Community SAFETY and JUSTICE

A GUIDE TO KEY IDEAS, EFFECTIVE APPROACHES,
AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RESOURCES FOR
MAKING CONNECTIONS CITIES AND SITE TEAMS

part of a series from the Technical Assistance/Resource Center of The Annie E. Casey Foundation

PRINTING SPECIALIIST: this is the Safety and Justice book
DELETE THIS TEXT BOX!

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due to many people who worked on this guide. The Vera Institute of Justice in New York City drafted the guide, and Bart Lubow and Lisa Kane of the Foundation shaped it in a way that is consistent with the Foundation's agenda. The Center for the Study of Social Policy prepared the final version of the guide.

A list of Technical Assistance/Resource Center Resource Guides appears on the inside back cover.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for vulnerable children and families in the United States. It was established in 1948 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of United Parcel Service, and his siblings, who named the Foundation in honor of their mother.

Headquartered in Baltimore, the Foundation is the largest private foundation in the nation dedicated solely to the needs of vulnerable children and families, with assets of more than $3 billion. The Foundation's grants are intended to help states, cities, and neighborhoods improve the life chances of the millions of American children at risk of poor educational, economic, social, and health outcomes. For more information, visit the Foundation's website at www.aecf.org.

contents

preface to family strengthening resource guides

Children do well when their families do well, and families do better when they live in supportive neighborhoods.

This simple premise underlies *Making Connections*, the centerpiece of a 10- to 15-year commitment by the Annie E. Casey Foundation to improving the life chances of vulnerable children by helping to strengthen their families and neighborhoods. The Foundation is working in 22 American cities to promote neighborhood-scale programs, policies, and activities that contribute to stable, capable families.

Making Connections seeks to help families raise healthy, confident, and successful children by tapping the skills, strengths, leadership, and resilience that exist in even the toughest neighborhoods. The initiative is founded on the belief that families and their children can succeed if the people who live, work, and hold positions of influence in distressed neighborhoods make family success a priority—and if there are deliberate and sustained efforts within the broader community and at the state level not only to connect isolated families to essential resources, opportunities, and supports, but also to improve the material conditions of the neighborhood.

The Foundation is dedicated to helping selected communities engage residents, civic groups, public and private sector leadership, and faith-based organizations in efforts to transform the toughest neighborhoods into family-supportive environments. *Making Connections* seeks to enable residents in these neighborhoods to live, work, play, earn decent wages, and interact with family, friends, neighbors, and social institutions in a safe, congenial, and enriching environment.

In order to improve the health, safety, educational success, and overall well-being of children, *Making Connections* is a long-term campaign aimed at helping selected cities build alliances and mobilize constituencies at the neighborhood level.

Making Connections has identified three kinds of connections essential to strengthening families:

- **Economic opportunities** that enable parents to secure adequate incomes and accumulate savings, thus assuring their families the basic necessities of food, clothing, shelter, and health care. To meet this need, communities must address job development, employment training, wage supplements, and asset-building strategies—all of which help ensure predictable incomes, which in turn bolster healthy child development.
- **Social networks** in the community, including friends, neighbors, relatives, mentors, community organizations, and faith-based institutions that provide neighbor-to-neighbor support and help family members feel more confident and less isolated.
- **Services and supports**, both formal and informal, public and private, which provide preventive as

MAKING CONNECTIONS CITIES

Atlanta	Milwaukee
Baltimore	New Orleans
Boston	Oakland
Camden	Philadelphia
Denver	Providence
Detroit	San Antonio
Des Moines	San Diego
Hartford	Savannah
Indianapolis	Seattle
Louisville	St. Louis
Miami	Washington, D.C.

well as ongoing assistance, and are accessible, affordable, neighborhood based, family centered, and culturally appropriate. These might include high-quality schools, health care, housing assistance, and affordable child care.

How will we know when Making Connections goals have been achieved?

Making Connections will have succeeded in a city when community leaders and residents have built a local movement on behalf of families that has the power and momentum to accomplish the following:

- Build on existing efforts and spur neighborhood-scale, family strengthening strategies that reduce family isolation by increasing their connections to critical economic opportunities, strong social networks, and accessible supports and services.
- Use these neighborhood-scale initiatives to rethink, revamp, and redirect policies, practices, and resources on a citywide scale to improve the odds that all families succeed.

As this movement grows, it will enable each city to know it is succeeding in a number of other ways:

- When parents have the means, confidence, and competence to provide for their families economically, physically, and emotionally;
- When residents have people to talk to and places to go for help, support, and camaraderie;
- When families feel safe in their homes and in their neighborhoods;
- When children are healthy, succeed in school, and go on to college or a job after high school;
- When communities offer the resources families need to pass on a legacy of literacy and opportunity to their children.

What do we mean by "family strengthening"?

Family strengthening policies, practices, and activities recognize the family as the fundamental influence in children's lives. These policies and practices both reinforce parental roles and messages and reflect, represent, and accommodate families' interests. Family strengthening means giving parents the necessary opportunities, relationships, networks, and supports to raise their children successfully, which includes involving parents as decision-makers in how their communities meet family needs.

A family's major responsibility is to provide an optimal environment for the care and healthy development of its members, particularly its children. Although basic physical needs—housing, food, clothing, safety, and health—are essential, children also need a warm emotional climate, a stimulating intellectual environment, and reliable adult relationships to thrive.

Threats to a family's ability to manage its responsibilities come from many sources: externally generated crises, such as a job or housing loss, or internal crises, such as child abuse or estrangement among family members. Unexpected events, such as the birth of a child with a disability or a teen's substance abuse problems, or more common events, like new jobs, marriages, deaths, and household moves, precipitate potentially destabilizing changes. The family's ongoing stability hinges on its ability to sustain itself through these disruptions. To help families cope effectively with crises and normal life events, communities need a variety of resources, including adequate and accessible services for children at all stages of their development, effective supportive services for families, and a critical mass of healthy families who can effectively support their neighbors.

Family strengthening policies and practices consider the whole family, not just individual family members. Often, agency protocols and programs

create tensions inadvertently when their focus excludes family needs. A striking example is a well-intentioned nutrition program arranged to ensure that homeless children were fed breakfast, lunch, and dinner at school. The children's parents and other siblings had no source of food, however, and the program participants had no opportunity to share meals with the rest of their families. Once the program leaders recognized the problem, parents and siblings were included in the school mealtimes, and the program designers learned to reconsider their strategies. Similarly, many welfare-to-work programs report difficulties in job retention because of family stresses—stresses often resulting from the jobs themselves. When a family member finds work, family rituals, logistical patterns, roles, and responsibilities change. More successful programs consider these disruptions ahead of time and develop ways to help the family cope.

What do we mean by "strengthening neighborhoods"?

Families must be helped to thrive within the context of their neighborhoods and broader communities. Job development, for example, should be coordinated with specific local or regional businesses, and community economic development should build on the resources of each unique neighborhood. Connecting families to economic opportunities can have a ripple effect: Just living in a neighborhood where a substantial number of families work can reinforce positive expectations for the children in the neighborhood.

Making Connections recognizes that the informal social networks that are most important to people (their friends, neighbors, faith communities, and clubs) almost always exist at the neighborhood level. Time and time again, these natural helping networks prove most important to families' abilities to raise their children successfully. One component of strengthening neighborhoods is thus to invest in the social capital provided by neighborhood-based networks. At the same time, *Making Connections* seeks to widen the networks that families have at their disposal, thereby broadening their aspirations, attitudes, and opportunities. Linking families to broader networks both within and outside their own neighborhoods promises to open up new possibilities for children and parents alike.

Finally, strengthening neighborhoods means placing formal public services in neighborhoods, and making them comfortable rather than intimidating for families. This requires redefining the jobs of public workers so that professionals from several separate mainline systems — as well as natural helpers or informal caregivers—work together in teams and are deployed to specific neighborhoods to take the necessary steps to help families succeed.

The Technical Assistance/Resource Center

The Foundation's Technical Assistance/Resource Center (TARC) seeks to connect people in the 22 cities to powerful ideas, skillful people and organizations, examples of what works in other communities, and opportunities to develop leadership skills in their own neighborhoods. It provides assistance to the 22 *Making Connections* cities on a range of topics, from building alliances that lead to stronger families in healthier, more stable communities, to diverse strategies that community leaders may pursue in terms of jobs, housing, safety, schools, and health care. TARC responds to the sites' priorities through a "help desk" approach, which seeks to meet sites' requests for assistance, and "peer consultation," where colleagues who have successfully addressed a particular problem help their peers in other communities to frame and solve a similar issue. In this way, *Making Connections* cities can capitalize on the practical knowledge that emerges from on-the-ground innovators.

One component of the Foundation's technical assistance strategy is a set of Resource Guides, including this one. The Resource Guides articulate the Foundation's perspective about issues pertaining to *Making Connections* sites, as well as summarize trends in the field, highlight effective examples, and point to people, organizations, and materials that can provide additional help. The Resource Guides are intended first for Foundation staff, in order to create a common fund of knowledge across a broad range of issues. Second, the guides are intended for residents and other leaders in *Making Connections* cities who may want to learn more about specific subjects.

The precise number of Resource Guides will fluctuate as demand changes, but approximately 12-15 guides will be produced during the year 2000 (see the inside back cover for a list). All guides will address topics aimed at both supporting individual families and strengthening neighborhoods. The guides fall into four categories: (1) Economic Opportunities for Families, (2) Enhancing Social Networks, (3) Building High-Quality Services and Supports, and (4) Techniques for Advancing a Family Strengthening Agenda in Neighborhoods.

The guides in the first three categories address substantive areas in which activities can directly lead to better outcomes for children and families as well as strengthen neighborhoods. The first Economic Opportunity Resource Guide, on jobs, for example, provides information about how to connect low-income residents to regional and local labor markets, allowing families to provide for their basic necessities and contributing to family stability. Simultaneously, successful jobs initiatives fortify the neighborhoods in which they operate, making them more attractive places to live and providing strong incentives for younger residents to participate in the labor force.

Likewise, the Resource Guides in the second and third categories were chosen because they affect both individual families and their neighborhoods. For instance, the guide on housing is intended to help communities provide affordable housing to low-income families, which in turn leads to enhanced housing stock and more desirable neighborhoods. The guide on child care seeks to help communities develop plans for increasing the supply of affordable, quality child care—especially the notoriously hard-to-find care for infants and school-age children, and care during nontraditional work hours. Achieving this goal not only would improve the developmental preparation of young children, but it also would help stabilize parental employment, enhance the viability of neighborhood enterprises, and promote safer, better-connected communities.

The guides in the last category address techniques for advancing neighborhood-based family strengthening work, such as how to develop a communications strategy and how to use data and maintain accountability for specific outcomes.

Additional guides may be developed as new requests for assistance surface from the sites. This guide is a working draft that may be updated periodically as we receive particular information requests from Foundation staff and *Making Connections* sites. We view these guides not as an end in themselves, but as a first step in posing and answering some of the most difficult questions we face about how to help families in the toughest neighborhoods. Toward this end, we welcome readers' comments and thoughts on any of the subjects included in these guides.

Douglas W. Nelson
President
The Annie E. Casey Foundation

executive summary

While *Making Connections* neighborhoods are likely to have the highest crime rates in their communities as evidenced by high arrest rates, the most 911 calls, and the greatest prison admission rates—they also are places where residents are least empowered to control their own safety. This guide discusses ways communities try to make neighborhoods safer and the formal justice system more responsive.

The **Introduction** describes how safety and justice issues may affect residents in *Making Connections* neighborhoods. It shows how isolated residents, commercial wastelands, and inadequate services are the by-products of high crime rates and the antithesis of the core strategies essential to neighborhood transformation. Safety and justice must be addressed simultaneously, and new partnerships developed between low-income, crime-ridden neighborhoods and the public safety institutions residents now view as hostile, punitive, unfair, or insensitive.

Potential Requests, Opportunities, and Challenges lists questions that could be raised about crime reduction and ways to make public safety systems more responsive to and respectful of residents. Opportunities for sites are identified, including ways to build social networks, modify the current formal service systems, and enhance economic opportunities—all have implications for neighborhood safety.

Promising Approaches and Resources describes examples in three categories:

A. Community-Initiated Programs include neighborhood safety campaigns, efforts to prevent crime by making neighborhood environments safer and more livable, and community-based services aimed specifically at delinquent youth. An example of the last category is found in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, where the Youth Advocate Programs hire residents to work with delinquent youth, supervising them daily, checking on school attendance and curfews, and involving them in recreation and other activities.

B. Criminal Justice Agency Initiatives aimed at making public agencies more effective in dealing with neighborhood crime problems include (1) community policing, where law enforcement personnel are retrained and redeployed to specific neighborhoods; (2) community prosecution models, where residents give input to district attorneys' offices on the types of crimes and criminal cases that should be given priority for prosecution; (3) neighborhood-based indigent defender services, which give clients better, more timely access to legal services; (4) community courts, which are either decentralized "satellites" of the formal court system located in a neighborhood or informal structures that adjudicate juvenile cases referred by the formal juvenile courts; and (5) community probation, where youth or adults sentenced by the courts are assigned to probation services on a geographic basis and where probation activities are conducted in the neighborhoods.

C. Comprehensive System Reform Initiatives are designed to lessen the gap between the communities most affected by crime and the public safety system. They include federally sponsored initiatives that promote community engagement, such as Operation Weed and Seed, and foundation-sponsored initiatives like the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Key Decision Makers Project and the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative.

introduction

Safety and justice often are prominent concerns in *Making Connections* neighborhoods. Crime and victimization are place-based phenomena, concentrated in certain neighborhoods and communities, even in certain blocks and buildings. Whether one analyzes 911 calls by telephone exchange, arrests by zip code, or prison admissions by census tract, the basic picture is the same. Certain neighborhoods have far higher rates of victimization and offending. Neighborhoods where crime is concentrated also tend to have higher rates of poverty, failing schools, single-parent households, school dropouts, unemployment, drug abuse, and substandard housing. These are the places least empowered to affect their own safety, but whose residents are most likely to be the grist of the justice system, including its reliance on incarceration and out-of-home placements (for youth). These neighborhoods are the most victimized and the least helped by how we currently do the business of safety and justice. These are *Making Connections* neighborhoods.

Why are safety and justice issues particularly important to Making Connections neighborhoods? Safety and justice issues are directly related to a community's potential for transformation. In areas with high crime rates, residents isolate themselves for fear of being victimized. Businesses move away or choose not to move in. Potential service providers often shun these areas, remaining in downtown offices rather than getting out in the field where they might be of timely assistance. Isolated residents, commercial wastelands, and inadequate services are the by-products of high crime rates and the antithesis of the core strategies essential to neighborhood revitalization.

Interestingly, the huge public safety apparatus that has been built in this country has proven largely ineffective in responding to these problems. Part of its ineffectiveness stems from its approaches. Our public safety system was designed to respond *after* crimes occur and to punish those who have been caught. It does virtually nothing to prevent crime other than threaten punishment, relying on a deterrence model that is relevant only to those with something to lose. This model also requires that the vast majority of public dollars devoted to safety be spent warehousing people in expensive, counterproductive institutions, depriving communities of public funds that could be applied to delinquency prevention, alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, or community-based interventions.

an uneven PLAYING FIELD

African-American and Hispanic youth are disproportionately represented in the population of juvenile offenders removed from their homes (40 percent and 18.5percent, respectively). Between 1985 and 1995, juvenile detention rates for white youth decreased by 13 percent, while corresponding rates for African-American and Hispanic youth increased by 180 percent and 140 percent, respectively.

Finally, our current public safety strategies have major dysfunctional (albeit largely unanticipated) consequences for poor neighborhoods. For example, approximately one out of three African-American males between the ages of 18 and 35 is under some form of correctional supervision on any given day. Many of these young men live in *Making Connections* neighborhoods. Their criminal justice status often precludes their employment, makes them ineligible to vote, or removes them from their homes and communities, depriving their children of a second parent and their neighbors of another thread in the social fabric. Current approaches also overlook the prevalence of family violence, which often occurs

FACTS at a GLANCE

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

- Approximately 5.5 million adult residents of the United States were under some form of correctional supervision in 1996; seven out of ten of these people were on probation or parole.
- About 2.8 percent of all adult residents were under correctional supervision in 1996, up from 1.6 percent in 1985.
- More than 500,000 adults are in local jails on any given day, about one out of every 400 people in the country.
- Approximately 1.1 million men and women were in prison at the end of 1996.
- In 1999, the nation's combined total of local jail and prison inmates exceeded 2 million people.
- Approximately 3.2 million adults were under probation supervision in 1996; another 725,000 were on parole.
- Crime rates in the United States, including those for the most serious and violent offenses, have declined for the past seven years.

JUVENILE JUSTICE

- Juvenile courts handled approximately 1.6 million delinquency cases in 1994, 8 percent of which involved serious violent crimes.
- Almost half of all delinquency cases are handled "informally" and do not involve a formal court petition.
- Approximately 500,000 delinquency cases were formally adjudicated by juvenile courts in 1994. Almost 29 percent of these cases resulted in out-of-home placements; another 53 percent were placed under probation supervision.
- Approximately 126,000 juvenile offenders were in residential placements in 1997, 72 percent in publicly operated facilities. Less than half of those placed were removed from their communities for committing serious violent or property crimes; more than 29,000 were placed for status offenses, public order offenses, or probation and parole violations.
- The juvenile arrest rate for murder increased dramatically between 1987 and 1993, but had declined by nearly 25 percent in 1995. It has continued to decrease every year since then.
- The most serious juvenile crimes are concentrated geographically. For example, in 1994, four cities with 5 percent of the nation's youth population accounted for 30 percent of all juvenile homicide arrests. Eighty percent of the nation's counties had no juvenile homicide arrests that year.
- Though juvenile violence is often portrayed as the dominant reason for person-to-person crime in the United States, juveniles accounted for less than 20 percent of the arrests for violent crimes in 1995 and fewer than 15 percent of the violent crimes cleared by the police.
- In 1994 the rate of violent victimization of juveniles (ages 12 through 17) was nearly three times that of adults.

behind closed doors, but which we know has a devastating impact on the futures of the innocent children who are its victims or witnesses.

Can neighborhoods and families help improve the picture? Not all poor neighborhoods are equally affected by crime. Recent comparisons of crime rates among socioeconomically similar communities reveal that family and neighborhood characteristics play important moderating roles in both the life trajectories of youth in high-crime areas and overall degrees of victimization. We have learned, for example, that poor kids who grow up in families that set limits and where love and nurturing are common are less likely to become delinquent. We have also learned that neighborhood characteristics—such as the degree to which adults know and trust each other and take responsibility for the behavior of each other's children—can similarly reduce the odds that children will become serious delinquents or that adults will commit crimes.

an uneven PLAYING FIELD

African Americans represent about 12 percent of the general population but more than half of the nation's incarcerated adult population. Nationally, one in three African-American males between the ages of 20 and 29 is under some form of criminal justice control—either in prison or jail, or on probation or parole. In major urban centers, these percentages are often much higher.

These findings are critically important. They indicate that safe neighborhoods are not necessarily distinguished by the ratio of police to residents, the number of arrests, the frequency of probation violations, or incarceration rates. Neighborhood safety has at least as much to do with the family and neighborhood social fabric as it does with the public safety system's current policies, structures, or operations. Yet virtually no juvenile justice system work is family focused, even though strengthening families is one of the best things we can do to reduce delinquency. Similarly, justice agencies remain largely remote bureaucracies whose operations have very little, if anything, to do with building the civic infrastructure essential to improved safety.

These discoveries underscore the fact that we have built an enormous, hard-to-understand, often hostile system of justice and safety (at least from the perspective of residents in poor communities) that is misdesigned to solve the problems it is charged to address. Indeed, it is increasingly apparent that current approaches have had such limited impact on community safety because of the disconnections between those places most affected by crime and the agencies, individual professionals, laws, and resources supposedly responsible for affecting safety and justice.

It follows, then, that solutions to the concentration of crime and violence in certain communities must be found in principles and strategies that are genuinely community based. Safer environments will not be achieved solely through the actions of public safety agencies, but neither can responsibility for improving safety fall completely upon residents and organizations in disadvantaged neighborhoods already struggling to get by. Improved safety is far more likely if responsibility for it is shared—or coproduced.

How can strategic partnerships support "community justice"? The concept of strategic partnerships also helps to clarify why safety and justice must be addressed simultaneously, rather than as separate issues. If we expect new partnerships to grow between poor, crime-ridden neighborhoods and the

public safety institutions residents see as hostile, punitive, unfair, or insensitive, those new relationships must be based on innovative approaches to preventing and responding to crime. Such strategies must ensure everyone's rights equally, must build and support families and communities, and must seek to empower neighborhood residents to define and solve their crime problems in uncommon ways.

Fortunately, trends and experiments are under way that give reason to hope that such innovations are possible. A movement toward community justice has emerged among the formal system's agencies, starting with community policing and now extending to prosecutors, probation, and the courts. These innovations are based on two essential changes in bureaucratic behavior: active consultation with residents regarding problems and solutions and the decentralization of service delivery. On the community side, several innovative safety initiatives that rely on community assets rather than traditional law enforcement have dramatically reduced violence. Community-based organizations are also experimenting with new ways to adjudicate cases, supervise offenders, and influence public policy. If these innovations can be undertaken concurrently, the real potential of a genuine community justice and safety system might be demonstrated.

possible community safety & justice OUTCOMES

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

- Increased neighborhood capacities to define safety and justice problems, issues, and potentials and to advocate for solutions.
- Increased capacity of formal system agencies to work with communities, including increased consultation with residents, decentralization of services, contracting of functions to community agencies, development of neighborhood databases, etc.
- Resident mobilization around safety and justice concerns and increased services and interventions from community organizations.
- Improved alignment between community prevention and intervention efforts and formal system policies and strategies.
- Experimentation with justice system innovations and reforms intended to focus more on family strengthening and community building.

LONG-TERM OUTCOMES

- Reduced rates of victimization for neighborhood residents and organizations; increased victim satisfaction with system and community responses to their losses.
- Decreased rates of arrest, detention, and incarceration for juveniles and adults.
- Elimination of crime "hot spots".
- Increased perception (by residents and outsiders alike) that a neighborhood is safe.
- Decreased complaints of police brutality.
- Evidence of increased resident activity in public spaces.

potential requests, opportunities, and challenges

A. WHAT ISSUES MIGHT NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS AND LEADERS RAISE ABOUT COMMUNITY JUSTICE?

Community justice and safety concerns assume so many forms and are prompted by such a range of needs and motivations that the types of requests site team leaders might hear from community organizations, residents, or local justice agencies will vary widely. These requests may range from appeals for the removal of open-air drug markets to complaints about police brutality. Assessing which issues are most pertinent and appropriate in *Making Connections* sites will be complicated, if only because there are numerous minefields to navigate.

Among the most predictable questions will be:

- **"What can we do to make our neighborhood safer?"** Recent initiatives indicate that solutions to issues of crime and violence can be best achieved when residents and organizations share the responsibilities and resources for community justice and safety. Neighborhoods can also be made safer by altering physical environments (by adding street lights, having one-way streets, etc.). Furthermore, public safety system reforms like community policing offer important opportunities for improved neighborhood safety.

- **"How can we reduce the risks of violence faced by children?"** Many encouraging initiatives have demonstrated potential for reducing the risks of violence faced by children. Community-based efforts in Boston and Washington, D.C., for example, have focused on street-level interventions with gang members and other at-risk youth, achieving dramatic reductions in youth violence. A number of these programs rely on collaborations among neighborhood-based organizations, local law enforcement, and community service providers.

- **"What are some effective delinquency prevention programs?"** Some of the most promising models of delinquency prevention stem from the work of community-based organizations that work with neighborhood youth. Although many of these young people have already been adjudicated, effective means of preventing further delinquency are taking shape in these programs. The most comprehensive effort to reduce delinquency (and to reform juvenile justice) is reflected in the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent and Chronic Juvenile Offenders developed by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. This model seeks to reorganize community services and policies to promote positive development in all spheres of children's lives. Though the Comprehensive Strategy has not yet been tested in practice, its core ideas represent the best of what we know about delinquency prevention and intervention.

- **"How can we make public safety systems more responsive and respectful?"** Justice system agencies are beginning to recognize that, in order to be effective, they must develop closer ties to neighborhood residents and organizations. At a minimum, these agencies are starting to solicit resident input regarding problems and solutions, as well as experiment with decentralized services. Various community organizing and education endeavors also have been effective in promoting greater system responsiveness and addressing injustices.

- **"Are there best practices and innovative models in community crime reduction and community justice?"** The *Promising Approaches and Resources*

section provides brief descriptions of effective crime reduction and community justice initiatives. Although not all models are right for all neighborhoods, ideas are abundant, and the resources listed will provide an effective starting point for exploration as sites prepare to move forward.

- "**What are some resources and responses to heal the impact of being a victim?**" Most local justice systems operate victim service agencies that can be of some assistance to the victims of crime. However, the most promising developments in meeting victims' needs are emerging in "restorative justice" programs that are now springing up around the country.

Answers to these questions are explored in the *Promising Approaches and Resources* section of this guide.

B. WHAT ARE THE TRENDS AND OPPORTUNITIES ON WHICH SITES CAN BUILD?

In contrast to the seemingly intractable nature of the safety and justice dilemmas that disadvantaged communities must confront is the truly great potential of various solutions to contribute to the neighborhood transformation agenda. Serious efforts to improve safety and justice will produce opportunities for building social networks, reforming public systems, and creating jobs and other assets. Consider, for example, a neighborhood that identifies youth violence as a critical problem requiring immediate attention. Social networks can be built or enhanced by:

- community efforts to clarify the problem, perhaps through surveys and focus groups that include youth as data collectors and analysts;
- mobilizing community organizations around a shared agenda whose power will prove much greater than the uncoordinated projects currently under way;
- organizing adult residents to serve as mentors and role models; and
- enlisting local self-help groups to proactively identify and reach out to at-risk youth and families prior to formal system involvement.

Similarly, system reform opportunities arise when addressing these problems. For example, to effectively address youth violence in a *Making Connections* neighborhood, the formal system might:

- form new partnerships with local organizations (e.g., churches) to deepen its understanding of the problem and increase opportunities to stay abreast of new developments and potential conflicts;
- become more familiar with neighborhood history, culture, leadership, and tradition, in order to operate in more respectful and productive ways;
- refocus its probation caseloads to prioritize families with intergenerational histories of crime and violence and to develop new family-focused approaches to service delivery;
- reallocate system funds to include more dollars for prevention;
- contract with community-based organizations for services traditionally provided by civil service bureaucracies; or
- introduce new interventions that are developmentally appropriate and more likely to head off future offending.

Finally, the economic opportunities presented by new community justice and safety approaches should not be minimized. In our example of a neighborhood that is trying to reduce youth violence, novel

approaches could bring a number of opportunities, including the following:

- new rentals and increased commercial exchange as formal system agencies decentralize services to the neighborhood level;
- new jobs for residents, supported by new community-based programming;
- infrastructure improvements resulting from "defensible space" strategies (like new street lamps) or delinquency prevention activities (like improved recreational space for youth); and
- increased public dollars for the delinquency prevention activities of community organizations.

C. WHAT CHALLENGES MIGHT SITES FACE?

Genuine community justice and safety efforts will involve formerly unassociated stakeholders—formal justice system staff and community leaders and residents—in new relationships requiring intensive coordination and consensus building around highly controversial issues. The challenges presented here are intended to alert those who would propose and promote innovations like those described in this guide.

Myths prevail in criminal justice, not just among that system's stakeholders, but also among citizens in general. Many people in the United States think that greater punitiveness reduces crime, that high ratios of police to residents make communities safer, that kids are responsible for most violence, that most deaths by guns are the result of homicide. None of these myths is true, but they are deeply ingrained in our collective belief system. Consequently, strategies that focus on strengthening communities and families, that call for reduced reliance on incarceration, or that demand more police accountability will confront considerable skepticism.

Crime and safety issues are perhaps the most highly politicized, controversial arenas for innovation that we will address. In a recent speech, Doug Nelson, president of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, captured this minefield perfectly: "It is probably fair to say that no area of domestic policy—not even welfare—has been so thoroughly abandoned to misinformation, overstatement, oversimplification, emotion, and disregard for consequences as has the arena of juvenile justice." Efforts to enhance community safety and justice, therefore, must anticipate opportunistic attacks that seek to label proponents of change as "soft on crime" or "insensitive to victims."

Formal justice system agencies typically view poor communities as pathological places with little to offer in terms of partnerships for safety and justice. System personnel are generally unfamiliar with neighborhood history, leadership, or assets and probably do not look like, speak like, or live near the people they are supposed to serve. Justice system agencies are not typically structured or operated to view neighborhoods as the unit of analysis or as "the customer." Consequently, their data systems, places of operation, and staff deployment strategies may all require reconfiguration to facilitate solutions oriented in neighborhoods.

Under the guise of "community collaboration," system agencies may dump responsibilities on communities for problems that the formal system cannot or does not want to handle. For example, many jurisdictions now encourage the operation of teen courts or neighborhood tribunals to resolve cases. These forums can be both effective in achieving justice and valuable for building social networks. However, often only "garbage" cases (ones that would not be deemed serious enough or considered legally sustainable for formal court processing) are referred to these community courts. In other

SCANNING the FIELD

Site teams will want to identify the people, organizations, and other stakeholders who are currently championing effective community justice practices and who could be valued partners in advancing the ideas of *Making Connections*. Here are some questions site teams may want to ask during their initial work in a community:

WHERE IS THE LOCUS of criminal and juvenile justice coordination in the city? This will typically be a person in the mayor's office (though there may be a corresponding county unit that is equally relevant). Ask for reports, lists of grants, and other related material from this office.

WHAT CURRENT EFFORTS are in the works to promote safety and justice at the neighborhood level? Ask agency personnel.

WHAT, IF ANY, MAJOR CRIMINAL and juvenile justice grants does the city have (e.g., Weed and Seed, Safe Futures, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Comprehensive Strategy)? Ask to examine related plans.

Site teams may also want to ensure that the following stakeholders are involved in discussions:

REPRESENTATIVES from community-based organizations that have juvenile or criminal justice system grants

FACULTY MEMBERS of local law schools, especially if there is a criminal or juvenile law clinic (they will usually have a keen practitioner's sense of the quality of justice in the jurisdiction, as well as thoughts about advocates and advocacy organizations you might need to contact)

THE PUBLIC DEFENDER (or whoever provides defense services to indigent delinquents and defendants)

PUBLIC INTEREST LAW organizations, which are likely to be critics of the system and will balance the perspectives you receive during meetings with agency representatives

KEY COMMUNITY LEADERS and organizations that have a sense of safety and justice problems and relationships with key agencies

In addition to the various materials and resources that site teams will gather from meetings with stakeholders and asking key questions, they may wish to pursue other local resources and information:

NATIONAL CRIMINAL and juvenile justice organizations will know *Making Connections* cities. Organizations like the National Council on Crime and Delinquency may be able to share valuable insights from prior work with the site.

ANNUAL REPORTS from formal system agencies will present the agency and its activities in a self-serving light, but they should contain essential statistical information as well as descriptions of innovations that the agencies are promoting.

NATIONAL COMPILATIONS of site-specific information can contain useful data (for example, the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports: www.fbi.gov/ucr.htm).

instances, "important" cases may be referred, but community volunteers are expected to perform the same adjudicatory functions for which public servants earn significant salaries. If safety and justice functions are devolved to the neighborhood level, there must be corresponding shifts in resources and authority to support those activities.

Most neighborhoods lack organizations or leaders familiar with the policies and practices of the often-mysterious public safety system. An institutional capacity to analyze neighborhood crime data, for example, is uncommon in most poor communities. Similarly, community activists may have limited experience negotiating with justice system officials. Finally, taking on justice system functions at the neighborhood level requires skills and experience that initially may be in short supply. Therefore, efforts at community safety and justice innovation must acknowledge the need to build community capacities and avoid the pitfall of piling too much responsibility on too few people or organizations too quickly.

promising approaches and resources

Promising ideas and initiatives across the country offer insight into the forms that community justice and safety might take. The following sections are organized by the source of innovation: (A) Community-Initiated Programs, (B) Criminal Justice Agency Initiatives, and (C) Comprehensive System Reform Initiatives supported by the federal government or by private foundations. Many of the examples on the following pages represent efforts that are heading in the right direction but that are not necessarily fully developed or fully embraced by various stakeholders, who have been expected to think and act in significantly different ways. Consequently, the "What to Look Out For" sections are intended to describe why practices can fall short of ideal. Nevertheless, many of these initiatives offer a useful framework and a plethora of ideas, inspiration, strategies, and tools for those sites interested in finding meaningful ways to address justice and safety issues.

A. COMMUNITY-INITIATED PROGRAMS

The Idea

New approaches to reduce crime and improve justice for neighborhood residents can and are being developed at the community level. Innovation in this area falls into four categories: (1) community organizing and advocacy, (2) neighborhood safety, (3) crime prevention through environmental design, and (4) community-based services.

What to Look Out For

- Most community initiatives require some coordination with local justice agencies. The formal justice system, however, does not necessarily welcome community input. In such cases, the formal system does not acknowledge the ability of residents and community organizations to contribute to improved safety and justice.
- Even when communities can find support for neighborhood-based programming among residents, the organization and leadership required to succeed in these endeavors may not yet exist. Many groups need to build the capacity to address justice and safety issues.
- Some community groups may be hesitant to work with justice agencies, particularly in areas with a history of hostility between law enforcement and poor neighborhoods.

1. Community Organizing and Advocacy

The Idea in Practice

The **Chicago Alliance for Neighborhood Safety** (CANS) is an independent nonprofit coalition of community organizations committed to crime prevention. CANS works to strengthen a community's capacity to make neighborhoods safe and police accountable. The alliance led a coalition of community organizations in a campaign to encourage Chicago to embrace community policing as its primary law enforcement strategy. Once community policing began, CANS mobilized and trained resident participants. Over the years, CANS has trained tens of thousands of residents as partners in community-policing endeavors. CANS offers technical assistance, research, and training in other areas of community safety and justice; organizes young people; and seeks to improve relations between youth and police.

Contact:
Warren Friedman, Executive Director
Chicago Alliance for Neighborhood Safety
220 S. State Street, Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60604
312-461-0444
312-461-0488 (fax)
chicagoCANS@earthlink.net

The **Citizens Committee for New York City** encourages and supports volunteer action that improves the quality of life in New York City neighborhoods. The committee provides assistance in three program areas: the Neighborhood Anti-Crime Center, Youth Unlimited, and the Neighborhood Resources Department. Neighborhood Anti-Crime Center services include the Neighborhood Safety Leadership Institute training program, collaborative problem-solving training, training communities and law enforcement to work together throughout the country, expert assistance for local leaders fighting crime in their neighborhoods, and small grants to support anti-drug and anti-crime efforts in New York City.

Contact:
Michael Clark, Executive Director
Citizens Committee for New York City
305 Seventh Avenue, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10001
212-989-0909
212-989-0983 (fax)
www.citizensnyc.org
info@citizensnyc.org

The **Center for Third World Organizing** (CTWO) is a racial justice organization contributing to a movement for social and economic justice both nationally and around the globe. The center is a 20-year-old training and resource center promoting and sustaining direct action community organizing in communities of color in the United States. The center's programs include the well-known Minority Activist Apprenticeship Program. It has established model multiracial community organizations and built an active network of organizations and activities to achieve racial justice.

Contact:
Mark Toney, Executive Director
Center for Third World Organizing
1218 E. 21st Street
Oakland, CA 94606
510-533-7583
510-533-0923 (fax)
www.ctwo.org
mtoney@ctwo.org

As an affiliate of CTWO, **People United for a Better Oakland** (PUEBLO) organizes across a broad range of issues and constituencies. PUEBLO has successfully campaigned for the local police department to allocate a portion of its asset forfeiture funds (confiscated during drug busts) for neighborhood-based crime prevention and youth development programs. It also has organized to strengthen Oakland's Citizen Police Review Board. Finally, PUEBLO helped to organize the KIDS FIRST! Initiative, which requires the city of Oakland to set aside 2.5 percent of its annual budget for public and nonprofit programs that serve youth.

Contact:
Dawn Phillips
People United for a Better Oakland
1920 Park Boulevard
Oakland, CA 94606
510-452-2010
510-452-2017 (fax)
www.peopleunited.org

Chicago's **Community Justice Initiative** (CJI) is a diverse coalition of youth-serving organizations that addresses safety and justice issues by educating,

training, and empowering youth (and their communities) to advocate or promote alternative approaches, smarter policies and practices, and enhanced youth development opportunities.

Contact:
Jonathan Peck, Director
Community Justice Initiative
Southwest Youth Collaborative
6400 S. Kedzie Street
Chicago, IL 60629
773-476-3534
773-476-3615 (fax)

2. Neighborhood Safety

The Idea in Practice

The **Alliance of Concerned Men** (ACM) is dedicated to saving the lives of young men and women. ACM is a nonprofit organization that provides a range of comprehensive services to high-risk youth, serious juvenile offenders, and residents of low-income communities throughout Washington, D.C. ACM currently has eight members who have skills and expertise in the areas of law, substance abuse treatment, gang intervention and mediation, community development, life skills counseling, and job training. The relationship between ACM's members began during high school more than 30 years ago. Although they chose negative paths as young adults, ACM's founders overcame the obstacles in their lives through spiritual transformation. Years later, they united in their commitment to youth and their communities. Since 1991, ACM has been a change agent in addressing youth violence and gang activity. It successfully facilitated peace agreements between warring youth groups (male and female) and provided services that stress young people's ability to lead productive lives. To date, ACM can celebrate 2- and 3-year peace truces in various neighborhoods. Not only have the youths become productive community members, but neighborhoods have been revitalized as a result.

Contact:
Tyrone C. Parker, President/Executive Director
Alliance of Concerned Men
1424 16th Street, NW, Suite 103
Washington, DC 20036
202-535-1060
202-535-1059 (fax)
www.allianceofconcernedmen.com
info@allianceofconcernedmen.com

The **Safety First, Community Resources for Justice** initiative of Boston is premised on the notion that reductions in crime (and related quality-of-life improvements) can occur in select neighborhoods when the right partners, timely and accurate data, and relevant interventions are brought together to focus on specific problems. This initiative was piloted in Lowell, Massachusetts, in 1996 and is now being replicated in two other cities in the state.

Contact:
John J. Larivee, Chief Executive Director
Community Resources for Justice, Inc.
79 Chandler Street
Boston, MA 02116
617-482-2520
617-482-4836 (fax)

The **National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise** (NCNE) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research and demonstration organization. NCNE works with neighborhood-based organizations to reduce crime and violence, restore families, create economic enterprise and employment, and revitalize low-income communities. Currently, NCNE is coordinating a major initiative called Violence Free Zones, which is being tested in Washington, D.C.; Hartford; Indianapolis; Los Angeles; Dallas; and San Antonio.

Contact:
Robert L. Woodson, Sr., Founder and President
National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise
1424 16th Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20036
202-518-6500
202-588-0314 (fax)
www.ncne.com

The **Boston Ten Point Coalition** was born in the wake of a gang-related shooting and stabbing incident during a funeral at the Morning Star Baptist Church. The coalition is an ecumenical group of Christian clergy and lay leaders working together to mobilize the Christian community around issues affecting black and Latino youth—especially those at risk for violence, drug abuse, and other destructive behaviors. Their work includes adopting gangs and gang members, patrolling neighborhoods, and counseling victims of youth violence.

Contact:
Reba Danastorg, Executive Director
Boston Ten Point Coalition
215 Forest Hills Street
Boston, MA 02130
617-524-4311
617-524-4169 (fax)
TenPtCo@aol.com

The **National Ten Point Leadership Foundation** is a nonprofit organization whose primary mission is to help provide African-American Christian churches with the strategic vision, programmatic structure, and financial resources necessary to save at-risk, inner-city youth. Its goal is to mobilize 1,000 churches in 50 inner-city neighborhoods by the year 2006. This work grew out of the Ten Point Coalition, described above. Reverend Rivers's work with young people through the Ella J. Baker House is also noteworthy for its contributions to positive youth development and community peace.

Contacts:
Reverend Eugene F. Rivers III and
Mrs. Jacqueline Rivers, Cofounders and Co-Directors
National Ten Point Leadership Foundation
Ella J. Baker House
N411 Washington Street
Boston, MA 02124
617-282-6704
617-822-1832 (fax)
www.ntlf.org

The Boston Community Centers' **Streetworker Program** began in 1990 in response to the rise in teen violence across Boston. Streetworkers walk the streets, reach out to troubled youth, and provide on-site crisis intervention to kids exposed to violence. They work in collaboration with schools, churches, and neighborhood service providers to connect kids and families to resources. They participate in the training of community police officers and often act as advocates for youth in court. Their program is funded through the mayor's office, but they are hired on a geographic basis so that they have intimate knowledge of the people and communities they serve.

Contacts:
Tracy Litthcut, Director of Youth Services
Chris Byner, Program Manager
Boston Community Centers' Streetworker Program
1010 Massachusetts Avenue
Boston, MA 02118
617-635-4920
617-635-4524 (fax)

The **Community Law Center** provides legal counsel, representation, and technical assistance to neighborhood residents and organizations seeking innovative solutions to problems affecting their safety, physical appearance, and quality of life. The center's efforts are part of a broader comprehensive community development, crime prevention, and anti-

drug strategy that includes neighborhood leaders, community organizers, nonprofit housing developers, and the police.

Contact:
Anne Blumenberg, Executive Director
Community Law Center
2500 Maryland Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21218
410-366-0922
410-366-7763 (fax)
www.communitylaw.org
mail@communitylaw.org

3. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

The Idea In Practice

The nonprofit **Neighborhood Design Center** works with community-based organizations to manage the services of hundreds of design and building industry volunteers who donate their expertise to community development projects aimed at effecting change in Baltimore's neighborhoods, making them safer and more livable.

Contact:
Carol Gilbert, Executive Director
Neighborhood Design Center
1401 Hollins Street
Baltimore, MD 21218
410-233-9686
410-233-9687 (fax)

The **Enterprise Foundation's** work is focused on ensuring that low-income people have affordable housing and have opportunities to move out of poverty into the American mainstream. George Rice is knowledgeable about strategies for designing, transforming, or managing public and private community space to reduce crime and promote community development.

Contact:
George Rice, Director
Safety & Neighborhood Division
The Enterprise Foundation
American City Building
10227 Wincopin Circle, Suite 500
Columbia, MD 21044
410-772-5287
410-964-1918 (fax)
grice@enterprisefoundation.org

4. Community-Based Services for Youth

The Idea in Practice

Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. (YAP) is a nonprofit agency that operates pretrial and post-disposition intervention services for delinquent youth in jurisdictions throughout the country. YAP hires neighborhood residents to supervise and assist delinquent youth from their immediate communities. Depending on the program, YAP workers typically spend from 10 to 30 hours per week with their clients, either individually or in group activities. Typical interventions include daily face-to-face supervision; recreational, educational and vocational opportunities; daily checks on school attendance and curfews; and home visits to work on family problems and issues.

Contact:
Thomas L. Jeffers, President
Youth Advocate Programs, Inc.
2007 N. Third Street
Harrisburg, PA 17102
717-232-7580
717-233-2879 (fax)

Barrios Unidos is a nationwide organization with affiliate chapters in 27 cities. Working closely with schools and community organizations, Barrios Unidos provides discussion groups, cultural activities, employment opportunities, and adult role

models to assist positive youth development and to reduce violence in the community. Outreach programs address at-risk children, parents, and homeless and incarcerated youth. Barrios Unidos also offers cultural and leadership development programs in secure detention settings and facilitates reintegration for youth released from custody.

Contact:
Antonio Avalos
Barrios Unidos
226 Capitol
Salinas, CA 93901
831-751-9054
831-751-9011 (fax)
barrios@salinas.com

Run by five community-based organizations, the **Evening Reporting Centers** of Chicago, Illinois, provide a nonsecure alternative to detention for juveniles who have violated probation or who have been apprehended on a warrant. The centers provide a structured, supportive, and productive environment between 4 p.m. and 9 p.m. on weekdays, and they offer services that include individual counseling, tutoring, recreation, healthy meals, and transportation.

Contact:
Ernest Jenkins
Westside Association for Community Action
3600 W. Ogden Avenue
Chicago, IL 60623
773-277-4400
773-277-0270 (fax)

New York City's **Andrew Glover Youth Program** (AGYP) is a nonprofit, community-based program working with court-involved youth on the Lower East Side and in East Harlem. The foundation of its unique program is 24-hour, on-the-street supervision combined with intervention and advocacy in the criminal justice system. Its mission is to intervene to save young people from lives of crime, provide the court system with a reliable alternative to incarceration for youth, and make communities safer for everyone.

Contact:
Angel Rodriguez, Executive Director
Andrew Glover Youth Program, Inc.
Manhattan Criminal Courts
100 Centre Street, Room 1541
New York, NY 10013
212-349-6381
212-349-6388 (fax)

Project Confirm, a demonstration project of the Vera Institute of Justice, is operated in cooperation with various New York City agencies. Project Confirm was developed to remedy the disproportionate presence of foster care youth in New York detention facilities. When teens are arrested, New York City police and detention intake workers contact Project Confirm to determine whether the young people are in foster care. If so, Project Confirm ensures that their caregivers and caseworkers are involved in the juvenile justice process, so that prosecutors and juvenile court judges need not detain foster youth unnecessarily.

Contact:
Molly Armstrong, Director
Project Confirm
55 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10013
877-KID-CHEK
212-941-4851
www.vera.org
armstrongm@projectconfirm.org

B. CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCY INITIATIVES

Criminal justice system agencies are increasingly involved in initiatives to make their systems more effective in dealing with neighborhood crime problems. Much of the impetus to experiment stems

from a widely shared view that current policies and practices are failing to render justice or protect the public. From policing to probation, virtually every agency or stage in the traditional justice system process has a corresponding community justice and safety innovation aimed at improving practice. Examples of these new approaches have been organized into the following categories: (1) Community Policing, (2) Community Prosecution, (3) Community Indigent Defender Services, (4) Community Courts, and (5) Community Probation.

The ideas described in this section set standards of system practice that, for the most part, remain unrealized. True innovation will require shifts in power, accountability, and resources—changes that take time. Improved justice and safety outcomes will require the development of new community and system capacities, along with a willingness to take risks and to strive beyond current small-scale experiments. Although there are few fully developed models of neighborhood/justice system partnerships, exciting efforts that are currently under way may become the basis for further innovation. Some of the challenges noted in the following pages are, not surprisingly, similar to those described in the previous section on community-led efforts.

1. Community Policing

The Idea

Community policing involves retraining and redeploying law enforcement personnel so that they can identify and respond more effectively to community-specific problems. In contrast to traditional police approaches (e.g., squad cars responding to 911 calls), community policing deploys officers to patrol specific beats with the expectation that the officers will get to know the residents and businesses in their assigned areas. Rather than simply emphasizing arrests, community policing seeks to solve the problems that contribute to crime. For example, officers may seek to have abandoned cars moved or have vacant houses boarded up to limit their use by drug dealers. Ideally, community police officers (or related community services liaisons) leverage municipal services to address environmental and quality-of-life conditions that contribute to crime on their beats.

Effective community policing relies heavily on involving local residents in decision-making and problem-solving processes. Police-to-resident interaction leads to better informed police who can therefore identify local crime problems and patterns more quickly and develop more responsive enforcement approaches. Opportunities for community leaders and residents to exchange information and ideas with the police also increase police awareness of a neighborhood's strengths. Such efforts deepen respect between often-hostile parties, and they lead to improved police practices grounded in community concerns and priorities, marking a significant shift from more centralized and reactive policing.

One of the most important theories recently advanced by criminologists describes the link between disorder in a neighborhood and the fear residents experience as a result—whether the disorder is signaled by an abandoned car or by broken street lights. This new theory suggests that when these conditions go unchecked, they signal residents that the area is unsafe. Predictably, residents avoid these areas and curtail normal activities. As residents withdraw physically, they also begin to lose connections to the mutual supports that safe public places might otherwise foster, leading to increased stress on families and neighborhoods. All too frequently, this unattended disorder leads to more disorder and serious crime.

As a result, effective community policing focuses on developing a wide range of responses to disorder.

Some of these interventions may serve as productive starting points for rebuilding community life around families. Seemingly persistent problems, such as abandoned buildings, can be tackled through partnerships between police and city code enforcement departments. Where disorder is signaled through behavior—by a menacing, street-corner drug dealer, for example—police can work with residents to restore order and reduce fear. It is important to note, however, that community groups can initiate many of these efforts

What to Look Out For

- Nowadays, the community policing label is applied to a range of policing efforts, many of which are very incomplete imitations of the real thing. Simply deploying police in a new way, for instance, does not constitute genuine community policing. Likewise, if resident input does not influence police strategy, the practice is not community policing.
- Community policing depends on the willingness of law enforcement agencies to restructure their work and organizations. This requires strategic planning, new professional incentives, retraining, and tactical integration with traditional policing duties.
- In many poor communities, residents feel menaced both by criminals and by the police. Under such circumstances, citizens may be suspicious of police intentions and reluctant to participate in neighborhood advisory groups. On the other side, the police may lack sufficient connections to build the new relationships essential to success.
- Not all resident consultation is representative. In some neighborhoods, the police may interact primarily with residents who fulfill police expectations, as opposed to residents who champion community concerns.

The Idea in Practice

The **Police and Community Together** (PACT) program is a community policing program within the Aiken, South Carolina, Department of Public Safety. Ten officers have been assigned to work with residents of five neighborhoods. The officer and resident leadership councils share problem definition and problem-solving responsibilities in an effort to systematically address longstanding crime problems.

Contact:
Captain Thomas M. Galardi
Aiken Department of Public Safety
251 Laurens Street
PO Box 1177
Aiken, SC 29802
803-642-7620
803-642-7681 (fax)
adps.aiken.net/!welcome_to.htm

The **Neighborhood Policing Section** of the San Diego Police Department works with neighborhood organizations and with an organized and formally trained pool of over 100 volunteers in the Volunteers In Policing Program. They currently collaborate with the San Diego Organizing Project to address drug dealing in two city neighborhoods. The department also is known nationally for its Regional Community Policing Training Institute, which offers community-oriented training to all levels of law enforcement personnel, including sworn, civilian and volunteer, management, supervisory, and line employees.

Contact:
Sergeant Andrew Mills
Mid-City Division
San Diego Police Department
4310 Landis Street
San Diego, CA 92105
619-516-3052
sarge@nctimes.net

The **Child Development Community Policing Initiative,** an innovative effort now being replicated in several cities, is a partnership between the New Haven police, clinicians from the Yale Child Study Center, and youth workers from community-based organizations. Through intensive training of front-line police and mental health workers, shared access to information and service referral opportunities, and strategic shifts in policy and practice to support collaborative teams, the program responds quickly to the multiple needs of kids who are exposed to or are the victims of violence.

Contact:
Colleen Vadala
Yale Child Study Center
230 S. Frontage Road
New Haven, CT 06520
203-785-7047
203-785-4608
Collen.Whelan-Vadala@yale.edu

To implement 1994 Crime Act, which promised to put 100,000 community policing officers on the streets of America's cities, Attorney General Janet Reno created the **Office of Community Oriented Policing Services** (COPS) in the U.S. Department of Justice. This office allocates resources and facilitates technical assistance to promote effective community-policing strategies.

Contact:
U.S. Department of Justice Response Center
800-421-6770
www.usdoj.gov/cops

The **Community Policing Consortium** consists of five of the country's leading law enforcement agencies: the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP); the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives (NOBLE); the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF); the National Sheriffs' Association (NSA); and the Police Foundation. The consortium provides community policing training and technical assistance to COPS grantees. Publications related to community policing are available from the consortium.

Contact:
William Matthews, Executive Director
Community Policing Consortium
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 801
Washington, DC 20036
800-833-3085
202-833-3305
202-833-9295 (fax)
www.communitypolicing.org

The **Police Executive Research Forum** (PERF) is a national association of progressive law enforcement professionals who are dedicated to advancing innovative policing practices through research, leadership, and debate. PERF's executive members serve more than 50 percent of the nation's population. The nonprofit association is based in Washington, D.C., and it includes categories of membership for individuals who are criminal justice practitioners, academicians, and others interested in improving police service to their communities. The organization is a helpful resource for general information and research on community policing efforts across the country.

Contacts:
Chuck Wexler, Executive Director
Lorie Fridell, Research Director
Police Executive Research Forum
1120 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 930
Washington, DC 20036
202-466-7820
202-466-7826 (fax)
www.policeforum.org

The **National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives** (NOBLE) was created to

provide black law enforcement executives with a unified voice through which to foster effective relations with communities to reduce crime and violence. NOBLE provides training, conducts research, and offers consultation on criminal justice issues, including community policing.

Contact:
Robert L. Stewart, Executive Director
National Organization of Black
Law Enforcement Executives
4609 Pinecrest Office Park Drive, Suite F
Alexandria, VA 22312
703-658-1529
703-658-9479 (fax)

2. Community Prosecution

The Idea

Traditionally, prosecutors' contact with communities is limited because the cases that district attorneys take on are primarily generated by the charge requests of police departments. Residents have little input in determining what types of crimes and criminal cases are prosecuted and rarely can call upon the prosecutor's legal skills to eradicate the conditions that promote crime. As with community policing, community prosecution models are based on the idea that district attorney offices will be more effective at identifying problems and tailoring solutions in specific neighborhoods if they develop mechanisms and capacity for input from community residents. Although community prosecution is a new and not yet fully developed idea, these programs recently have begun to spring up across the country.

Increased contact with neighborhood residents and businesses should allow prosecutors to better identify place-specific patterns of crime or environmental conditions that contribute to unsafe areas. In other words, community prosecution moves away from a singular reliance on criminal law and criminal prosecution to a "problem-oriented prosecution" strategy. Once prosecutors' focus turns to the quality of community life, their priorities may shift from criminal prosecutions to civil remedies, such as using nuisance abatement statutes to close troublesome liquor stores or getting landlords to board up vacant buildings. Prosecutors in Kansas City, for example, are helping to train landlords and property owners to recognize and prevent crime before it destroys their property. To accomplish these tasks, prosecutors are hiring more nonlawyers, including experts in public health, substance abuse treatment and social services, community organizing, and crime prevention. Community legal resource centers provide education about legal rights and services, and may also serve as a legal resource.

What to Look Out For

- In order for community prosecution to take hold, prosecutors must be willing to significantly alter their approach to make themselves available to poor and under-resourced neighborhoods.
- Some initiatives have been labeled community prosecution and have been reviewed favorably, even though the offices are located outside of residential neighborhoods and serve the interests of local commercial associations and downtown business districts exclusively.
- Community prosecution efforts that "adopt" a community or "represent" a neighborhood require a significant shift in the focus and mission of prosecution offices. Currently, most community prosecutors carry individual cases *in addition to* their community-oriented prosecution work; yet prosecutors typically get no "extra credit" for their community-based efforts. Making community prosecution valuable to prosecutors requires strategic planning that integrates new and traditional roles within the community.

- Legal and social service advocates working on behalf of the homeless, mentally ill, and chronic substance abusers claim that the success of some community prosecution efforts, especially those targeting local "nuisances," comes at the expense of the community's most vulnerable members.

The Idea in Practice

In Denver's **District Attorney Community Prosecution Program,** Community Justice Councils made up of community volunteers, police, business volunteers, and the community prosecutor have been formed to set public safety priorities for the city's neighborhoods.

Contact:
Bill Ritter Jr., Denver District Attorney
Second Judicial District
Denver District Attorney's Office
303 W. Colfax Avenue, Suite 1300
Denver, CO 80204
720-913-9000
720-913-9035 (fax)

The **U.S. Attorney's Office,** in Washington, D.C., has adopted a "community prosecution" approach to law enforcement. Prosecutors are assigned to cases by neighborhood rather than by type of crime. (In Washington, Assistant U.S. Attorneys prosecute the cases a local district or state's attorney would handle in another jurisdiction.) Prosecutors therefore become more familiar with their communities and are in a better position to solve specific problems. In addition, each of the city's seven police districts is staffed with a Community Outreach Specialist, a trained employee of the U.S. Attorney's Office, who acts as a liaison between the office, the police, and the community. This approach concentrates resources on problem solving within the community rather than on processing cases in a more traditional, reactive manner.

Contact:
Clifford T. Keenan, Chief
Community Prosecution Major Crimes Section
Office of the U.S. Attorney
555 Fourth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
202-305-1373
202-305-1577 (fax)

The **Travis County District Attorney's Office,** in Austin, Texas, has received national recognition for its efforts to encourage community involvement in government through the promotion of community justice and restorative justice efforts.

Contacts:
Ronald Earle, District Attorney
Travis County District Attorney's Office
PO Box 1748
Austin, TX 78767
512-473-9400
512-473-9695 (fax)

Darla Gay
512-473-4736

The **National District Attorneys Association,** the nation's largest professional association of prosecuting attorneys, offers members guidance and support and tracks legislation and public policy. The **American Prosecutors Research Institute,** its research and nonprofit technical assistance arm, provides prosecution research and technical assistance in various areas.

Contact:
Teresa Ware
National District Attorneys Association and
American Prosecutors Research Institute
99 Canal Center Plaza
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-549-4253
703-836-3195 (fax)
www.ndaa-apri.org

3. Community Indigent Defender Services

The Idea

Public defenders usually take cases by appointment from the court, provide only criminal defense services, and are located in courthouses or office buildings far from the neighborhoods where their clients live. Community-oriented, client-focused defender offices work quite differently. They are intentionally located in poor neighborhoods so that their clients can have better, more timely access to legal services. Poor defendants often have no choice of legal counsel; neighborhood defender offices also help to promote local trust and confidence in their services.

Community defender offices often take on cases requested by residents, rather than through court appointment. Using local knowledge—of resources and of client circumstances—attorneys can provide a better planned, more thoughtful defense. Many community defender offices employ social workers and paralegals to respond to the social service needs of their clients. Lawyers sometimes offer services beyond pending criminal cases, including handling civil matters, such as housing or custody disputes, or representing groups of residents in actions against landlords or municipal agencies. In some cases, community defender offices recruit attorneys from private firms to donate their services pro bono, increasing the legal horsepower available to the neighborhood while building connections between poor neighborhoods and powerful law firms.

What to Look Out For

- In some community public defender offices, pressure to respond to the neighborhood's many social service needs threatens to overwhelm the primary mission, which is to provide high-quality legal representation.
- These agencies often have difficulty sustaining funding, in part because the public officials responsible for funding decisions are not necessarily interested in the community-building potential of these services.
- Court dockets are not usually arranged by neighborhood, so concerted efforts must be made to attract clients and alert neighborhood residents to the office's presence and services.

The Idea in Practice

The **Neighborhood Defender Service** (NDS) of Harlem is a community-based public defender office that takes cases by request and court appointment, and only from the surrounding neighborhood. In order to provide a stronger defense and more holistic services, NDS's aim is to acquire more in-depth knowledge of clients, their families, and the circumstances that lead them to legal difficulties. Because clients can "hire" NDS, it often can intervene in cases earlier than traditional defender offices (either at the precinct or before arrest, when the person knows he or she is a suspect). NDS also works with community groups to teach people skills to help them minimize the likelihood of violence or arrest when they interact with police.

Contact:
Leonard Noisette, Director
Neighborhood Defender Service of Harlem
55 W. 125th Street
New York, NY 10027
212-876-5500
212-876-5586 (fax)

The mission of the **Youth Advocacy Project** (YAP) is to protect and advance children's legal and human rights and to promote their healthy development through active partnerships with the community. YAP began in 1992 as a public defender initiative to assign experienced trial attorneys to defend children who faced adult incarceration because they had been charged with serious offenses. Recognizing that the

lives of these children were filled with missed opportunities for intervention and diversion, YAP broadened its representation and advocacy to include children with lesser and fewer offenses. In 1993, with private foundation support, YAP became a community-based project with an innovative, multidisciplinary approach to advocating for children both in the courtroom and in the community. In addition to legal advocacy and training, YAP offers clinical assessment, education advocacy, service planning, referrals, and social service consultation to high-risk children. YAP is a community partner with local organizations, schools, and programs to develop new services and identify existing resources that meet the needs of young people in Boston's neighborhoods.

Contact:
Josh Dohan, Director
Youth Advocacy Project
11 Roxbury Street
Roxbury, MA 02119
617-445-5640
617-541-0904 (fax)
jdohan@cpcs1.cpc.state.ma.us

A satellite office of the Children and Family Justice Center of Northwestern University's School of Law Legal Clinic, the **Community Law Clinic** operates out of a Chicago settlement house and provides free legal services to neighborhood residents. Relying primarily on carefully trained volunteer attorneys and law students, the clinic represents clients in delinquency cases, special education and other school-related cases, and many family law matters, including uncontested adoptions and guardianships.

Contact:
Angela Coin, Director
Community Law Clinic
1014 N. Noble Street
Chicago, IL 60622
773-342-5071
773-342-5161 (fax)
a-coin@nwu.edu

The **Juvenile Justice Center's** training, technical assistance, model program design, and advocacy work centers on the right to counsel and the representation of delinquent youth; juvenile detention and corrections reform; waiver of juveniles into the adult criminal courts; and the disproportionate presence of minority children in the justice system.

Contact:
Patricia Puritz, Director
Juvenile Justice Center
American Bar Association
740 15th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202-662-1515
202-662-1501 (fax)

Professor Angela Jordan Davis is a scholar and former director of the Washington, D.C., Public Defender Service whose work at the **Washington College of Law** focuses on race and class issues at all stages of the criminal justice process.

Contact:
Angela Jordan Davis, Associate Professor of Law
Washington College of Law
American University
4801 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Suite 388
Washington, DC 20016
202-274-4230
202-274-4130 (fax)
angelad@wc1.american.edu

4. Community Courts

The Idea

Community courts take many forms, but each seeks to narrow gaps between the justice system and the community. Community courts function either as decentralized "satellites" of the formal court system, or as informal structures designed to adjudicate juvenile cases referred by the formal juvenile court system. Whereas the more traditional court process seeks to hold offenders accountable to the state, adult and juvenile community courts attempt to hold offenders directly accountable to the community they have violated. Community courts also enable the system to focus on "quality-of-life" crimes that often receive low priority because the formal courts are generally preoccupied with serious felony offenses.

Adult community courts are usually neighborhood satellites of the formal court system. They handle less serious and quality-of-life offenses committed in a specific geographic area. In their most developed form, social service agencies place staff in the neighborhood courts so defendants have immediate access to referrals. Sentences often involve some form of community service in the neighborhood in which the offense took place. These courts, however, rarely involve community residents in the adjudication process, a reflection of the court system's hesitancy to concede responsibility for the adjudication of adult cases to communities.

Community engagement is most often found in juvenile community courts, where adults or the defendant's peers handle all the aspects of a case. These cases are usually referred to the community or "teen court" by some part of the formal justice system—the police, the formal courts, probation officers, or the district attorney's office. These courts primarily address first-time offenders or low-level offenses. In all but a few cases, youths must admit their guilt before being sent to these alternative courts. When teens successfully complete the sanctions provided through the program, their records often will be wiped clean.

Teen court or community court models are, for the most part, creative ways to both educate the community about the court system and involve civilians in the adjudication of cases. In teen courts, youths play the parts of stakeholders in the formal court system (e.g., defense attorney, prosecutor, judge), learning about the philosophy and administration of justice through the cases they handle. Teen courts cultivate interest in the judicial process, heighten positive influence among peers, and encourage teen investment in neighborhood safety. They also engage troubled youth, because most sentences handed down by these courts require that the teens later serve as members of the court.

In addition to teen courts, a variety of alternative tribunals involving adults are used to adjudicate delinquency cases. A common model recruits neighborhood residents to serve on panels that hear from victims, the accused youth, and family members. The panels attempt to craft dispositions that compensate victims for losses while also developing options that help young people avoid recidivism. One especially promising variant of these community courts, known as "family group conferencing," is practiced extensively in New Zealand. The goals of the family group conference are to get offenders and their families to take responsibility for the offense and to ensure that offenders have the support and supervision necessary to preclude other offenses. The key is to construct a nexus of support around the offenders, beginning with their families but extending into the community when necessary.

What to Look Out For

- Community courts often handle cases that would never have made their way to the formal court

system in the first place. This raises a number of important issues: Are the community courts widening the net of social control by adjudicating matters that the regular court system deems unworthy of its time? Is the formal system using the community tribunals as a "dumping ground" for cases it considers unimportant? If community courts handle "unimportant" cases, how much influence or value do these courts actually have?

- Critics, especially some indigent defense attorneys, take issue with the requirement that accused persons must admit guilt before being allowed access to the alternative courts. They fear, among other things, that their clients will not receive due process under such stipulations, and that these admissions could be used against the client if the alternative process breaks down and the case is later referred back to the formal court.

- With revived attention to low-level youthful offenders, kids run the risk of receiving harsher sanctions than they might through the formal juvenile court system.

- Simply locating a court in a community does not necessarily empower that community or, for that matter, encourage just and safe processes and environments. Some community courts are largely decentralized components of the traditional system. Engagement of residents and responsiveness to neighborhood priorities are hallmarks of effective community courts.

The Idea in Practice

FORMAL DECENTRALIZED ADULT COMMUNITY COURTS

Launched in 1993, the **Midtown Community Court** in New York City is the nation's first community court. Midtown seeks to address quality-of-life crime in and around Times Square and to build stronger links between courts and neighborhoods. An official branch of the New York State Unified Court System, the court handles more than 13,000 misdemeanor cases (shoplifting, fare-beating, prostitution, low-level drug offenses, and others) each year. Offenders are sentenced to "pay back" neighborhoods by performing visible restitution projects, such as painting over graffiti, sweeping the streets, and cleaning local parks. Offenders are also linked to an array of on-site services, including drug treatment, job training, and health care. Independent evaluators from the National Center for State Courts found that Midtown had both improved compliance rates with alternative sanctions and reduced local crime. Midtown has served as the model for two new community courts in New York —one in Harlem, the other in Red Hook—and for more than two dozen others across the country.

Contact:
Julius Lang, Coordinator
Midtown Community Court Project
314 W. 54th Street
New York, NY 10019
212-484-2703
212-586-1144 (fax)
www.communitycourts.org

The recipient of an Innovations in American Government Award from the Ford Foundation and Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government, the **Center for Court Innovation** is a public/private partnership that works to promote public confidence in justice, both in New York and nationally. In New York, the center works as the independent research and development arm of the New York State Unified Court System, creating demonstration projects (including the award-winning Midtown Community Court) that test new approaches to difficult problems within the courts. The center uses these projects as laboratories, spreading the word about what works and what

doesn't to the rest of the country through white papers, websites, workshops, and individualized technical assistance. With support from the U.S. Department of Justice, the center operates the Community Justice Exchange (www.communityjustice.org), which provides information and practical tools to community justice planners across the country.

Contact:
John Feinblatt, Director
Center for Court Innovation
351 W. 54th Street
New York, NY 10019
212-373-8080
212-397-0985 (fax)
www.courtinnovation.org

Judge Willie G. Lipscomb Jr. of the **36th District Court** in Detroit runs a three-hour weapons court program that works primarily with African-American males charged with carrying concealed weapons: Attendance is required as a condition of bond. The program juxtaposes photographs and testimony about gun violence with images of historic leaders who dedicated their lives to improving the lives of others.

Contact:
Judge Willie G. Lipscomb Jr.
36th District Court
421 Madison, Suite 3069
Detroit, MI 48226
313-965-8730
313-965-3951 (fax)

The **National Center for State Courts** is a nonprofit leadership and service organization for the state courts. Drawing upon research conducted in courts nationwide, the center provides detailed models for ways to plan, implement, and operate community-focused courts. Assistance is available on the roles of judges, court administrators, staff, and community members; assessing public perceptions and priorities; securing public participation; evaluation methods; and adapting the community court concept to local concerns.

Contact:
Lynn Grimes
National Center for State Courts
300 Newport Avenue
Williamsburg, VA 23185
757-253-2000
757-220-0449 (fax)
ncsc.dni.us/lgrimes@ncsc.dni.us

INFORMAL JUVENILE COMMUNITY COURTS

The **Juvenile Conference Committees** of New Jersey are six- to nine-member panels of trained adult volunteers who hear the cases of juveniles charged with minor offenses. If approved by the juvenile court judge, their recommendations become court orders that the Juvenile Conference Committees monitor.

Contact:
Janis Alloway, Assistant Chief
Administrative Office of the Courts
Family Practice Division
Hughes Justice Complex
PO Box 983
Trenton, NJ 08625
609-984-4227
609-984-0067 (fax)

The **Time Dollar Youth Court** of Washington, D.C., transfers sentencing power to juries or young people for offenses committed by first-time, nonviolent teen offenders. In this court, offenders must perform community service and later serve on the jury; jurors earn one "time dollar" for every hour served. These time dollars can be cashed in for recycled computers.

Contacts:
John Dortch
Rita Epps
Time Dollar Institute
Time Dollar Youth Court
405 E Street
Building B, Suite 102
Washington, DC 20001
202-686-5200
202-537-5033 (fax)
www.timedollar.org

Volunteer citizen panels of the **Travis County Neighborhood Conference Committees,** in Austin, Texas, hear youth diversion cases and help families and youth resolve legal issues. The committee determines what sanctions would be appropriate for each offense and each family situation. The committee maintains a relationship with youth and family via regular contact with a case manager.

Contact:
Marilyn Kennerson
Travis Country Health and Human Services
Community Services Division
PO Box 1748
Austin, TX 78767
512-473-9879
512-473-4115 (fax)

The Children and Family Justice Center, in partnership with the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, has established **Community Panels for Youth,** a community-based juvenile court diversion program in five Chicago neighborhoods. In each community, adult residents are recruited and trained to conduct hearings with young offenders and their victims, develop contracts to provide appropriate sanctions and supports, and monitor the offenders during the three- to six-month contract period. A guidebook and video containing training curricula, documentation of lessons learned, and information and resources on how to develop community panels will be available later this year.

Contact:
Cheryl M. Graves, Attorney
Children and Family Justice Center
Northwestern University Law School
357 E. Chicago Avenue
Chicago, IL 60611
312-503-1138
312-503-4172 (TDD)
312-503-0953 (fax)

5. Community Probation

The Idea

Like all probation, community probation provides supervision and referral services to youth or adults under court sentencing. The primary differentiating features of community-based probation are that cases are assigned geographically, and probation activities (e.g., office reports) are conducted in the neighborhoods where probationers live. In most cities, probation offices are physically located in downtown, nonresidential areas some distance from the populations served. Geographic caseloads are intended to maximize probation staff's familiarity with specific neighborhoods (including the "hot spots" for trouble) and local service providers. Community probation officers are often based within neighborhood organizations so that they are visible and available, not only to those they supervise, but also to residents in general. As with community policing, community probation's aim is to help solve problems and be more preventive by building ties with residents and businesses.

What to Look Out For

+ Like many other community justice efforts, some community probation initiatives revolve mainly around decentralizing services, rather than engaging or empowering the community.

- In communities seriously affected by crime, residents often think that decentralized probation offices will attract troublemakers to the neighborhood. Community outreach should precede any redeployment of probation staff to neighborhood locations, and mechanisms should be developed to allow residents to have input with department personnel.
- Neighborhood-based probation service providers should take care not to unnecessarily label youth as problems within the community. The confidentiality of juvenile court proceedings can be undermined if young people on probation are easily identifiable simply because they report to a particular office.

The Idea in Practice

In the **Auxiliary Probation Service** of Memphis, Tennessee, volunteer auxiliary probation officers are responsible for supervising youth assigned to the program. The volunteers are officers of the court and carry badges. Once a paid probation officer hands a case over to an auxiliary counterpart, the volunteer officer has sole responsibility for supervising the case.

Contact:
Denise M. Hinson, Juvenile Court Administrator
Volunteer Services Bureau
Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County
PO Box 310
Memphis, TN 38101
901-405-8420
901-405-8839 (fax)

The **Community Probation Program** of Alameda County, California, has an advisory committee whose members include police agencies, schools, and community-based organizations. These stakeholders make up problem-solving teams led by probation officers who handle cases from specific neighborhoods. The program's goal is to marshal the resources of the client's family, school, and neighborhood to optimize preventive services and eliminate behaviors leading to chronic delinquency.

Contact:
Sylvia Johnson, Chief Probation Officer
Alameda County Probation Department
400 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94607
510-268-7233
510-839-2776 (fax)

Located within the community, **Reaffirming Young Sister's Excellence** (RYSE), Oakland, CA, attempts to prevent female offenders from returning to the juvenile justice system and to promote the development of their social, academic, and vocational competencies. RYSE's advisory committee is made up of community-based organizations and juvenile justice professionals.

Contact:
Sylvia Johnson, Chief Probation Officer
Alameda County Probation Department
400 Broadway
Oakland, CA 94607
510-268-7233
510-839-2776 (fax)

Juvenile Court School Liaisons work with delinquent and at-risk youth in Iowa through cooperative arrangements between local schools and the Juvenile Court. Approximately 130 liaisons work in middle and high schools across Iowa. The liaisons perform a variety of functions, depending on the needs of the school and community, including working with Juvenile Court Officers to supervise students who are on probation to the Juvenile Court, working with individual youth who have been identified as at risk, working to reduce truancy, responding to disruptive classroom behavior so all students can learn

better, and working with delinquent and at-risk youth after school or during the summer to prevent delinquency.

Contacts:
Chief Juvenile Court Officer
in any of Iowa's eight judicial districts or
Bill Roach
Iowa Attorney General's Office
Hoover State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319
515-281-5536
515-281-4209 (fax)
broach@max.state.ia.us

One way Davidson County, Tennessee, decentralizes its probation services is by assigning more than half of its 27 probation officers to public housing projects, one or two to an office. These **public-housing-based probation officers** serve as resources, not only for the cases assigned to them, but for the entire housing project.

Contacts:
Jim Wells
Probation Department
Juvenile Court
100 Woodland Street
Nashville, TN 37213
615-862-8091

H. Ted Rubin, Consultant
Juvenile and Family Courts and Justice Systems
203 Granite Drive
Boulder, CO 80302
303-444-1669
303-440-5856 (fax)
tedrubin@aol.com

North Carolina funds **day reporting centers** under its State-County Criminal Justice Partnership Act. Serving specific counties, the centers are responsible for probationers ordered by the courts to participate in their programming. The overall goal of the centers is to enhance accountability and treatment for adult offenders. In the more than 30 counties that have developed reporting centers, the types of services provided depend on the needs and community-based resources of the county.

Contact:
Robert Guy, Director
North Carolina Division of Community Corrections
North Carolina Department of Correction
PO Box 29540
Raleigh, NC 27626
919-733-4926
www.doc.state.nc.us/dcomcor/index.htm
info@doc.state.nc.us

The **American Probation and Parole Association** is an international association of individuals in the United States and Canada actively involved with probation, parole, and community-based corrections in adult and juvenile sectors.

Contacts:
Karen Fuller
Lynda Wilkerson
American Probation and Parole Association
2760 Research Park Drive
PO Box 11910
Lexington, KY 40578
606-244-8197
606-244-8001 (fax)
www.appa-net.org
appa@csg.org

The **National Institute of Corrections,** an agency within the U.S. Department of Justice, provides on-site technical assistance, information resources, and training to state and local corrections agencies and to other criminal justice components.

Contact:
Eduardo Barajas Jr.
National Institute of Corrections
320 First Street, NW
Washington, DC 20534
202-307-3995, ext. 127
202-307-3106 (fax)
www.nicic.org/inst
ebarajas@bop.gov

C. COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM REFORM INITIATIVES

The Idea

Many examples presented in this guide are discrete innovations designed to improve particular aspects of the juvenile or criminal justice systems. These programs generally have limited—albeit important—objectives. In the long term, efforts to make poor neighborhoods safer and the administration of justice fairer will require comprehensive system reform. New programs alone won't suffice.

Both the federal government and a few private foundations have supported significant justice system reform initiatives designed to lessen the gap between the communities most affected by crime and the public safety system. These initiatives are usually multiyear, multisite endeavors that call for significant restructuring of policies, resource allocations, practices, and programs. Typically, these projects require the active participation of multiple stakeholders, including community leaders and residents, who are charged with identifying major problems, developing plausible solutions, tracking results, and making necessary modifications.

Consequently, comprehensive system reform initiatives are much more complicated and difficult to implement than most of the program innovations described in this guide. These projects seek to transform major aspects of the justice system's operations, requiring new partnerships and principles. System reform projects by definition involve risks, because they challenge the status quo and question the most prevalent myths about the justice system.

Innovation in the areas of community justice and safety sometimes takes place on a national scale, but with local focus. Either the federal government—usually through an office or bureau of the Department of Justice—or a private foundation identifies a widely defined area in need of innovation (such as juvenile crime) and defines its goals regarding this issue. Then, usually through a grant process, the government office or foundation chooses local sites to implement and demonstrate the effectiveness of its ideas.

What to Look Out For

Although federal and foundation-driven initiatives often are backed by sound ideas and strong funding, implementation can be difficult:

- Practical mechanisms for meaningful community involvement might not be well developed. Although the ideas are there, the tools for community engagement could be absent.
- These initiatives are based on mandates that may not be applied with equal ease at all sites: What works in one jurisdiction may not be in the best interest of another. Because effectiveness across sites is usually necessary for continued funding, implementation expectations or requirements must allow for site-specific needs, opportunities, and political environments.
- Poor planning, politics, and funding problems are among the reasons that an initiative may struggle to effect tangible change.
- Hype often accompanies comprehensive justice system reform initiatives. Therefore, it is important to judge projects by their actual practice, not simply by their claims. Often, what appears to be

a genuinely unique partnership on paper proves to be little more than the "same old thing" in practice.

1. Federally Sponsored Initiatives That Promote Community Engagement

The Idea in Practice

Operation Weed and Seed of the U.S. Department of Justice is a multiple-agency strategy that "weeds out" violent crime, gang activity, drug use, and drug trafficking in targeted neighborhoods and then "seeds" these neighborhoods through social and economic revitalization. The Weed and Seed strategy recognizes the importance of linking and integrating federal, state, and local law enforcement and criminal justice efforts with federal, state, and local social services and private sector and community efforts to maximize the impact of existing programs and resources. It focuses on community involvement, stressing that community residents must be empowered to help solve problems in their neighborhoods. The private sector is a pivotal partner in the Weed and Seed strategy.

Contact:
Steve Rickman, Director
Executive Office of Weed and Seed
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
810 7th Street, NW, 6th Floor
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-1152
202-616-1159 (fax)
www.ojp.usdoj.gov/eows/aeows.htm

The **Balanced and Restorative Justice** project of the U.S. Department of Justice (BARJ) is a national training and technical assistance effort supported since 1993 by a grant from the department's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Project trainers, researchers, and juvenile justice practitioners work with jurisdictions nationwide, giving assistance in advancing systemic change in juvenile justice policy and practice. BARJ has a cadre of national consultants and trainers who work with states and local jurisdictions actively involved in implementing restorative justice. These consultants and trainers have extensive and diverse expertise in the restorative justice field, including strategic planning, program planning, implementation, and evaluation. They represent diverse cultures and jurisdictions, as well as disciplines that include the criminal justice system, social services programs, and conflict resolution. The BARJ project also involves intervention professionals and court decision-makers who provide guidance and support in the development and implementation of restorative justice. Decision-makers are involved in advisory committees, focus groups, and roundtables where leadership roles and topics are discussed. The BARJ project also publishes *Kaleidoscope of Justice*, a newsletter.

Contacts:
Gordon Bazemore, Director and Professor
Community Justice Institute
220 SE 2nd Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
954-762-5668
954-762-5626 (fax)
bazemor@fau.edu

Sandra Pavelka O'Brien, Project Manager
BARJ Project
Senior Research Associate
Community Justice Institute
220 SE 2nd Avenue
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
954-762-5107
954-762-5626 (fax)
www.fau.edu/divdept/caupa/cji
sobrien@fau.edu
barj@fau.edu

In response to increases in juvenile violence and arrests, the Department of Justice's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has developed the **Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders** to provide strategic planning for communities and states. A comprehensive guide provides tools and program information to systematically address juvenile crime. OJJDP has provided technical assistance to sites in Texas, Maryland, Iowa, Rhode Island, Florida, Ohio, Oregon, and Wisconsin.

Contact:
Mark Matese, Comprehensive Strategy Program Manager
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street, NW, 3rd Floor
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-5924
ojjdp.ncjrs.org/strategy/index.html
matesem@ojp.usdoj.gov

2. Foundation-Sponsored Comprehensive Justice System Reform Initiatives

The Idea in Practice

The **Key Decision Makers Project,** funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation and run by the Center for the Study of Youth Policy, worked with selected states to help policymakers and practitioners re-examine their use of training schools (youth corrections facilities) and design more efficient and cost-effective alternatives. Participating sites developed structured approaches to sentencing and the classification of adjudicated youth, modified state statutes, retrained staff, and developed community-based systems of care as alternatives to training schools. A variety of states have successfully reduced training-school populations without sacrificing public safety. Although the project is no longer active, techniques developed and used are still relevant and viable.

Contact:
Judge Frank Orlando
Former Co-Director, Key Decision Makers Project
Director, Center for the Study of Youth Policy
Nova Southeastern University
Shepard Broad Law Center
3305 College Avenue
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33314
954-262-6239
954-262-3833 (fax)
orlandof@nsu.law.nova.edu

The **Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative** (JDAI) of the Annie E. Casey Foundation was developed to demonstrate that jurisdictions could establish smarter, fairer, more efficient, and more effective systems to accomplish the limited purposes for which juvenile detention was established. Through collaborative decision-making and the implementation of data-driven policies and programs, participating sites were able to reduce both admissions to and lengths of stay in secure detention without sacrificing public safety.

Contact:
Bart Lubow, Senior Associate
Annie E. Casey Foundation
701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410-223-2960
410-223-2983 (fax)
www.aecf.org

The **Vera Institute of Justice** (Vera) is a private nonprofit organization dedicated to making government policies and practices fairer, more humane, and more efficient. Vera operates demonstration projects in partnership with government, conducts original research, and provides technical assistance to public officials and communities in New York and throughout the world.

Vera's National Associates Programs link practitioners and policymakers who have succeeded in changing their justice systems with those who intend to do so. The National Associates Programs stress capacity building and adapt to serve the evolving needs of each client. They do not promote a specific policy, and they stop short of making operational changes. Instead, the programs create a space for debate and discussion, where local decision-makers can develop alternative and innovative ways of helping their communities. Program areas include public defender manager leadership training, responses to domestic violence, fathers in the criminal justice system, and state sentencing and corrections.

Contact:
John M. Jeffries
Director, National Associates Programs
Vera Institute of Justice
233 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, NY 10279
212-334-1300, ext. 438
212-941-9407 (fax)
www.vera.org

resource GUIDES

As part of the *Making Connections* Technical Assistance/ Resource Center, the following Resource Guides are scheduled to be produced during 2000:

Economic Opportunities for Families

- Connecting Families to Jobs
- Building Family Assets
- Creating Economic Opportunities in Neighborhoods

Enhancing Social Networks

- Family Support
- Engaging Residents in an Agenda to Strengthen Families

Building High-Quality Services and Supports

- Building More Effective Community Schools
- Community Safety and Justice
- Child Care for Communities
- Meeting the Housing Needs of Families
- Community Partnerships to Support Families
- Improving Health Care for Children and Families

Techniques for Advancing a Family Strengthening Agenda in Neighborhoods

- Using Communications to Support Families and Neighborhoods
- Neighborhood Data Utilization and Technology
- Outcomes-Based Accountability

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410.547.6600
410.547.6624 fax
www.aecf.org