*Timothy S. Bynum, Professor,
School of Criminal Justice,
Michigan State University;
Geoffrey P. Alpert, Professor,
College of Criminal Justice,
University of South Carolina; and
Craig Uchida, Acting Director,
Office of Criminal Justice
Research, National Institute of
Justice*

The responsibilities of many state agencies include evaluations of criminal justice programs funded within their states. Some of the main considerations for planning and implementing evaluations were discussed.

First, evaluation is not a simple matter of "thumbs up" or "thumbs down." Multiple outcome measures are needed. Planners and program managers need to be realistic about program expectations, and about what an evaluation can be expected to tell. Evaluations are not the only input into the process of deciding program continuation. Political popularity is also a factor (e.g., the popularity of the DARE program). In addition, the right climate for an evaluation must be created. Evaluations should not be punitive. The SMART program is a good example of an ongoing data collection and analysis effort that is not used for punitive purposes. Finally, it is important to consider the unintended consequences of research and evaluations. For example, youth in Metro Dade County, Florida, when asked who their heroes were, named several local disc jockeys. Activities were subsequently conducted that involved these DJs.

APPENDIX

Fourth Annual Evaluation Conference Speakers

Thomas F. Albrecht

Chief, Corrections Branch
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-6236

Geoffrey P. Alpert

Professor
College of Criminal Justice
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208
803-777-6424

Bernard Auchter

Program Manager
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-0154

James Austin

Executive Vice President
National Council on Crime
and Delinquency
685 Market Street, Suite 620
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-896-6223

Joanna R. Baker

Associate Professor
Department of Management Sciences
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State College
Blacksburg, VA 24061
703-231-5804

Keith Baker

Evaluation Consultant
The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation
9521 Seminole Street
Silver Spring, MD 20901
301-589-2832

Virginia B. Baldau

Director, Research Applications and
Training Division
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-6204

Allan R. Barnes

Director
Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis
Unit
University of Alaska at Anchorage
3211 Providence Drive
Anchorage, AL 99508
907-786-1810

Charles W. Bennett, Jr.

Deputy Chief
Division of Patrol Operations
Richmond Bureau of Police
501 North 9th Street
Richmond, VA 23219
804-780-6718

Barbara Boland

11 Ninth Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002
202-543-8571

Dale P. Boll

Office of Criminal Enforcement
Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460
202-260-4539

David Boyd
Director
Science and Technology
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-6394

Ellen Brickman
Director of Research
Victim Services
280 Broadway, Room 401
New York, NY 10007
212-571-2660

Laurie C. Bright
Social Science Analyst
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-3624

Elliott A. Brown
Deputy Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-6278

Lee P. Brown
Director
Office of National Drug Control
Policy
Executive Office of the President
750 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20500
202-514-2000

Robert (Bob) H. Brown, Jr.
Chief, Crime Prevention Branch
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-5943

Timothy S. Bynum
Professor
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
560 Baker Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-355-2197

Michael F. Cahn
President
Queues Enforth Development, Inc.
432 Columbia Street
Cambridge, MA 02141
617-225-2510

Dennis Campa
Director
Youth Services
Health and Human Services
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, TX 78767
512-473-4100

Ruth Ann Cardella
Program Analyst
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-6638

David P. Cavanagh
Technical Director
BOTEC Analysis Corporation
1698 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-491-1277

John A. Cocoros
President
Cocoros Associates
221 Royal Oaks
Huntsville, TX 77340
409-295-7730

Jacqueline Cohen
Principal Research Scientist
Carnegie Mellon University
The Heinz School
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
412-268-3629

James (Chip) R. Coldren, Jr.
Director of Research
Program on Human Development and
Criminal Behavior
Harvard School of Public Health
25 E. Washington, Suite 1537
Chicago, IL 60602
312-984-0398

Caroline Cooper
Research Professor/Senior Staff
Attorney
American University
3615 Wisconsin Avenue
Washington, DC 20016
202-362-4183

Helen G. Corrothers
Commissioner, U.S. Sentencing
Commission (Ret.) / Fellow
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-6208

Ernest L. Cowles
Assistant Professor
Center for the Study of Crime,
Delinquency, and Corrections
Southern Illinois University
Faner 4234
Carbondale, IL 62901
618-453-6368

Kenneth R. Coyle
Research Analyst
American Prosecutors Research
Institute
1033 N. Fairfax Street, Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-549-4401

Cheryl Ann Crawford
Program Specialist
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-6210

Roberta Cronin
Principal Research Scientist
American Institutes for Research
3333 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007
202-342-5000

David Curry
Principal Investigator
Department of Sociology and
Anthropology
West Virginia University
P.O. Box 6326
Morgantown, WV 26506
304-293-3569

Christine Curtis
Assistant Director
Criminal Justice Research Division
San Diego Association of Governments
401 B. Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
619-595-5361

Howard L. Davis, Jr.
Director of Evaluation
North Carolina Governor's Crime
Commission
3824 Barrett Drive, Suite 100
Raleigh, NC 27609-7220
919-571-4736

Peter Delany
Social Science Analyst
National Institute on Drug Abuse
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 10A-38
Rockville, MD 20857
301-443-6697

Douglas Dodge
Director
Special Emphasis Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-5914

Robert L. DuPont, M.D.
President
Institute for Behavior and Health, Inc.
6191 Executive Boulevard
Rockville, MD 20852
301-231-9010

Terence Dunworth
Senior Operations Research Specialist
RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
P.O. Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90406

Daniel Ellison
Planning Director
New Hampshire Department of
Corrections
P.O. Box 1406
Concord, NH 03302-0769
603-271-5635

Kim English
Director
Statistical Analysis Center
Department of Public Safety
Colorado Division of Criminal Justice
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000
Denver, CO 80215
303-239-4442

Susan Ennet
Research Health Analyst
Research Triangle Institute
3040 Cornwallis Road
P.O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-
2194
919-541-6252

Gregory P. Falkin
Principal Investigator
National Development and Resources
Institute, Inc.
11 Beach Street
New York, NY 10013
212-966-8700

Terrence P. Farley
Director
National Drug Prosecution Center
American Prosecutors Research
Institute
99 Canal Center Plaza, Suite 510
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-549-6790

Sally Flanzer
National Center for Child Abuse
and Neglect (NCCAN)
P.O. Box 1182
Washington, DC 20013
202-205-8708

Bennett Fletcher
Research Psychologist
National Institute on Drug Abuse
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 10A-30
Rockville, MD 20857
301-443-4060

David A. Ford
Associate Professor of Sociology
Indiana University at Indianapolis
425 University Boulevard
Indianapolis, IN 46202
317-257-3049

Richard Freedman
Director
Maryland Governor's Juvenile Justice
Advisory Council
Room 1513
State Office Building
301 West Preston Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-225-1671

Frank Gajewski
Captain
Jersey City Police Department
280 Grove Street
Jersey City, NJ 07302
201-547-4310

Luke Galant
Law Enforcement Branch
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-0894

James Garofalo
Director
Center for the Study of Crime,
Delinquency, and Corrections
Southern Illinois University
Faner Hall
Carbondale, IL 62901
618-453-5701

John S. Goldkamp
President
Crime and Justice Research Institute
520 N. Delaware Avenue, Suite 304
Philadelphia, PA 19123
215-627-3766

Heike Gramckow
Research Associate
Jefferson Institute for Justice
Studies
1910 K. Street, N.W., Suite 601
Washington, DC 20006
202-659-2882

H. Clifton Grandy
Senior Staff Attorney
National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8798
804-253-2000

Scott Green
Vice President
Government Affairs
Twenty-First Century Technologies, Inc.
1945 Old Gallows Road, Suite 580
Vienna, VA 22182
703-760-1521

Peter Greenwood
Senior Researcher
Social Policy Department
RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
P.O. Box 2138
Santa Monica, CA 90407-2138
310-393-0411

Randolph M. Grinc
Senior Research Associate
Vera Institute of Justice
377 Broadway
New York, NY 10013
212-334-1300

Randall Guynes
Principal Associate
Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-684-5300

Rudy Haapanen
Chief, Ward Information and Parole
Resource Bureau
California Youth Authority
4241 Williamsborough Drive
Sacramento, CA 95823
916-262-1485

Adele Harrell
Senior Research Associate
Urban Institute
2100 M. Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037
202-857-8738

Richard J. Harris
Research Specialist
Delaware Statistical Analysis Center
60 the Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
302-577-2642

Lana D. Harrison
Statistician
National Institute on Drug Abuse
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 9A-53
Rockville, MD 20857
301-443-6637

David Hayeslip
Program Manager
Evaluation Division
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-1355

Peter Haynes
Professor of Justice Studies
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-0403
602-965-7093

John R. Hepburn
Director
School of Justice Studies
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287
602-965-7085

Sally T. Hillsman
Vice President of Research
National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8798
804-253-2000

Janice Hirota
Documentation Specialist
Center for Addiction and Substance
Abuse
152 West 57th Street
New York, NY 10019
212-841-5200

Gwen A. Holden
Executive Vice President
National Criminal Justice Association
444 North Capitol, N.W., Suite 608
Washington, DC 20001
202-347-4900

Charles M. Hollis
Chief, Prosecution Branch
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-5947

Roy A. Holt, Sr.
Director
Statistical Analysis Center
Arizona Criminal Justice Commission
1501 West Washington, Suite 207
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-542-1928

Julie Horney
Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Nebraska at Omaha
Annex 37
Omaha, NE 68182-0149
402-554-2610

Mary Ann Hughes
Research Analyst
Delaware Statistical Analysis Center
60 The Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
302-739-4627

David Huizinga
Institute of Behavioral Science
University of Colorado
Campus Box 442
Boulder, CO 80309-0442
303-492-1410

Gwyn Smith Ingle
American Correctional Association
8025 Laurel Lakes Court
Laurel, MD 20707
301-206-5045

Joan E. Jacoby
Executive Director
Jefferson Institute for Justice
Studies
1910 K. Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
202-659-2882

Bruce Johnson
Director, Institute for Special
Populations Research
National Development and Research
Institutes
11 Beach Street
New York, NY 10013
212-966-8700

David E. Jones
Director
Criminal Justice Analysis Center
Governor's Crime Commission
3824 Barrett Drive, Suite 100
Raleigh, NC 27609-7220
919-571-4736

Edwin Kennedy
Senior Analyst
Illinois Criminal Justice
Information Authority
120 South Riverside Plaza
Suite 1016
Chicago, IL 60608
312-793-8516

Robert A. Kirchner
Chief of Program Evaluation
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-3455

Carole Sanchez Knapel
Visiting Fellow
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-2962

Anna T. Laszlo
Group Director
The Circle, Inc.
8201 Greensboro Drive, Suite 600
McLean, VA 22102
703-821-8955

Pamela K. Lattimore
Social Science Analyst/Senior
Researcher
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-2961

Robert Levinson
Special Projects Manager
American Correctional Association
8025 Laurel Lakes Court
Laurel, MD 20707
301-206-5045

Robert Long
40634 Mirada Way, No. 17
Sarasota, FL 34238
813-924-2416

Doris Layton MacKenzie
Research Scholar
Department of Criminal Justice
and Criminology
University of Maryland
2220 LeFrak Hall
College Park, MD 20742
301-405-3008

Ann B. Madison
Director
Human Relations and Staff
Development
Norfolk School District
P.O. Box 1357
800 East City Hall Ave., Suite 905
Norfolk, VA 23501
804-441-2780

Michael Maltz
Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Illinois at Chicago
1310 Lee Street
Evanston, IL 60202-1643
708-864-2536

Mary J. Mande
Director
MJM Consulting Services
4751 Essex Circle
Boulder, CO 80301
303-530-0307

Jay Marshall
Chief, Special Programs Branch
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-5943

Lance A. Matheson
Assistant Professor
Department of Management Science
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
and State University
Blacksburg, VA 24061
703-231-5804

Michael Matlick
Lieutenant
Washington State Patrol
4242 Martin Way
Olympia, WA 98504
206-753-6800

Michael S. McCampbell
Project Director
The Circle, Inc.
8201 Greensboro Drive, Suite 600
McLean, VA 22102
703-821-8955

Joan McCord
Professor of Criminal Justice
Temple University
623 Broadacres Road
Narberth, PA 19072
215-667-6197

J. Thomas McEwen
Principal
Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-684-5300

Garry A. Mendez, Jr.
Executive Director
The National Trust for the Development
of African-American Men
908 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E.
Washington, DC 20003
202-374-3200

Thomas Mieczkowski
Professor of Criminology
University of South Florida
140 7th Avenue, South
St. Petersburg, FL 33701
813-893-9156

Arnold R. Mills
Public Health Advisor
National Institute on Drug Abuse
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 9A-30
Rockville, MD 20857
301-443-6014

Lois Mock
Program Manager
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-0693

William Modzeleski
Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202
202-401-3050

Gary Mohr
Director
Statistical Analysis Center
Governor's Office of Criminal
Justice Services
400 East Town Street, Suite 120
Columbus, OH 43215
614-466-0280

Patrick M. Moran
Evaluation Coordinator
Washington State Department of
Community Development
906 Columbia Street, S.W.
P.O. Box 48300
Olympia, WA 98504
206-586-0665

Marilyn Moses
Social Science Program Manager
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-6205

Rosemary Mumm
Diversionary Program Coordinator
Orleans Parish District Attorney
619 S. White Street
New Orleans, LA 70119
504-822-2414

Rosemary Murphy
Program Manager
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-2960

Timothy J. Murray
Director
Office of Substance Abuse Control
Metropolitan Dade County
111 NW 1st Street, Suite 2740
Miami, FL 33128
305-375-2676

Jack A. Nadol
Acting Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-6278

Kenneth Nimmich
Special Agent/Section Chief
Federal Bureau of Investigation's
Laboratory
JEH Federal Building
10th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20535
202-324-4493

Richard T. Nixon
Director
National Environmental Crime
Prosecution Center
American Prosecutors Research Institute
1033 N. Fairfax Street, Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-549-4401

Nancy J. Nowak
Director
Maryland Division of Parole
and Probation
6776 Reisterstown Road, Suite 305
Baltimore, MD 21215
410-764-4276

Hugh Nugent
Principal Associate
Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-684-5300

John (Jack) O'Connell
Director
Delaware Statistical Analysis Center
60 The Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
302-739-4846

Garrett J. O'Keefe
Professor
Department of Agricultural Journalism
440 Henry Hall
Madison, WI 53706
608-262-1464

Joyce O'Neil
Drug Use Forecasting Program Director
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-5981

Tony Pate
Director of Research
Police Foundation
1001 22nd Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, DC 20037
202-833-1460

Kent E. Paulin

Supervisory Special Agent Examiner
Federal Bureau of Investigation
JEH Federal Building
10th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20535
202-324-4493

Susan Pennell

Director
Criminal Justice Research Division
San Diego Association of
Governments
401 B. Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101
619-595-5383

Roger Przybylski

Coordinator of Research
Chicago Police Department
721 South State
Chicago, IL 60605
312-747-6203

W. Hardy Rauch

Director
Standards and Accreditation Division
American Correctional Association
8025 Laurel Lakes Court
Laurel, MD 20707
301-206-5100

Donald Rebovich

Director of Research
American Prosecutors Research
Institute
1033 N. Fairfax Street, Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-549-4401

Emily Reed

Management Analyst
Delaware Criminal Justice Council
820 North French St., 4th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19801
302-577-3430

Janet Reno

U.S. Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
Main Justice Building
10th & Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20530
202-514-2001

William Rhodes

Senior Scientist
Law and Public Policy Department
Abt Associates, Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-349-2731

Thomas F. Rich

Senior Analyst
Queues Enforth Development, Inc.
432 Columbia Street
Cambridge, MA 02141

Christopher L. Ringwalt

Research Health Analyst
Research Triangle Institute
3040 Cornwallis Road
P.O. Box 12194
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709-
2194
919-541-6252

Jorge Rodriguez

Research Specialist III
Delaware Statistical Analysis Center
60 The Plaza
Dover, DE 19901
302-739-4846

Janice A. Roehl

Senior Vice President
Institute for Social Analysis
510 Lighthouse Avenue, Suite 7A
Pacific Grove, CA 93950
408-655-1513

Steven J. Roman
Lead OCDETF Attorney
Assistant U.S. Attorney
U.S. Attorney's Office
555 4th Street
Washington, DC 20001
202-514-6974

Dennis P. Rosenbaum
Director
Center for Research in Law and Justice
University of Illinois at Chicago
P.O. Box 4348 (M/C 2222)
Chicago, IL 60607
312-996-4632

Janet Rothacker
Associate Program Analyst
Bureau of Research and Evaluation
New York State Division of
Criminal Justice Services
Executive Park Tower
Stuyvesant Plaza
Albany, NY 12203
518-457-6131

Paula N. Rubin
Visiting Fellow
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-0649

Michael J. Russell
Acting Director
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-2942

Michael Sabath
Director
Center for Criminal Justice
and Information
Indiana Criminal Justice Institute
302 West Washington St., Room E209
Indianapolis, IN 46204
317-232-1619

Susan Sadd
Project Director
Vera Institute of Justice
377 Broadway
New York, NY 10013
212-334-1300

John Schaaf
Research Analyst
American Prosecutors Research
Institute
1033 N. Fairfax Street, Suite 200
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-549-4401

Anthony J. Schembri
Commissioner
Rye Police Department
21 Third Street
Rye, NY 10580
914-967-1234

Max Schlueter
Director
Vermont Criminal Justice Center
10 Crescent Avenue
Northfield, VT 05663
802-485-2085

Michael D. Schrunk
District Attorney
Multnomah County Courthouse
1021 S.W., 4th Street
Portland, OR 97204
503-248-3162

June Sivilli
Project Director
COSMOS Corporation
1735 I Street, N.W.
Suite 613
Washington, DC 20006
202-728-3939

Frank Smith
Office of Juvenile Justice
and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-5914

Severin L. Sorensen
President and Research Director
Drug Control Policy Group
P.O. Box 71072
Chevy Chase, MD 20813
301-530-1169

Henry J. Steadman
President
Policy Research Associates
262 Delaware Avenue
Delmar, NY 12054
518-439-7415

Robert L. Stephenson, II
Special Assistant to the Director
Division of Workplace Programs
Substance Abuse and Mental Health
Service Administration
5600 Fishers Lane, Room 9A-54
Rockville, MD 20857
301-443-6780

Daniel Storkamp
Director
Minnesota Criminal Justice
Statistical Analysis Center
300 Centennial Office Building
658 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55155
612-297-7518

Pamela Swain
Director
Office of Weed and Seed
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-5947

Robert Swisher
Criminal Justice Researcher
Statistical Analysis Center
Governor's Office of Criminal
Justice Services
400 East Town Street, Suite 120
Columbus, OH 43216
614-466-3888

Faye S. Taxman
Principal Associate
Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-684-5300

Ann Taylor
Visiting Fellow
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-0153

Diane G. Thompson
Project Director
Bradenton Drug Treatment Community
Program
P.O. Box 1406
Oneco, FL 34264-1406
813-751-7605

Richard M. Titus
Program Manager
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-0695

Al Toczydlowski
Assistant District Attorney
Philadelphia District Attorney's Office
1421 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19102
215-686-8700

Alan I. Trachtenberg
Medical Officer
National Institute on Drug Abuse
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857
301-443-6637

Sandra L. Tunis
Senior Research Associate
National Council on Crime and
Delinquency
685 Market Street, Suite 620
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-896-6223

Susan Turner
Senior Researcher
RAND Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90406
213-393-0411

Craig Uchida
Acting Director
Office of Criminal Justice Research
National Institute of Justice
U. S. Department of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-6204

Jody Adams Weisbrod
Project Coordinator
Center for Addiction and Substance
Abuse
152 West 57th Street
New York, NY 10019
212-841-5200

David Weisburd
Associate Professor
Rutgers University
Administration Service Bldg.
P.O. Box 1089
New Brunswick, NJ 08855
908-932-3329

Deborah Lamm Weisel
Senior Research Associate
Police Executive Research Forum
2300 M. Street, N.W., Suite 910
Washington, DC 20037
202-466-7820

Ralph Weisheit
Professor of Criminal Justice
Department of Criminal Justice
Illinois State University
401 Schroeder Hall
Normal, IL 61761
309-438-3849

James Wilson
Director
Department of Public Safety
Office of Special Projects
4491 Cerrillos Road
Post Office Box 1628
Santa Fe, NM 87504
505-827-9099

Robert K. Yin

President

COSMOS Corporation

1735 I Street, N.W., Suite 613

Washington, DC 20006

202-728-3939

Edwin Zedlewski

Senior Economist/Director

Corrections and Adjudication Research

National Institute of Justice

U.S. Department of Justice

633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20531

202-307-2953