



U. S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

Programs Meeting Effectiveness Criteria of Section 401 (a) Justice Systems Improvement Act 1979

66670

Prepared by
Office of Development, Testing and Dissemination
National Institute of Justice

**PROGRAMS MEETING EFFECTIVENESS
CRITERIA OF SECTION 401(a)
JUSTICE SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT ACT, 1979**

Prepared by:

**Model Program Development Division
Office of Development, Testing and
Dissemination
National Institute of Justice
February 22, 1980**

CONTENTS

Individual Program Descriptions (20)

Community Crime Prevention Program, Seattle, Washington
Project New Pride, Denver, Colorado (juvenile)
Project CREST, Gainesville, Florida (juvenile)
Managing Criminal Investigations
Commercial Robbery Reduction, Seattle, Washington
Street Crime Unit, New York City
Police Resource Sharing
Commercial Security for Small Businesses
Economic Crime Units
Structured Plea Negotiation
Administrative Adjudication of Traffic Offenses
Dispute Resolution - Neighborhood Justice Centers
Community Arbitration Project, Anne Arundel, Maryland (juvenile)
Career Criminal Programs
One Day/One Trial Jury System, Wayne County, Michigan
Witness Information Service, Peoria, Illinois
Community Response to Rape
Public Defender Services
Work Release/Pre-Release Centers
Grievance Mechanisms in Correctional Institutions

Resource Documents Listing

Training Resource Packages

PREFACE

The Justice System Improvement Act of 1979 (Section 401(a)) identifies 22 areas which can be supported by LEAA's formula grant funds. Programs funded in each of the 22 areas must be those which are "of proven effectiveness, have a record of proven success, or which offer a high probability of improving the functioning of the criminal justice system."

This report is intended to assist states and localities in responding to the requirements of the new legislation. The National Institute of Justice reviewed its previous research, program development, and evaluation activities and identified 20 specific programs which meet the Act's criteria. Each program is briefly described in this document, which was compiled by staff of the Institute's Model Program Development Division. The report also lists some 60 resource documents that can help jurisdictions in developing and implementing a wide variety of programs responsive to the Act's purposes. Unless otherwise noted, all publications are available free of charge from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Paul Cascarano, Assistant Director
National Institute of Justice for the
Office of Development, Testing and
Dissemination
February 1980

Program Title

Community Crime Prevention Program -- Exemplary Project, Seattle, Washington

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(1) "establishing or expanding community and neighborhood programs that enable citizens to undertake initiatives to deal with crime and delinquency."

Description

The Community Crime Prevention Program (CCPP) is designed to reduce residential burglary in selected neighborhoods by helping residents to anticipate, recognize, and appraise burglary risk and to initiate specific actions to remove or reduce that risk. Many of the services provided by the Seattle program are common to other crime prevention efforts, however, what distinguish the Seattle CCPP is its careful planning and individualized targeting of particular strategies and approaches to the crime problems and demographic make-up of each neighborhood. Before any effort is initiated, well-trained program staff meet with area residents, local leaders, and the police to jointly develop a "Community Profile" which determines the approaches used.

CCPP concentrates on four principal tactics and services, each confronting one of the problems identified in their study of burglary patterns:

- 1) To encourage citizens to protect their homes against relatively easy entry by burglars, CCPP provides residential security inspection services. Using a home security checklist, a home service technician accompanies the occupant through his home, checking doors and windows and offering advice for making them more secure. The technician gives the resident a copy of the checklist with his recommendations noted.
- 2) To deter burglars, discourage fencing of property, and assist in returning property to its owners, CCPP provides assistance and equipment for marking personal property. Property identification is usually done during the home security inspection visit. An electric engraving tool is used to mark up to ten items with the owner's driver's license number. Residents are encouraged to continue engraving their property and to display decals warning potential burglars that property has been marked.

- 3) To augment the "range of vision" of traditional police preventive patrol, CCPP organizes neighborhood burglary prevention groups, familiarly known as Block Watches. A Block Watch typically consists of 10 to 15 families on a block who are willing to exchange information about their schedules and habits, watch each others' homes, and report suspicious activities to each other and to the police. CCPP considers the Block Watch the citizen's most important weapon against burglary.
- 4) To promote citizen awareness of their role in reducing burglary rates, the program supplies informative materials about burglary and its prevention.

In addition, advisory services are provided on request to communities not targeted for CCPP intensive services. The advisory program makes extensive use of the media, mailers, speaking engagements and other public events and gatherings to encourage homeowners to mark their property, inspect their home security measures, or to organize community block watches under their own initiative.

Performance Information

A. Program Development and Implementation (necessary steps)

- . Development of recruitment, training, and selection procedures for a team of community organizers to plan and implement the burglary reduction program. Specific, written training materials should be produced, or adapted from existing materials.

- . Identification of target neighborhoods through a review of police incident reports on residential burglary. (Victimization surveys are highly desirable, if local resources allow).

- . Preparation of a "Community Profile" for each neighborhood based upon a review of demographic and crime data and discussions with residents, local leaders, and the police.

- . Development of an individualized strategy for organizing the neighborhood and providing services, based on the Community Profile Information.

- . Establishment of a close working relationship with local law enforcement (a detailed listing of specific ways in which the police and community can collaborate in a CCPP effort can be found on page 14 of the Exemplary Project manual).

B. Service Delivery*

. form neighborhood block watch groups in 30-40 percent of all occupied single family and duplex dwelling in test communities;

. complete the marking of property for identification in 30 percent of all target households;

. complete security inspections in 30 percent of all target households;

. provide at least 70 percent of all target households with information about burglary and ways to reduce it;

. outside the target communities, on request provide all possible aid regarding burglary reduction.

C. Impact Measures (to be obtained by pre/post victimization surveys)**

. Reduction in the burglary victimization of program participants

. Increase in burglary reporting rates of citizens in the target areas

. Higher proportions of burglary in process calls to police by citizens in the target areas

* The goals listed here are those established by the Seattle Program Variation among sites should be anticipated based on the nature of the community served. Seattle, for example, implemented its program in an area of single family and duplex residences. Different procedures and results could be anticipated if the program were adapted to an area with a number of multi-family units.

** Guidelines for conducting a relatively inexpensive victimization survey by project staff may be found in Chapter 6 of the Exemplary Project manual on the Seattle CCPP.

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effective

The Community Crime Prevention Program has undergone two extensive evaluations, conducted by the Seattle Law and Justice Planning Office. Among the findings of these evaluations were that:

- CCPP treated residences realized a 48 to 61 percent reduction in burglary;
- The CCPP influence over citizens action lasts from 12-18 months;
- reporting rates by citizens in treated areas have increased significantly (from 51% to 76% of actual burglaries committed)
- burglary in progress calls as a proportion of all burglary calls to police have increased markedly-27%-in treated areas.

An independent assessment of these evaluations was done by Aht Associates, Inc. as part of the validation process for the Exemplary Projects Program. The CCPP was designated an Exemplary Project in January 1977.

For further information see: Community Crime Prevention: Seattle, Washington (Exemplary Project Manual) available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Program Title

**Project CREST (Clinical Regional Support Teams) - Exemplary Project,
Gainesville, Florida**

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(1) "Establishing or expanding community and neighborhood programs that enable citizens to undertake initiatives to deal with crime and delinquency."

Description

Project CREST (Clinical Regional Support Teams), a community outreach program, provides volunteer professional counseling services to delinquent youth in three counties in North Central Florida. The project, an add-on to existing probation services, serves as one of the practicum or "field experience" courses graduate students must complete to fulfill academic requirements for an advanced degree in counselor education at the University of Florida at Gainesville. CREST successfully combines community action and outreach with the dedication and career aspirations of advanced students seeking to become professional counselors. Implemented in 1972 through an LEAA block grant to Columbia County, and later included in the state budget, Project CREST provides services to its host communities in four areas:

- Counseling - To assist delinquent youth to develop more positive attitudes about themselves and society, and thus reduce delinquency.**
- Education - To assist advanced graduate students to achieve career goals by providing field experience in real life situations where their skills can be of benefit to individuals and to the community.**
- Outreach - To assist the juvenile authorities by reaching out into the community to provide professional quality counseling to youth who are perceived as being able to benefit from such services.**
- Community Action - To involve the whole community in the fight against delinquency by fostering an atmosphere of support for troubled youngsters.**

The typical CREST client is a young felon or misdemeanor, 14-16 years of age, who has not responded to diversion programs offered under Florida's Juvenile Justice System and has consequently been adjudicated delinquent and placed on probation. CREST offers intensive counseling and support

to delinquent youth including 2-4 hours of weekly individual counseling, family counseling, and extended group therapy, and provides consulting assistance to schools for its clients. In addition, Project CREST uses community advisory boards in each of the counties it serves to keep abreast of community needs, to insure that project receives community support, and to provide whatever counseling services community leaders feel are needed to support troubled youngsters in their respective areas.

Performance Information

A. Program Development and Implementation (necessary steps)

- ° Development of working relationship among county probation officials, juvenile court judges, Area University's Department of Counselor Education, and community leaders.
- ° Identification of target client group to be served (i.e. adjudicated youthful offenders on probation, youthful offenders awaiting a court hearing, delinquent prone youth, first offenders).
- ° Development of an individualized strategy for organizing delivery of CREST services, either on a neighborhood or county level, depending on the size of the community, and the structure of the community's juvenile justice system.

B. Service Delivery

- ° Establish a practicum course for counseling delinquent youth within the graduate Counselor Education or Psychology Department of a local University.
- ° Develop Treatment Teams consisting of a supervisory team leader and several volunteer counselors whose members provides services to a particular geographic area, neighborhood or county.
- ° Work with Probation of other juvenile justice officials to identify those youth who can most benefit from intensive counseling services.
- ° Develop an outreach capability for establishing and maintaining contact with difficult clients.
- ° Develop, through team meetings and supervision of progress, a method for maintaining continuity of treatment for the long term client whose need for support may extend beyond the length of his or her counselor's practicum.

C. Impact Measures

- Reduction of Acts of misconduct
- Improved school attendance
- Improved academic and social school performance

Effectiveness Criterion

Project CREST has undergone evaluation by project staff who established a non-equivalent control group design, comparing CREST clients to youth not referred for Project CREST services. A two year follow-up study was also performed to evaluate Project results. Among the findings of these studies were that:

- Acts of misconduct committed by CREST clients declined during the project period.
- The rate of school suspensions for the CREST clients declined and grade point averages and days absent improved.
- Felony charges for former CREST clients dropped 89% after probationary controls were removed.

An independent assessment was done by Abt Associates Inc. as part of the validation process for the Exemplary Projects Program. CREST was designated Exemplary in September, 1979. Documentation on the CREST program will be available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service in early June 1980.

Program Area (Section 401(a))

(1) "establishing or expanding community and neighborhood programs that enable citizens to undertake initiatives to deal with crime and delinquency."

Program Title - Project New Pride*

Description

The Denver (Colorado) New Pride Project has demonstrated effectiveness in working with a target population of serious juvenile offenders through a core of integrated and comprehensive services, which have been described as a "Wholistic Approach." Since its inception in 1973, Project New Pride has demonstrated success in keeping serious offenders in the community, reducing recidivism rates, improving academic abilities, employing youth and reducing their incarceration. The project, through extensive and well developed relationships with juvenile justice agencies, has had a significant impact on the Denver juvenile justice system's dispositional response to youth adjudicated for serious offenses. Juvenile justice agencies refer multiple offenders to Project New Pride with confidence that both youth and community interests are protected.

In 1979 the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) launched a discretionary grant program to replicate Project New Pride. The objective is to establish non-residential community-based treatment services for adjudicated youth with a history of serious offenses. The New Pride concept is based on reducing recidivism, improving social functioning, and increasing academic achievement, job skills and employment of youth who have repeatedly failed in traditional programs.

The problem addressed by this program is the lack of effective non-residential community-based treatment approaches for serious juvenile offenders with a myriad of social adjustment problems, and a history of failure in traditional alternatives. Based upon a skilled diagnostic assessment of each youth referred, the program provides comprehensive and integrated treatment services supported by intensive supervision. Projects are implemented by private non-profit youth-serving agencies in conjunction with public institutions such as courts, schools, probation services, police, and other human resources agencies.

The target for this program is adjudicated youth from 14 to 17 years of age residing in jurisdictions with high levels of serious juvenile crime and juvenile offenders under court supervision for a serious offense, with records of at least two prior adjudications/convictions for serious misdemeanors and/or felonies (preferably robbery, burglary, or assault) within the past 24 months who would otherwise be confined in correctional institutions or placed on probation. There should be no deviations from these target population characteristics except for applicants from jurisdictions that have established a maximum juvenile court jurisdictional age other than 18.

*Project description prepared by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Performance Information

A. Program Development and Implementation (necessary steps)

- o Provide for the intensive and consistent participation of all cognizant juvenile justice agencies in all phases of the projects, throughout their existence.
- o Provide for legal safeguards to protect the rights of participating juvenile offenders. Such safeguards must assure that a youth is represented by counsel at any hearing which may result in termination of participation in the project or result in incarceration.
- o Utilize existing resources within the jurisdiction and involve both public and private non-profit agencies in the development and implementation of the project.
- o Provide for an advisory board which will participate in all phases of planning and program implementation throughout the duration of the project. The board should include youth, community residents and representatives from juvenile justice system agencies, institutions of higher education, private industry, labor unions, and local and state public officials.
- o Include appropriate public education and information dissemination activities which gain and maintain public understanding and support for the program.
- o Develop a program management component which includes a management information system and procedures for using feedback in program planning and operation.

B. Service Delivery

- o Diagnostic Assessment - Use of an interdisciplinary diagnostic team to evaluate all clients individually.
- o Remedial Education - Use of academic remediation designed to decrease educational lag and to facilitate reintegration into the public schools following completion of the intensive phase of the program.
- o Special Education to Youth with Learning Disabilities.
- o Cultural, Physical and Health Education - Cultural education is designed to expose youth to the total community (not just a segment of it, while physical education is designed to teach self-awareness, group interaction cooperation and inter-dependence in a supervised environment.
- o Job Preparation and Job Placement.
- o Intensive Supervision and Counseling.
- o Volunteer Support.

C. Impact Measures

- °Increased school achievement, remediation of learning disabilities employment of youth participating in the program and improved social functioning.
- °Reduction in the incarceration of youth adjudicated for criminal offenses.
- °Reduction in rearrests for any offense of those youth involved in the community-based treatment project.
- °Institutionalization of comprehensive and integrated community-based treatment services for serious juvenile offenders through redirection of state and local resources into more cost-effective community-based treatment services.

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effective

Project New Pride was designated an Exemplary Project by the National Institute of Justice in 1977. The effect on the 160 clients who have completed the New Pride program has been significant.

- °The non-status offense rearrest rate for New Pride clients during a 12 month period in the community was 27 percent. The rate for a control group was 32 percent.
- °Seventy percent (70%) of clients have been placed in full or part-time jobs, and the re-arrest rate for employed clients was one-third the rate for unemployed clients.

New Pride has also pointed up the potential economic advantages to the community. The cost of incarcerating a youth in Colorado is estimated at \$12,000 a year. New Pride spends \$4,000 per year to keep a youngster out of institutions.

Further information on the New Pride program is contained in the OJJDP program announcement, Project New Pride: Replication, available from OJJDP, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531. The Exemplary Projects manual entitled Project New Pride - Denver, Colorado is available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Program Title

Managing Criminal Investigations

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(2) "improving and strengthening law enforcement agencies, as measured by arrest rates, incident rates, victimization rates, the number of reported crimes, clearance rates, the number of patrol or investigative hours per uniformed officer, or any other appropriate objective measure."

Description

The Managing Criminal Investigation (MCI) program represents a management tool for increasing investigative resource efficiency by redefining the roles of patrol officers and detectives in terms of what each can realistically contribute to the investigative process. In so doing, the program focuses upon research findings which suggest that the value of the patrol officer in the initial investigation has been underestimated while the role of the detective in follow-up activities has been overestimated. The resultant program design consists of five required components:

- 1) Redefining the role of the patrol officer in the initial investigation to include the detection of solvability factors.
- 2) Screening out predictably "unsolvable" cases after the initial investigation.
- 3) Systematically assigning cases for continuing investigation and periodically reviewing their progress.
- 4) Preparing cases consistent with prosecutorial requirements for charging, indictment and conviction.
- 5) Providing administrators with continuous feedback on the performance of the investigative process.

Various combinations of these elements have been implemented with some success in Rochester, New York; Birmingham, Alabama; Montgomery County, Maryland; and Santa Monica, California. For a fuller description of the program and site experience see Managing Criminal Investigation: Program Design by Ilene Greenberg and Robert Wasserman (available from NCJRS).

Performance Information

A. Service Delivery

- . Development of forms and procedures which allow greater involvement in the initial investigation by the patrol officer.
- . Development of a methodology for screening out predictably unsolvable cases.
- . Development of a system for allocating investigative workload.
- . Development of communication networks with prosecutors.
- . Development of an investigative monitoring system.

B. Impact Measures

MCI performance should be measured in terms of three primary goals: (1) reduction in investigative resources, (2) increased investigative efficiency, and (3) increased investigative effectiveness. Examples of impact measures for each goal are as follows:

Reduction in investigative resources

- . Reduction in the number of personnel assigned to investigative tasks

Increased investigative efficiency

- . Reduction in the average time spent for continuing investigations
- . Increase in the percentage of cases closed within ten (10) days of assignment

Increased investigative effectiveness

- . Increase in the percentage of actively investigated cases which are cleared
- . Increase in the percentage of actively investigated cases which result in arrest
- . Increase in the percentage of actively investigated cases accepted for prosecution
- . Increase in the percentage of cases prosecuted resulting in conviction

Effectiveness Criterion

C. High Probability of Improving the Functioning of the Criminal Justice System

The National Institute field tested the MCI program in five police departments from 1976 - 1978 -- Rochester, New York; Birmingham, Alabama; Santa Monica, California; Montgomery County, Maryland; and St. Paul, Minnesota. Subsequent evaluations of the program by Abt Associates, Inc. and the Urban Institute noted some of the following achievements:

- . Two sites significantly reduced the numbers of investigators assigned to burglary, larceny and robbery cases by screening out between 70 and 80 percent of those cases.

- . Total investigative caseload was reduced in all sites.

- . Average monthly caseload and the average time spent in continuing investigations were reduced in two or more jurisdictions.

Investigative effectiveness in the test sites appeared to be, for the most part, unresponsive to the local MCI models implemented -- each department utilized different combinations of the five elements discussed earlier. Yet, despite what appear to be limited accomplishments, the MCI staff in the test sites report that the program has been a success. For them, success is defined in terms of more rational resource allocation.

Program Title

Commercial Robbery Reduction -- Seattle, Washington

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(2) "improving and strengthening law enforcement agencies, as measured by arrest rates, incident rates, victimization rates, the number of reported crimes, clearance rates, the number of patrol or investigative hours per un-informed officer, or any other appropriate objective measure."

Description

Commercial robbery is especially difficult for police to solve. Robbers usually strike quickly, rarely leaving any tangible evidence. In response, police departments in several cities have equipped robbery-prone businesses with concealed cameras that are activated when a "trip" bill is removed from the cash register. The resultant pictures of the robbery-in-progress (the camera can also be used for burglary, shoplifting, and employee theft) then make it possible to identify the suspect and gain admissible evidence for trial.

One such program, the Hidden Camera Project in Seattle, Washington, has been designated an Exemplary Project for its demonstrated success in increasing arrest, clearance and conviction rates and reducing the city's commercial robbery rate. The project is relatively simple, straightforward and inexpensive. In Seattle, only one staff member is required for the installation and maintenance of 100 cameras. This same individual, who is on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week, retrieves all film, develops prints, and distributes them to police personnel.

An Exemplary Projects manual, describing the Seattle project entitled Focus on Robbery: The Hidden Camera Project is available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service. The manual also briefly describes similar programs in six other cities.

Performance Information

A. Service Delivery

- °To randomly assign all hidden cameras within a pool of previously determined robbery-prone commercial businesses.
- °To minimize turnaround time in film retrieval, development, and photo distribution.
- °To inspect all cameras at least twice monthly to minimize camera down time and activation failures.

B. Impact Measures

- °Increase in robbery clearances by arrest for those businesses in which hidden cameras are installed as compared to other comparable businesses.

°Increase in the proportion of convictions for commercial robberies in which photographs are taken as opposed to commercial robberies not involving hidden cameras.

°Reduction in the incidence of commercial robbery in the hidden cameras city, as compared to other comparable jurisdictions.

°Accomplish project objectives without increasing the risk of injury to victims, bystanders, police and offenders.

°Reduce the cost of processing robbery cases for those cases involving hidden cameras as compared with other commercial robbery cases.

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effective

Seattle's Law and Justice Planning Office conducted a rigorously controlled experiment to measure the Hidden Cameras Project's impact on arrests, convictions, and the overall commercial robbery rate in Seattle. The results of that experiment were that:

°The overall clearance rate for robberies of businesses equipped with hidden cameras was 68 percent, compared to a 34 percent clearance rate for the control group of businesses without hidden cameras.

°Fifty-five percent of all hidden camera cases were cleared by arrest, compared to only 25 percent of control group cases.

°Forty-eight percent of the robbers at hidden camera sites were eventually identified, arrested and convicted, compared to only 19 percent of control group robbers.

°Commercial robbery in Seattle declined by 38 percent in the one year period following project onset; non-commercial robberies increased by 6.7 percent in that same period.

°Case processing time from arrest to conviction was approximately one month shorter for hidden camera cases than for control group cases.

An independent assessment of this evaluation was done by Abt Associates, Inc. as part of the validation process for the Exemplary Projects Program. The Hidden Cameras Project was designated an Exemplary Project in August 1978.

Program Title

Street Crime Unit -- Exemplary Project, New York City

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(2) "improving and strengthening law enforcement agencies, as measured by arrest rates, incident rates, victimization rates, the number of reported crimes, clearance rates, the number of patrol or investigative hours per uniformed officer, or any other appropriate objective measure."

Description

The New York City Street Crime Unit (SCU) focuses upon the reduction of violent street crime by making quality arrests -- those which lead ultimately to convictions -- and deterring would-be violent criminals on city streets. Utilizing carefully selected and specially trained patrolmen and supervisors in plainclothes surveillance and decoy tactics -- deployed on a monthly basis to high crime precincts -- the unit attempts to apprehend suspects in the act of committing a crime. Briefly, the decoy police officer, disguised as a potential crime victim, is placed in an area where he or she is likely to be victimized. A back-up team dressed to blend into the area is stationed nearby, ready to come to the decoy's aid and effect an arrest.

The necessary planning information for deployment of the SCU is provided by the crime analysis unit of the Police Department's Anti-Crime Section (the same section in which the SCU is organizationally located). The SCU itself is administered by a commanding officer and is divided into squads each directly controlled by a lieutenant.

Creation of an SCU project should not incur substantial personnel costs as its members can be selected, and transferred -- as in New York City's case -- from other areas of a department. Considerable funding, however, may be required -- depending on tactics to be employed -- for materials which in New York included a small fleet of taxis, unmarked cars and vans, radios and walkie-talkies.

For a fuller description of the program see New York City Police Department Street Crime Unit: An Exemplary Project by Andrew Halper and Richard Ku (NCJ 26492).

Performance Information:

A. Service Delivery

°Deploy program personnel in those areas, shown by crime analysis, to be particularly prone to violent street crime.

B. Impact Measures

°Increase the percentage of arrests for street crimes in target areas compared to other areas.

- °Increase conviction rates for arrests made in target areas compared to other areas.
- °Reduce target crimes in target areas compared to other areas.
- °Experience no higher serious injury rate to program personnel than to uniformed patrol officers.
- °Reduce average man-days per program target crime arrest compared to average for uniformed officers.

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effective

An assessment of the SCU was undertaken for the National Institute by Abt Associates, Inc. as part of the validation process for the Exemplary Projects Program. Here is the Unit's 1973 record:

- °3,551 arrests (85 percent felonies);
- °76 percent of robbery arrests lead to conviction;
- °95 percent of grand larceny arrests lead to conviction;
- °Average man-days per arrest: 8.2 (departmental average for all uniformed officers: 167);
- °Nominal increase in arrest and conviction costs due to equipment costs;
- °Virtually no increased danger to police or citizens.

Based upon these findings, the SCU was designated an Exemplary Project in January, 1975. Since that time, the project has been averaging 3,500 arrests a year, 85 percent of which are felonies and 91 percent of which result in conviction.

Copies of the New York City Police Department Street Crime Unit: An Exemplary Project are available from the GPO.

Program Title

Police Resource Sharing

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(2) "Improving and strengthening law enforcement agencies, as measured by arrest rates, incident rates, victimization rates, the number of reported crimes, clearance rates, the number of patrol or investigative hours per uniformed officer, of any other appropriate objective measure."

Description

The concept of Police Resource Sharing is aimed at increasing police operational efficiency by encouraging the sharing of support service costs among neighboring police agencies. Currently, the National Institute of Justice is sponsoring the preparation of Program Models report which will identify and document existing examples of resources sharing which have been shown to produce cost savings. One such project already documented is the "Central Police Dispatch" (CPD) Project of Muskegon County, Michigan, which was designated an Exemplary Project in January 1975. Begun as an experiment in 1970 to reduce the number of police agencies maintaining their own dispatch service from nine to two, CPD has subsequently resulted in a significant decrease in dispatcher personnel costs, a decrease in the cost per dispatch transaction, and a capacity to handle ever-increasing workloads. CPD has also enabled its eight member agencies to gain the benefits of increasingly sophisticated communications hardware which would otherwise be beyond the means of any one single department.

Preparation of the Police Resource Sharing Program Models document summarizing related efforts -- for example, Pinellas County, Florida's "Police Applicant Screening Service" which has reduced police recruitment costs, and LEAA's "Resident Trooper" Program -- is scheduled for completion in late 1980. The Muskegon experience has been documented in the report, Central Police Dispatch: An Exemplary Project, available through NCJRS (NCJ 33626).

Performance Information

A. Program Development and Implementation (necessary steps)

°Performance of a needs assessment to identify those support services -- and their costs -- which are duplicated by two or more police agencies in the same geographic region.

°Utilize the cost findings of the needs assessment to foster support for centralizing, and sharing the costs of, specific services.

°Where necessary, enact legislation which will permit the sharing of resources or services.

- °Create a committee or task force for establishing cost allocation formulas and overseeing the program's operations.

B. Service Delivery

The creation of specific measures of service delivery is dependent on the nature of the service for which costs are shared. In the case of Central Police Dispatch, however, some of these measures are:

- °Maintenance of full time telephone service.
- °Installation of a sufficient number of emergency lines to minimize caller delay.
- °Provision of 24-hour continuous two-way radio capability.
- °Dispatcher access to local, State and Federal criminal justice information systems.

C. Impact Measures

- °Change in the level of the service received by each participating agency. (In the case of CPD, for example, this includes the number of communications transactions and average caller delay.)
- °Change in the average cost per unit of service.

Effectiveness Criterion

C. High Probability of Improving the Functioning of the Criminal Justice System

The National Institute of Justice is selecting for inclusion in its Police Resource Sharing Program Model only those projects which have been proven effective or those which offer a high probability of improving the functioning of the criminal justice system. Illustration of the level of performance sought is the Central Police Dispatch Project. In an evaluation performed as part of the validation process for the Exemplary Projects Program, it was determined that between 1970 - 1975 CPD resulted in:

- °A 32 percent reduction in personnel time.
- °A 42 percent reduction in personnel costs.
- °A 9 percent reduction in the cost per dispatch transaction (a 23 percent reduction when controlling for inflation).

It is particularly significant that all of the above savings were experienced during a time when communications workload increased 60 percent.

Program Title

Commercial Security for Small Businesses

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(3) "Improving the police utilization of community resources through support of joint police-community projects designed to prevent or control neighborhood crime."

Description

In 1979 the National Institute of Justice developed a test design for a Commercial Security Program which is intended to reduce the vulnerability of small commercial establishments to burglary, robbery, and larceny through the cooperation of businessmen and police in the conduct of crime prevention surveys and subsequent implementation of survey recommendations. The program will be tested in 1980 in 3 cities having populations over 250,000.

The test effort has two major programmatic components and several sub-components derived from previous research and experience:

1) Structured Community Involvement, including:

°Business/police cooperation; and,

°Administration by a city-wide agency.

2) Crime Prevention Surveys:

°A standardized survey instrument developed for the test effort through a synthesis of those used by various police departments, the National Crime Prevention Institute and the Texas Crime Prevention Institute. The instrument is designed to detect security shortcomings in both physical and procedural arrangements;

°Target area saturation;

°Measures to increase survey compliance.

A detailed description of each of these components may be found in the NIJ document:

Commercial Security Test Design available from NCJRS

Performance Information

A. Program Implementation

°To involve the business community and police in a joint

commercial crime prevention program.

°To conduct crime prevention surveys in all commercial establishments in target areas to identify security vulnerabilities that present opportunities for burglary, larceny, or robbery.

°To effect compliance with survey recommendations, thus reducing opportunities to commit these offenses and thereby reducing the incidence of the offenses.

B. Impact

°To reduce the incidence of the target crimes -- burglary, robbery, and larceny -- in commercial establishments which are surveyed.

°To reduce economic losses due to these offenses in surveyed stores.

°To reduce fear of crime on the part of proprietors, managers, and employees of these stores.

°To enhance relations between the business community and the police.

Effectiveness Criterion

C. High Probability of Success

Although evaluation results from the NIJ field test will not be available until 1982, the techniques and strategies being tested are well grounded in previous research and experience and the program is considered to have a high probability of success.

The Commercial Security Field Test Design and a Program Model on Security Techniques for the Small Business Retailer are available from NCJRS.

Program Title

Economic Crime Units

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(6) "Developing investigations and prosecutions of white collar crime, organized crime, public corruption related offenses, and fraud against the government."

Description

The nature of economic crime presents special problems for prosecutors. Many victims are unaware of fraud and those who are have few avenues for action. Moreover, judges are often reluctant to impose a jail sentence on economic criminals, many of whom may have strong ties in the community. In 1973, LEAA, as a response to this concern, began to support prosecutorial efforts in 15 states (today there are 62 such programs). In addition, the National Institute has recognized the success of the Seattle and San Diego programs (1975) and the Connecticut program (1978) by designating them as Exemplary Projects. The goals of the economic crime units are essentially the same:

- °to increase the number of economic crime investigations and prosecutions;
- °to increase public and police awareness in order to prevent and deter economic crimes before they occur and to recognize them when they do occur; and,
- °to develop a comprehensive approach to investigate and prosecute offenders (particularly through cooperation with other criminal justice and related agencies, i.e., motor vehicle, tax, insurance, postal agencies, etc.).

However, each has unique features as illustrated by San Diego, Seattle and Connecticut.

Seattle, Washington (King County)

The King County Fraud Program was established in 1972, following the successful prosecution of several consumer protection cases. The program relies on several key operational approaches. For example, it concentrates on major impact cases which have the most significant deterrent effect and on developing and supporting legislative changes in the criminal statutes to facilitate the prosecution of illegal economic activities.

San Diego, California

The San Diego Program began in 1971 to prosecute all economic crime cases, to deter economic crime, and to secure redress of grievances for victims of economic crime. The San Diego Program, unlike that of Seattle, handles a large volume of consumer complaints. These cases include real estate, securities, insurance and other (both major and minor) fraud cases. While Seattle concentrated on major fraud cases, San Diego dedicated most of its efforts to persistent consumer complaints from the general public.

Connecticut

The Connecticut Economic Crime Unit was one of the first statewide approaches to prosecuting economic crime. The benefits of such broad jurisdiction are that protection is extended beyond the one or two most populous counties and the State's investigatory and prosecutorial resources can be marshalled to strengthen the case against alleged offenders across local boundaries. The ECU in Connecticut is able to coordinate and refer thousands of complaints to appropriate agencies for action and concentrate on the major fraud abuse cases.

Performance Information

A. Program Development and Implementation

As the previous section illustrates, each program directs its efforts differently for a variety of reasons. Therefore, each program must first define the scope of the effort -- all consumer complaints or only major violations, etc., before developing the program structure and process.

The Programs have had much in common regarding development:

- °develop high visibility among the general public;
- °set priorities:
 - °high impact cases that involve a large number of cases;
 - °cases likely to have a major deterrent effect ;
 - °cases with strong likelihood of success;
 - °cases with strong possibility of restitution.
- °coordination with related agencies (a well designed screening process);
- °balanced staff of prosecutors and investigators;

°authority and supportive legislation.

B. Service Delivery

°Identify client:referral process and public notification program;

°establish a case screening mechanism,

°assign for ECU action;

°arrange process for other referral sources;

°establish training mechanism;

°establish case processing system;

°assign investigation;

°set up files;

°develop investigation guidelines;

°develop arrest and disposition process;

°coordinate adjudication and alternative processing function;

°arrange repayment to victim (if required).

C. Impact Measures

An ECU (fraud units) should first identify the number and type of complaints, arrests, pending cases and investigations processed before establishing the measures for post-program performance.

°to increase the number of economic (fraud) investigations and successful prosecutions;

°increase fines or restitution to victims;

°increase number of convictions, incarcerations or economic sanctions to violators;

°improve reporting of fraud cases by public to ECU or police;

°reduce processing time of cases;

°increase reporting mechanism available to public, as well

as referral sources to public;

°involve "community" or victim in process where available;

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effective

The fraud or economic crime units have undergone several evaluations and much of what is known shows a marked increase in funds back to victims or to the "state." The Connecticut ECU, for example:

°increased restitution and fines:

<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>
\$72,558	\$296,707	\$375,178

°returned almost \$100,000 to the State of Connecticut over and above its total operating budget;

°reported conviction rate is 92% of total dispositions;

°resulted in a 100% conviction rate for all cases tried.

Copies of Connecticut Economic Crime Unit (1978) - Exemplary Project and Fraud Divisions, Seattle and San Diego Prosecutor's Offices (1975) - Exemplary Project are available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Program Title

Structured Plea Negotiation/Pre-Trial Settlement Conference

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(7) "Reduce the time between arrest or indictment and disposition or trial;" and (12) "Developing and implementing programs which...encourage victim and witness participation in the criminal justice system."

Description

For many years, guilty pleas have played a significant part in the processing of cases through the criminal justice system..

In 1975, recognizing that little empirical research on plea bargaining existed, the Office of Research Programs of NILECJ undertook several efforts to begin to build a knowledge base. One of these efforts was an experiment in Dade County which provided the opportunity for the victim and defendant to participate in the plea bargaining process. In addition, the prosecution, defense and judge were all partners in the process. The project studied the impact of the test procedure on case processing and measured the satisfaction of the victim with the process and the outcome.

Performance Information

A. Program Development and Implementation

- °develop judicial, prosecution and defense cooperation with the structured plea negotiation process;
- °collect and review statutes and court rules;
- °develop operational guidelines;
- °collect pre-implementation data;
- °schedule conference;
- °notification of participants,
 - °victim;
 - °defendant;
- °monitor conferences;
- °follow-up survey of all participants for periodic update of procedures;
- °collect project data for ongoing evaluation of program impact.

B. Impact Measures

°to produce plea agreements that are more consistent by making the process more explicit, open and subject to judicial review;

°to reduce the average time between initial indictment and final case disposition;

°to reduce delays and minimize disruption of court scheduling;

°to increase victim understanding of the process;

°to encourage greater participation by victims in the process.

Effectiveness Criterion

C. High Probability of Success

Based on the results of the Dade County experiment, the Office of Development, Testing and Dissemination of NIJ has developed a field test design on "Structured Plea Negotiation" to further examine and assess the efficacy of the pre-trial settlement process described above. This field test is just beginning and results will not be available until 1982. The results of the single site Dade County experiment are as follows:

°Experimental cases took an average of 84 days to process while control cases took an average of 138 days.

°The rate of disposition was not hindered by victim presence;

°Early closings of cases was 33% for experimental cases and only 6% for the control group. From another perspective, 43% of the conference cases and only 23% of the control cases closed on or before the original trial date.

°The severity of sentence between the conference cases and control cases did not vary significantly, for example:

% of Incarcerations

Conference Judges

average 40%

Control Judges

average 44%

The highest severity score for judges in the experimental group was 7.21 and for control judges 10.28 while the lowest score was 2.92 for test and 3.19 for control.

**Pre-Trial Settlement Conference: An Evaluation and the Structured Plea
Negotiation: Test Design are available from the National Criminal Jus-
tice Reference Service.**

Program Title

Administrative Adjudication of Traffic Offenses

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(8) "Implementing court reforms."

Description

Traffic cases clog the calendars of many urban court systems despite the absence of any evidence that court processing is an effective, efficient or equitable means of controlling minor violations. A substantial price is paid for continued reliance on the judiciary for the disposition of these cases:

- °Court resources required for the adjudication of serious crime are diverted to matters of far lower priority;
- °Police and court time is wasted in uncontested cases;
- °Judicial efforts often duplicate those of motor vehicle regulatory authorities;
- °Traffic safety suffers through excessive delays in clearing the roads of demonstrably unsafe drivers and applying disciplinary or rehabilitative measures.

In 1970 New York State attacked this problem by developing an administrative system for processing routine traffic cases, in lieu of criminal court action. Since that time several other states have experimented with various administrative or modified judicial approaches. In addition to reducing the strain placed on the police and judicial system, the potential benefits of an administrative approach include more efficient case processing, more equitable sanctions on traffic violators, better control of problem drivers and the opportunity to realize substantial gains in revenues from fines.

Key features of such a system include:

- °Decriminalization of those violations to be processed under the revised method;
- °Pay-by-mail procedures;
- °Centralized data processing to provide access to updated driving records;
- °Use of trained hearing officers instead of judges for those cases that do require a hearing;
- °Informal hearing procedures, with ultimate access to judicial review in case of appeals;

- °Diagnosis of problem drivers and application of appropriate training and improvement programs.

Performance Information

Impact Measures

- °Reduced costs of driver control operations;
- °Increased revenue from fines;
- °Reduced criminal court congestion;
- °Reduced time spent by police and judges in traffic proceedings;
- °Increased convenience for citizens;
- °Reduced case processing time;
- °Improved sanctioning process.

Effectiveness Criteria

A. Proven Effective

The Administrative Adjudication of Traffic Offense program in New York State was designated an Exemplary Project in 1975. Benefits in the three jurisdictions in which it was implemented -- New York City, Buffalo, and Rochester -- included the following:

- °A 25% increase in revenues over that produced by the prior court system (through a combination of more efficient operations and improved collection of fines);
- °Freeing of 20 judges and 9 courtrooms from traffic offense adjudication;
- °A 50% reduction in police time spent in traffic hearings;
- °Increased citizen convenience through pay-by-mail and simplified hearing procedures;
- °Reduction in processing time for those cases requiring a hearing from 1 year to 45 - 60 days;
- °A 25% reduction in the number of motorists evading summonses;

Similar improvements have been reported in other jurisdictions experimenting with modified traffic offense processing. An overview of procedures being followed in several states may be found in the recently published NIJ Policy Brief, Administrative Adjudication

of Traffic Offenses, available from NCJRS.

The Exemplary Project manual detailing the operations and procedures of the New York program entitled, Administrative Adjudication Bureau of the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles is available from the U.S. Government Printing Office. A brochure on the New York program entitled Handling Traffic Cases: A Better Way is available from NCJRS.

Program Title

Dispute Resolution -- Neighborhood Justice Centers

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(9) "Increasing the use and development of alternatives to the prosecution of selected offenders."

Description

In recent years, a number of programs have been developed to provide a forum for the relatively inexpensive, expeditious, and fair resolution of minor criminal and civil disputes, without arrest or formal court action. The programs offer conciliation, mediation, and sometimes arbitration, services and make referrals to social service agencies if appropriate. In contrast to the courts, the focus is on finding lasting solutions to interpersonal problems rather than a determination of guilt or innocence.

In 1977 the National Institute prepared a Program Models report and subsequently funded a field test of these dispute-resolution forums in three communities under the name of "Neighborhood Justice Centers." Since that time, roughly 100 such programs have been developed in approximately 28 states through a variety of funding sources.

Performance Information

A. Program Implementation

- ° Establishment of a community organization to provide conciliation, mediation and/or arbitration services for individuals with minor criminal and civil disputes and to serve as a referral mechanism for disputes more appropriately handled by other community service or government agencies. Development of procedures for active solicitation of cases from a wide variety of referral sources, including the courts, prosecution, police agencies, other public or private agencies and self referrals. Development of public awareness materials to inform the community at large of the services available.

- ° Formation of a broad pool of mediators who have received at least 40 hours training in methods of dispute resolution.

- ° Development of record keeping procedures which allow follow-up of clients who fail to appear for hearings and the reasons therefor, as well as follow-up of clients who have received hearings, to determine their satisfaction with the dispute resolution process.

Service Delivery/Impact Goals

- °To divert a portion of citizen dispute cases that might otherwise have been processed by the criminal justice system.
- °To provide a more accessible and convenient forum than the courts for citizen dispute resolution (e.g. through holding of hearings at times convenient to all parties, including evenings and weekends; by not requiring the presence of attorneys, and by providing multi-lingual staffs to serve non-English speaking disputants).
- °To process minor dispute cases more quickly than the courts -- typically within 7-15 days of initial referral.
- °To process cases at costs that are lower than traditional court processing.
- °To enable the parties involved in the disputes to arrive at fair and lasting solutions.

Effectiveness Criterion

B. Record of Proven Success

The three Neighborhood Justice Centers in Atlanta, Georgia, Kansas City, Missouri and Los Angeles, California were evaluated by the Institute for Social Analysis with funding from NIJ's Office of Program Evaluation. The conclusions presented by the evaluation follow:

- °Neighborhood Justice Centers provide a needed and effective alternative mechanism for the resolution of minor disputes. The three Centers attracted and handled a respectable number of cases during their first year of operations.
- °NJC's need to develop more effective ways for improving public awareness about their program, and for bringing cases to mediation or conciliation. While the Centers did resolve disputes after the cases had been referred to them, they had some difficulty in soliciting cases from the community.
- °NJC's appear to handle most minor interpersonal dispute cases more efficiently than the courts. The Centers resolve disputes more quickly than the courts, and citizens are more satisfied with the mediation process than those who go to court.

- °NJC's with connections to the local justice system will attract and resolve more disputes than Centers without such referral sources. While a modest caseload can be developed from self-referrals and referrals from community agencies, it is the police, prosecutors, and the courts who refer large numbers of cases.
- °NJC's are capable of handling a wide variety of minor disputes, including interpersonal/criminal cases as well as civil/consumer cases. Both criminal and civil cases were handled at the Centers, although a higher percentage of interpersonal/criminal cases reached a hearing than did the civil cases.
- °Reliable analytical data are not yet available on the costs of processing cases through NJC's as compared to court processing costs; however, available data indicate that Center costs, for at least some cases, may become competitive with the courts.
- °The three NJC's differ in caseload size, type of disputes handled, and to a lesser extent, in resolution effectiveness. The most probable sources of these differences include the Centers' philosophy/approach, their socio-cultural context, and their organization and management.
- °NJC disputants tend to reflect the ethnic characteristics of their surrounding community, but represent a disproportionate number of low income people.

Documentation currently available from the Reference Service on the Neighborhood Justice Center concept includes:

Neighborhood Justice Centers: An Analysis of Potential Models
(Program Models report)

Neighborhood Justice Centers Field Test: Interim Report

In addition, a Policy Brief aimed at legislators and state officials will be available in late March 1980 and the Executive Summary of the final field test evaluation results will be available in late Spring.

Program Title

Community Arbitration Project -- Exemplary Project
Anne Arundel County, Maryland

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(9) "increasing the use and development of alternatives to the prosecution of selected offenders".

(12) "developing and implementing programs which provide assistance to victims, witnesses, and jurors, including restitution by the offender, programs encouraging victim and witness participation in the criminal justice system, and programs designed to prevent retribution against or intimidation of witnesses by persons charged with or convicted of crimes"

Description

The Community Arbitration Project (CAP) is a voluntary, pre-trial alternative to the disposition of juvenile misdemeanants. CAP was designed to alleviate the misdemeanor burden on the court while still impressing the offender with the consequences of his or her behavior. Under the program, juveniles are issued a citation which records the offense and schedules a hearing to arbitrate the case seven days later. The suspect's parents and the victim receive copies of the citation and are asked to appear at the hearing. The right to counsel is made clear to the youngster and parents.

Although the arbitration hearing is informal, it is held in a courtroom setting to emphasize the fact that the child has become involved with the juvenile justice system. The arbitration is conducted in the presence of the victim (if he or she chooses to attend) but is legally confidential and cannot be used or admitted into evidence in any subsequent criminal or civil proceeding. The arbitrator -- an attorney with experience in juvenile cases -- hears the complaint and reviews the police report. If the child admits committing the offense and consents to arbitration, the arbitrator makes an informal adjustment, sentencing the child to a prescribed number of hours of community work or restitution, counseling, or an educational program. If the case is serious, if the child denies involvement or if the child or parents so request, the case will be forwarded to the State's Attorney for formal adjudication.

Performance Information

A. Service Delivery

Once a jurisdiction establishes a commitment to informal, pre-trial adjudication of juvenile offenders, the following measures should be undertaken:

- °prepare a comprehensive listing of community service agencies and tasks to be performed by project youth

- °recruit personnel to arbitrate cases, supervise clients and handle administrative details

- °establish formal procedures which assure due process: insuring confidentiality in all hearings and guaranteeing accused youths the right to a court hearing if they prefer.

B. Process/Impact

- °reduce the processing time for juvenile cases

- °reduce recidivism

- °reduce the burden on the criminal justice system while enhancing the system's impact on youth

- °involve victims and the community in the juvenile justice system.

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the Community Arbitration Program has been subject to extensive review. Based on these reports, the following results have been documented:

- °Juvenile cases handled by CAP are processed in 7 days in contrast to the 4 - 6 weeks of traditional processing

- °After a one year follow up period, CAP clients experienced a 4.5% lower recidivism rate and 37% fewer arrests per client than youths processed in the traditional manner

- °Dismissals due to insufficient evidence rose from 4.1% for traditional processing to 30.6% for CAP

- °7.2% of a sample of CAP cases were forwarded to the State's Attorney for processing. Prior to CAP, 75% of traditional intake cases were forwarded to the State's Attorney

An independent assessment of these findings was conducted by Abt Associates, Inc. as part of the validation process for the Exemplary Projects Program. CAP was designated an Exemplary Project in August, 1978.

Program Title

Career Criminal Programs

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(11) "Increasing the rate at which prosecutors obtain convictions against habitual non-status offenders."

Description

It has been recognized for many years that a small number of offenders are responsible for a disproportionate share of serious criminal acts. In 1975, LEAA launched the National Career Criminal Program in 11 cities; today it extends into 46 such jurisdictions. Two of these programs have been designated exemplary -- the Bronx Major Offense Bureau and the San Diego Major Violator Unit. The Bronx program focuses on all major felonies while the San Diego program concentrates on robbery and selected burglary cases only.

There is wide variation in the organization and policies of the various career criminal programs, however, the following are central features that they all share:

- °Organization as a separate unit within the District Attorney's Office.
- °System for direct referral of cases to the unit by police agencies.
- °Objective screening procedures for identifying offenders who qualify for career criminal prosecution. Three factors are weighed: 1) the nature of the offense; 2) the defendant's history and current status in the community; and, 3) strength of the case.
- °Vertical prosecution whereby one assistant district attorney has responsibility for a case from beginning to end.
- °Full disclosure policy to reduce the time spent in pre-trial discovery and avoid constitutional challenges on ground's of the defendant's inability to prepare for trial.
- °Severe limitations on plea bargaining.
- °Priority court scheduling.
- °Information sharing with the courts in terms of pre-trial release and sentencing decisions.

Performance Information

A. Improvements in Prosecutorial Techniques.

Prosecutors involved in career criminal programs have typically reported improvements in each of the following aspects of successful criminal prosecution:

- °case intake procedures (case screening);
- °case tracking and monitoring;
- °victim/witness cooperation;
- °internal investigative resources;
- °conversion from horizontal to vertical prosecution;
- °curtailment of case continuances.

B. Improvements in Prosecutorial Effectiveness.

Evaluation studies of Career Criminal Programs have focused on the following measures of prosecutorial effectiveness:

- °reduction in the amount of time required to prosecute a case;
- °increase in the rate of conviction;
- °increase in the rate of conviction for the most serious charge;
- °increase in the rate of incarceration;
- °reduction in the scope of plea bargaining negotiations;
- °increase in the average length of sentence.

Effectiveness Criterion

B. Record of Proven Success

Various evaluations of career criminal programs have been conducted including the Mitre evaluation of 4 sites, California's evaluation of its 12 state-wide programs, and an independent evaluation of the Suffolk County, Massachusetts program. The following is a summary of the accomplishments of several of these programs:

- °Reduction in the amount of time required to prosecute a case. The California Career Criminal Prosecution

Program reported no change in prosecution delay across its state-wide system of 12 career criminal units. In contrast, the Major Violators Project in Suffolk County, Massachusetts cited a 67 percent reduction in the time required to process an offender from arrest to conviction. Similarly, the Kalamazoo unit reported a 51 percent reduction, while units in New Orleans and Columbus, Ohio posted more modest reductions. The Bronx Major Offense Bureau achieved the most dramatic reduction in case processing time -- from 400 to 97 days.

° Reduction in the number of repeat offenders securing pre-trial release. Only two programs cite figures for this outcome measure. The Suffolk County unit reported that a 30 percent reduction in the number of career criminals being released on bail had been achieved, primarily through the setting of higher bail. The average bail for repeat offenders increased threefold in California counties having career criminal units; the percentage of such offenders in custody at the time of trial increased from 79 percent to 82 percent.

° Increase in the rate of conviction. Increases in the percentage of repeat offenders convicted of one or more crimes have been uniformly modest. For example, Suffolk County reported a conviction rate for career criminals of 87 percent prior to the creation of its Major Violator Project; this rate increased to 96 percent after the project was started. The Bronx and San Diego achieved similar conviction rates of 96%. Other programs have reported increases ranging from 2 to 7 percent.

° Increase in the rate of conviction for the most serious charge. Prior to the establishment of the California Career Criminal Prosecution Program, only 60 percent of the prosecuted career criminals were convicted of the most serious charge against them. With the installment of those programs, this figure rose dramatically to 81 percent. Within San Diego County alone this increase was from 41 percent during the baseline period to nearly 76 percent after the special prosecution unit had been established. The Kalamazoo program saw a 15 percent increase in its conviction rate for the top-listed offense.

° Increase in incarceration rates. In San Diego incarceration rates for convicted felons rose from an already high rate of 95.3% to 100%, while in the Bronx the incarceration rate rose from less than half of those convicted to 94% of those convicted.

°Reduction in the scope of plea bargaining negotiations.

Data on fulfillment of this objective are available only from the California program. During the baseline period only about 42 percent of the charges made against repeat offenders resulted in conviction; 51 percent were dropped by the prosecutors, in part as a result of plea negotiations. In contrast, establishment of the program saw the number of charges leading to conviction increase to 61 percent, with only 32 percent of the charges being dropped by the prosecuting attorneys.

°Increase in the average length of sentence. Reflecting their success in securing convictions on the top-listed charges and in reducing the scope of plea negotiations, most units report an increase in the average sentence meted out to convicted repeat offenders. For example, across all 12 of its programs, California reports an increase in the average sentence from 4 years, 6 months to 5 years, 5 months. Suffolk County reports an increase in the minimum average sentence from 6 years, 11 months, to 8 years, 5 months. More modest increases were reported by units in New Orleans and Columbus, while Kalamazoo showed a slight decrease in the average sentence given career criminals.

An examination of the 12 California units suggests that those units focusing on only two crimes, such as burglary and robbery, show greater improvements than those concentrating on a wider range of felonies. Less improvement is shown by units working out of offices that previously had enjoyed a fair amount of success in prosecuting repeat offenders.

An Exemplary Project manual, The Major Offense Bureau, is currently available on the Bronx program from NCJRS. Documentation on the San Diego program is in process and will be available by May, 1980, as will a Policy Brief on Career Criminal Programs being prepared for an audience of legislators and state executives.

Program Title

1 Day/1 Trial: Jury System in Wayne County, Michigan (1977)

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(12) "Developing and implementing programs of assistance to victims, witness, and jurors..."

Description

The Wayne County courts instituted a One Day/One Trial jury system to address several major concerns:

- °long periods spent by jurors waiting in court hallways and assembly rooms;
- °prospective jurors not being selected for duty after waiting many days and weeks;
- °long terms of jury service.

Under the reform, prospective jurors are either selected or dismissed for duty on their first day. Those who are accepted to serve are required to complete the duration of a trial, usually about three days.

Wayne County, in addition to slashing the term of jury service to a single day or trial, instituted several other major innovations:

- °computerization of the jury pool;
- °elimination of the qualification interview;
- °initiation of stand-by jurors pool;
- °juror orientation via slide presentation; and,
- °recycling jurors.

The result of the reforms was (1) efficiency in jury system management, and (2) improved administration of justice.

Performance Information

A. Program Development and Implementation

- °Establish a system that allows for the call of jurors on a day-to-day basis, based on the predictable number of jurors needed on a particular day, by:
 - °conducting an analysis of prior experience in

the jurisdiction, taking into account variables such as the average length of jury trials and the number of available judges;

°interviewing the jury clerk and the Circuit Court Assignment Clerk as to past experience;

°examining the juror time -- study records which show the times and number of jurors who were previously available for the voir dire in prior periods; and,

°creating a stand by list of "on-call" jurors.

B. Service Delivery

°Establish an eligibility pool which seeks to identify all citizens, using a combination of voter registration lists, auto registration, telephone directories, property owners, etc. (100%);

°develop a notification system capable of servicing the eligibility pool;

°systemize the juror list to retrieve within 15 minutes all the available jurors for two weeks;

°identify available stand by jurors to adequately fill gap when required;

C. Impact Measures

°Cost reduction for jurors time;

°increase of citizen participation in the jury process;

°juror representativeness as a % of population increased;

°juror attitude (satisfaction) toward the juror process improved;

°more efficient use of juror time (Juror Utilization Index).

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effective

Data on the accomplishments of the One Day/One Trial program were collected by Wayne County and validated by Abt Associates, Inc. under the Exemplary Projects Program. The results follows:

°a savings of \$93 per day or \$329,200 per year;

°increased representativeness of the juror pool

<u>R</u> <u>Race</u>	<u>Population</u> <u>County</u>	<u>Pre-</u> <u>Program</u>	<u>Post</u> <u>Program</u>
White	67%	74%	68%
Minority	33%	26%	32%
Male	47%	42%	46%
Female	53%	58%	54%

°increased number of citizens participating as jurors
from 1,348 to 9,975 a year;

°more productive use of juror time -- 24% increase
in juror utilization in one year.

Note: The Wayne County program should be examined in conjunction with the broader Juror Usage and Management Incentives program developed by the Adjudication Division of LEAA.

The Exemplary Projects manual: One Day/One Trial Jury System is available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Program Title

Witness Information Service -- Exemplary Project, Peoria, Illinois

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(12) "Developing and implementing programs which provide assistance to victims, witnesses, and jurors, including restitution by the offender, programs encouraging victim and witness participation in the criminal justice system, and programs designed to prevent retribution against or intimidation of witnesses by persons charged with or convicted of crimes."

Description

Administered by the County State's Attorney's Office, the Witness Information Service (WIS) works with that office to reduce the number of cases dismissed because witnesses fail to appear. WIS was initially established to notify and assist witnesses in misdemeanor cases, but has recently expanded its services to witnesses in selected felony cases. Assistance and advocacy services to victims eligible for compensation or restitution are also provided.

With a paid staff of only three people, WIS relies heavily upon the 5 to 10 volunteers affiliated with the program to perform a variety of tasks: making evening phone calls to witnesses about court dates, serving as witness aides in the courthouse corridors, assisting victims with compensation claims, collecting information for monitoring program operations and performing clerical duties in the office.

The development, organization and operations of WIS are described in the forthcoming Exemplary Project brochure and manual. The major services provided by WIS are:

°Notification and Assistance to Witnesses -- Along with the official notification from the State's Attorney's Office,, WIS sends information to witnesses explaining the court process and encouraging witnesses to call WIS if they need assistance or have questions. Telephone calls placed to witnesses a day or two before their scheduled appearance provide a reminder and an offer of assistance; moreover, WIS can inform prosecutors about the likelihood that their witnesses will appear. To prevent unnecessary trips to the courtroom in misdemeanor jury trial cases, witnesses call the morning of the trial to find out if a jury has been selected and if their appearance will be necessary. To eliminate repeated continuances, pre-trial conferences are now used;

°Employer Agreements to Compensate Witnesses -- WIS negotiated agreements with local employers to permit employees to serve as witnesses with no loss of pay.

°Restitution -- WIS routinely screens case records to identify and contact victims who may be eligible for restitution and provides help in gathering information for the process.

°Compensation -- WIS screens UCR lists and examines cases where victims appear to be eligible for victim compensation. Further help is offered throughout the whole process until a decision is made by the Board.

°Property Return -- WIS serves as a liaison between victims and police and prosecutors on questions concerning return of property.

Performance Information

Needs Assessment -- To provide a foundation for effective program development as well as monitoring and evaluation, a needs assessment effort should be directed at each group of individuals for whom service is contemplated. For projects like WIS, these groups would include victims of crime, non-victim witnesses to crime and prosecutors. By selecting a large and representative sample, a survey of potential users can provide insights into the types of services most needed and those needs which are less critical.

Process and Impact Information

Process information is needed to determine if the project is performing the activities and services it was set up to perform. Impact information seeks to determine whether the performance of project activities makes the difference it was intended to make.

WIS established five goals and collected performance information on each, as briefly described below:

°Increasing witness appearances and reducing dismissals for witness non-appearance. The process for achieving this goal includes sending out notification letters, making reminder phone calls, being available for witness "call-ins" on the day of trial, and providing assistance at the courthouse.

Measuring the impact of such services on witness appearance and on dismissals for witness non-appearance requires the use of an experimental design. Witnesses in the "experimental" group receive project services; witnesses in the "control" group are handled in the standard fashion. The appearance rates, dismissal rates and reasons for dismissal for the two groups are then compared.

°Reducing unnecessary witness appearances. Process information monitors delivery of the following procedures and services: witness call-off procedures, pre-trial conferences and telephone call-ins for witnesses scheduled in jury demand courts. Impact information would utilize baseline data to compare the

effect of these new procedures against the previous system.

- ° Increasing the availability of reimbursement for losses caused by crimes. Process information monitors the number of victim compensation claims filed which receive assistance from WIS, and the use of new restitution procedures instituted by WIS including preparing pertinent loss data prior to court appearance, centralizing restitution payments and supervision and imposing time limits on restitution orders. Impact information would analyze the percentage of eligible victims filing for and receiving victim compensation and percentage of victims receiving restitution against comparable baseline data.
- ° Improving information flow between witnesses, prosecutors, and the criminal justice system. Process information serves to monitor the delivery of informational materials, the outreach contacts and the problem solving services provided by the project, such as locating witnesses for whom notification letters were returned undelivered, answering telephone inquiries and helping witnesses at the courthouse. Impact Information on these services attempts to determine whether witnesses and prosecutors consider WIS services to be improving the flow of information.
- ° Obtaining employer endorsements guaranteeing employees that they would not suffer financial loss because of the need to appear as a victim/witness in a criminal proceeding. Process information monitors the number of employer agreements and the corresponding employees covered by such agreements. An attempt to measure the impact of these agreements would be concerned with the actual reimbursement of employees in comparison with baseline data.

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effective

The results of WIS include the following:

- ° witness appearances increased with WIS services;
- ° WIS services seem to reduce dismissals due to the lack of witnesses;
- ° victims are now routinely assisted in and have easier access to restitution and compensation reimbursement;
- ° communication difficulties and barriers between witnesses, prosecutors and the criminal justice system have been lessened; and,

many employees in Peoria no longer need to fear loss of pay due to appearing as witnesses in court.

NIJ Documents Available:

Witness Information Service:

Exemplary Project Brochure

Publication anticipated in May, 1980. To be available from NCJRS.

Witness Information Service:

Exemplary Project Manual

Publication anticipated in June, 1980. To be available from NCJRS

Victim/Witness Assistance Monograph

Published July, 1979

Available from GPO

Program Title

Community Response to Rape

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(12) "developing and implementing programs which provide assistance to victims, witnesses, and jurors, including restitution by the offender, programs encouraging victim and witness participation in the criminal justice system, and programs designed to prevent retribution against or intimidation of witnesses by persons charged with or convicted of crimes.

Description

In the past decade, growing public awareness of the problems encountered by victims of rape has brought about a variety of improvements in the way communities respond to the crime of rape and to its victims. Typically, a rape crisis center or a sexual assault center has been the impetus for change and the coordinating mechanism whereby legal reforms, treatment services, community awareness and improved criminal justice procedures have been realized. Two of these efforts have been widely publicized as Exemplary Projects: Stop Rape Crisis Center, Baton Rouge, Louisiana and Rape/Sexual Assault Center, Des Moines, Iowa. The experiences of (these and other) projects have been combined with findings from research and evaluation efforts to create a "Program Model" for designing or improving a community response to rape, entitled Rape: Guidelines for a Community Response.

Two mutually supportive sets of goals direct the Community Response to Rape:

°Victim Support Goals:

--to develop innovative procedures for law enforcement and medical agencies that reduce the victim's psychological and physical trauma;

--to involve the community in the delivery of program services.

°Criminal Justice Goals

--to increase the reporting of rape; and

--to increase the number of arrests and ultimate conviction of rapists.

Five essential program elements comprise a communitywide response to rape:

°The Rape Crisis Center provides both staff and volunteers to the effort and coordinates the matching of community resources to the

needs. Through such means as an Advisory Board or Board of Directors, the rape center also offers a way to build initial and continuing community support for a special emphasis on the treatment of rape.

Victim Services are provided by rape center staff or community counseling agencies. Services include 24-hour telephone hotlines, crisis intervention, escort services, third party reporting, and such ancillary services as transportation and child care.

The Criminal Justice Component includes new procedures for investigating and prosecuting rape cases such as restructuring the case assignment system, better training of personnel and using vertical prosecution (where one prosecutor handles the case for the entire court process). Prosecutors also work to encourage and facilitate the victim's participation in the court process and to collaborate more effectively with other agencies in such crucial issues as evidence collection.

The Medical Services Component focuses on more compassionate treatment of the victim and a more effective evidence collection process.

Public Education seeks to dispell common myths about rape, to increase community awareness of the true nature of rape, to emphasize preventive measures that can be taken, and to increase community support for the entire rape program.

Performance Information

Process Measures relating primarily to the Victim Support goals and project service delivery would include client questionnaire data on perceptions of the program, descriptive statistics of the number of clients served by the various project components, the amount of resources devoted to these services, observational data on the functioning of medical and criminal justice personnel, the amount or time required for case processing and so forth.

Questionnaire instruments used in two projects are included in the Program Model report cited previously.

Impact Measures deal with the project's influence upon activities outside of the project -- e.g. crime rates, rape reporting rates, criminal justice system functioning -- in comparison to the internal activities assessed by the process measures. Primary impact measures are related to the Criminal Justice Goals mentioned previously and include increased reporting of rape, increased arrests and increased convictions. Unless a project is fortunate enough to have had repeated victimization surveys conducted, UCR data are likely to comprise the only information available on rape reporting rates. Data on arrests are available from the police department and differences

for the percentage of reported rapes cleared by arrest can be compared for the period preceding the project and the period following project implementation. Data on conviction rates should be obtainable from the prosecutor's office, and these rates can similarly be compared to baseline data along with comparisons of the length and type of sentences given to defendants.

Measures of the operation of the criminal justice system (e.g./length of time elapsed from arrest to case disposition, number of hearings held per case, and so forth) can be used to partially indicate the impact of the project upon case processing if such measures are compared to those for cases prior to project implementation. (When used for this purpose the measures of criminal justice processing can be viewed as project impact measures rather than as process measures).

Effectiveness Criterion

B. Record of Proven Success

The effectiveness of the Community Response to Rape Program concept is exemplified by the success of the two projects cited above -- Baton Rouge, Louisiana and Polk County, Iowa -- as they pursued parallel goals. Both projects were founded on the premise that achievement of the "process" goals (i.e., innovative procedures, community awareness and citizen participation) will, along with prioritization programs in the police and prosecutors offices, result in the achievement of the criminal justice impact goals.

Measurement of these outcome goals in both cases was done through pre/during tabulations of reports, arrests and convictions and pre/post program perceptions. Both projects documented success in achieving their Victim Support Goals and further reported success in their Criminal Justice Goals of:

- °an increase in the reporting of rape
- °an increase in the number of arrests for the crime of rape
- °an increase in convictions for the crime of rape.

NIJ Documents Available

Available from NCJRS:

- °Stop Rape Crisis Center, Baton Rouge Louisiana. Exemplary Project Brochure

°Stop Rape Crisis Center, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Exemplary Project Manual

°A Community Response to Rape: Rape Sexual Assault Care Center, Polk County, Iowa. Exemplary Project Brochure

°A Community Response to Rape: Rape Sexual Assault Care Center, Polk County, Iowa. Exemplary Project Manual

Available from GPO in March, 1980:

°Rape: Guidelines for a Community Response. Program Model

Program Title

The D.C. Public Defender Service -- Exemplary Project, Washington, D.C. (1974)
Guide to Establishing a Defender System -- Prescriptive Package (1978)

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(13) "Providing competent defense counsel for indigent and eligible low-income persons accused of criminal offenses."

Description

The D.C. Public Defender Service was established in 1970. The primary purpose of the PDS was to provide effective legal representation to those unable to afford counsel in criminal, juvenile and mental health commitment proceedings.

As a follow-up to the effort conducted in D.C. the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice supported a research effort to develop a guide to assist defender offices in the screening and processing of cases.

PDS had overcome the traditional barriers faced by public defender services -- high caseloads and poorly paid and inadequately trained attorneys. The PDS provides quality representation to the indigent defendant from arrest to release through:

- °limited caseloads;
- °an on-going training program beginning with a special 6 week program for new staff attorneys;
- °individualized and continuous client representation;
- °use of supportive services, such as psychiatric evaluation, counseling and other rehabilitative services;
- °development of a management process patterned after large law firms; and,
- °involvement of private bar in public defense.

Performance Information

A. Program Development and Implementation

The organization of the D.C. program reflects a number of key policy provisions:

- °introduction of the mixed system concept -- use of both public defense and private bar counsel;
- °development of eligibility guidelines for screening and assigning clients;

- °institute a schedule for assigning cases and process for initial contacts;

- °development of caseloads standards;

- °establish the necessary administrative support; and,

- °provide adequate investigative services.

B/C. Service/Impact Delivery

- °increased client satisfaction;

- °reduced case load -- a PDS attorney handles 180 cases per year which is consistent with NLADA data which shows that only 3% of public defenders service more than 200 cases per year;

- °individualized and continuous client representation;

- °use of supportive services such as psychiatric evaluations, counseling, and other rehabilitation services.

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effective

- °client population satisfaction improved, for example, 54.9% of all inmates surveyed preferred having a PDS lawyer versus private;

- °total cases handled went from 4,693 in 1971 to 6,846 in 1973, however the cost per case did not increase significantly -- \$253 per case to \$257 per case was average range for 1971, 1972 and 1973.

Note: The D.C. Public Defender Service program should be examined in conjunction with the broader examination described in the Prescriptive Package. Both the Exemplary Project and the Prescriptive Package are available through the NCJRS.

Program Title

Work Release/Pre-Release Center -- Exemplary Project, Montgomery County, Maryland
Pre-Release Centers Field Test

Program Category (Section 401(a))

(15) "increasing the availability and use of alternatives to maximum security confinement of convicted offenders who pose no threat to public safety."

Description

The Montgomery County (Maryland) Work Release/Pre-Release Center (PRC) is a residential, community-based correctional facility for sentenced offenders (and some pre-adjudication releasees) who are within six months of their release or parole hearing. To fulfill its dual commitment to provide services to offenders and to assure community safety, PRC offers a diversified program of treatment services while at the same time imposing a maximum level of accountability and control of client movement.

Participation in four components of the treatment program is mandatory for all PRC residents:

- °Work and educational release;
- °Counseling;
- °Utilization of community social services;
- °Social awareness instruction.

Other services are available on an optional basis.

Control of residents' behavior is maintained in several ways:

- °Each resident enters a program contractual agreement with a Center staff member which details specific behavioral and programmatic objectives.
- °Periodic and unannounced counts and drug/alcohol testing are routinely conducted.
- °Checks with employers and community service agency personnel are made to verify the clients continued employment and participation in those agencies activities.
- °The furlough/release program is closely supervised by center staff.

°A tri-phased pre-release plan is established for each resident in which each successive phase affords additional privileges. Graduation from one phase to the next depends on the individuals performance and behavior in the center.

°The Center deducts 20% of the residents gross earnings for room and board and 10% is set aside for savings.

The consequences of violating the Center's rules or the terms of an individual's contract range from counseling to revocation from the program and return to security confinement.

Performance Information

A. Service Delivery

Each client will have a coherent program of services prescribed in a contract. Pre-release centers must maintain some mechanism for assuring that the elements of a client's service program are delivered. The range of such measures includes:

- °the number and kind of services offered directly by the project;
- °services outside the project to which referrals may be made;
- °the number of participants applying for and receiving services, by type of service;
- °the level of each service (e.g. hours of counseling, number of job interviews arranged, number of training hours provided);
- °employment positions held by participants (number and type of jobs);
- °amount of resources accumulated by clients at the time of release;
- °participants' housing arrangements at time of release.

B. Impact

The range of client outcome measures required to determine program effectiveness include:

1. In-program performance

- °program drop-out, administrative removal, and revocation rates (nature, number and dates of infractions);

- °changes of security status and reasons;

- °new offenses (arrests, warrants issued, convictions);

- °technical violations (resulting from rule infractions and/or new offenses).

2. Post-Program Recidivism

- °new offenses (arrests, warrants issues, convictions, including dates and charges);

- °technical violations (resulting from rule infractions and/or new offenses).

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the Montgomery County Work Release/Pre-Release Center has been thoroughly documented. The most significant findings of recent evaluation reports include:

- °virtually all PRC residents successfully discharged from the program had jobs, housing, and cash savings upon release;

- °after a one year follow-up period, 80% of successfully released offender's had not been re-arrested;

- °the PRC experienced an absconder rate of less than 5%;

- °over a three year period, PRC residents paid approximately \$73,000 in taxes, \$3,000 in fines, and \$100,000 for support of their families.

An independent assessment of these findings was conducted as part of the validation process for the Exemplary Projects Program. The PRC was designated an Exemplary Project in August 1977.

A field test of the pre-release center concept, modeled in large part after the Montgomery County program, was undertaken by the National Institute of Justice in 1978. The objective of this effort is to determine the effective-

ness of the program strategy under quasi-controlled conditions in a limited number of sites and to assess the transferability of the concept and its suitability for further demonstration.

The Exemplary Project manual: Montgomery County Work Release/Pre-Release Program may be obtained from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Copies of the Pre-Release Centers Field Test Design will also be available from NCJRS shortly.

Program Title

Grievance Mechanisms in Correctional Institutions

Ward Grievance Procedure -- Exemplary Project, California Youth Authority

Program Category [Section 401(a)]

(16) "reducing the rates of violence among inmates in places of detention and confinement."

Description

In 1972 the California Youth Authority implemented a formal, but operationally simple method for resolving inmate grievances in the State's institutions for youth. Departmental regulations specify procedures for the various levels of grievance review, maximum time limits of each level, and methods of handling special or emergency grievances. Three levels of review have been established to ensure the opportunity for appeal if the decisions reached are unsatisfactory or require action by higher administrative levels:

1. Grievance Committee Hearing

The Committee consists of a non-voting Chairman (usually a first line supervisor or middle manager trained in mediation) two elected inmates and two available staff

2. Superintendent or Director

If the Committee's resolution is appealed, it is reviewed by the correctional facilities administrative head, or in the case of departmental policy grievances, the Director, CYA.

3. Outside Review

If second level resolution is unsatisfactory, the grievance is reviewed by a professional arbitrator from the American Arbitration Association.

At each level, grievances are responded to in writing within strict time limits.

There are generally five types of grievable complaints that are likely to arise in an institutional setting:

- ° Complaints about a specific departmental or institutional policy
- ° Complaint involving the specific application or interpretation of a policy

- Complaint involving the behavior or actions of institution employees
- Complaints involving the behavior or actions of inmates
- Complaints about the living conditions or institutional environment

Rule infractions and violations of law are usually excluded from institutional grievance systems.

It is important to note that the grievance procedure developed in California is one of several models to be used in designing an effective grievance mechanism. The Prescriptive Package, "Grievance Mechanisms in Correctional Institutions" provides detailed description and implementation guidelines grievance procedures and three other types of grievance mechanisms:

- Ombudsman Programs
- Inmate Councils
- Labor Model Procedures

Performance Information

A. Implementation

Four tasks have been identified as crucial activities for the effective implementation of grievance mechanism services regardless of model type:

- Conduct needs assessment
Conduct needs assessment is important to define the nature and extent of complaints within the institution and to help determine the mechanism and procedures most suited to institutional requirements.
- Establish creditability for the Mechanism
The administration, staff and inmates must have a commitment to the grievance mechanism and confidence in its feasibility. Through early involvement in the design and operation of the project, staff and inmate skepticism can be overcome.
- Integrate the Mechanism into the Institution
Grievance mechanisms are not a substitute for normal disciplinary or investigatory procedures in an institution. It is important to determine how the grievance mechanism will relate to existing actions and policies within the institution.

- ° Prepare for successful Department-wide Implementation
Incremental implementation of the grievance mechanism in several institutions is recommended prior to attempting to implement on a department wide basis.

B. Process Measures

The following information should be systematically collected to document the processing of grievances:

- ° number of grievances filed
- ° type of grievance
- ° disposition
- ° adherence to time limits
- ° degree to which rights to appeal are honored
- ° availability of representation for grievants
- ° use of written responses to grievances
- ° attitudes (of staff and inmates) concerning
 - perceived fairness of system
 - satisfaction

C. Impact Measures

Impact measures include any observable or measurable effects of the program which do not specifically involve grievances:

- ° changes in social climate
- ° changes in the volume of disciplinary activities
- ° changes in the volume of litigation brought by inmates

Effectiveness Criterion

A. Proven Effectiveness

The Ward Grievance Procedure of the California Youth Authority has been extensively evaluated by the Authority's Research Division and by independent evaluators. Although it is difficult to quantitatively document the impact of a grievance mechanism, evaluations consistently indicate:

- the procedure has enhanced staff-inmate communication and improved their relationships
- staff are more amenable to acting on inmate suggestions
- policies, regulations, and rules for which there was no articulated justification have been revised and altered as a direct result of grievances being filed
- the procedures documentation requirements have provided an effective tool for administrators to monitor the institutional environment
- the procedure has created new roles and responsibilities for inmates who function as grievance committee members, representatives or clerks

In general, the project has been credited with "humanizing" the institutional environment and contributing to the reduction of tension among inmates and staff.

An independent assessment of the evaluation reports prepared on the Ward Grievance Procedure was conducted as part of the validation process for the Exemplary Projects Program. The project was designated Exemplary in September 1975.

The Exemplary Project Manual, "Controlled Confrontation: The Ward Grievance Procedure of the California Youth Authority" and the Prescriptive Package. "Grievance Mechanisms in Correctional Institutions" may be obtained from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

**RESOURCE DOCUMENTS IN
SUPPORT OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
UNDER SECTION 401(a), JUSTICE
SYSTEM IMPROVEMENT ACT, 1979**

**Office of Development, Testing
and Dissemination
National Institute of Justice
February 22, 1980**

UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, ALL DOCUMENTS LISTED ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFERENCE SERVICE.

"(1) establishing or expanding community and neighborhood programs that enable citizens to undertake initiatives to deal with crime and delinquency."

Exemplary Projects

*Community Crime Prevention, Seattle, Washington (1977)

*Project CREST, Gainesville, Florida (1979)
(available Summer 1980)

Program Models

Volunteers in Juvenile Justice (1977)

Planning Community Crime Prevention Programs
(available Summer 1980)

"(2) improving and strengthening law enforcement agencies, as measured by arrest rates, incidence rates, victimization rates, the number of reported crimes, clearance rates, the number of patrol or investigative hours per uniformed officer, or any other appropriate objective measure."

Exemplary Projects

*Street Crime Unit, New York City Police Department (1975) -(available from Government Printing Office only)

*Hidden Cameras Project, Seattle, Washington (1978)

*Central Police Dispatch, Muskegon, Michigan (1975)

Program Models/Program Design

Improving Patrol Productivity, Vol. 1, Traditional Police Patrol, Vol. 2, Specialized Police Patrol (1977)

Managing Criminal Investigations (1979)

Small Police Agency Consolidation (1979)

Field Test Design

Managing Patrol Operations (1979)

"(3) improving the police utilization of community resources through support of joint police-community projects designed to prevent or control neighborhood crime."

See crime prevention documentation listed under Priority 1 and:

Field Test Design

*Commercial Security Test Design

"(4) disrupting illicit commerce in stolen goods and property and training of special investigative and prosecuting personnel, and the development of systems for collecting, storing and disseminating information relating to the control of organized crime."

Program Models

Racket's Bureau: Investigation and Prosecution of Organized Crime (1978)

Multi-Agency Narcotics Unit Manual (1976)
(available from Government Printing Office only)

"(5) combating arson."

Program Models

Arson Prevention and Control (1979)

"(6) developing investigations and prosecutions of white collar crime, organized crime, public corruption related offenses, and fraud against the government."

Exemplary Projects

*Connecticut Economic Crime Unit (1978)

*Economic Crime Units - Seattle & San Diego (1975)
(available from Government Printing Office only)

Program Models

Prevention, Detection and Correction of Corruption
in Local Government (1978)(being reprinted)

"(7) reducing the time between arrest or indictment and disposition of trial."

Field Test Design

Structured Plea Negotiations (1979)

Research Report

Pre-Trial Settlement Conference: An Evaluation (1979)

"(8) implementing court reforms."

Program Models

Trial Court Management Series (1979)

°Records Management

°Personnel Management

°Financial Management

Grand Jury Operations - (available Summer 1980)

Court Planning and Research: The Los Angeles
Experience (Monograph) 1976

Court Unification (Monograph) 1978

Field Test Design

Multi-Jurisdictional Sentencing Guidelines

Policy Brief

*Administrative Adjudication of Traffic Offenses, 1980
Mandatory Sentencing: The New York Drug Law
Experience (available late Spring 1980)

"(9) increasing the use and development of alternatives to the prosecution of selected offenders."

Exemplary Projects

*Community Arbitration Program (juvenile)
Anne Arundel, Maryland (1978)

Program Models/Program Designs

*Neighborhood Justice Centers: An Analysis of
Potential Models
(Policy Brief on this topic also available March 1980)

Evaluation Report

Neighborhood Justice Centers Field Test:
Interim Report (Final report available,
Summer 1980)

"(10) increasing the development and use of alternatives to pre-trial detention that assure return to court and a minimization of the risk of danger."

Field Test Design

Pre-Trial Supervised Release

"(11) increasing the rate at which prosecutors obtain convictions against habitual, nonstatus offenders."

Exemplary Projects

*Major Offense Bureau, Bronx (1976)

*Major Violator Unit, San Diego, California
(1979)(available late Spring 1980)

Policy Brief

*Career Criminal Programs
(available late Spring 1980)

"(12) developing and implementing programs which provide assistance to victims, witnesses, and jurors, including restitution by the offender, programs encouraging victim and witness participation in the criminal justice system, and programs designed to prevent retribution against or intimidation of witnesses by persons charged with or convicted of crimes."

Exemplary Projects

*Stop Rape Crisis Center, Baton Rouge, La. (1978)

*A Community Response to Rape, Des Moines, Iowa
(1976)(available Government Printing Office only)

*Witness Information Service, Peoria, Illinois
(1979)(available Summer 1980)

*One Day/One Trial Jury System, Wayne County,
Michigan (1977)

*Community Arbitration Program, Anne Arundel, MD
(1978)

Program Models/Monographs

*Rape: Guidelines for a Community Response
(available March 1980)

Crime Victim Compensation(1979)

Victim/Witness Assistance Services (Monograph)
(1979)

Field Test Design

Structured Plea Negotiations (1979)

"(13) providing competent defense counsel for indigent and eligible low-income persons accused of criminal offenses."

Exemplary Project

*Public Defender Service, District of Columbia
(1974)

Program Models

*Guide to Establishing a Defender System (1978)

"(14) developing projects to identify and meet the needs of drug dependent offenders."

Program Models

Drug Programs in Correctional Institutions (1977)--available from
Government Printing Office only

"(15) increasing the availability and use of alternatives to maximum-security confinement of convicted offenders who pose no threat to public safety."

Exemplary Project

*Work Release/Pre-Release Center, Montgomery County,
Maryland (1977)

Program Models

Promising Strategies in Probation and Parole

Halfway Houses

Sentencing to Community Service (monograph)

Field Test Design

***Pre-Release Centers**

"(16) reducing the rates of violence among inmates in place of detention and confinement."

Exemplary Project

***Ward Grievance Procedures, California Youth Authority
(1975) (available Government Printing Office only)**

Program Model

***Grievance Mechanisms in Correctional Institutions**

"(17) improving conditions of detention and confinement in adult and juvenile correctional institutions, as measured by the number of such institutions administering programs meeting accepted standards."

Program Models

Health Care in Correctional Institutions

**Adult Offender Education
(available Fall 1980)**

"(20) coordinating the various components of the criminal justice system to improve the overall operation of the system...."

Program Models

**Criminal Justice Planning for Local Governments
(available May 1980)**

"(22) encouraging the development of pilot and demonstration projects for prison industry programs at the State level..."

Research Report

**Analysis of Prison Industries and Recommendations
for Change, 1978 (available from GPO only)**

**TRAINING RESOURCE PACKAGES
IN SUPPORT OF
SECTION 401(a), JUSTICE
SYSTEMS IMPROVEMENT ACT, 1979**

**Office of Development, Testing
and Dissemination
National Institute of Justice
March 18, 1980**

The training resource packages listed below each contain:

- 1 Hour Video Tape (Color)
- Training Manual
- Trainees Handbook
- Resource Documents

Initially developed for workshops to present research findings to criminal justice executives, they will be of particular use to criminal justice agency training departments, academics and/or universities. Further information can be obtained from the indicated program manager of the Training and Testing Division, NIJ, Washington, D. C. 20531. (Telephone 301/492-9100).

UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, ALL DOCUMENTS LISTED ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFERENCE SERVICE.

Biden Issue

"(1) establishing or expanding community and neighborhood programs that enable citizens to undertake initiatives to deal with crime and delinquency."

(Program Manager - John Bonner)

a. Small Business Security

"(2) improving and strengthening law enforcement agencies, as measured by arrest rates, incidence rates, victimization rates, the number of reported crimes, clearance rates, the number of patrol or investigative hours per uniformed officer, or any other appropriate objective measure."

(Program Manager - John Bonner)

a. Managing Criminal Investigations

b. Managing Patrol Operations

"(6) developing investigations and prosecutions of white collar crime, organized crime, public corruption related offenses, and fraud against the government."

(Program Manager - John Bonner)

a. Maintaining Municipal Integrity

"(8) implementing court reforms."

(Program Manager - Robert Soady)

a. Juror Usage and Management

b. Sentencing Guidelines

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

**Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

**Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Justice
Bus 436**

THIRD CLASS



Washington, D.C. 20531

9,5025

END