



Office  
of Justice  
Programs

National  
Institute  
of Justice  
and  
Bureau  
of Justice  
Assistance

160326

**EVALUATING DRUG  
CONTROL INITIATIVES**

Third Annual Conference

July 27-29, 1992  
Washington, DC

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## KEYNOTE SPEECHES

Craig D. Uchida.....	5
Charles B. DeWitt .....	7
Elliott Brown .....	9
Stephen Goldsmith.....	11
Jimmy Gurulé.....	21
Timothy J. Shea.....	29
Dennis E. Nowicki .....	37

## PRESENTATIONS

WEED AND SEED.....	47
DRUG ENFORCEMENT.....	51
COMMUNITY POLICING.....	59
DRUGS, GANGS AND PUBLIC HOUSING.....	63
PROSECUTING AND ADJUDICATING OFFENDERS.....	69
INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS.....	75
DRUG TESTING AND TREATMENT IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.....	81
EVALUATING COMMUNITY INITIATIVES .....	93
EVALUATING SYSTEMWIDE EFFORTS .....	101
RELATED WORKSHOPS.....	105
BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON PRESENTERS (Appendix A).....	109
PRESENTERS' ADDRESS LIST (APPENDIX B).....	141

---

---

## **Craig D. Uchida, Director, Evaluation Division, National Institute of Justice**

Welcome to the Third Annual Conference on Evaluating Drug Control Initiatives. I am the Director of the Evaluation Division at the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), a role I have played for about nine months now. Thank you for attending and participating in this conference. I think it is very important that you are here to share information about the programs that are being conducted across the country. NIJ must develop a stronger evaluation program over the next few years, and this is one of the better places to start doing that.

We have a number of panels for you in the next two and a half days that deal with various issues related to drugs. We also have a number of workshops in which I hope you will participate. To a great extent, the intent of the workshops is for you to get involved and interact with the individuals who are making presentations. I urge you to ask questions and to participate in the workshops as well as in the panels. It is very important that you ask the presenters questions about their work and about the research that is being undertaken. That way you will get more out of it and can take home more information about the programs.

If you have questions for NIJ—about the evaluation efforts—I would be happy to meet with you. We have rooms set up where we can meet, and I will try to make myself available to talk to you about evaluation and NIJ's programs.

This morning's program involves a keynote address and introductory remarks from the Institute's Director, Charles B. DeWitt, and from the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Acting Director, Elliott Brown.

Now I would like to introduce my boss. Chuck has been NIJ's Director for almost two years. He has changed many of the programs in which we are now engaged, and has turned our direction toward the state and local agencies by focusing on the practical use of information NIJ develops. That is a key part of our evaluation program.

**Chuck changed the way we do business at NIJ. The direction that he is taking will lead NIJ toward the kind of research and evaluation programs that practitioners need. Let me introduce Chuck DeWitt, Director of the National Institute of Justice.**

---

---

## Charles B. DeWitt, Director, National Institute of Justice

Good morning and welcome. I will spend only a moment or two with you just to express my gratitude for your attendance at this conference and to ask you to consider for just a few moments why we are here. I have found it worthwhile, over a couple decades of attending conferences like this one, to have an introspective moment to consider, as the conference begins, what you hope to accomplish while here and what you hope to take back home with you.

This conference is fascinating because of its uniqueness. If you look around you or consider the list of attendees, you will see just what I am talking about. Consider for a moment why you are here. You are not here because of your particular field or your agency. We have all levels of government represented: federal agencies, state and local agencies, universities as well as private organizations. In that way, we have a conference which is very different.

You are not here because of a particular discipline. As you can see, we have people from law enforcement, corrections, courts, and virtually every other element of the criminal justice system represented here today. This conference distinguishes itself through that diversity.

So when we ask why we are here, what we really have in common is a commitment, and it is indeed a commitment to good government. That is why I would like to welcome you with a congratulatory note and commend all of you for being here, especially when resources are more scarce than ever before.

We have a diverse audience with one specific objective, and that objective is well stated in the title of NIJ's publication, which was released last Friday and is available to you

**"WHAT WE REALLY  
HAVE IN COMMON  
IS A COMMITMENT  
TO GOOD  
GOVERNMENT"**

today: *Searching for Answers*. If I were to ask and answer the question, "Why are we here?" stating it most succinctly, I would say, we are searching for answers.

Like many of you here, I have been in the grants "business" going back 20 years—since the inception of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) program. It is not difficult to develop programs; certainly not difficult for those of us in government to award grants and proceed with either the continuation of existing programs or new ones that are requested of us. What is difficult is exemplified by this document and by your presence here.

Our commitment to good government means we want to proceed with projects that will really make a difference. We want to determine, while we are here for a couple of days, what works and why it works. The American people deserve no less. Indeed they are demanding that our scarce resources be allocated in the areas where they will have greatest impact.

So I again congratulate you for being here and celebrate the diversity of the audience. I hope you will have an opportunity, because of this diversity, to meet some people and build some bridges that might not otherwise be possible at more typical conferences.

With regard to our new NIJ report: like this conference, it represents a partnership with the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). It is my pleasure to host this conference, which is jointly sponsored with BJA.

---

---

## **Elliott Brown, Acting Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance**

On behalf of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), I want to welcome you to our Third BJA/NIJ Annual Conference on Evaluating Drug Control Initiatives. I also want to extend a special welcome to our state and local representatives, with whom we have developed a partnership to focus on improving the criminal justice system and to combat narcotics trafficking, drug abuse, and violent crime. I applaud all of you for being here today and helping to make the difference in attacking this criminal cancer that undermines our political, economic, and social institutions.

All of us here today realize the importance of evaluating the programs funded under the 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act legislation. I am proud to have helped formulate and secure passage of that law. By finding out what works and why, we can replicate successful programs throughout the country. Under the first four years of the Act, states have allocated almost \$20 million to evaluate their programs; and the number of presentations at this conference highlight the results of those commitments.

During this annual evaluation conference, public officials, academicians, policy analysts, and research consultants share their experiences and evaluations with us on such diverse topics as community anti-drug abuse programs, narcotics enforcement in public housing, substance abuse programs in jails and prisons, multijurisdictional task forces, and Weed and Seed projects. We have quite an array of exciting topics to examine, to study, and to learn from.

1992 also represents the fourth year of BJA's partnership with the National Institute of Justice. During that four-year period, BJA has contributed over \$10 million to our joint BJA/NIJ evaluation effort. Forty-five national evaluations covering BJA's formula and discretionary grant programs have been initiated. Many of the results from those evaluations are being presented here for the first time.

Evaluation is the key to our efforts to combat drug trafficking, drug abuse, and violent crime that is occurring in every urban, suburban, and rural community. Every city, town, and school district is reeling under this impact,

under this tidal wave of violent crime. We can write the best legislation in Congress and in the state legislatures. We can construct the best prevention and control models and operate the best programs; but in the final analysis, evaluation becomes the critical component of any program. That is why we are here today, to examine what is working and why.

***"IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS,  
EVALUATION BECOMES THE  
CRITICAL COMPONENT OF ANY  
PROGRAM. THAT IS WHY WE ARE  
HERE TODAY, TO EXAMINE WHAT  
IS WORKING AND WHY."***

We must be able to replicate successful programs and to modify or discontinue those that do not work. The public demands that we find out what is working and why. We have an exciting program with numerous panels, workshops, and roundtable discussions, covering virtually the entire waterfront of counter-narcotics control initiatives.

Welcome to our conference. Let's get on with finding out what works and why. That is our mission; and that is truly our challenge.



---

---

## Stephen Goldsmith, Mayor, City of Indianapolis

I have had, from time to time, occasions to speak to combined groups of researchers and practitioners. One of the earlier opportunities I had was at the National Science Foundation. I was a prosecutor at the time, in Indianapolis, and we were one of the first cities to do career criminal prosecutions. After two or three years of working on career criminal cases, I was invited to speak. I stood in front of a group of several hundred well-known researchers and said, "I've been studying all of these evaluations, and have modeled our career criminal selection criteria based on what I think are the most scientifically validated criteria and predictors of future violence." I sat down, sure that this statement would please the audience.

Marvin Wolfgang, whom everybody knew, raised his hand and said, "Had I any idea that people like you would use the things I wrote, I would never have written them in the first place." This shows there is a little confusion about the relationship between practitioners and researchers.

It is similar to a story that many of you may have heard, which goes: "How much is 2 plus 2?" The accountant says "4." The statistician says, "I have to do a regression analysis, and it's 4 plus or minus .05, with a margin of error of .025." And the lawyer says, "Just a minute," walks over, shuts the door, sits down, and says, "How much would you like it to be?"

People like myself, who are practitioners, want definitive responses. We are looking for a definite answer from research. Many of you in the room, who are involved in program analysis, know that these things are more sophisticated and difficult.

Rather than talk about Indianapolis, I thought I would discuss a few failures of mine over the last few years to illustrate some opportunities where we can work better together.

Despite the enormous efforts of the two host agencies and a substantial amount of progress in moving practical research forward to the point where it can be of benefit to practitioners, there is still a very tenuous linkage between

research and practitioners' use of research results. It is not anyone's fault; it is historic. We are moving in the right direction, but we are far from the point where practitioners actively use the work of researchers on a daily basis.

In fact, as the Marvin Wolfgang story illustrated, there are academics who believe that it is inappropriate for practitioners to use research; and there are practitioners who believe that their intuition is better than any sort of program evaluation. They don't wish to be encumbered by knowledge that may be inconsistent with their predetermined conclusions. There are some gaps that need to be filled.

My first clue that I did not have all the answers came recently. After being elected district attorney in Indianapolis, I doubled, essentially, the number of people incarcerated per year into the major state prison system. The total went from 480 per year to 1,200 per year. Over time crime dropped about one percent per year.

It seemed to me that doubling the detention of the right number of people for the right amount of time should have caused more than a one percent reduction in the crime rate. I thought that perhaps we were locking up the wrong folks, and we began to grapple for answers.

I think the job of law enforcement is to ration out authority and resources so that we use the least necessary amount of both to produce an effective result. We are in the business—I, as mayor, with the police department—of rationing both authority and resources. In a limited budget, and in a period of marginally increasing resources, the extent to which we can produce a result with the least expensive and most effective sanction is a legitimate common goal for research and practitioners.

This would be a good return on investment. It all comes down to looking at the continuum of sanctioning and resources, and considering how you can affect it.

A number of examples come to mind. When I was appointed to my state's task force on drunk driving, in 1983, I had the idea that Indiana ought to crack down on drunk driving. I went and told the governor, and he said, "Fine. Go do it."

We gathered and passed the necessary laws. DOT and NHTSA gave us a lot of money because we became the first state in the country to pass all

**"IN A PERIOD OF  
MARGINALLY  
INCREASING  
RESOURCES, THE  
EXTENT TO WHICH WE  
CAN PRODUCE A RESULT  
WITH THE LEAST  
EXPENSIVE AND MOST  
EFFECTIVE SANCTION IS  
A LEGITIMATE COMMON  
GOAL FOR RESEARCH  
AND PRACTITIONERS."**

these draconian laws that I had written. We had public advertising, campaigns, paid a lot of overtime to officers, and arrested an enormous number of people.

Two or three years later, reading primarily NIJ-funded but also NHTSA-funded research, I found that six of seven studies showed that jail had absolutely no effect on the behavior of drunk drivers. Yet I had up to seven hundred drunk drivers in a sample study of two of my large prisons.

I began to look at the research funded by NIJ and NHTSA concerning alternative sanctioning for drunk drivers I had mistakenly put into prison. We began to adjust the sanctioning authority of the state to find out what did or did not make a difference.

It was clear that arrests made a difference. It was clear that prosecution made a difference. But it was not clear at all that jail made a difference. For an enormously expensive sanction to be used without accurate program evaluation on its effect on behavior and recidivism, reflects a major waste. It is probably a great opportunity for better investing local, federal, and state resources.

The story has additional confusing results. In trying to pay attention to research, we found that four of five studies reflected that diversion programs, where people are counseled instead of prosecuted and convicted, are ineffective. It showed that the people who were diverted and counseled had recidivism in drunk driving more frequently than those people who were convicted.

Therefore, I actually tried at that time to connect policy and research. We said, "All right: Any city in Indiana that does not prosecute drunk drivers will not receive any federal pass-through dollars for overtime for police officers."

Like the exclusionary rule, this is a great way to penalize those who are not responsible for the result. We refused to give overtime to the police officers because the prosecutor in that community was diverting drunk drivers,

and the diversion was causing recidivism. We wanted to get their attention through failing to fund the police department.

Two things happened. The city continued to divert drunk drivers. I subsequently ran for lieutenant governor of the State of Indiana and lost that county by a four-to-one margin. They are still diverting drunk drivers, and I am still not lieutenant governor. But there is a place for research.

Let me give you one other non-drug example and then spend a few minutes on drugs. This illustrates to some extent the difficulty we have, and it also illustrates the importance of local and state research. If there is one thing clear, it is that research needs to be replicated from community to community because the same work often does not lead to the same conclusion.

As a young prosecutor, I read about the Minneapolis domestic violence experiment. It is probably the most read-about experiment ever done. I saw that if people are arrested for domestic violence, they showed recidivism less frequently, at least in Minneapolis. So I rushed to the Indiana legislature and got a law passed to allow police officers to arrest people in their homes for domestic violence. A subsequent study in Milwaukee showed that it wasn't such a good idea at all.

I thought, anecdotally, intuitively, and I think legitimately, that if arrest makes a difference for domestic violence—and I was very sincere in my efforts to reduce domestic violence—then surely prosecution would make a difference. We set up a special prosecution unit and did everything that advocacy groups wanted to be done for domestic violence crackdowns in the United States.

NIJ then funded a study in which they evaluated about 12 different treatments to determine which ones made a difference. After three years of careful study, they found that no prosecution effort done in that three-year period made any difference in behavior of domestic batterers. The arrests did make a difference; and some counseling made a difference; but prosecution made no difference at all.

Therefore we had three years of investment in a relatively expensive domestic violence prosecution unit, a specialized court, and a whole number of other things that were based on the intuition that if you get tougher on something, you will better deal with that situation. The research proved to the contrary.

Failure is a little bit difficult, especially if you have to run for office. At the same time, this is really a remarkable opportunity for researchers to assist practitioners. It is an opportunity to look at the way we use sanctioning capacity, authority, and resources; and a chance to determine what actions have the greatest effect on behavior.

Here is an example: Research may find that for a given crime, arrest affects behavior, and counseling affects behavior; but prosecution does not affect behavior. You would have prosecutors and court time freed up for some other opportunity where they do, perhaps, make a difference.

As we look at these things and try to connect them to each other, there are enormous opportunities. Better utilization of research can return more on the investment than nearly anything else.

In relation to drug problems, I was a prosecutor for 12 years. I was the token D.A. for many activities. I was an unemployed lawyer for a year. I am a recently elected mayor. I have all of six months' experience and even fewer answers about managing cities than I had about prosecuting crime. I think the problem with research on drugs is that practitioners, and even a few researchers, cannot figure out what effectiveness means. Leave out the program design, the matched samples, the experimental designs, quasi-experimental designs, and the rigor of the analysis. Just go back to the beginning to figure out what we are trying to do with an anti-drug program.

The answers are so disparate and the lack of understanding about those answers so substantial that I think it gets in the way of much of our dialogue. We can all name different reasons that we fight drugs. We get very different definitions of a program's effectiveness, depending on what it is trying to accomplish.

In the old days, and for the less sophisticated, arrests were one of the reasons that we fought drugs. We measured arrests. The more people arrested for drugs, the more effective the program was. Someone later suggested that another way to measure effectiveness was by the reduction in violence, that arrests alone were not a particularly important measure of anything, that it was violence reduction in the community that was important.

***"BETTER UTILIZATION OF  
RESEARCH CAN RETURN MORE  
ON THE INVESTMENT THAN  
NEARLY ANYTHING ELSE."***

Another measure of effectiveness was the extent to which we reduced drug usage in the community. That led to a whole set of additional questions: Were we trying to reduce drug usage for juveniles? For the poor? Because of the health problems associated with drugs? Were we trying to reduce certain types of drugs? Were we trying to reduce the potency of different types of drugs? There is also the interesting example of how reduction of the quantity of drugs such as marijuana may drive up the THC potency of the remaining marijuana, causing a more harmful effect. That is another confusion in our standard of effectiveness.

Finally, a whole new definition of effectiveness in the fight against drugs is evolving: the fight to reclaim urban spaces, regardless of arrests, regardless of drug potency, and regardless of violence. The extent to which we clear open spaces may be a standard of effectiveness in itself.

You can name two or three other problems, but lack of attention to a definition of effectiveness at the beginning of a program almost ensures that evaluation of it is not going to be particularly productive, especially with the many varieties of local and state program funding. Some closure on this issue at the beginning of a program would be helpful.

Let me give you just a couple examples of how the problem may develop. We had 15 "state drug czars" at Harvard a month or so ago. We talked about retail drug sales for several hours, about some of the same examples you are going to discuss today, such as the tactical narcotics team in New York City, Tampa's quick uniform attack on drugs, and the much-written-about Lynn and Lowell heroin studies. Everybody in the room now is asked: Were these successful?

The answer means something dramatically different depending on your definition of effectiveness. For example, several of them were not particularly effective in increasing prosecutions. In Lowell, in particular, the number of arrests increased dramatically, but everybody was turned free. Is that part of a definition of effectiveness?

A couple of other studies indicate that crime displaced from a public housing unit or a drug bazaar in an urban park moves to a more secretive place. What is successful about that? Can we measure the result of retail drug enforcement by the "broken windows" concept, which says that if there are safer streets, a greater perception of safety, fewer broken windows, and secret but not open drug deals, that is success? What is the definition that we are trying to use?

**"LACK OF ATTENTION TO A DEFINITION OF EFFECTIVENESS AT THE BEGINNING OF A PROGRAM ALMOST ENSURES THAT EVALUATION OF IT IS NOT GOING TO BE PARTICULARLY PRODUCTIVE, ESPECIALLY WITH THE MANY VARIETIES OF LOCAL AND STATE PROGRAM FUNDING. SOME CLOSURE ON THIS ISSUE AT THE BEGINNING OF A PROGRAM WOULD BE HELPFUL."**

The argument over retail drug sales and open space preservation brings us to the core problem in drug control evaluation. Until we agree on what we are trying to accomplish, we cannot measure it very well. The differences of opinion are significant.

As a hard-line prosecutor, I pride myself on the fact that I put all sorts of folks in jail. It was not until after I was elected mayor and I met with 15 communities in my most drug-infested neighborhoods, that I found out those folks did not really care directly about drug sales. They cared about their street corner, harassment of their kids, deterioration of their quality of life, inability to open up commercial establishments, and the difficulties of mothers with little kids in public housing complexes. They wanted it out of sight, out of mind, and out of their lives so they could experience some quality of life.

That does not mean condoning drug sales, but it did tell me definitely that I had to clear those open spaces. If I reclaimed them for the good folks that lived in the community, that would be a standard of success to consider, regardless of the other issues.

There are some interesting studies that show when you move drug dealers out of open spaces, the displacement is not one for one. The disruption of the market, the disruption of the nexus between retailer and wholesaler, the increased costs and risk forcing people to have new distribution systems, all result in a net reduction in drugs. It varies a lot, but the point is, we need to pay more attention to what we are trying to accomplish.

In Indiana, we have mandatory sentencing minimums. If you have more than \$250 worth of cocaine (I will translate the grams to dollars), you get a 20-year sentence. If you have \$249 worth of cocaine, you get zero. This is mandatory minimum sentencing.

We have people in prison serving 20- and 30-year sentences for possessing \$255 worth of cocaine. And we have folks who were fortunate enough to have a few grams less, in their pocket or in their car, with suspended sentences.

As we look at how to measure and meter out resources, I think some of the most exciting things you are going to be doing in the next few days refer to sanctioning, and to what we are trying to accomplish with sanctioning. It makes a big difference.

If we look at earlier NIJ work, the Eric Wish work, and some of the things covered today, it becomes clear to me that increased evaluation and use of drug testing programs to reduce drug usage and violence are particularly important.

Helpful suggestions can be made about combinations of sanctioning. If we are trying to reduce the amount of crime in our community and there is a nexus between heroin, cocaine, and crime; we want to keep people off these drugs and look at the best mix of sanctions to do that.

We did an electronic monitoring evaluation in Indianapolis several years ago. It was helpful to find out that these issues are complicated. Drug offenders and alcohol offenders actually did better on electronic monitoring than other offenders did. Each of these studies is worth discussing in terms of how we can move forward together for a better result.

Let me close with a few ideas. No matter how much dramatic progress has been made in separate fields, we are not doing a very good job of linking program evaluation and research with day-to-day practice. But we can do it, and now is the time to do it more effectively than ever before because there is not much money, and yet there is an enormous problem.

Taxpayers want less crime, but they don't want more taxes. Federal government is investing enormous resources in drug programs, but probably will not invest much more in the near future.

The opportunity to use that investment in a more effective way is a win-win situation for all the people in this room. I suggest driving the evaluation agenda in a public and forceful way as quickly as possible. In my opinion, my state ought not to give away federal money without earmarking a part of each grant to program evaluation. It may not be necessary for each program, but it ought to be collectively earmarked for program evaluation.



The role of state government ought to include assembling evaluations in a way that is particularly helpful and useable for local governments.

Those of you in program evaluation should also meet with your grant people at the front end of the grant, to force people like me, who ask for money, to state what we are trying to accomplish. We can determine how to measure success at the beginning of the process, instead of coming six months or a year later and trying to measure the effectiveness of the grant.

We should also not demean the study of organizational changes coming from grants. It is very difficult to measure these outcomes, because there are so many variables. But grants do affect organizations and how those organizations take on new initiatives. Grants cause them to think outside their boundaries, and cause infrastructural changes that lead to new programs.

There is a tendency to look at interim measurements and then decide they are not helpful. For example, I set up a metro drug task force in Indianapolis. It was a nine county initiative to attack drug problems, and we seized lots of assets. Then I left office. About six months later, I was driving around in my car and I heard the head of the drug task force say, "We've done such a great job that cocaine is down, but marijuana is up. Next year the metro drug task force is going to spend its time trying to reduce the amount of marijuana usage in the community."

I think this showed a complete disregard of recent research and a lack of definition of effectiveness. If cocaine is more directly correlated with crime and violence than marijuana, why doesn't the metro gang task force, which uses an enormous amount of state and federal money, pay attention to that research?

If alternative sanctioning capacity exists for marijuana but not for cocaine, why aren't we paying attention to that? I was very aggressive in asset forfeiture with the metro drug task force, but I was never under any illusion that I could forfeit enough assets to dramatically affect the marketplace. Frankly, I viewed it as a profit opportunity to raise money to invest in other drug enforcement. When we measured asset seizures, we were measuring the wrong thing. We should have been measuring cost effectiveness of the seizures as related to funding other drug enforcement opportunities.

I have been doing drug control programs for 15 years, and we are at a point in time where drugs are of enormous importance. The public wants answers. We are beginning to find some answers. The abstracts in this conference material, which I have read over the last few hours, show more

practical research leading to answers about what practitioners can do than any other work done in the last 10 or 15 years.

We have to visibly and actively get practitioners and academics together to talk about these results. This agenda today ought to be replicated in each state; where police chiefs, District Attorneys, and sheriffs are invited to discuss the research. They can talk about what they are trying to do, and they can think about national implications of the research. Those discussions will be very effective in altering police and district attorney strategy. I think they will also be effective in helping academics understand what the sheriffs, police chiefs, District Attorneys, and mayors are looking for.

As we go forward in the next few days, I wish to express my thanks to NIJ and BJA for understanding the importance of program evaluation in the critical mixture of responses that eventually will turn the tide on drugs in this country.

***"WE HAVE TO VISIBLY AND ACTIVELY GET PRACTITIONERS AND ACADEMICS TOGETHER TO TALK ABOUT THESE RESULTS. THIS AGENDA TODAY OUGHT TO BE REPLICATED IN EACH STATE; WHERE POLICE CHIEFS, DISTRICT ATTORNEYS, AND SHERIFFS ARE INVITED TO DISCUSS THE RESEARCH."***

---

---

## **Jimmy Gurulé, Former Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs**

It is a pleasure, a distinct pleasure, to be with you this afternoon. It is a great opportunity for me to address this Third Annual Conference on Evaluating Drug Control Initiatives. As many of you may know, and as Chuck has alluded to, this is the last forum in which I will be addressing you as Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs. Friday of this week I will be leaving this position to resume my professorship at the University of Notre Dame School of Law. However, I plan to continue working to promote the importance of all that is underway at OJP to bring an end to violent crime, gang activity, and drug abuse in this country.

I feel very strongly about those issues. In fact, as an attorney for the last 12 years—and I was just reflecting on this the other day—I have spent my entire legal career fighting in the war against drugs. Starting in 1980 at the Department of Justice, I worked in the Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Section as a trial attorney. Shortly after coming to Washington, I had an opportunity to serve on the first federal narcotics task force that was created in 1980 under the leadership of President Bush, who was then Vice President. I went to Miami, which was at that time the gateway for cocaine importation into the United States, and prosecuted narcotics cases. From there I went on to become a state prosecutor in my home town of Salt Lake City and was special counsel to the Metro Narcotics Task Force. I once again handled drug-related prosecutions and investigations, and worked closely with my colleagues in law enforcement. I have the greatest respect and admiration for the work that they are doing daily in putting their lives on the line to make this a safer country and a drug-free country for all Americans. Then, in 1985, an opportunity came my way to work in the U.S. Attorney's Office in Los Angeles. Rob Bonner was then the U.S. Attorney, and I was the first Assistant U.S. Attorney that he hired. As you know, he is now the Administrator of DEA. It was there that I undertook the responsibility of heading up the narcotics investigation involving the murder of DEA Agent Enrique Camarena. That was a very sobering and eye-opening experience. The Camarena case really brought home to me in a way that I had really never thought of before; that the war on drugs is not simply about drugs

on the street and the drug problem in our neighborhoods and communities, but the drug epidemic is further corrupting and terrorizing governments in foreign countries throughout the world. We are certainly seeing that take place in Colombia, with the corruption of government officials, and the terrorizing and murder of Supreme Court judges and newspaper reporters.

***"SCARCE FEDERAL DOLLARS SHOULD NOT BE USED TO FUND PROGRAMS WHERE WE ARE NOT ABLE TO ARTICULATE ANY POSITIVE IMPACT IN CURTAILING DRUG USE AND REDUCING DRUG-RELATED CRIME."***

It seems very appropriate that I end my tenure as Assistant Attorney General as I began two years ago this month, talking about the importance of evaluation in this nation's struggle against violent crime and drug abuse. In July 1990, at my confirmation hearing before the United States Senate Judiciary Committee, I was asked what would be my top priority if I was confirmed as Assistant Attorney General. Based upon what I had seen on the streets of Los Angeles, with the drug problem and gang violence impacting and destroying the lives of honest law-abiding citizens of this country day-in and day-out, it really struck me what a great opportunity this position held to impact drug policy in this country and to ensure that limited, scarce federal dollars were being directed to respond to these problems of drug abuse and violent crimes in a coordinated and cost-effective way.

It is critical to know what works and what doesn't in the war on drugs. Moreover, it is important that we fund only those programs that are working and that have proven successful. Scarce federal dollars should not be used to fund programs where we are not able to articulate any positive impact they are having in curtailing drug use and reducing drug-related crime. I was concerned then, as I am today, that while Congress is appropriating literally hundreds of millions of dollars annually to combat that war on drugs and violent crime, we still do not know in many instances what works and what doesn't. We need to know when grantees come to the Federal Government looking for funding whether public money will have any return on investment, a return not in dollars but in progress against the tide of drugs and crime, in which too many American citizens are drowning. So I made a commitment to Congress that I would work to find out what is effective in the fight against drugs and violent crime so that we are not simply throwing good money after bad in this problem.

I set forth other priorities at my Senate confirmation hearing. I pledged that the Office of Justice Programs would play a leadership role in working to make the problem of gang violence a priority for this country. I further pledged that OJP would work to foster federal, state, local, and private sector partnerships to combine our resources and coordinate our resources to work together to find solutions to the problems of drugs and violent crimes. And I pledged to keep our own house straight at OJP by improving the cooperation and coordination among the OJP bureaus.

I believe that, during the past two years, OJP has made significant accomplishments in each of these areas. OJP has been in the forefront in opening new frontiers in the administration of justice in America. We have championed the rights of the innocent victims of crime and worked to improve the criminal justice system's response to crime victims and their families. We have encouraged the adoption of community policing by communities across the country, so that police and the community work together to develop solutions to crime and other neighborhood problems, that they work together in partnership, not in confrontation. We have fostered the development and demonstration of a range of intermediate sanctions to provide alternatives to either probation or incarceration for non-violent offenders; and we have supported community-based programs to get citizens involved in taking back their neighborhoods. I think this is critical. The citizens in these drug-infested neighborhoods must get involved, must assume responsibility for cleaning up their own neighborhoods, and must take back the streets from the gangs and the drug thugs. Furthermore, through all of these major efforts, we have worked to ensure that minority communities are not forgotten in the fight against crime and to remind the nation that it is these citizens who suffer the most from crime, drugs, and gang violence.

As previously stated, under my direction, the Office of Justice Programs has made gang violence a top priority. To learn more about the scope of the problem of gangs, OJP held a series of national field studies on gangs and gang violence. We held these last year in Los Angeles, Dallas, and Chicago. We heard from over one hundred criminal justice officials, law enforcement officials, community leaders, educators, tenants of housing associations, and gang members themselves. We heard about their needs and about the programs they found to be effective in combating gang violence.

To learn what is working in reducing drugs and violent crime, I believe it is imperative that we in OJP, from time to time, get out of Washington, D.C., and go out into the communities, go out into the streets, and hear from the people that are living with the problems of drugs and violent

crime on a daily basis. We must talk to them and, more importantly, listen and learn. That is exactly what we did. The bureau directors, the deputy directors, and the senior management staff went out to these three cities, spent two days in each, and heard from various officials and community leaders about the problem of gangs; and we learned from that experience.

At the same time, OJP has worked to foster federal, state, local, and private sector partnerships to combine all available resources in the fight against crime and drug abuse. For example, we are working with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to support programs to drive gangs and drug dealers out of public housing developments. We are working with the National Crime Prevention Council and an Hispanic advertising agency to find ways to encourage Hispanic and other minority citizens to become involved in efforts to prevent crime and drug abuse in their communities. And we are implementing perhaps the ultimate federal, state, local, and private-sector partnership called "Operation Weed and Seed." I am proud to say that OJP has played a leadership role in developing the Weed and Seed model and in implementing the Weed and Seed strategy now in 19 cities across America.

Moreover, we have increased cooperation and coordination among OJP and its bureaus. For the past two years, OJP and the bureau directors and staff have met in a series of planning sessions to develop a coordinated program plan describing priorities, programs, and funding levels that OJP would undertake in each new fiscal year. It was important to go through this effort because there is tremendous expertise in each of the OJP bureaus, whether it is research from NIJ, statistical expertise in BJS, program demonstration expertise in BJA, the juvenile justice office, and the victims of crime office. Each of these bureaus can make an important contribution in reducing the problems of violent crime and drugs. However, we must confront the problem in a coordinated, holistic manner if we truly expect to make a difference. So it

***"WE HAVE FOSTERED THE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION OF A RANGE OF INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS TO PROVIDE ALTERNATIVES TO EITHER PROBATION OR INCARCERATION FOR NON-VIOLENT OFFENDERS; AND WE HAVE SUPPORTED COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS TO GET CITIZENS INVOLVED IN TAKING BACK THEIR NEIGHBORHOODS."***

was imperative that we come together, share our respective expertise, and develop comprehensive initiatives to confront and combat these very serious and tragic problems facing this country. Just a few weeks ago, in fact, we met to discuss the OJP comprehensive program plan for fiscal year 1993. We are still in the process of developing and fine tuning the strategy.

In addition, the OJP bureaus have developed a number of cooperative programs and other initiatives over the past two years. The NIJ/BJA evaluation partnership that we are all part of here today is an excellent example, as this is the third annual evaluation conference being cosponsored by the two OJP bureaus. During the past two years, OJP has made an unprecedented commitment to evaluations. In fiscal years 1991 and 1992, evaluations were identified as a top funding priority of OJP. OJP allocated more than \$13 million for evaluations and launched an effort to evaluate ongoing programs and to build an evaluation component into new programs. Since 1989, NIJ, which is responsible for the vast majority of the OJP evaluations, has awarded 47 grants to evaluate drug and crime control programs funded by OJP's Bureau of Justice Assistance. During my tenure at OJP, NIJ, under the strong leadership of Chuck DeWitt, has developed an Evaluation Division to institutionalize evaluations with OJP, to develop a strategic plan of action, both long- and short-term, and to identify and disseminate information on what works. Evaluations this fiscal year included, for example, the collaborative program for high risk youth, a program funded by the Ford Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trust, and the Casey Foundation, as well as BJA, NIJ, and OJJDP. It is a program that works to provide a safe environment at home and

***"IN FISCAL YEARS 1991 AND 1992, EVALUATIONS WERE IDENTIFIED AS A TOP FUNDING PRIORITY OF OJP. OJP ALLOCATED MORE THAN \$13 MILLION FOR EVALUATIONS AND LAUNCHED AN EFFORT TO EVALUATE ONGOING PROGRAMS AND TO BUILD AN EVALUATION COMPONENT INTO NEW PROGRAMS."***

at school for young people between the ages of 11 and 13. NIJ will evaluate the delivery of services and the overall impact on children's achievement, drug usage, and criminal involvement.

The evaluations conducted previously under this successful BJA/NIJ partnership have yielded important results for the criminal justice community and the nation. NIJ evaluations, for example, have documented the effectiveness of BJA-supported, multijurisdictional task forces, provided detailed information about strategies for ensuring effective multijurisdictional law enforcement approaches. Evaluation results also have

demonstrated the success of law enforcement crackdowns, street sweeps, crack house raids, and other law enforcement tools in disrupting drug markets, driving drug traffickers and their customers off the streets, and reducing the availability of drugs in targeted neighborhoods. But evaluations also have shown that law enforcement alone cannot solve the problem. Without the support and the involvement of the community in keeping their neighborhoods safe, criminals will return as soon as the "heat" is off. Other evaluations have documented the effectiveness of community policing. In fact, OJP has committed over \$18 million to support community policing efforts over the last two years.

These invaluable insights, together with the knowledge gained through generations of research, program demonstrations, and practical experience in working to combat violent crime in this country, have coalesced into the development of Operation Weed and Seed. Operation Weed and Seed is the Administration's landmark comprehensive national initiative to put gangs, drug dealers, and other criminals out of business; but, at the same time, to revitalize crime-infested neighborhoods so that all American citizens can live, work, and raise their families free from the fear of violent crime and drugs. Operation Weed and Seed is a multi-agency initiative that builds upon the foundation laid by the success of many individual criminal justice efforts across the nation; efforts such as the violent traffickers project in Philadelphia; efforts such as multijurisdictional task forces that have been so successful in demobilizing drug trafficking networks; and efforts such as community policing, which serves as a vital link between the "weeding," or enforcement component, and the "seeding," or human services component, of the Weed and Seed strategy. Operation Weed and Seed is taking successful initiatives such as these—we are not reinventing the wheel—and molding them into a comprehensive national strategy to combat crime in targeted high crime neighborhoods. You will be hearing more about the development, implementation, and future of Operation Weed and Seed tomorrow morning. I believe there is a workshop that will be covering this later in your program.

One new area of emphasis under Operation Weed and Seed, for example, will be the coordination of existing OJP programs, such as Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing, Cities in Schools, and the Wings of Hope Program administered by the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The Juvenile Justice Office is also developing a new youth component for the Weed and Seed strategy that will be implemented in Fiscal Year 1993.

I would also like to point out the special role evaluation has played and will continue to play in Operation Weed and Seed. As I mentioned, the Weed



and Seed strategy builds on the experience of a number of successful programs. Many of these programs were identified and documented through evaluations conducted previously by NIJ. These evaluations provide guidelines that the Weed and Seed sites, as well as other jurisdictions throughout the country, can use to replicate successful approaches to controlling crime and drug use. Moreover, NIJ is evaluating the implementation process in a number of the Weed and Seed sites, thereby identifying for future sites the pitfalls communities have faced in getting the Weed and Seed program up and operational. Next fiscal year, NIJ will expand this effort by undertaking intensive impact evaluations in approximately three to five Weed and Seed sites. These evaluations will provide an understanding of the costs and benefits of Operation Weed and Seed in urban areas, document promising innovative strategies being demonstrated in the Weed and Seed sites, and then make recommendations regarding future development and refinement of the Operation Weed and Seed strategy.

We also need to focus on the cost-effectiveness of programs we fund, and this is the last point that I would like to make this afternoon. Now obviously, to the extent that programs we fund prevent the victimization of innocent citizens, their value is beyond measure. You cannot place a value on human life. I believe, however, that it is imperative that we try to determine whether the programs we fund are worth their cost in terms of the impact they are having on violent crime and to determine whether they can be used to leverage additional federal funds. Let me give you an example. OJP's Bureau of Justice Statistics reports that in 1989 the estimated cost of violent crime to victims, excluding homicide, was approximately \$1.5 billion. This includes such things as losses for medical expenses, lost wages, property theft and damage, and other crime-related costs. This figure, however, does not include other costs, such as the cost to the criminal justice system to prosecute these crimes or the cost of increased insurance premiums.

There are examples of OJP supported programs that more than pay for themselves, and I think with the tough budgetary times that we are now facing, we need to start focusing more on that specific issue. For example, for every federal dollar invested in the National Citizens' Crime Prevention Campaign, more than \$50 worth of free advertising is generated. In my opinion this is a cost-effective program. In addition, the campaign receives funding from a large number of corporate and private sponsors. Operation Weed and Seed is another example of how federal money can be used to leverage other funding. The Department of Justice has invested \$13 million in federal funds in the Weed and Seed initiative so far. The sites selected to receive these funds, however, had to first arrange for additional resources from state and local

governments as well as from the private sector. One thing that most people don't understand or appreciate about the Weed and Seed program is that from this \$13 million in federal money invested in Fiscal Year 1992, the Weed and Seed sites have leveraged over \$57 million in state and local funding, over \$20 million in private sector funding, and over \$104 million in funds from other federal agencies. That is only for 11 of the 16 sites funded in Fiscal Year 1992. From my perspective, that was money well spent; federal tax dollars that were well invested, because we were able to use that money to leverage additional monies in these targeted high-crime neighborhoods.

Another good investment is asset seizure and forfeiture programs. Once again, these programs more than pay for themselves. The cars, homes, jewelry, cash, and other valuables seized from drug traffickers are returned to federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies that participate in the investigations. I believe that is the challenge for us today, and it is going to be the challenge in the tougher budgetary times that I am sure we will face in Fiscal Year 1993 and Fiscal Year 1994.

In conclusion, much has been accomplished, I believe, during my two years as Assistant Attorney General for OJP. The credit for these accomplishments goes to those dedicated individuals, both within OJP and the Department of Justice, and outside our agency, working together to make a difference in the lives of the citizens of this great nation; working so that one day every parent in every community in every part of this country can send their children to school without being afraid that they will be accosted by drug dealers, harassed by gang leaders or killed by random violence.

I am proud that I have been able to contribute my experience, energy, and ideas to securing a better future for the children of America; for my children and for yours. I am proud to have had the opportunity to serve my country, the Bush Administration, and the citizens of this great nation.

I want to thank each of you for your support during my tenure at the Office of Justice Programs, and I look forward to continuing to work with you from the academic arena at Notre Dame Law School. Thank you very much. It is a pleasure to be here with you this afternoon.

---

---

## **Timothy J. Shea, Associate Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice**

I appreciate being invited here today, and I know I also speak for the Attorney General when I thank very much the Office of Justice Programs, in particular BJA and NIJ, for their support and leadership given to the Weed and Seed effort since its inception last year. Without the assistance and leadership of these organizations, I doubt we would be this far. I know Elliott Brown and Chuck DeWitt have the confidence of the Attorney General. They speak for him on these issues, and I appreciate their leadership and assistance in putting this important initiative on the agenda. I do appreciate the opportunity to be here with you today at this important conference on drug abuse program evaluation. In my view, evaluation is a crucial element of any successful government program, especially one that is designed to address the important issue of drug abuse control.

We have an obligation as government managers, as program directors, as community leaders, and as taxpayers, to evaluate the effectiveness of drug control initiatives and to make changes or enhancements in the programs as they are necessary. The process of evaluation is important to many programs of the Justice Department and throughout the government, and indeed it is important to the new and emerging Weed and Seed program.

I would like to focus my remarks this morning on the Weed and Seed program, taking this opportunity to explain the philosophy behind Weed and Seed, the thinking that guided the creating and establishing of the program. I will take a few minutes to explain the program implementation and the elements that go into a Weed and Seed project, and then accept questions if anybody has any. Operation Weed and Seed has come a long way since two small demonstration projects were announced in 1991, and a long way since the program was expanded for 1993 in the January budget submission to Congress. The riots in Los Angeles raised the profile of Weed and Seed when the program and the strategy was used to assist in the overall recovery efforts in Los Angeles.

Because of the program's high profile, I have had the opportunity to speak around the country about it. Most recently, I was in Florida at the Southwest Florida Law Enforcement Conference. It was entitled "Challenges and Opportunities for Drug Abuse Prevention: Bridging the Gap." "Bridging the Gap," is an excellent theme for discussing Weed and Seed, because that is really what we are talking about: bridging the gap with this strategy.

We, in law enforcement, and those in the profession of delivering social services to drug abusers and others, are surely challenged by the pervasiveness of drug abuse in today's society. I can see in neighborhoods I have visited across the country that there is an opportunity to make a difference, an opportunity to bridge the gap. The gap that I am talking about, whether it is perceived or real, is between law enforcement on one hand and the social programs meant to address crime on the other. The Weed and Seed program attempts to bridge this gap.

There is a tendency in public discourse to draw a dichotomy between approaches to dealing with violent crime and dealing with drug abuse. On one hand, there is the law enforcement response. This approach tends to see crime as being caused by criminals and seeks to deter, interdict, and incapacitate those criminals. The proponents of this approach call for more enforcement activities and stricter punishments. On the other hand, there is a social rehabilitation approach to violent crime and drug abuse. The proponents of this approach say that law enforcement can't solve the problem of violent crime by simple suppression activities alone. They say we must address the root causes of violent crime.

In our view, advocates of the social rehabilitation approach are partly right, but they are also partly wrong. They are partly right because law enforcement is not, standing alone, the complete answer to the problem of violent crime and drug abuse. Law enforcement sweeps without a sustaining commitment to neighborhood development result in little permanent improvement in the community's security or its quality of life.

**"WE HAVE AN OBLIGATION AS GOVERNMENT MANAGERS, AS PROGRAM DIRECTORS, AS COMMUNITY LEADERS, AND AS TAXPAYERS, TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DRUG CONTROL INITIATIVES AND TO MAKE CHANGES OR ENHANCEMENTS IN THE PROGRAMS AS THEY ARE NECESSARY."**

Only an approach combining tough law enforcement with the economic and moral revitalization of high crime areas offers the prospect for a safer America. Advocates who see social programs as a solution to crime are also partly wrong. Historically, proponents of the policy of attacking the root causes of crime through social programs frequently present their proposals as an alternative strategy to law enforcement. They frequently sought to shift resources from law enforcement to social programs. You hear it all the time: "We don't need more prisons; we need more schools. We don't need more police; we need more social workers."

We have to reject this dichotomy as a false one. It is not an either/or situation. In our view, law enforcement programs must be complemented by social programs. Both law enforcement and social programs are essential; and they must work together, mutually reinforcing one another. Social revitalization and social programs cannot be established at the expense of aggressive law enforcement policies. Nor should law enforcement be relegated to second place.

On the contrary, a strong law enforcement effort is absolutely necessary for social progress. Law enforcement is the foundation on which all of the programs build. Indeed, social rehabilitation cannot even get started without law and order in the community. It makes no sense to put a model school in a community which is overrun by crime, where students are shot or robbed on the way to school, or terrorized in that model school. It doesn't make sense to set up job training programs if trainees are afraid to come out of their homes, or afraid to stand at the bus stop because of drive-by shootings.

To address this cycle of violence and drug abuse, we have spent billions and billions of dollars over the years on social service programs and law enforcement activities. The problem has been not how much we are spending, but how we are spending. In other words, it is not the scale of our programs but the structure of our programs.

One of the critical structural shortcomings of the past has been the failure to coordinate our social programs and integrate them with law enforcement. For the past 25 years, many social service agencies, each with their own planned programs, have spent billions across the nation without any regard for what is happening on the law enforcement side. And on the law enforcement side LEAA and other grant-making institutions have placed police cruisers, communication equipment, and other law enforcement assets in the community without regard to what the other social support services have done. The challenge of the '90s is to deploy and focus both the law enforcement assets

and our social service resources at the same time, at the same place, and in the same mutually enforcing way.

***"ONLY AN APPROACH  
COMBINING TOUGH LAW  
ENFORCEMENT WITH THE  
ECONOMIC AND MORAL  
REVITALIZATION OF HIGH  
CRIME AREAS OFFERS THE  
PROSPECT FOR A SAFER  
AMERICA."***

To accomplish this goal and address this problem in America's neighborhoods, the Weed and Seed program was launched. Weed and Seed is a relatively simple but compelling concept. It is basically a strategy implemented as the name describes. First, federal, state and local law enforcement join forces and focus their efforts in one geographically defined neighborhood to weed out the most violent criminal elements of the community. As the weeding takes place and the streets are reclaimed, intensive community policing is put into effect. After that, the seed programs are implemented to hold the community, and to give people who live there a fighting chance to reclaim their neighborhoods for good. The seed phase takes many forms, based on the local need. In general, we focus on human services and economic development, the long-term programs that give residents the best chance to fight back.

The Weed and Seed program builds on the two motivating principles behind this strategy: (1) the need to effectively coordinate law enforcement and social service programs, and (2) the partnership on all levels of government and the private sector. Each city has certain common elements, even though each community works in a unique way to reclaim its own neighborhood.

Four basic elements are common to each Weed and Seed project that is up and running. I would like to take a few minutes to describe those elements briefly and describe our implementation of the program. The first element is law enforcement. State, local, and the federal government agencies build a partnership. That takes the form of many activities in the targeted neighborhood.

One of the programs we have used involves the federal system. We use the federal system, when it is appropriate, for the most violent and worst elements in a neighborhood. That means pretrial detention. They are not getting out if they are a danger to the community. It means no probation, no parole, and mandatory minimum sentences for a long, long time. Let me give you an example. The prototype for Weed and Seed was a project called the Violent Traffickers Project in Philadelphia. It was conducted by the United States Attorney, the District Attorney, the Attorney General in the State of Pennsylvania, and others.

The project occurred in the Spring Garden neighborhood, and received a lot of praise. It was really the impetus for Weed and Seed, and it received notoriety when Bill Clinton visited our project and liked it. The Spring Garden neighborhood is now a different neighborhood than it was in 1989. It is revitalized. Here is a recent article on one of the "weeds" who started running when we began the project. We finally caught him. A *Philadelphia Inquirer* article on July 14 was headlined, "Spring Garden Drug Boss Accepts 30-Year Prison Term." This man named Ramos was head of an organization. I would like to read just a few paragraphs from this because it speaks for itself.

The Ramos organization grossed about \$16.1 million from the sale of crack and cocaine. At its peak in the summer of 1989, the prosecutor said the group's 24-hour-a-day open-air drug supermarket was doing a tremendous business with sidewalks jammed with sellers and with addicts and other customers lined up to buy drugs. On weekend nights they said it was a virtual gridlock. And the group sold more than \$20,000 in crack and \$15,000 in cocaine every day. In September 1990, the federal indictment was announced and most members of the organizations were scooped off the street by law enforcement and held without bail.

This one bad apple won't be coming out for a long time. He will be in jail for 30 years.

Those kind of law enforcement activities can help the community take back their neighborhoods. If you went to Spring Garden today, you would see a totally different place—a place where the President of the United States can walk down the street, and the Secret Service are not as nervous as they would have been two years ago.

The second element to the local level of Weed and Seed strategy is the bridging element, community policing. In this very important element to the Weed and Seed strategy, the police are working closely with the residents to develop solutions to the problems of violence and drug abuse. That, of course, takes many forms. There are many definitions of community policing. Within Weed and Seed there are foot patrols, resident community police officers,

substations, and the like. Each community is adopting the community policing aspect in different ways.

The third element involves human services, the first "seed" to come into a community. That means drug abuse prevention, education, family services, recreation, and youth training programs.

Finally, we have the economic development for neighborhood revitalization. This is longer term, and it includes housing, economic development, and enterprise zones to make up the long-term health of a neighborhood and build an economic base for it. In each of these four elements, I would like to stress the importance of evaluation. That is why everybody is here today.

It is important to devise a method to measure the effectiveness of this strategy, the implementation of these four elements that I just mentioned. It is a very difficult task. This is not a traditional law enforcement program or a traditional social service activity. In this program we are turning away from a body-count war to a territorial war, where the law-abiding citizens take back their neighborhoods block by block. It is a serious challenge to evaluate this comprehensive, complex strategy designed to empower a community to take back their own streets. If Weed and Seed is implemented and executed as planned, we should see a vibrant neighborhood where residents are essentially free from the fear of crime, and where crime no longer seriously affects the quality of life or economic viability of the community.

We are not going to totally erase crime, but it will not seriously affect quality of life and economic viability in such a neighborhood. There are neighborhoods in this country that meet this description, and there are others that don't. We believe it is a basic right of an American to be free from the fear of crime and to live in that positive kind of atmosphere. How do we measure that freedom, the freedom from fear of crime? It is a very tough question, and we are going to have to ask for information from you and many others to get the answer. When do we know that the community activist is free to attend a meeting in Kansas City; or that the residents of Fort Worth are free to go to church services on Friday night? When are small businesses in the Hills District of Pittsburgh able to feel safe and get their businesses back up?

Evaluation is a very complex task, but it is extremely important as we continue to implement phases one and two, and to plan for phase three. I would like to talk about the third phase briefly and tell you how the Weed and Seed program has developed. We have conceptually divided the program into



three phases to explain it to Congress and others, and to work on it ourselves. Phase one was the pilot phase that started in 1991 in Trenton and Kansas City. We have added another pilot site in Omaha, Nebraska. That was really a test site to take the Spring Garden example and put it into practice.

In 1992, we got a small amount of additional appropriations from Congress to start a demonstration project in several other cities. We put it on a fast track. Sixteen cities competed. Each one of them submitted an excellent application. We started implementing the phase two demonstration sites in April in 16 cities across the country. The total is 19. In addition, we have one more that is a special operation in Los Angeles. That is a program announced in the wake of civil unrest in Los Angeles. I have been there many times to work on that project. It is going very well in Los Angeles despite the understandable political and social difficulties faced by the people of South Central, Pico Union, and indeed the whole Los Angeles area.

Phase three is the expanded program for Weed and Seed, that we are now working on before the Congress. President Bush proposed a \$500 million expansion for Fiscal Year 1993 in his budget submission in January. That program consists of \$100 million for the Weed and Seed ongoing program to expand it to additional cities and \$400 million to be associated with the establishment of enterprise zones. At the present, the House has passed HR-11, which is called the Revenue Act of 1992, which is also known as the Urban Aid Bill. That bill has a provision that authorizes and appropriates \$500 million under the Weed and Seed program for enterprise zone cities. The House has designated eight enterprise zones for urban areas and eight for rural areas in the first year. We need to expand the Weed and Seed program to nonenterprise zones, and we are hopeful that that will occur as well. That is going ahead in the weeks to come. The appropriations process is also moving ahead. We are getting support from the Appropriations Committee to continue Weed and Seed. I am confident that Weed and Seed will continue in Fiscal Year 1993. We will work in more than the present 20 cities. The work that is planned here and the evaluations needed in the future will be very important.

I would like to end by making three points to reinforce what I have already mentioned. The program is a simple but compelling concept. Weed and Seed is designed to coordinate law enforcement with social service spending where law enforcement and social services are mutually reinforcing to each other. It doesn't make sense to spend social service dollars in neighborhoods terrorized by violent crime or poisoned by drugs. Weed and Seed is also a strategy to reclaim America's neighborhoods. It is not another federal grant program. Leveraging under Weed and Seed is very important. In

a preliminary survey of 11 of our 19 sites, we found \$104 million from other federal agencies that have been put into these neighborhoods, over \$60 million in state and local resources, and another \$20 million in private resources, leveraged with the \$12 million we had from the Department of Justice in 1992.

Finally, the third point I would like to leave with you is that Weed and Seed is a strategy built on partnership. That is the partnership between federal, state and local law enforcement, between law enforcement and social service providers, and between the public and the private sector. Partnership with state and local governments and with other federal agencies is of the greatest importance. This is essential on the local level, but even more so in Washington, because our job is to cut through red tape and give those in the field an unencumbered opportunity to take back their neighborhoods.

Again, I want to thank you for your attention and your interest in Operation Weed and Seed and to wish you a good conference. We need your help in the future.

---

---

## **Dennis E. Nowicki, Executive Director, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority**

When I was first invited to speak to you this afternoon, I was somewhat apprehensive about accepting. I thought, "What am I, someone who has been a cop for 28 years, but director of a research agency for less than 28 weeks; going to say about evaluation to an audience that includes some of the best program evaluators in the country, the upper crust of the research community?" I thought the wise thing to do is to decline and say nothing rather than say something wrong. But the more I thought about it, the more excited I got about coming. Being here this afternoon not only provides me the opportunity to tell you a little bit about what's going on in Illinois, it gives me the chance to share with you the insights of someone who has worn many different hats when it comes to evaluation.

Let me assure you at the outset, though, that I am not here to tell you how to design sound methods to conduct evaluations. I am certainly not able to do so, and there are already far too many of your fellow researchers willing to meddle in and be critical of your efforts.

I would like to speak to you from the perspective of my many years as a police officer and Chief, during which I've worn the hat of the evaluated, the program administrator and the policy maker. In other words, the practitioner decision maker who needs information, who ultimately uses or discards an evaluator's work.

Recently, as Executive Director of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, an agency that conducts evaluations, I've been more closely aligned with researchers. My responsibilities now include ensuring that the state's evaluation needs are met, and providing direction and guidance to a staff of evaluation researchers.

In the time I've spent in these different roles, I've noticed that among both policy makers and researchers there is often a lack of recognition of the true merits of the evaluation process, of the true relationship between evaluation and effective decision making.

More evaluators need to recognize that decision makers at all levels are yearning for information that will enable them to make more fully informed decisions, information that will help them make the right decision, information that will help them look good.

It was once said that the two most meaningful things an author must do are to make new things familiar, and familiar things new. In evaluation research, you are obliged not only to determine what works and what does not, but also to convince practitioners of the benefits in replicating successful programs.

Evaluators need to recognize that their services and their products are needed and wanted, but they must be properly packaged; they must be properly marketed. Evaluators must strive to make their work relevant to the needs and concerns of decision makers. They must consult with practitioners for ideas. They must communicate findings in simple language and understandable terms. And they must be sensitive to decision making timetables and cycles.

On the other hand, more decision makers need to recognize that evaluations are a valuable resource, a source of information that can help them make the right decisions. Decision makers must recognize that, when used effectively, evaluations can make them look good, not bad.

I'm fortunate to work in a state where decision makers have increasingly recognized the merits of evaluation, and where evaluation has been actively supported. For example, the Authority was provided with a statutory basis for evaluating state and local criminal justice programs when it was created in 1983. And I'm confident in saying that the Authority, and the State of Illinois, are committed to

***"IN EVALUATION RESEARCH, YOU ARE OBLIGED NOT ONLY TO DETERMINE WHAT WORKS AND WHAT DOES NOT, BUT ALSO TO CONVINC PRACTITIONERS OF THE BENEFITS IN REPLICATING SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS."***

evaluation. We have been and would be conducting evaluation activities even without the recent push which has come from the federal government.

BJA, NIJ, and the entire Department of Justice should be commended for their leadership, for their commitment to evaluation, and for their contributions to the development of state-level evaluation capacities. Without the technical assistance and financial support that has come from Washington, without conferences like this, the evaluation capacity of virtually every state in the nation, including Illinois, would be severely diminished. Some states, it is likely, would not be involved in any evaluation activities at all.

But all of us at the state level need to realize that we can't rely on the federal government to be doing the work we should be doing ourselves. Those of us at the state and local level must develop and actively participate in a marketing campaign, a sort of public education campaign if you will, about the merits of evaluation and the intimate relationship between evaluation and effective decision making. We must actively lobby lawmakers and policy makers for the resources that are needed to improve evaluation capacities. And we must use whatever resources are made available to us as efficiently and effectively as possible.

What Illinois has done to take evaluation from rhetoric to reality is not necessarily the best, and surely not the only way to get the job done. I'd like to share some of our experiences with you. To make evaluation a reality in Illinois, the Authority created, within its Research and Analysis Unit, a mechanism for conducting drug and violent crime research and for performing program evaluations. The Drug Strategy Impact Program, as we call it, was designed to improve the effectiveness of drug and violent crime control efforts in Illinois by providing policy makers with better information on the extent and nature of the problem and the impact of the justice system's response. Program staff work in a collaborative manner with sources within each component of the criminal justice system, as well as outside of the system, to obtain, on an ongoing basis, the most useful data possible to support drug and violent crime control efforts on a statewide basis.

To ensure that the state's need for information on the impact and effectiveness of drug and violent crime control efforts is met, multiple evaluation projects are undertaken. They are designed to determine "what works" among Illinois' drug and violent crime control programs and are carried out by staff or through subcontracts with outside organizations such as universities. The Drug Strategy Impact Program is staffed with professional researchers and evaluators. It is funded with Anti-Drug Abuse Act (ADAA)

programming dollars, *not* ADAA administrative funds--*This is a significant point.*

While evaluation is an acceptable program area to support with ADAA dollars, that's no guarantee that evaluation will actually receive funding within a given state. In Illinois, funding evaluations with ADAA programming dollars required a strong lobbying effort by Authority staff. It required convincing key policymakers from all components of the justice system that evaluation was not only in their best interest, but imperative to their success. Staff arguments were persuasive. Key policymakers, the Authority members who are themselves practitioners such as the Illinois State Police, Department of Corrections, State's Attorneys, Sheriffs, and Police Chiefs, have earmarked more than \$2.5 million dollars for evaluation activities over the past 3 years.

The evaluation activities that we conduct in Illinois span a continuum from simple monitoring to full-scale impact evaluations. Simple monitoring occurs for every program supported with Anti-Drug Abuse Act funds. This monitoring includes: reviewing the goals and objectives of each program, identifying data that will measure progress in meeting them, collaborating with program officials to develop data-reporting formats, collecting data on a monthly basis, and generating periodic reports on program performance. We do this at a minimum for every ADAA-funded program in the state.

I can tell from first hand experience that information available to police administrators concerning police operations is deficient. The reports that the Authority generates on program performance, though relatively simple, are an extremely valuable source of information, not only to the program monitor, but to program administrators as well.

During the years I served as a member of our local multi-agency drug task force policy board, I often struggled with the question of how best to determine the effectiveness of the task force's efforts. Evaluation feedback would have been helpful, particularly if the initial evaluator left us with an evaluation method that we could easily replicate. The monitoring reports now produced by the Authority, which were developed in partnership with the grantees, are proving to be valuable administrative tools in the hands of an informed policy board.

However, there is a tendency to exclusively emphasize data analysis. In your efforts as evaluators, to enlighten the administrator you need to refine your focus to include thinking, not just counting. We all need to do a better job of selecting, defining, and understanding the problem before attempting the

***"EVALUATIONS WHICH ARE CONDUCTED THROUGH SUBCONTRACTS USUALLY FOCUS ON EMERGING AND INNOVATIVE STRATEGIES, AND ARE AWARDED THROUGH A COMPETITIVE BIDDING PROCESS."***

require much more in the way of resources.

Full-scale impact evaluations, for example, can take several years, and cost hundreds of thousands of dollars each. It would be hard for me to envision any state undertaking more than a handful of these complex projects at any single point in time.

In Illinois, we conduct process and impact evaluations in one of two ways, with internal staff and through subcontracts. Projects undertaken by internal staff are typically somewhat less resource intensive. Our evaluators collaborate with program officials to identify research questions (the problem identification phase of our evaluation). They then develop the research designs, collect and analyze data, and communicate findings in published reports.

One example of program assessment being conducted by Authority staff is an evaluation of the St. Clair County Drug Testing and Services Program, on which there was a report on at one of the breakout sessions this morning.

Evaluations which are conducted through subcontracts usually focus on emerging and innovative strategies, and are awarded through a competitive bidding process. Authority staff draft and distribute Requests for Proposals to which universities and research organizations respond.

Examples of evaluations we have underway through subcontracts with universities include: a process and impact evaluation of Neighborhood Oriented Policing and Problem Solving in Joliet and in Aurora, Illinois—being conducted by the University of Illinois at Chicago; an evaluation of the Illinois Department of Corrections' PRESTART program, which is an alternative to traditional parole, being conducted by Southern Illinois University at Carbondale; and an evaluation of nuisance abatement practices in Cook County, being conducted by Loyola University of Chicago.

answer. Although evaluations benefit from quantitative analysis, as you know, many basic questions about criminal justice system operations involve questions that are difficult, if not impossible, to quantify. Thus, we at the Authority are conducting more process evaluations, as well as full-scale impact evaluations. These types of research activities, of course,

One of the major advantages of the subcontracting approach is that it has strengthened our ties with the academic and private research community. While universities and private institutions have always been active in pursuing, and obtaining, discretionary grants for the purpose of conducting evaluations, we've opened the door to their involvement in the state's strategy development process and taken advantage of the tremendous talent that resides at these institutions.

But subcontracting is not without its problems. It can be a time consuming and expensive process. It can also result in what I have come to call the "evaluator's ambush." I have personally been "victimized" by such an ambush, and continue to see a lack of methodological attention to the issue of timely feedback to program administrators. An evaluator's interim findings should not be unavailable to program operators, "the ambush." Concern over researcher "contamination" of the program being evaluated must give way to the need to advance the success of the program effort. To the fullest extent possible, actions of the project staff that are clearly detrimental to positive outcomes should be exposed by the researchers in a timely manner, so that program administrators are able to make intermediate program improvements. Evaluation is not an end product. It is a means to gather information to assist decision makers.

An excellent example of policy-relevant research and evaluation is the work we have been doing in the area of homicide. A growing body of research suggests that many homicides can be prevented. The key to prevention is to focus on specific homicide syndromes, to focus on specific neighborhoods in which the risk of being murdered is especially high, and to focus on specific groups who are at the highest risk of victimization. In Chicago, our researchers are collaborating with the police department and community groups to map potential hot spots for gang-related violence and to develop interventions that will actually save lives.

There are many new and innovative concepts being undertaken in policing and in the field of criminal justice in general. This is both exciting, and unsettling—unsettling, not because of any resistance to change, but because many new ideas are spreading without any evidence that they are demonstrably superior to what we have been doing. This often happens out of frustration with the ineffectiveness of traditional strategies. I am very concerned about this. It is dangerous for policy making to be unsupported by facts. Good practices, both old and new, may be cast aside on the basis of seat-of-the-pants impressions.



Our inability to adequately document program implementation processes and to measure program impact interferes with effecting changes and impedes our ability to learn from one another. We must know what works. The large sums we are spending on crime control and criminal justice demand it.

It is unrealistic to expect the criminal justice agency administrator to simultaneously devise new strategies and to also devise effective ways of evaluating their impact. As enlightened and educated as these administrators may be, they are still generally operationally oriented. Their expertise at evaluation is limited. It is enough that they are willing to be creative and to participate in evaluation efforts. The responsibility for evaluation, therefore, must rest with state planning agencies, research organizations, and academic institutions.

I have been reminded many times that, in closing every speech, you should leave your audience with an assignment. In keeping with that advice, may I suggest the following. The responsibility for funding research falls on our elected officials. The responsibility for educating funding authorities on the value of such efforts rests with each of you present here this afternoon. We must do two things in furtherance of evaluation research. First, you must convince your constituents within your respective states of the value of evaluation so that they will lobby state and local policy makers to fund it. Secondly, you must serve as the vocal constituency for federal agencies responsible for and interested in research to see that they too are properly funded.

***"OUR INABILITY TO ADEQUATELY DOCUMENT PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION PROCESSES AND TO MEASURE PROGRAM IMPACT INTERFERES WITH EFFECTING CHANGES AND IMPEDES OUR ABILITY TO LEARN FROM ONE ANOTHER. WE MUST KNOW WHAT WORKS."***

The Office of Justice Programs must also continue to advocate and support (that is, fund) training and assistance as well as program evaluation efforts. Evaluation *is* important. OJP must strive to enhance the usefulness, and use of, evaluation reports, by a broader group of local audiences.

***ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS***

**WEED AND SEED**

**Section Contents**

<b>San Diego</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>Trenton</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>Kansas City</b> .....	<b>47</b>
<b>Philadelphia</b> .....	<b>47</b>

---

---

## **WEED AND SEED**

*William Braniff, United States Attorney, Southern District of California*

**San Diego.** This presentation was an overview of the Weed and Seed Program in San Diego, including information on target selection, grant proposal, organizational structure, and program strategy. The status of law enforcement operations in the target neighborhood and the partnership approach as a critical "seed" strategy were discussed.

*Robert DeGeorge, Assistant Attorney General, Trenton, NJ*

**Trenton.** The goals of Trenton, New Jersey's Weed and Seed program are community safety and neighborhood reclamation. Program components include a violent offender removal task force, four school "safe haven" sites, a community policing component, and reclamation/revitalization of the target neighborhoods. Trenton's Weed and Seed project encompasses the work of hundreds of individuals in federal, state, and local government, human services, and nonprofit agencies that have worked together since August 1991.

*Dennis Rogan, Project Director, School of Criminal Justice, University of Maryland*

**Kansas City.** The University of Maryland prepared the evaluation design for the Weed and Seed Project being conducted by the Kansas City Police Department. Initial start-up problems faced by the project and evaluation of the substantive and legal classification of crime as they pertain to identifying crime patterns and problems were addressed. Information regarding the baseline data in the experimental and control areas was also presented. The discussion assessed the impact of two strategies of enforcement.

*Tom Rueter, Assistant United States Attorney, Eastern District of Pennsylvania*

**Philadelphia.** Philadelphia's weeding strategy centers on a number of innovative Philadelphia-based programs that have become models for the nation, including Violent Traffickers Project, Operation Fishnet, Federal Alternatives to State Trials (FAST) Program, and the Philadelphia District

## **Weed and Seed**

**Attorney's Vertical Prosecution Model.** Philadelphia's seeding strategy contains a strong youth drug prevention component, including the BANNER Project, where children paint banners with the names of persons they know who have died or been incarcerated due to drug involvement. The banner also describes the child's vision of the future. These banners are displayed or carried by the children during anti-drug vigils or marches. Other efforts include a new Minority Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Interdiction Program, the Student Anti-Violence Education Program (SAVE), and a variety of school-based substance abuse prevention programs. The Philadelphia Housing Authority is implementing programs that also focus on drug prevention.

# ***ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS***

## **DRUG ENFORCEMENT**

### **Section Contents**

<b>Cooperative Law Enforcement</b>	
<b>Narcotics Control Task Forces .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Hartford Drug Market Analysis Program.....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Evaluation Activities in Arizona.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Jersey City Drug Market Analysis.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Alternative Sanctions—Asset Forfeiture and     Suspension of Drivers Licenses.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Nuisance Abatement Applied to Drug     Offenders.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Multijurisdictional Drug Task Forces     in Nebraska .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Community Effects of Street     Level Narcotics Enforcement.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Emerging Drug Enforcement Tactics:     A Program Assessment .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Kansas City Drug Market Analysis Program .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Multijurisdictional Drug Task Forces in Iowa.....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>The Impact of Narcotics Crackdowns .....</b>	<b>55</b>

---

---

## **DRUG ENFORCEMENT**

*James R. Coldren, Jr., Director of Research, Justice Research and Statistics Association*

**An Implementation Study on Cooperative Law Enforcement Narcotics Control Task Forces.** In 1991, the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) completed a six-site study of multijurisdictional drug enforcement task force implementation. Based on an organizational life cycle model, the study examined the creation, implementation, and maturation processes for multijurisdictional task forces in California, Kentucky, Minnesota, New Jersey, Oregon, and Texas. Since the completion of that study, JRSA and others have continued to conduct research on task forces. This presentation reviewed the findings from the six-site task force implementation study, discussed the extent to which the study findings are born out by other studies, reviewed other findings from state-based task force studies, and suggested future directions for task force research.

*James Donnelly, Lieutenant, Hartford Police Department*

**Hartford Drug Market Analysis Program.** A before and after picture of drug arrest statistics across Hartford was presented. The picture provides an overview of the Hartford DMAP entry process which is part of the department's COMPASS program. This was coupled with an illustrative accounting of the various strategies used in the enforcement and maintenance phases. The presentation provided insight into the advantages of a focused drug market interruption strategy and how it affects citizen satisfaction. DMAP technology can affect user views of drug markets and supplements police intuition and experience.

## **Drug Enforcement**

*Joseph R. Farmer, Drug Program Coordinator, Arizona Criminal Justice Commission*

**Evaluation Activities in Arizona.** The 1992 National Drug Control Strategy, the 1992 Arizona Drug Enforcement Strategy, and the Southwest Border High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Strategy form the foundations for all federal drug-grant-enhanced programs in Arizona. Evaluations are ongoing, with monthly activity reports, quarterly financial reports, and an annual report required from each project. Public meetings are scheduled six months after projects are funded, and within three months after completion of a 12-month funding cycle, to review evaluations. Detailed evaluations are submitted when requests for funding are reviewed by the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission. This presentation was an overview of this evaluation process.

*Frank Gajewski, Captain, Jersey City Police Department*

**Jersey City Drug Market Analysis.** The Jersey City, New Jersey, Drug Market Analysis project commenced in March 1992. This DMAP experiment is designed to determine what type of drug enforcement strategy is most effective in de-stabilizing street level drug activity under experimental conditions. The experiment includes 56 randomly assigned drug markets that are distributed between control and experimental groups. The control group is using traditional narcotics enforcement tactics of surveillance and arrest, while the experimental group is using an innovative stepwise strategy using closedowns and crackdowns in a systematic procedure. Additionally, the experimental strategy places responsibility for each market on individual officers and aims to gain support of community members to tackle the street drug market problems.

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

**Alternative Sanctions—Asset Forfeiture and Suspension of Drivers Licenses.** In 1987, New Jersey passed a stringent statute calling for the mandatory loss of driving privileges for a minimum of six months upon conviction of any drug offense (misdemeanor or felony). This NIJ-funded study analyzed data for 500 adults whose licenses were suspended during early 1990 following a drug conviction. The analysis covers offender characteristics, offense details, prior drug arrests, driver history information, and any subsequent arrests for a drug offense. Results of the evaluation give support for loss of driving privileges as a means of reducing recidivism for drug offenses.

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

**Nuisance Abatement Applied to Drug Offenders.** The Institute for Law and Justice (ILJ) studied civil nuisance abatement programs in four cities: Miami Beach, Portland, San Diego, and Denver. Under a Florida statute, Miami Beach established a Nuisance Abatement Board that dealt quickly and flexibly with problem properties. A valuable by-product of Portland's drug enforcement programs is a landlord training program that explains in detail how landlords can recognize and stop drug trafficking in their rental properties. San Diego formed an interagency team to bring all city enforcement powers to bear on problem properties. Denver used Colorado's broad nuisance abatement statute for asset forfeiture. The study found that civil nuisance abatement can be an effective supplemental tool against urban drug trafficking.

### *Michael Overton, SAC Director, Nebraska Crime Commission*

**Multijurisdictional Drug Task Forces in Nebraska.** The number of law enforcement personnel assigned strictly to drug enforcement in Nebraska was very limited prior to the availability of funds in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. Currently there are nine task forces, eight receiving funds, which cover 81 of the 93 counties and involve personnel in enforcement and prosecution. Task forces are organized at the county level and include coordination of state agencies. Due to limited manpower in smaller agencies, rural task forces contract with the Nebraska State Patrol for undercover services. The nature of multijurisdictional enforcement and the opportunity provided by federal funds contribute to a level of cooperation that has broken down many barriers. In addition to the significant impact on drug enforcement, this opportunity provided the groundwork for an ongoing commitment to the use of task forces and interaction between agencies.

### *Michelle Sviridoff, Research Scientist, Substance Abuse Strategy Initiative Program, Robert Wagner School of Public Service*

**Community Effects of Street Level Narcotics Enforcement.** In 1990, the Vera Institute of Justice initiated quasi-experimental research on the community-level effects of New York City's Tactical Narcotics Teams (TNT's) in three Brooklyn precincts. TNT's provide short-term, intensive, street-level enforcement in designated target areas and rely heavily on the strategy of rapid "buy and bust." The initiative also draws upon tools of problem-solving policing, including inter-agency partnerships and community outreach. Vera's



## **Drug Enforcement**

research included four components: surveys of community residents, panel interviews with community leaders, process evaluation of program implementation, and ethnographic analysis of program impacts on street-level drug markets. The research found short-term impacts on the visible drug trafficking in target areas, but little effect on other types of crime, perceptions of disorder, fear of crime, use of public amenities, or attitudes toward the police.

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

### **Emerging Drug Enforcement Tactics: A Program Assessment.**

During the 1980s, it became increasingly clear that traditional law enforcement tactics alone were not effective in ameliorating drug activity and reducing concerns and fears of residents in drug-infested neighborhoods. The resultant pressure increasingly forced law enforcement agencies at all levels to try different tactics. Local police agencies answered by beefing up patrol resources while narcotics units continued to focus on undercover operations. By the early 1990s, drug enforcement in most American cities had changed dramatically, shifting from a reliance on narcotics units to enforcement by line officers. The literature indicates that uniformed officers had always made more drug arrests than narcotics units, often as the result of routine traffic stops. During this period, many police departments expanded the range of uses of old tactics and developed new tactics, tailored to their local problems. Many of these tactics relied on the efforts of uniformed officers. PERF is conducting an assessment of the innovative responses currently in use by police agencies. Although this project is in its early stages and neither the national survey nor case studies have been conducted, a search has turned up a wide variety of innovative drug enforcement tactics. The range of these tactics were discussed with a focus on those that are innovative or show promise of effectiveness.

*Rachel Whipple, Captain, Kansas City Police Department*

**Kansas City Drug Market Analysis Program.** The purpose of the DRAGNET experiment was to determine the effect of serving narcotics search warrants on the quality of life of the block on which they were served. Narcotics purchases were made on blocks that were comparable in calls for service and crime patterns. The purchases were then randomly placed in either a control group, which had no action taken, or the other group, in which warrants were served. No additional action was taken in either group for the 30

## Drug Enforcement

days after the duty. The activity on the block for that 30 day-period was then compared.

*Dennis Wiggins, Principal Researcher, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning, Department of Human Rights, Des Moines, Iowa*

**Multijurisdictional Drug Task Forces in Iowa.** This presentation provided an overview of the make-up, operation, and impact of multijurisdictional drug law enforcement task forces in Iowa. The results of a Iowa recent study of task forces was discussed. Efforts to assist multijurisdictional task forces and address organizational and operational concerns are ongoing. Data collection and performance monitoring are maintained.

*Robert E. Worden, Assistant Professor, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York at Albany*

**The Impact of Narcotics Crackdowns.** Police drug crackdowns could be expected to affect the availability of illicit drugs, the incidence of drug-related predatory crime, and the quality of life in targeted neighborhoods. This quasi-experimental evaluation examines the implementation and impact of a drug crackdown, comparing two treatment areas with two control areas before, during, and after intensified drug enforcement. Implementation is assessed in terms of quantifiable enforcement outputs (raids, arrests, seizures) and through observation of enforcement activities. Impacts are assessed in terms of official data on crime, calls to the drug hotline, and survey data on the quality of life.

# ***ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS***

## **COMMUNITY POLICING**

### **Section Contents**

<b>Evaluation of Baltimore County Police Department's Community Oriented Drug Enforcement Program .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Community Policing in Richmond, Virginia.....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Evaluation of New York City Police Department's Model Precinct Program .....</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>An Evaluation of Drug Enforcement Techniques Implemented within a POP Framework in Two Cities .....</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>Implementation and Impacts of Innovative Policing Neighborhood Programs .....</b>	<b>60</b>

---

---

## COMMUNITY POLICING

*David Hayeslip, Director for Graduate Programs, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Baltimore*

**Evaluation of Baltimore County Police Department's Community Oriented Drug Enforcement Program.** This paper presented findings from the two-phase evaluation of the Community Oriented Drug Enforcement (CODE) project in Baltimore County, Maryland. The preliminary findings suggested that a community oriented drug enforcement program can result in valid arrests and punitive dispositions, may be associated with declines in crime, and may positively influence satisfaction with the police. However, the effects of such a program on the reduction or displacement of drug markets appeared mixed.

*Stephen Mastrofski, Visiting Fellow, Evaluation Division, National Institute of Justice*

**Community Policing in Richmond, Virginia.** This presentation describes a research project on what police do in community policing. The study's purpose is to learn how police officers spend their time, who they encounter, what problems they address, and how they address them. The study is being conducted in Richmond, Virginia, where a team of researchers is conducting ride-a-long observations of patrol officers operating in a community policing framework.

*Tony Pate, Director of Research, Police Foundation*

**Evaluation of New York City Police Department's Model Precinct Program.** The New York City Police Department has committed itself to implement community-oriented policing throughout the city. A "model precinct" has been fully staffed to allow a pilot test of the operational effects of such a strategy. The lessons learned from that pilot test—about what works and what does not—will prove valuable not only to the New York City Police Department but to the entire policing world. The National Institute of Justice funded the Police Foundation to document and evaluate the process by which community policing is implemented in the "model precinct." This presentation provided a status report on that evaluation.

## Community Policing

*Janice Roehl, Vice President, Institute for Social Analysis*

**An Evaluation of Drug Enforcement Techniques Implemented within a POP Framework in Two Cities.** The Institute for Social Analysis' evaluation of drug enforcement strategies applied within a problem-oriented policing framework by the San Diego and Tulsa Police Departments is in its second year. The purposes of the study are to provide detailed descriptions of problem-solving behaviors employed by officers, assess the effectiveness of solutions implemented, and analyze the organizational environments in which the problem-oriented behavior takes place. Information was presented on findings to date in three areas: (1) problem-oriented policing characteristics in San Diego and Tulsa in terms of the types of problems addressed, solutions implemented, time period of intervention, and general information on problem-solving styles; (2) effectiveness data (reported crime rates and calls for service) in five POP target areas in Tulsa; and (3) highlights from a recently completed officer survey in San Diego, which concentrated on general attitudes and beliefs concerning problem-oriented and community policing.

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

**Implementation and Impacts of Innovative Policing Neighborhood Programs.** The Vera Institute of Justice is conducting an evaluation of the eight BJA-funded Innovative Neighborhood Oriented Policing (INOP) programs. The purpose of the INOP program is to provide police departments with funds to implement community policing approaches to drug demand reduction. The eight programs cover very small portions of each respective city and take place in widely diverse geographic locations such as New York City, Portland, Oregon, and Houston, Texas. Participating police departments range in size from about 155 to 27,000 officers. The research has relied primarily upon qualitative data, collected during three week-long visits per site. The data are gathered through individual and focus group interviews with police personnel, staff from government and private agencies involved in the local programs, and residents and business people in the communities where these programs operate. An interim report, submitted to NIJ in September 1991, provided descriptions of the eight programs. The final report, to be completed at the end of 1993, will contain the results of the analysis of the effectiveness of the programs with regard to drug-demand reduction, drug-related crime, quality of life, and police-community relations.

***ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS***  
**DRUGS, GANGS, AND PUBLIC HOUSING**

**Section Contents**

**Drugs and Public Housing—Develop Effective  
Police Response: Denver and  
New Orleans..... 63**

**Jurisdictions Unified for Drugs and  
Gang Enforcement (JUDGE) ..... 63**

**Narcotics Enforcement in Public Housing..... 64**

**Police Response to Drugs and Gangs..... 64**

**Street Gangs and Drug Sales ..... 64**

---

---

## DRUGS, GANGS AND PUBLIC HOUSING

*Sampson O. Annan, Deputy Director of Research, Police Foundation*

**Drugs and Public Housing—Develop Effective Police Response: Denver and New Orleans.** In August 1989, BJA funded police departments in Denver, Colorado, and New Orleans, Louisiana, to set up special narcotics enforcement units in public housing neighborhoods to address the problems of drug trafficking. The Police Foundation, with funding from NIJ, conducted a process and impact evaluation of the two cities' efforts. This presentation focused on the lessons learned about implementation of enforcement strategies in public housing developments in those two cities and on the impact of these strategies on the drug problem and on the quality of residents' life.

*Christine Curtis, Assistant Director, Criminal Justice Research Unit, San Diego Association of Governments*

**Jurisdictions Unified for Drugs and Gang Enforcement (JUDGE).** Recent increases in violent crime suggest that drug-related activities by gang members may be associated with the rise in violence. With limited resources available to most jurisdictions, a multi-agency approach is one means to identify, monitor, arrest, and prosecute gang members involved in drug use and sales. This research evaluates the impact of such a BJA-funded program. The research is being carried out by the San Diego Association of Governments, Criminal Justice Research Division. JUDGE task force members include police from several cities, prosecutors, and probation officers who work in a central location to target probation violators and apprehend new offenders with the goals of reducing criminal activities, including drug sales among gang members. A pre- and post-test control group design is being used to compare a sample of gang offenders targeted by JUDGE to a similar sample of gang members from a prior time period. Results of the study will identify those features of a multi-agency approach associated with successful outcomes.

## **Drugs, Gangs, and Public Housing**

*Terence Dunworth, Project Director, RAND Corporation*

**Narcotics Enforcement in Public Housing.** The goal of this study of drug crime in public housing is to provide an empirically-based description of drug and crime problems in public housing. The study is organized around three basic questions: (1) What is the nature of drug crime in public housing projects? (2) How does the rate of drug crime in public housing compare to rates of other types of crime? (3) How do rates of drug and other crime in public housing projects compare to rates in areas that do not contain public housing? The study addresses these questions by analyzing crime statistics in three sites: Los Angeles, California; Phoenix, Arizona; and Washington, DC. In each of these sites, police department data are used to calculate crime and arrest rates in a number of public housing projects. Crime and arrest rates are also calculated for "comparison areas," i.e., areas of private housing that are geographically and demographically similar to the public housing projects.

*John Eck, Associate Director of Research, Police Executive Research Forum*

**Police Response to Drugs and Gangs.** Under an NIJ grant, PERF undertook case studies of police responses to gangs by the Metro-Dade, Chicago, Kansas City, Austin, and San Diego Police Departments. Experienced police managers from other cities conducted the site visits and wrote reports with the assistance of PERF staff. Though all five sites recognize they have serious gang problems in their cities, they vary substantially in the way they organize their resources to address these problems. The contrasting approaches of these agencies to different types of gang problems was the subject of this presentation.

*Malcolm W. Klein, Professor, Social Science Research Institute, University of Southern California*

**Street Gangs and Drug Sales.** An earlier project on gang involvement in crack distribution in Central Los Angeles demonstrated that the level of gang involvement had been greatly over-stated by law enforcement and the media. Levels of sales-related violence attributable to gangs were also overstated. Our current project expands the investigation to two suburban areas, and to other drugs as well as crack. Results will not be available for a year or so. This depiction of street gangs suggests a severe limit on their capacity for effective drug distribution. The data so far supports this picture,



## **Drugs, Gangs, and Public Housing**

**although policymakers may take a different viewpoint. This disparity needs more open and dispassionate discussion.**

**ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS**  
**PROSECUTING AND ADJUDICATING**  
**OFFENDERS**

**Section Contents**

<b>Prosecution of Drug Cases:</b>	
<b>A National Assessment.....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>A Study of Involuntary Civil Commitment of</b>	
<b>Drug Dependent Persons .....</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Prosecuting Complex Drug Cases:</b>	
<b>A Program Assessment .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Evaluation of the Program for the</b>	
<b>Expedited Management of Drug Cases.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>To Evaluate Asset Seizure and Forfeiture</b>	
<b>Programs .....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>A Time Series Analysis of Drug</b>	
<b>Court Intervention.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Sentencing Practices for Drug Offenders:</b>	
<b>A National Assessment.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Eastside Wilmington Anti-Drug Abuse</b>	
<b>Program Evaluation.....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>Improving the Court Response to Drug</b>	
<b>Cases: A Program Assessment.....</b>	<b>71</b>

---

---

## PROSECUTING AND ADJUDICATING OFFENDERS

*Kenneth Coyle, Research Analyst, American Prosecutors Research Institute*

**Prosecution of Drug Cases: A National Assessment.** The Prosecution of Drug Cases project will provide a nationwide review and assessment of variation among drug prosecution programs involving coordination of efforts among jurisdictions, agencies within the same jurisdiction, and different levels of government. Specifically, the project will: (1) identify effective drug trafficking prosecution mechanisms; (2) develop a general assessment of obstacles to more effective prosecution efforts; and (3) articulate prosecutors' needs for new mechanisms to enhance drug prosecutions and diversion of drug cases. The proposed research activities involve the use of a mail survey to stratified samples of prosecutors. The survey will be self-administered, and will contain both open- and close-ended questions designed to gather information about mechanism focus, creation, implementation, and maintenance. The sample (n = 2,828) will be stratified according to size of population served by the prosecutor's office and geographic location. Emphasis will be placed on sampling larger jurisdictions as the majority of drug-trafficking prosecutions take place there. The second phase of the project involves assessment of specific drug prosecution mechanisms by site visits to selected prosecutor's offices. The site visits will produce detail-rich data not available through the standard survey approaches. The results of these research activities will be incorporated into a final project report for use by federal, state, and local officials.

*Thomas Diggs, Research Associate, National Center for State Courts*

**A Study of Involuntary Civil Commitment of Drug Dependent Persons.** This presentation summarized the results of a descriptive study of drug dependency commitment laws and practices in the United States in 1991. The NIJ-funded study was conducted by researchers of the Institute on Mental Disability and the National Center for State Courts. It included a review of

## **Prosecuting and Adjudicating Offenders**

relevant state and federal statutes and case law, a national telephone and mail survey of justice and social service officials, and field research in Boston, Minneapolis, and Tampa, three cities where commitment laws are used.

*Joan Jacoby, Executive Director, Jefferson Institute for Justice Studies*

**Prosecuting Complex Drug Cases: A Program Assessment.** The prosecution of complex drug cases differs from routine prosecutions because these cases make significant demands on time and resources. They require case management policies and practices that are not commonly employed by prosecutors, and they create a new set of decisions for the prosecutor to bring about successful dispositions. This paper presented preliminary results of a nationwide survey of prosecutors that forms the basis for this evaluation.

**Evaluation of the Program for the Expedited Management of Drug Cases.** Expedited Drug Case Management (EDCM) and Differentiated Case Management (DCM) programs represent the most important court reform since docketing became a science and court administrators became indispensable. In New Brunswick, NJ, the average time from charging to disposition dropped from 241 to 81 days; and in Philadelphia, up to 420 jail beds per day were freed up as a result of this program. This paper presented the results of the evaluation of EDCM programs at three sites.

**To Evaluate Asset Seizure and Forfeiture Programs.** The complexity of asset forfeiture programs and their unfamiliarity to the public and large parts of the criminal justice community have limited the use of one of our most powerful weapons to control drug usage and trafficking. This paper presented the results of a needs assessment survey and the evaluation of asset forfeiture programs in four jurisdictions.

*John Krimmel, Chief, Grants Monitoring Unit, Division of Criminal Justice, Trenton, NJ*

**A Time Series Analysis of Drug Court Intervention.** An interrupted time series analysis using Box-Jenkins ARIMA modeling was used to assess the impact on case-processing time and backlog reduction of drug court intervention in New Jersey. Certain counties participated in the intervention to create an environment for a classical experiment. This study is ongoing, but certain evaluation design issues were presented.

## Prosecuting and Adjudicating Offenders

*Raymond H. Milkman, Director, The Lazar Institute*

**Sentencing Practices for Drug Offenders: A National Assessment.** In order to improve knowledge about how the judiciary handles drug cases, the Lazar Institute is conducting a survey of approaches used by 300 jurisdictions to process and sentence adult drug offenders in felony courts. Judges and prosecutors received surveys in each jurisdiction and provided data about a wide range of topics such as intermediate sanctions, court system performance ratings, and analysis of charges, plea bargains, and sentences associated with "typical" drug cases. Lazar's presentation described the preliminary findings from the survey.

*Jack O'Connell, Director, Delaware Statistical Analysis Center, and Jorge Rodriguez, Research Specialist III, Delaware Statistical Analysis Center*

**Eastside Wilmington Anti-Drug Abuse Program Evaluation.** The State of Delaware revised its drug trafficking law in July 1989. The new law lowered the weight thresholds for a mandatory sentence. This year's impact study of the law, the second conducted by the Delaware Statistical Analysis Center, found that (1) lowering the weight threshold more than doubled the number of potential drug trafficking charges, (2) actual trafficking charges are at an all-time high, and (3) the drug trafficking law had a marginal deterrence effect but has contributed greatly to admissions to prison. This presentation focused on the evaluation's impact on political processes that shape criminal justice decision-making in Delaware, and updated materials presented at last year's conference.

*Marilyn Roberts, Deputy Director, Washington Office, National Center for State Courts, and Brian Lynch, Staff Associate, National Center for State Courts*

**Improving the Court Response to Drug Cases: A Program Assessment.** The project began on January 1, 1992, and has progressed through the stage of program identification and typology development.

***ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS***  
**INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS**

**Section Contents**

**Assessing the Impact of a Co-operated  
Boot Camp for Drug Offenders..... 75**

**Conceptual Framework, Supervision Issues..... 75**

**Boot Camp, Drug Treatment and Aftercare:  
An Evaluation Review ..... 75**

**Evaluation of Intensive Supervision  
Probation in Colorado ..... 76**

**Multi-Site Study of Shock Incarceration..... 76**

**The Effectiveness and Costs of Intensive  
Supervision for Drugs ..... 76**

**What Works in Delaware: Research  
and Evaluation Results ..... 77**

**Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders:  
Constructive Intervention ..... 77**

**The Impact of Short-Term Residential  
and Intensive Community Supervision..... 78**

---

---

## INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS

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

**Assessing the Impact of a Co-operated Boot Camp for Drug Offenders.** This research assesses the structure, administration, and impacts on criminal behavior of a jail-administered boot camp program operated by the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department. The L.A. RID program included a 90-day period of intensive probation in the boot camp. The presentation focused on types of services and programs made available to participants, selection and screening methods, costs, and preliminary recidivism results.

*Todd Clear, Vice President, National Council on Crime and Delinquency*

**Conceptual Framework, Supervision Issues.** A conceptual framework was presented for understanding the supervision issues raised by placing drug-related offenders on probation and parole. Implications of non-traditional intermediate sanctions were also discussed.

*Ernest L. Cowles, Assistant Professor, Crime Studies Center, Southern Illinois University*

**Boot Camp, Drug Treatment and Aftercare: An Evaluation Review.** The growth of shock incarceration or boot camp programs has occurred so rapidly that there has been little opportunity to evaluate the impact of common elements in these programs. One such element of particular note, due to the large number of younger drug offenders found in these programs, is drug treatment and education. This presentation examined some of the issues of drug treatment in boot camp programs, including the impact of highly structured environment, voluntary versus mandatory participation, appropriate treatment modalities, and the need for an aftercare component.

## **Intermediate Sanctions**

***Kim English, Manager of Research, Colorado Department of Public Safety, Division of Criminal Justice, and Suzanne Pullen, Research Analyst, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice***

**Evaluation of Intensive Supervision Probation in Colorado.** This study, which is still in progress, designs research for evaluation of an intensive supervision probation (ISP) program that targets drug offenders. This project documents differences in supervision/surveillance and treatment services delivered to the ISP clients and two comparison samples drawn from probation placement and community corrections cases. The study follows each case for 12 months after program termination. The presentation included the researchers' approach to managing a variety of methodological problems including obtaining comparable samples, gathering reliable data (on treatment, case management, and outcome), and defining program success.

***Doris MacKenzie, Associate Professor, University of Maryland, National Institute of Justice***

**Multi-Site Study of Shock Incarceration.** This multi-site study of shock incarceration examines boot camp prisons in eight different state jurisdictions. These sites were asked to participate in the study because they differed in characteristics that would be expected to have impact on the correctional systems and the individual participants. The process analysis of the study has been completed. This study demonstrated large differences in the boot camp programs among the states. Programs differed in entry and exit decisionmaking, rehabilitation and treatment activities, focus of program (work, drug treatment, or education), follow-up, and aftercare. Preliminary data analyses have been completed examining the impact of the program on offenders' attitudes toward the program and society. The presentation focused on the results of the process evaluation and on the preliminary analysis of attitude change.

***Joan Petersilia, Director of Criminal Justice Programs, RAND Corporation***

**The Effectiveness and Costs of Intensive Supervision for Drugs.** This presentation reported on results from a recently completed randomized field experiment testing the intensive supervision probation/parole (ISP) for drug-involved offenders. The ISP demonstration project, funded by BJA, included five jurisdictions: Contra Costa, California; Seattle, Washington; Des Moines, Iowa; Santa Fe, New Mexico; and Winchester, Virginia. Jurisdictions



## Intermediate Sanctions

developed ISP programs tailored to their own contexts, using the general ISP model developed by Georgia and New Jersey in the early 1980s. Results show that ISP offenders were seen more often, submitted more often to drug testing, received more drug counseling, and had higher levels of employment than their counterparts on routine probation/parole supervision. With respect to one-year recidivism outcomes, a higher proportion of ISP offenders had technical violations (primarily for drug use), but there was no difference between the two study groups in new criminal arrests. At the end of the one-year follow-up, more ISP offenders had been placed in jail or prison (mostly for technical violations). This policy drove system costs up. For ISP, these averaged just under \$8,000 annually per offender, versus about \$5,500 per offender for routine supervision. The presentation concluded with a discussion of how these results can inform future ISP research.

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

### **What Works in Delaware: Research and Evaluation Results.**

This presentation included a survey of a variety of evaluation types that have been conducted on Delaware drug initiatives. These included intensive outpatient treatment, community-based programs, intensive supervision probation, and mandatory incarceration for drug traffickers. These were used to illustrate different approaches to the drug problem and equally diverse approaches to evaluation of it.

*Jackson Toby, Professor of Sociology, Rutgers State University of New Jersey*

### **Boot Camps for Juvenile Offenders: Constructive Intervention.**

This presentation discusses three boot camps, financed by the U.S. Department of Justice, in Mobile, Alabama; Denver, Colorado; and Cleveland, Ohio. The boot camps were part of a controlled experiment testing whether boot camps constitute an effective correctional response for adjudicated juvenile delinquents. A tacit hypothesis of all three juvenile boot camps is that the mechanism by which external coercion leads to self-discipline, and thereby to control of anti-social impulses, is through recruits forming positive relationships with the boot camp staff, particularly with the most visible boot camp staff, the drill sergeants. Recruits claimed to have developed enhanced self-control, which they anticipated would serve them well in the community when they might need to restrain themselves in the face of criticism from employers, teachers, and parents.

## **Intermediate Sanctions**

*Susan Turner, Senior Researcher, RAND Corporation*

**The Impact of Short-Term Residential and Intensive Community Supervision.** Michigan's Department of Social Services combines two promising approaches in the design of the Nokomis Program, wilderness challenge programming and intensive community supervision. The objective of RAND's evaluation of the Nokomis Program is to determine whether an integrated three-month residential and nine-month intensive community supervision program provides a more cost-effective means of controlling delinquent youth and reducing subsequent criminal behavior and drug use than traditional 12-15 month residential placements. Using a classical experimental design, a sample of 199 youths were randomly assigned to the experimental Nokomis program or the control group from February to December 1992. They will be followed up for a period of at least 12 months. Individual-level data are being collected by interviews at three points in time: intake during placement, 12 months following placement, and again, if funding is continued, at 24 months following placement. These data include measures of self-reported delinquency and drug use, coping skills, self-esteem, and family functioning. Official record data, including demographics, prior criminal record, drug use history, and family attributes, are being coded at intake and at 24 months following placement. The intensity and characteristics of program services and activities are measured by program observation and the youths' 12-month interviews. As of July 1992, approximately one-half of the experimental youths have either completed the 12-month Nokomis program, or, if they failed, have been escalated to a training school. Preliminary analyses of the official record background information and the youth intake interviews show that there are few significant differences between the experimental and control groups.

## ***ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS***

### **DRUG TESTING AND TREATMENT IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**

#### **Section Contents**

<b>Drug Testing Throughout the Criminal Justice System.....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Demonstrating the Use of DUF Findings: Portland, Oregon and Denver, Colorado.....</b>	<b>81</b>
<b>Drug Treatment Within the Criminal Justice System: A Comprehensive Assessment .....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Drug Testing for Youthful Offenders on Parole Experimental Study.....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Evaluation of Drug Offender Treatment in Local Corrections.....</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>Divergent Trends in Illicit Drug Use.....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Drug Testing Technology/Focused Offender Disposition Program .....</b>	<b>83</b>
<b>Assessment of a Substance Abuse Program for Probationers.....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>Study of Impacts in the States of Implementing Drug Testing .....</b>	<b>84</b>
<b>St. Clair County Illinois Drug Testing Program: An Experimental Design.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Evaluation of South Dakota's Penitentiary Substance Abuse Program.....</b>	<b>85</b>
<b>Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC)....</b>	<b>86</b>

**ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS**

**DRUG TESTING AND TREATMENT IN THE  
CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**

**Section Contents**

<b>Drug Offender Treatment, Prevention, and Education.....</b>	<b>86</b>
<b>Maximizing Use of DUF Results for Planning and Policy Analysis .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Jail Substance Abuse Programs.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Analysis of Statewide DUF Data Collected from Illinois Arrestees.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>Special Initiative on Drug Program Evaluation – Therapeutic Community .....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Developing Jail-based Substance Abuse Programs: The Montgomery County Experience.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Urinalysis Test of Probationers and Parolees: Implementation Effectiveness.....</b>	<b>89</b>

---

---

## **DRUG TESTING AND TREATMENT IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM**

*David P. Cavanagh, Technical Director, Botec Analysis Corporation*

**Drug Testing Throughout the Criminal Justice System.** The Multnomah County Drug Testing and Evaluation (DTE) program is intended to help selected pre-trial arrestees and post-trial probationers and parolees to rid themselves of drug abusing behavior by providing random, weekly drug tests to clients and sanctioning those clients who fail to show or test positive for drugs. The program supplements testing with client drug evaluations and treatment recommendations. Botec Analysis Corporation and the Urban Institute are currently evaluating Multnomah County's DTE program with support provided by NIJ. The evaluation consists of both a process and impact evaluation. Preliminary process evaluation suggests that the program is hampered by a lack of sanctioning. A more detailed investigation of sanctioning within the program is underway.

*Marcia R. Chaiken, Research Director, LINC*

**Demonstrating the Use of DUF Findings: Portland, Oregon and Denver, Colorado.** This NIJ-funded project is designed to help organizations and jurisdictions make better use of DUF data, or urinalysis and self-report data similar to DUF data. The project involves one development demonstration site (Multnomah County, Oregon) and one test demonstration site (Denver, Colorado). In addition to in-depth interviews with demonstration site administrators, a telephone survey was conducted to determine innovative local uses of DUF data around the country. State and local agency directors and other policymakers reported using DUF results for a wide range of applications that were described in this presentation. Initial recommendations for increasing the usefulness of DUF data in all DUF sites were discussed.

## **Drug Testing and Treatment**

*Greg Falkin, Senior Researcher, National Drug Research Institute*

**Drug Treatment Within the Criminal Justice System: A Comprehensive Assessment.** Evaluation research findings have been used to support the recent expansion of drug treatment programs for offenders. This presentation reviews the evaluation research findings, particularly for programs that specialize in treating drug-dependent offenders, and provides a critique of the methodologies used in the research. Although findings favor drug treatment for offenders, there are a number of gaps and limitations in the research. The presentation focused on what policymakers, program planners, and criminal justice evaluators can do to improve the quality and reliability of evaluation studies.

*Rudy Haapanen, Research Program Specialist II, Parole and Classification Research Bureau, California Youth Authority*

**Drug Testing for Youthful Offenders on Parole Experimental Study.** In May 1990, NIJ and the California Youth Authority began a process of designing an experimental study to assess the effectiveness of drug testing for parolees. This process, which is not yet complete, sought to achieve an appropriate balance between having a strong, controlled experimental design, and having findings with clear policy implications for the department, that is, which reflect the realities of parole. This presentation focused on: (1) process and outcome evaluations, (2) how the issues were addressed and resolved, (3) the "final" research design, (4) additional issues identified during training, and more.

*Patricia Hardyman, Director of Research, National Council on Crime and Delinquency*

**Evaluation of Drug Offender Treatment in Local Corrections.** Evaluation of Drug Offender Treatment in Local Corrections will track post-incarceration results, focusing on arrest and drug usage, for matched control groups, of 100 each, at five program sites. (In all, the study will track 1,300 experimental cases and 1,130 control cases). The sites are: Westchester County, New York; New York City; Contra Costa County, California; Los Angeles County, California; and Santa Clara County, California. The programs are diverse in size, clientele profiles, in-custody program content, and aftercare services. This study provides detailed descriptions of the programs. It compares control and treatment group outcomes, overall and site-by-site, to assess program effectiveness. It uses multivariate analysis to determine the

## Drug Testing and Treatment

relative impact on program outcomes of a large number of particular program components, offender characteristics, and program environment factors.

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

**Divergent Trends in Illicit Drug Use.** This presentation examined whether drug use is decreasing in the United States. Data from several national studies lead to divergent conclusions regarding trends in illicit drug use in the USA. Two major population studies point to a downturn in drug use dating to the late 1970s. However, a study of drug-related deaths and hospital emergency room visits, shows increases in these events in recent years. Studies also show drug use, especially cocaine use, continuing to increase among criminals. This presentation suggested possible explanations for the divergent trends. Most notably, it suggested that lags between trends in the general population versus certain subgroups, and methodological differences in the compared studies account for most of the variation in the trend estimates. The paper concluded that illicit drug use is decreasing in the USA.

*John Hepburn, Director, School of Justice Studies, Arizona State University*

**Drug Testing Technology/Focused Offender Disposition Program.** NASADAD's Focused Offender Disposition program used a quasiexperimental design in both Birmingham and Phoenix to measure the effects of needs assessment and treatment with drug-using probationers. The evaluation uses survival function models of success on probation to examine (1) the prediction accuracy of NASADAD's Offender Profile Index and (2) the differences in Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC) treatment versus urinations monitoring alone.

The impact of the Maricopa County Demand Reduction Program's practice of user accountability ("Do Drugs. Do Time") was evaluated in terms of changes in law enforcement, diversion to treatment, and prosecution since the program's implementation. Recidivism of diversion-eligible offenders was examined to assess the effect of entry into the TASC treatment program for casual drug users.

## **Drug Testing and Treatment**

*Darlanne Hocter, Assistant Research Analyst, Criminal Justice Research Unit, San Diego Association of Governments*

### **Assessment of a Substance Abuse Program for Probationers.**

While national surveys suggest a decline in drug abuse in the general community, drug abuse in the criminal population remains consistently high. Most policymakers and practitioners recognize the need for integrating enforcement and treatment approaches as a means to reduce both crime and drug abuse. Recent RAND studies of intensive supervision programs reveal that such supervision may be effective with drug using offenders if drug treatment is included. A San Diego program called A Substance Abuse Program for Probationers (ASAPP), combines intensive probation supervision with drug treatment by co-locating staff who collectively develop case management plans. The program includes strict surveillance, drug testing, and graduated sanctions. Probationers with drug conditions also participate in court-ordered counseling, drug education classes, life skills training, and self-esteem sessions two to three times a week. The San Diego Association of Governments, Criminal Justice Research Division, is conducting a process and impact assessment of the program. Program participants are matched with a similar group of probationers who are not part of ASAPP. The evaluation is tracking probationers' activities in the program, level of involvement, and subsequent criminal activity and drug abuse. Other areas to be observed for outcome include employment, education, and nature of significant relationships. Regression analysis will be used to identify characteristics of programs and offenders associated with successful outcomes. This program also demonstrates the realities of conducting an assessment of an evolving program.

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

**Study of Impacts in the States of Implementing Drug Testing.** The National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) is completing work on a research project to assess the fiscal and other impacts of drug testing among certain criminal justice populations in states and localities. The study focuses on drug testing of adult criminal justice populations in both states and substate programs, including arrestees in prisons and jails, from arrest to conviction, and convicted offenders on supervised release in the community. This NIJ-funded study has three main objectives: (1) to identify, describe, and analyze the cost and other impacts of drug testing criminal justice populations; (2) to gain insight into the current status of drug testing programs in use by state and



## Drug Testing and Treatment

local jurisdictions; and (3) to provide guidance for government officials on costs involved in implementing drug testing among criminal justice populations. Research has included an extensive literature search; interviews; review of evolving legal issues; and a comprehensive national survey. Study products that will assist state and federal officials to assess drug testing options include a national overview of the nature and extent of state drug testing programs for the criminal justice populations covered by the study, hypothetical scenarios that apply information from current drug testing practices to possible drug testing policies, and spreadsheet-based computerized models that will enable jurisdictions to project the costs of alternative drug testing policies and to provide a common basis for evaluation of competing proposals.

*Edwin Kennedy, Senior Analyst, Drug Information Analysis Center, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority*

**St. Clair County Illinois Drug Testing Program: An Experimental Design.** A number of studies have concluded that drug testing deters drug use within involuntary populations. These studies offer encouraging and valuable evidence of the value of drug testing, but leave unanswered questions about the precise nature of the relationship between illicit drug use and the testing/feedback cycle. Does drug testing, or the threat of testing, produce the observed effect, or is feedback an essential ingredient? Alternatively, is it possible that drug deterrence begins with urine specimen collection? That is, does the requirement to provide a specimen create enough perceived vulnerability to deter drug use as long as the testing threat is real? The Authority used a true experimental pretest-posttest control group design to study the relationships in Illinois' largest intensive supervision program for high-risk drug abusing probationers. The study concluded that as long as urine specimens are collected, full testing and feedback are no more effective in deterring drug use than is partial testing and feedback. "Partial" testing and feedback was defined as a one-third random sample of specimens collected from the treatment group. All control group specimens involved testing and feedback. The study also examined self-disclosure validity and found no difference between the two groups.

*Gary Leonardson, Research Consultant, South Dakota Department of Corrections*

**Evaluation of South Dakota's Penitentiary Substance Abuse Program.** A drug and alcohol treatment program was started in recent years in the Department of Corrections in South Dakota. It was the first systematic

## **Drug Testing and Treatment**

attempt to provide substance abuse programs to persons in the state penitentiary system. All inmate drug or alcohol treatment clients receive three evaluations: (1) counselor's evaluation of how well the clients performed, (2) client's evaluation of the programs, and (3) follow up to measure client outcomes (arrests, drinking, working, education) after leaving the program. The follow-up is administered three months after parole or one year after leaving the penitentiary. The presentation focused on the first 200 persons for whom information has been collected.

*Douglas Longshore, Principal Investigator, UCLA Neuropsychiatric Institute, Drug Abuse Research Group*

**Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime (TASC).** This NIDA-funded evaluation will conduct data collection at TASC programs in six cities between 1992 and 1994. The evaluation will study program processes as well as outcomes. Processes to be studied include program history, organization, community context, and other factors. Outcomes include drug use, crime, HIV risk behaviors, employment, and interpersonal behavior. The outcome evaluation features random assignment of 400 eligible offenders in each city to TASC or to routine criminal justice processing. Findings will be used to identify offender characteristics associated with favorable treatment outcomes and to develop guidelines for TASC program implementation.

*C. Aaron McNeece, Director, Florida State University Institute for Health and Human Services Research, and Charles M. Daly, Faculty Member, Florida State University Institute for Health and Human Services Research*

**Drug Offender Treatment, Prevention, and Education.** In 1990, the Institute for Health and Human Services Research at Florida State University contracted with the Department of Community Affairs, Bureau of Public Safety Management, to evaluate drug offender treatment, prevention, and education programs funded under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act. The methodology included interviews with program personnel, community agencies, courts, law enforcement, and others. A sample of records were abstracted in each program, and record checks were conducted with the Florida Department of Law Enforcement and the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. Summary findings from the study of over 30 juvenile and adult programs were presented.

## **Drug Testing and Treatment**

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

### **Maximizing Use of DUF Results for Planning and Policy Analysis.**

This was a presentation on maximizing the use of Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) results for planning and policymaking. The association between drugs and crime requires enforcement and treatment programs that target drug-abusing offenders. To develop effective program strategies, policymakers need objective information about the nature and extent of drug abuse in the population. The DUF program provides such a barometer and allows a means to measure the impact of newly-implemented programs. This research examined the use of DUF information in the DUF sites. Interviews with project managers and surveys of over 100 policymakers identified how the DUF data are used and suggested ways to improve the dissemination and use of DUF to change strategies.

*Roger Peters, Assistant Professor, Department of Law and Mental Health, Florida Mental Health Institute, University of South Florida*

**Jail Substance Abuse Programs.** Results from the BJA-sponsored national survey of jail substance abuse programs indicate that only a small fraction of drug-involved inmates participate in treatment services. Key findings from the survey and survey methodology were discussed. The presentation also highlighted findings from the recent evaluation of the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office Substance Abuse Treatment program, providing preliminary evidence for the effectiveness of jail treatment interventions. Current jail evaluation initiatives and directions for future research efforts were discussed.

*Ethel Mull, Vice President, Treatment Alternatives for Special Clients, Chicago, IL*

### **Analysis of Statewide DUF Data Collected from Illinois Arrestees.**

In this presentation, an analysis of the data obtained from TASC's statewide (Illinois) DUF study was presented. The following were discussed: (1) rationale for expanding the Chicago DUF project statewide, (2) site selections, (3) methodology, (4) findings, (5) implications for future statewide testing. The presentation discussed the efficacy of replicating such a study in other states where there is interest in having information on drug use patterns.

## **Drug Testing and Treatment**

*Judy Schiff, Senior Evaluator, Georgia Department of Corrections*

**Special Initiative on Drug Program Evaluation—Therapeutic Community.** In August 1990, the Georgia Department of Corrections received funds from BJA to establish two therapeutic communities for the treatment of substance abuse within the prison setting. In October 1990, the Department received a grant from NIJ to evaluate the program. The evaluation period covers initial start-ups of both programs through June 1992. The first year was a process evaluation, which described the history and development of the prison setting therapeutic communities. The second year assessed program implementation and performance. Program participants and dropouts are tracked for one year after their release. Findings include analyses of program operations, effectiveness, outcomes, and impact in terms of individual participants and comparison groups.

*Faye Taxman, Acting Director, Montgomery County Criminal Justice Commission*

**Developing Jail-based Substance Abuse Programs: The Montgomery County Experience.** Montgomery County, Maryland, is one of three demonstration programs funded by the Office of Treatment Improvement, Department of Health and Human Services, to implement a jail-based addiction treatment program. The Montgomery County program is geared to pretrial defendants remaining in an incarcerated status for short periods of time. The evaluation includes both a process and impact evaluation. The impact evaluation uses random assignment of offenders to the treatment program to assess the effects of treatment on relapse, recidivism, and stability in the community. This paper presents an overview of the program processes and results from the first 18 months of operation. The discussion includes (1) differences in operational procedures on offenders receiving treatment services; (2) organizational, philosophical, and criminal justice system barriers that affect treatment programs in a jail environment; (3) integrating community-based services into the program; and (4) developing programs that meet offender needs. The process evaluation shows that barriers can be overcome by developing an infrastructure for the program that goes across organizational lines. This infrastructure provides a better service delivery system.

*Susan Turner, Senior Researcher, RAND Corporation*

**Urinalysis Test of Probationers and Parolees: Implementation Effectiveness.** In a Washington work release program, research has consistently shown high recidivism rates for offenders released from prison. One of the possible causes has been identified as lack of transitional services such as employment opportunities and job training for offenders returning to the community. Prison work-release programs directly respond to this need. It is believed that those offenders who return to the community through work-release have higher rates of employment, lower recidivism rates, and better community adjustment. While work-release has a lot of intuitive appeal, little empirical work has been done on its effectiveness. The current study addresses this need with a comprehensive evaluation of the work-release program in the State of Washington. The evaluation plan is a cooperative effort between the Washington Department of Corrections, Pioneer Human Services, and RAND. The project has completed a statewide review of how Washington implemented work-release. Ongoing data collection efforts entail a detailed case study by Pioneer Human Services and a randomized experiment in which offenders are assigned to work-release or to serve out their sentences in prison. Data sources include both official records and personal interviews.

**ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS**  
**EVALUATING COMMUNITY INITIATIVES**

**Section Contents**

<b>Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth (SIHRY) .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>National Evaluation of the Community Partnership Program .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Study of Effective Evaluation Methods .....</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>Community Response to Crack .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Develop a Practitioners Guide to Crime Prevention Thru Environmental Design .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Current Practice in Designing Crime Free Environments .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Anti-Drug Initiatives in Small Cities and Towns: A Program Assessment .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Anticipating and Combating Community Decay and Crime .....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Eastside Wilmington Anti-Drug Abuse Program Evaluation .....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Past and Future Directions of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education .....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>An Evaluation of Drug Enforcement Techniques Implemented within a POP Framework in Two Cities .....</b>	<b>97</b>

---

---

## EVALUATING COMMUNITY INITIATIVES

*Diane Biallargeon and Janice Hirota, Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, Columbia University*

**Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth (SIHRY).** This program is a joint undertaking of the Department of Justice, through BJA, and the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, Columbia University. Support is also provided by the Ford, Annie E. Casey, and Rockefeller Foundations and the Pew Charitable Trusts. This multi-site demonstration research program, which began in Fall 1992, was described. An overview of the research questions and corresponding research strategy was presented. The presentation also discussed the documentation study planned for the project, including overall areas of inquiry, methodology, and some already emerging research themes.

*Royer Cook, President, Institute for Social Analysis*

**National Evaluation of the Community Partnership Program.** The Community Partnership program, sponsored by the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, is based on the premise that alcohol and drug abuse prevention efforts are best implemented and sustained through the coordinated efforts of a coalition of key organizations in the community. OSAP has funded community partnerships in 251 communities across the country for a period of five years. This paper presented the design and methods of the national evaluation of the Community Partnership program, along with a brief discussion of interim findings.

*Lynn A. Curtis, President, The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, and Keith A. Baker, Deputy Director of Education, The Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation*

**Study of Effective Evaluation Methods.** Evaluations of most national, state, and local programs against drugs and crime are based more on public relations than on good science. In the absence of sound evaluations, the

## **Evaluating Community Initiatives**

likelihood is that most programs of this kind will continue to be supported more because they fit the political fashion of the moment or because they are able to capture media attention than because of their demonstrated effectiveness. In a time of inevitable limited resources, we can't afford that. A careful study of evaluation methods by the General Accounting Office is in order.

For community-based drug prevention in the inner city, nonprofit organizations work often with only small numbers of youth at any one time—typically 20 to 100. Program interventions sometimes are defuse, insufficiently funded, and not long enough to produce impact. Consequently, we need to develop a better balance between valid and reliable evaluations and street savvy evaluations that are reasonable in cost. Evaluations should follow the treatment group and control or comparison groups for 36 to 48 months. Experience shows that impacts may take that long to show up. Our interest should be in treatments whose impacts are long-lasting, not those which briefly appear and then vanish. Measures of change are needed among both at-risk youth and at the community level.

Whenever possible, random assignment to treatment and control groups should be used, although carefully selected comparison groups need to replace random controls in some circumstances. Extended time series designs may help to offset the weaknesses in the use of comparison (quasi-experimental designs) rather than control groups (true experiments). Proximate measures are insufficient. Ultimate outcome measures focusing on education, crime, substance abuse, and employment are more important. Community surveys are quite expensive and often not productive. Therefore, in some cases, existing police data should be used instead, both to examine crime rates within a community and to create comparison neighborhoods. Surveys of local merchants, before and after the intervention, may be useful. Other sources of data, as appropriate, should include changes in land use patterns and school records.

For both individual and community interventions, these approaches to impact measures should be supplemented by process measures over the same time period. If scarce resources require trade-offs between impact and process measures, impact measures should be favored.



## Evaluating Community Initiatives

*Robert Davis, Research Director, Victim Service Agency, New York, NY*

**Community Response to Crack.** Since the mid-1980s, citizens have joined ranks with police to wage the war against drugs. Citizen efforts to combat drugs have appeared in hundreds of communities across the country in forms ranging from visible street patrols to anonymous telephone hotlines. This investigation provides one of the first systematic looks at community anti-drug programs.

*Deane Evans, Director, American Institute of Architects*

**Develop a Practitioners Guide to Crime Prevention Thru Environmental Design.** The AIA/ACSA Council on Architectural Research, on behalf of its Justice Facilities Research Program, is undertaking research coordination, documentation, and information dissemination activities in order to expand awareness, understanding, and crime prevention tactics through use of environmental design principles (CPTED) in justice facilities. The topic of security design is of ongoing concern to the American Institute of Architects, and the proposed work effort builds on and expands AIA activities in this area. The presentation reported on the results of this research effort to date.

*Marcus Felson, Professor, Social Science Research Institute, University of Southern California*

**Current Practice in Designing Crime Free Environments.** Can drug abuse be prevented or reduced through environmental design? This presentation began with a brief statement of the "routine activity approach" and "designing out crime." The latter included changing the environment, not just buildings and grounds, but also how they are used, modifying the conduct of ordinary business to make crime less plentiful. Several examples were given for designing out drug abuse and drug sales. The idea is to make offenders less efficient as well as less numerous.

*James Garofalo, Director, Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections, Southern Illinois University*

**Anti-Drug Initiatives in Small Cities and Towns: A Program Assessment.** Most research on anti-drug initiatives has been conducted in large cities. However, there are major differences between large and small communities, and it seems reasonable to expect that the effectiveness of

## **Evaluating Community Initiatives**

different drug control strategies will vary according to community size. The project uses a three-stage sampling and data collection process to: (1) examine the nature and extent of drug problems in small cities and towns, (2) develop an empirically-based typology of anti-drug initiatives in small communities, and (3) identify promising program models. The presentation described the rationale for the study, the sampling and data collection procedures that are to be used, and the kinds of results that the projects should generate.

*Adele Harrell, Senior Research Analyst, Urban Institute*

**Anticipating and Combating Community Decay and Crime.** The presentation included an overview of issues in community decay, crime, and the objectives and procedures currently used to identify key research issues, strategies for anticipating community decay, and combating crime.

*Jack O'Connell, Director, Delaware Statistical Analysis Center*

**Eastside Wilmington Anti-Drug Abuse Program Evaluation.** The Eastside Wilmington project is a federal, state, and locally-funded project started in 1989. The purposes of the project are threefold: (1) detention and arrest of drug offenders through the team policing effort; (2) unity among local residents against illicit drugs through neighborhood organization; (3) resistance to illicit drugs and promotion of an improved quality of life through the direct provision of counseling, job assistance, day care, and education. The presentation reported on progress and successes to date.

*Christopher Ringwalt, Senior Health Analyst, Research Triangle Institute*

**Past and Future Directions of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education.** This presentation gave preliminary findings from the ongoing NIJ-sponsored study, *Past and Future Directions of the DARE Program*, which is being conducted by Dr. Richard Clayton of the University of Kentucky. Included will be an estimation of DARE's prevalence nationwide and a discussion of selected issues pertaining to DARE's organization, administration, and implementation at the regional, state, and local levels. Dr. Ringwalt reported results from a series of discussions with staff from the Regional Training Centers. He reported key results from surveys of state DARE coordinators and a representative sample of drug prevention coordinators in school districts both with and without DARE.

*Janice Roehl, Vice President, Institute for Social Analysis*

**An Evaluation of Drug Enforcement Techniques Implemented within a POP Framework in Two Cities.** This presentation was on the Institute for Social Analysis' national assessment of community-based anti-drug initiatives started in March 1992. The study provides a national overview of efforts by communities to fight neighborhood drug problems and to launch prevention efforts aimed at the underlying causes of drug use. The assessment includes a national survey of community-based efforts followed by a more extensive assessment of representative model programs. The literature search has identified two groups of potential taxonomic variables: organizational elements (composition, incentives, decisionmaking rules, leadership, maintenance, and relationships with external resources); and strategies (community mobilization, education and awareness, housing, citizen-police efforts, prevention, and political action).

***ABSTRACTS OF PRESENTATIONS***  
**EVALUATING SYSTEMWIDE EFFORTS**

**Section Contents**

**Using OBTS in Evaluating Drug Control Initiatives:  
Problems and Promise ..... 101**

**Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of  
Criminal History Information Systems..... 101**

**National Assessment of 1988 Anti-Drug  
Abuse Act ..... 101**

**Expanding the Applications of DUF Data..... 102**

**Evaluation of National Crime Prevention Media  
Campaign: 'Take A Bite Out of Crime' ..... 102**

**Evaluation Strategy—What Is Success  
and How Do We Measure It..... 102**

**Systemic Intervention Strategies ..... 103**

**FBI Internal Evaluation..... 103**

**Evaluation of State Criminal History Systems..... 104**

---

## EVALUATING SYSTEMWIDE EFFORTS

*Allan R. Barnes, Professor, Alaska Statistical Analysis Unit,  
University of Alaska-Anchorage*

**Using OBTS in Evaluating Drug Control Initiatives: Problems and Promise.** Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS) data have the potential to be an effective tool for evaluating justice system performance in drug control initiatives. New initiatives that impact the justice system, i.e., prosecution and court-related programs, are particularly suited to OBTS analysis. There are limitations in using OBTS data to answer many important questions. This presentation focused on the potential uses and limitations of OBTS data, and presented suggested improvements to OBTS.

*Sheila Barton, Director of Law and Policy, SEARCH Group, Inc.*

**Criminal Justice Information Policy: Survey of Criminal History Information Systems.** This presentation focused on the nationwide survey of state criminal history repositories conducted by SEARCH in 1990. The survey presented a comprehensive review of the nation's criminal history systems and established a baseline against which future advances can be measured. The report of the results was published by BJS in March 1991. The report covered topics such as number of criminal records maintained, level of automation, and the extent to which records include disposition data. The presentation included a discussion of plans to replicate the survey using 1992 data.

*Terry Dunworth, Project Director, RAND Corporation*

**National Assessment of 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act.** The 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act established a group of programs to provide financial and technical support for state and local jurisdictions to combat drug abuse and drug-related crime. The RAND program assessment of the Act will assess the consequences of these federal activities for state and local drug control systems. The assessment is organized around three central questions: (1) How have anti-drug abuse grants been distributed across various types of drug and crime

## **Evaluating Systemwide Efforts**

control initiatives and across jurisdictions? (2) What have been the consequences of the conceptual framework of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act, i.e., use of formula and discretionary grants, emphasis on state planning, and so on? To what extent might these conceptual features be open to change, and with what possible effects? (3) How have the federal activities undertaken as a result of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act (grants, training, technical assistance, research, evaluation) affected state and local innovation in criminal justice and drug control? Each of these questions was the subject of a stand-alone report. An additional final report, which synthesized the three major components of the assessment as well as previous research in this area, was released at the assessment's conclusion.

*Adele Harrell, Senior Research Analyst, Urban Institute, Washington, DC*

**Expanding the Applications of DUF Data.** The presentation focused on the problem of interpreting often divergent trends in multiple indicators of drug abuse. A conceptual framework based on patterns of drug diffusion and individual drug use careers was presented. Findings on trends in initial booking urinalysis tests of adult arrestees in Washington, DC, and community drug problems from 1984 to 1990 were also discussed.

*Garret J. O'Keefe, Professor, Department of Agricultural Journalism, Madison, WI*

**Evaluation of National Crime Prevention Media Campaign: "Take A Bite Out of Crime."** An overview was given of the research background and methodology for the ongoing evaluation of the public impact of the national crime prevention media campaign, *Take a Bite Out of Crime*. A primary goal is to make empirically-based recommendations for future media information campaigns on crime and drug abuse prevention. The study involves national sample surveys of crime prevention practitioners, media gatekeepers, and citizens, as well as analysis of campaign messages and themes.

*Robert E. Peterson, Director, Office of Drug Control Policy, Lansing, MI*

**Evaluation Strategy—What Is Success and How Do We Measure It.** This presentation addressed the question, "Are we asking the wrong questions?" Law enforcement has been tremendously successful at arresting

## Evaluating Systemwide Efforts

and convicting drug offenders, seizing illicit drugs, and obtaining forfeitures. In Michigan, standard performance measures for law enforcement improved by nearly 97% with a 35% increase in funds, a three for one return on the dollar. But if we ask if our communities are three times safer, or our neighborhoods three times better, do we get a different result? Maybe it's time to start asking.

*Roger K. Przybylski, Director, Drug Information Analysis Center, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority*

**Systemic Intervention Strategies.** The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority's Drug Information and Analysis Center (DIAC) works to improve the effectiveness of drug control efforts in Illinois by providing policymakers with sound information on the extent and nature of the drug problem and the impact of the justice system's response. The DIAC is also responsible for a multi-faceted evaluation initiative aimed at assessing the implementation and impact of drug control and system improvement programs throughout the state. Multiple drug evaluation projects designed to determine "what works" are carried out by DIAC staff or through subcontracts with outside organizations such as universities. This presentation discussed (1) recent analyses of repetitive offender processing that suggest the justice system needs a different approach based on early and intensive intervention, and (2) impact evaluation research on selected programs designed with "systemic intervention", e.g., each program attacks the drug problem through interagency or interdisciplinary collaboration. Projects discussed include evaluations of the Cook County Adult Probation Home Confinement/Drug Surveillance program, the Cook County State's Attorney's Narcotics Nuisance Abatement program, and the Illinois Department of Corrections' PRESTART program. Program operation, research design, and methodology were reviewed for each evaluation.

*Richard C. Sonnichsen, Deputy Assistant Director, Office of Program Evaluation and Audits, Federal Bureau of Investigation*

**FBI Internal Evaluation.** The FBI has developed a unique internal evaluation staff, using Special Agents as evaluators as part of their administrative advancement progress. This evaluation staff has been able to successfully impact the organization and can demonstrate significant changes to the organization. Effectiveness of this change agent capability is due, in part, to the reporting of the evaluators to the Director, their credibility and competency, and their ability to adapt evaluation processes to the decision-making apparatus of the organization.

## **Evaluating Systemwide Efforts**

*James M. Tien, Vice President/Treasurer, Queues Enforth Development, Inc.*

**Evaluation of State Criminal History Systems.** The United States Justice Department recently embarked on a multi-faceted effort to improve the quality of state criminal history records. A key component of this effort is a three-year Criminal History Record Improvement (CHRI) grant program, administered by BJA and BJS. It is designed to fund data quality improvement projects at various state and local agencies responsible for collecting or contributing to criminal history files. As of March 1992, a total of 50 grants totaling \$17 million had been awarded to 45 States. Given the substantial level of federal commitment to the program and the desire to assess and share the program experience, the Justice Department recognized the need for an overall evaluation of the CHRI program. Queues Enforth Development (QED), Inc., began the evaluation in March 1992. QED's two-year study effort is entitled Criminal History Record Improvement Evaluation and Guide (CHRIEG). The initial deliverable of this CHRIEG study is a preliminary assessment of the CHRI program. The primary objective of the assessment is to obtain an understanding and broad overview of the CHRI-funded efforts and to provide the basis for developing an effective data collection plan.



---

---

## RELATED WORKSHOPS

*Mary Causey, Pittsburgh Department of Public Safety, and  
Kimberly Glenn, San Diego Police Department*

During the past 18 months, the School of Urban and Public Affairs (SUPA) at Carnegie Mellon University has been working with the City of Pittsburgh Public Safety Department, City Information Systems, and City Planning on the NIJ-funded Drug Market Analysis Program (DMAP). The program is developing a computerized geographical information system with crime analysis capabilities for use in law enforcement efforts directed against local drug markets, especially open drug trafficking on the streets and in public places. The focus of the program is to disrupt local street markets with an array of enforcement approaches but with emphasis on evaluating two strategies that use multi-agency task forces. Samples of computer generated maps used by the enforcement unit and a brief summary of three specific applications already used during the past six months were presented. A brief outline of DMAP uses were shown along with second phase proposals to demonstrate the Drug Market Analysis Program.

*Kenneth Nimmich, Special Agent/Section Chief, FBI Laboratory*

The FBI Laboratory is leading the forensic community into the 21st Century with its application of innovative technology, DNA technology, computer database (CODIS), computer imaging of firearms ammunition components (DRUGFIRE), computer imagery, and computer graphics. With computers being used by criminals, the Magnetic Media and CART initiatives help to fight the modern sophisticated criminal. This workshop presented some of these technologies.

## **Related Workshops**

***Geoffrey P. Alpert, Professor, College of Criminal Justice, University of South Carolina, Timothy Bynum, Professor, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, Richard Kern, Director, Criminal Justice Research Center, Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, Terence Dunworth, Project Director, RAND Corporation, and Tony Fabelo, Executive Director, Criminal Justice Policy Council, Austin, TX***

The responsibilities of many state agencies include evaluations of criminal justice programs funded within their states. Some state agencies have in-house capabilities for conducting evaluations while others have contracted with universities or other organizations to conduct evaluations. This roundtable allowed conference participants to discuss problems associated with building and improving their evaluation capabilities. Roundtable panel members described the status of evaluation capabilities in several states and the steps that states are taking to improve their capabilities. Participants were encouraged to discuss their experiences in building evaluation capabilities at the state level.

***James R. Coldren, Jr., Director of Research, Justice Research and Statistics Association***

This practice-oriented workshop provided an introduction to performance measurement, specifically as it relates to evaluating drug control and criminal justice system improvement programs. Participants were provided an overview of developing performance measurement, including definition of the concept, how performance measurement differs from other measurement problems in evaluation research, and how performance measurement fits into the context of other evaluation activities. Examples of applications of performance measurement in the field were drawn from BJA performance data on multijurisdictional drug control task forces and from projects in the recently published compendium of state and local drug program assessment and evaluation results. Participants were engaged in an assessment of how well drug control program and strategy performance measurements are being conducted, improvements that should be made in performance measurement efforts at state and local levels, and capacity building efforts that will assist in making these improvements.

## Related Workshops

*Paul Lavrakas, Director, Northwestern University Survey Laboratory*

Unless one can conduct surveys that have sufficient accuracy to provide findings that can reasonably advise policy decisions, survey research should not be funded, to save otherwise wasted dollars. This was an interactive workshop with a comprehensive review of validity issues in general survey research and as related to evaluating drug control and other anti-crime initiatives. The concept of "Total Survey Error" provided the framework for instruction. Practical discussion was presented on issues related to sampling error, noncoverage error, nonresponse error, and measurement error (including interviewer error, respondent error, and questionnaire error). Workshop participants were afforded an opportunity to ask questions. Participants were given a more confident sense of what issues they should pay particular attention to when planning to fund, conduct, and/or interpret a survey.

*Christy Visher, Deputy Director, Office of Criminal Justice Research, National Institute of Justice, and Pamela Lattimore, Senior Research Associate, National Institute of Justice*

Historically, recidivism has been the most important measure of the effectiveness of criminal justice policies and programs. Conceptually, recidivism refers to the return to criminal activity of those previously identified as criminals. This return to criminal activity is seldom observed. Typically, therefore, recidivism is measured by the criminal justice system response to some criminal behavior, e.g., rearrest, reconviction, or reincarceration. The simplest measure of recidivism is the observation of whether or not the recidivism was observed during some fixed period. For example, in comparing two groups, one of which has participated in a special program, an evaluator might find that 30 percent of one group and 25 percent of the other had been rearrested during a twelve-month observation period. More recently, evaluators have developed recidivism models that can be used to estimate the probability that individuals with specific characteristics will show recidivism within a set period of time. Other models estimate the mean time to recidivism as a function of individual characteristics. This workshop discussed various measures of recidivism. Additionally, the advantages and disadvantages of the different models will be discussed. Data from the California Youth Authority and an evaluation conducted in North Carolina were used to demonstrate the concepts and models.

---

---

## APPENDIX A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION FOR CONFERENCE PRESENTERS

### *Geoffrey P. Alpert (See Workshops, p. 106)*

Dr. Alpert is a Professor in the College of Criminal Justice at the University of South Carolina and a Research Professor at the Institute of Public Affairs. He has extensive experience in criminal justice research. Dr. Alpert's areas of expertise are in law enforcement, community policing, and research methods. He has conducted research on police use of deadly force, police pursuits, firearm use, police behavior in multi-ethnic settings, and commercial security needs. He received an M.A. from the University of Oregon and a Ph.D. from Washington State University.

### *Sampson O. Annan (Abstract Section, p. 63)*

Mr. Annan has been a member of the Police Foundation research staff since 1982. He is currently the Deputy Research Director for the Foundation. Mr. Annan has more than 18 years experience in survey research and program evaluation. He has managed numerous evaluation research projects, including surveys for fear of crime experiments, anti-crime programs in public housing projects, police effectiveness study, modern policing and the control of illegal drugs, and spouse assault experiments. He recently completed an evaluation of narcotics enforcement in public housing projects conducted by the Police Foundation in Denver and New Orleans. Mr. Annan holds a B.S. degree in Psychology and has done graduate studies in Industrial Psychology.

### *James Austin (Abstract Section, p. 75)*

Dr. Austin is the Executive Vice President of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD). Prior to joining NCCD in 1974, he was employed by the Illinois Department of Corrections as a correctional sociologist at Stateville and Joliet Penitentiaries. He has written several articles on prison classification, prison population projections, and alternatives to incarceration. He earned his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of California at Davis.

*Allan R. Barnes (Abstract Section, p. 101)*

Dr. Barnes is an Associate Professor of Justice at the University of Alaska in Anchorage and currently teaches courses on research methods, comparative justice systems, and theories of crime and crime prevention. He is also the Director of the Alaska Justice Statistical Analysis Unit and represents the state in the National Drug Consortium. Much of his current research has focused on using Alaska OBTS for policymaking decisions. Dr. Barnes also has experience as a police officer, parole and probation officer, prison psychologist, and Assistant Director of a resident adult felon treatment center. He has worked with and evaluated programs at the local, state, and federal levels. Dr. Barnes received an M.A. in Clinical Psychology from the University of Missouri and a Ph.D. in Criminology from Florida State University.

*Sheila Barton (Abstract Section, p. 101)*

As Director of the Law and Policy Program of SEARCH, the national consortium for justice information and statistics, Sheila Barton is responsible for the development and implementation of a multifaceted program of public policy analysis, documentation of state and federal information policy development, education and assistance to state and local policymakers, the conduct of national conferences and workshops on justice information policy issues, and the publication of timely studies on justice information policy. She is also staff to the SEARCH Law and Policy Program Advisory Committee and Board of Directors. Prior to joining SEARCH, Ms. Barton was a Municipal Judge in Cheyenne, Wyoming, and was also engaged in the private practice of law. She also has held the positions of Public Defender for Cheyenne and Staff Attorney to the Wyoming Supreme Court. She has also served as a legal specialist in the New York State Department of Correctional Services, and as Associate County Judge for Lincoln County, Nebraska. She holds a B.A. from Augustana College and a J.D. from the University of Nebraska College of Law.

*Diane Biallargeon (Abstract Section, p. 93)*

Ms. Baillargeon is the Deputy Director of the Division of Program Development within the Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) at Columbia University. She oversees the research activities for CASA's demonstration research programs, including the Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth (in partnership with the Bureau of Justice Assistance) and CASA's Case-Management Program for Drug Addicted Ex-Offenders.

*William Braniff (Abstract Section, p. 47)*

Mr. Braniff is the United States Attorney for the Southern District of California. He has more than 20 years in the legal field. Prior to his appointment as United States Attorney, he served as the Chief of the Criminal Division in the United States Attorney's Office in Newark, New Jersey. He has bar memberships in the states of New York, New Jersey, and California. Mr. Braniff received his J.D. from Rutgers University Law School.

*Elliott A. Brown (See keynote speeches)*

Mr. Brown is the Acting Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). He has been involved in combatting narcotics trafficking and drug abuse for nearly two decades. Prior to joining BJA, Mr. Brown was the Minority Staff Director with the U.S. House of Representatives Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. In this capacity, he provided key senior staff leadership in formulating and in obtaining passage of the Anti-Drug Abuse Acts of 1986 and 1988. Mr. Brown was instrumental in formulating and securing passage of the International Narcotics Control Act of 1989. He also co-drafted the Rangel-Gilman-Hawkins Amendment to the State Department Authorization Act (1983), which authorized the President to suspend economic and military assistance to nations that fail to take adequate steps to prevent illicit drugs from entering the United States. Mr. Brown's Congressional activities have also included overseas missions to 36 drug trafficking, producing, and transiting nations in Latin America, Europe, Asia, and Africa, where he participated in meetings with heads of State and cabinet-level officials to develop comprehensive regional anti-drug strategies. During the 1980s, he co-drafted the anti-narcotics resolutions for the U.S. delegation attending the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conferences and met with legislators from the European and Andean parliaments to formulate regional anti-drug strategies.

*Timothy S. Bynum (See Workshops, p. 106)*

Dr. Bynum is a Professor in the School of Criminal Justice and the Associate Director of the Institute for Public Policy and Social Research at Michigan State University. In this role, he directs the activities of the program evaluation division of the Institute. Dr. Bynum has been the principal investigator in the evaluation of a wide range of criminal justice interventions including studies of the impact of programs in law enforcement, community corrections, juvenile diversion, delinquency prevention, alternative schools, and drug treatment. He co-directed an NIJ national study of the impact of the "good faith" exception of the exclusionary rule. He is the co-author of *Evaluating Juvenile Justice*

*Programs*, a monograph published by OJJDP. Dr. Bynum recently served as a consultant to the U.S. Sentencing Commission in the evaluation of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines. He is currently completing (with Rob Worden) an NIJ-funded evaluation of narcotics crackdowns. He received his Ph.D. in Criminology from Florida State University.

*Mary P. Causey (See Workshops, p. 105)*

Ms. Causey is a Detective First Grade and a Special Assistant to the Chief for the Pittsburgh Bureau of Police. Her assignments have included the Police Training Academy to provide instruction in CPR and firearms and the narcotics unit where she worked in an undercover capacity. Currently, she acts as the police liaison to the Public Safety Records Management System and supervises changes to the Police Policy and Procedure Manual. Detective Causey has set up an automated criminal complaint system in Pittsburgh's Warrant Office and coordinated the Drug Marketing Analysis Program (DMAP). She is also currently working with Carnegie Mellon University in a cooperative effort to obtain specialized no-cost programs for the police department while providing an opportunity for hands-on learning with real problem-solving experience for the students. Ms. Causey helped organize the Women Police of Western Pennsylvania, served as its secretary, and was a member of the International Association of Women Police. She has a B.A. in Administration of Justice and Sociology from the University of Pittsburgh.

*David P. Cavanagh (Abstract Section, p. 81)*

Dr. Cavanagh is currently Technical Director of BOTEC Analysis Corporation and a Research Fellow for the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. His research interests include drug control policy, criminological aspects of homicide, and criminal justice policy aspects of homicide. He has a Ph.D. in sociology from Brown University.

*Marcia R. Chaiken (Abstract Section, p. 81)*

After conducting and directing large scale research studies on drug use and criminal justice topics for over ten years at the RAND Corporation, Brandeis University, and Abt Associates, Inc., Dr. Marcia Chaiken founded LINC with the mission of carrying out relatively small-scale innovative research projects that have potential of yielding major impact on significant health and social problems. In addition to carrying out an NIJ-sponsored project to expand appropriate local uses of DUF data, she is completing an NIJ report on indicators of emerging patterns of drug abuse based on case studies of "crack"

and "ice" use in three cities. Marcia Chaiken also is the principal investigator for an evaluation of Teen Connections, a multi-site demonstration project to increase high-risk youngsters' use of health services including drug treatment programs. She recently completed a review of information and data on drug treatment in half-way houses for ADAMHA's Office for Treatment Improvement. Dr. Chaiken is the author and editor of many research-based reports on drug abuse control initiatives.

*Todd R. Clear (Abstract Section, p. 75)*

Dr. Clear is a Professor at the School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers University and Vice President for the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. His current research includes risk assessment, intermediate sanctions policy, religion in prison, and the concept of penal harm. He is the author of numerous publications regarding correctional policies, including *Controlling the Offender in the Community*, *American Corrections*, and *The Pre-Sentence Investigation Report*. His research concerns correctional policy, especially classification systems and offender case management systems in non-incarcerative correctional programs, and innovations in corrections. In 1986, Dr. Clear received the Cincinnati Award of the American Probation and Parole Association for his contributions to probation/parole technology. He has worked in more than 30 states and three nations, designing and evaluating offender classification and case management programs.

*James R. "Chip" Coldren, Jr. (Abstract Section, p. 51 and Workshops, p. 106)*

Chip Coldren is the Assistant Director of the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA). With the Association since 1987, he serves as Director of Research. He has been directing research projects relating to drug control task forces for four years, including multi-state task force evaluation projects and multi-site case studies. Mr. Coldren also directs the Association's forecasting activities. He provides assistance to state and local criminal justice forecasting projects in a variety of capacities and teaches statistical analysis and population projection classes at the JRSA Computer Training Center. He worked for seven years with the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, developing its data quality control program and conducting research in the areas of pretrial processing and repeat offenders. He then became the Director of Research and Computer System Development at Patuxent Institution in Maryland, a maximum security, treatment-oriented prison. He has been at JRSA since 1987.



*Royer Cook (Abstract Section, p. 93)*

Dr. Royer Cook is founder and President of the ISA Group, a social science research firm specializing in research on issues of drug abuse and crime. Prior to establishing ISA in 1978, Dr. Cook was Director of the Drug Abuse Research Unit at the Army Research Institute (1971-1974) and Vice-President of the Institute for Research (1974-1978). For the past 20 years, Dr. Cook's research has focused on the evaluation of drug abuse prevention methods, methods of assessing drug use prevalence, and drug abuse in the workplace. He currently serves as principal investigator of the National Evaluation of the Community Partnership Program, sponsored by the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention.

*Ernest L. Cowles, (Abstract Section, p. 75)*

Dr. Cowles is a faculty member of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections at Southern Illinois University. He specializes in correctional issues, criminal justice policy, administration, and research. In addition to his current NIJ project on boot camp drug treatment, he is also involved in a study of parole alternative programming in Illinois. He recently completed a study on financially motivated crime, sponsored by the Office of Naval Research. Dr. Cowles' past work experiences include work as a probation and parole officer, prison psychologist, and correctional administrator.

*Kenneth R. Coyle (Abstract Section, p. 69)*

Mr. Coyle is a Research Analyst for the American Prosecutors Research Institute (APRI). His research projects have involved collection of implementation, arrest, prosecution, asset forfeiture, expenditure, and other relevant data from more than 250 task forces in 16 states. He has directed or participated in several qualitative process/implementation task force studies, which required archival analysis of investigative files and extensive interviews with law enforcement and prosecution personnel. Mr. Coyle has also assisted in the development of the most recent conference of the National Environmental Enforcement Council. Other research projects have involved national surveys of prosecutors, dispute resolution centers, and state statistical analysis centers; and archival data collection in state corrections/prosecutorial files. In addition to database design and management responsibilities, Mr. Coyle has drafted and administered a variety of data collection and interview instruments on law enforcement and prosecutorial research projects. Mr. Coyle has an M.A. in Criminal Justice from Rutgers University, School of Criminal

Justice and is currently completing his doctoral dissertation at Rutgers University.

*Christine Curtis (Abstract Section, p. 63)*

Christine Curtis has been conducting research in the criminal justice field since 1977. She is currently the Assistant Director of Criminal Justice Research at the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Previously, she was a research analyst with the San Diego Police Department and the San Diego Court working on grant-funded projects. While at SANDAG, she has been a principal investigator on projects addressing a wide range of topics including: youth gangs; serious juvenile offenders; enforcement of drug laws; law enforcement computer system evaluation and development; crime trends and the justice response to crime; geographic distribution of crime; and intermediate sanctions, such as intensive probation and electronic monitoring of offenders. She is currently principal investigator on an NIJ-funded evaluation project involving a multi-agency approach to drug and gang enforcement that involves police, prosecutors, and probation officers, and a substance abuse program for probationers. She also manages SANDAG's regional criminal justice clearinghouse project which provides crime and justice information to elected officials through compilation of data and special studies.

*Lynn A. Curtis (Abstract Section, p. 93)*

Lynn A. Curtis is President of the Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation in Washington, D.C. The Foundation is a continuation, in the private sector, of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence and the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Dr. Curtis is also Vice Chair of Partners for Democratic Change, a Trustee of the Congressional Human Rights Foundation, a Senior Associate of the Youth Policy Institute, and a member of the Community Anti-Drug Coalitions of America Steering Committee. He has written or edited five books and numerous articles. Dr. Curtis has a Ph.D. in Urban Studies and Criminology from the University of Pennsylvania.

*Charles M. Daly (Abstract Section, p. 86)*

Dr. Daly has 22 years direct service and administrative experience with the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, including District Administrator, Deputy Assistant Secretary, and Regional Director. He also has five years experience in evaluation research with the Institute for Health and Human Services Research, Florida State University. He has an M.S.W. and Ph.D. from Florida State University.

*Robert Davis (Abstract Section, p. 95)*

Robert Davis is Research Director of the Victim Services Agency, New York City. He also consults for the American Bar Association and the New York Criminal Justice Agency. He is currently conducting research projects on drug house abatement laws, court strategies to process drug cases, and special drug courts. He is senior editor of an upcoming book on "Drugs and Community."

*Robert DeGeorge (Abstract Section, p. 47)*

Assistant Attorney General Robert DeGeorge is the Chief of the Narcotics Organized Crime and Racketeering Task Force of the Division of Criminal Justice, Department of Law and Public Safety, in the State of New Jersey. Mr. DeGeorge is a graduate of Rutgers University School of Law and served with the Division of Criminal Justice from 1974 to 1981 and from 1990 to 1992. He has supervised investigations and prosecutions in the field of organized crime, corruption, drug diversion, and narcotics. Since 1990, he has managed the work of attorneys, asset investigators, state police detectives, and analysts who are part of the Narcotics Organized Crime and Racketeering Task Force. The task force focuses on the investigation and prosecution of complex narcotics networks and is also involved in developing narcotics policy. It has been a key component of the Trenton Weed and Seed Program since its inception in July 1991.

*Charles B. DeWitt (See keynote speeches)*

Mr. DeWitt is the Director of the National Institute of Justice. He has reorganized the Institute to focus its research and development on the practical needs of state and local criminal justice agencies. He has created a Technology Division and an Evaluation Division, and has launched national initiatives to combat drugs, gangs, and violent crime. Prior to his nomination, Mr. DeWitt served as a consultant to the U.S. Department of Justice and as a Research Fellow at the National Institute of Justice, conducting studies on criminal justice issues and developing a national center to assist state and local governments with the expansion of jails and prisons. Director DeWitt has extensive experience in research, planning, and management to improve the criminal justice system. During the period of 1978 to 1984, he served as Director of Santa Clara County's Justice Division in San Jose, California, supervising the department responsible for administration and management of the County's justice services. Mr. DeWitt has also supervised planning, design, and construction of jails and courts valued at \$100 million. After leaving local government in 1984, Mr. DeWitt conducted research in adult corrections,

specializing in correctional facilities, and he is a nationally-recognized author in the corrections field. Mr. DeWitt was appointed in 1984 to the faculty of the National Academy of Corrections in Boulder, Colorado. He has a degree in Sociology from Stanford University and conducted graduate studies at the University of Cambridge's Institute of Criminology and the University of Oxford's Penal Research Unit in England.

*Thomas Diggs (Abstract Section, p. 69)*

Dr. Diggs is currently a Research Associate at the Institute on Mental Disability and Law, National Center of State Courts, and a Research Associate on the "Study of Involuntary Civil Commitment of Drug Dependent Persons." He was formally the Director of Admissions, Assistant to the President, Dean of Academic Services, Dean of School of Life-long Learning, and Associate Provost at Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia. He has a Ed.D. from the University of Virginia.

*James P. Donnelly (Abstract Section, p. 51)*

Lieutenant James P. Donnelly manages Public Safety Information Technology in Hartford, Connecticut, and is the Program Manager for the Drug Market Analysis Program (DMAP) sponsored by NIJ in that city. In managing the development of the Hartford DMAP technology, he extended the usability of the system by locating the systems resources on servers equipped with medialess workstations. In his capacity as Systems Manager for the Hartford Police Department, he acted as the principal architect of a publicly developed CAD system and previously provided analytical assistance and database design support for the department's incident reporting and booking systems. He has been a police officer for nineteen years.

*Terence Dunworth (Abstract Section, p. 64, p. 101, and p. 106)*

Dr. Dunworth is an Operations Research Specialist at the RAND Corporation, working in the Criminal Justice Research Program and the Institute for Civil Justice. During the past decade, he has led research projects for a variety of organizations, including the U.S. Department of Justice, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, World Bank, United Nations Development Program, and several state and local institutions. Previously, he was a member of the faculty of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. His areas of research interest include evaluation research, drug abuse enforcement policy, sentencing, problems of determining the allocation of public resources to the justice system, and the management of criminal and civil justice agencies. He is currently directing two projects funded by the National Institute of Justice: a

national assessment of the Bureau of Justice Assistance's formula grant program, and a study of narcotics enforcement in public housing.

*John Eck (Abstract Section, p. 64)*

Mr. Eck is the Associate Director for Research of the Police Executive Research Forum. He has conducted research on criminal investigations, problem-oriented policing, and police drug control strategies. Mr. Eck has served as a consultant on investigations management to the London Metropolitan Police and has taught courses on research methods at the Canadian Police College. He currently heads a two-year effort to develop a comprehensive multi-agency strategy to address gang problems and is also the principal researcher for the San Diego Police Department's Drug Market Analysis Project. He holds a Master of Public Policy from the University of Michigan and is a doctoral student at the Department of Criminology, University of Maryland.

*Kim English (Abstract Section, p. 76)*

Ms. English is Acting Research Director of the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice's Office of Research and Statistics. The division is charged with doing research and policy impact analysis for the governor's office, general assembly, and other state departments. In the eight years she has been with the division, she has conducted research in a variety of criminal justice areas and has been the co-principal investigator on projects involving replication of the RAND Inmate Survey on a sample of nearly 2,000 Colorado inmates; development and system-wide use of an actuarial risk scale of parolees; study of why community corrections clients fail; and two public opinion studies. She works closely with policymakers and legislators, assisting them in understanding the implications and limitations of empirical research.

*Deane Evans (Abstract Section, p. 95)*

Deane Evans, American Institute of Architects (AIA), is director of the AIA/ACSA Council on Architectural Research, an organization jointly sponsored by the AIA and the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture. The Council's main purpose is to foster research that benefits both the architectural curriculum and activities within the architecture profession, and that positively impacts the built environment and the public. Mr. Evans is a registered architect, and, prior to joining the Research Council, was a Senior Partner at Steven Winter Associates in New York City, where he was also an Adjunct Assistant Professor of Architecture at Columbia University.

*Tony Fabelo (See Workshops, p. 106)*

Dr. Tony Fabelo is the Executive Director of the Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council. Dr. Fabelo has been with the Criminal Justice Policy Council since 1984. Since that time, he has served as Planner, Director of Research, and most recently as Deputy Director for the Agency. Dr. Fabelo is presently overseeing a study of statewide sentencing patterns in Texas. The study will assist the state legislature in 1993 in making comprehensive revisions to the state's sentencing codes. Dr. Fabelo is also overseeing the development of a comprehensive evaluation plan of the recent criminal justice drug treatment programs proposed by the Governor and approved by the legislature. He has a B.A. in political science from Loyola University in New Orleans and a Ph.D. in Government from the University of Texas.

*Gregory P. Falkin (Abstract Section, p. 82)*

Dr. Falkin is currently the Principal Investigator of "Drug Treatment within the Criminal Justice System: A Comprehensive Analysis," an NIJ-funded project. He was previously the Project Director of an outcome evaluation study of the "Stay'n Out Program," a prison-based therapeutic community in New York that has served as a national model. Dr. Falkin also directed a BJA-funded study of six other prison-based drug treatment programs throughout the country. Since receiving his doctorate in an interdisciplinary public policy program from Cornell University in 1977, Dr. Falkin has held positions in government (U.S. Department of Justice), academia, and private sector research. He is currently employed by National Development and Research Institutes, Inc. (formerly Narcotics Drug Research, Inc.).

*Joseph R. Farmer (Abstract Section, p. 52)*

Mr. Farmer is the Drug Program Coordinator for the Arizona Criminal Justice Commission, the entity responsible for administration of the Drug Control and Systems Improvement formula grant and the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) grant program for Arizona. Prior to assuming this position in July 1990, Mr. Farmer served over 31 years with the Phoenix Police Department and retired as a Captain. His most recent assignment was Commander of the Drug Enforcement Bureau. He also served as Commander of the Communications Bureau, Advanced Department Training and Firearms, and Field Duty Commander.

*Marcus Felson (Abstract Section, p. 95)*

Dr. Felson is a Professor at the University of Southern California and Senior Research Associate in its Social Science Research Institute. Prior to this, he was a faculty member at the University of Illinois. Dr. Felson has conducted research on how criminal acts relate to routine activities, such as going to school, work, or shopping. He has a B.A. from the University of Chicago and an M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Michigan.

*Frank Gajewski (Abstract Section, p. 52)*

Captain Gajewski is a 20-year veteran of the Jersey City, New Jersey, Police Department. His work experience includes eight years with the narcotics squad. The last four years he has served as the Commander of the Planning and Research Bureau. He is the principal investigator of the Drug Market Analysis Program. Captain Gajewski has a B.S. in Criminal Justice from Jersey City State College and is currently enrolled in the M.P.A. Program at Seton Hall University.

*James Garofalo (Abstract Section, p. 95)*

Dr. Garofalo is Director of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections at Southern Illinois University. Previously, he was on the criminal justice faculty at Indiana University. Before that, he directed research centers at the State University of New York at Albany and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. He has conducted research projects and written extensively on victimization, fear of crime, policing, community crime prevention, and other topics.

*Kimberly Glenn (See Workshops, p. 105)*

Ms. Glenn is the Director of the Crime Analysis Division for the San Diego Police Department and has held this position since 1980. The Division is responsible for research and analysis, operational crime analysis, grant programs, and related automated functions for the department. Ms. Glenn received her B.A. and M.A. degrees in Political Science from the University of California at Riverside.

*Stephen Goldsmith (See keynote speeches)*

Mr. Goldsmith has been Mayor of Indianapolis, Indiana, since November 1991. Under his leadership, Indianapolis is becoming a model city for responsive, compassionate, and efficient government. Mayor Goldsmith believes that the

soul of Indianapolis is in its neighborhoods and has set out to make city government reflect that priority. Prior to his election, he was the Prosecuting Attorney for Marion County, Indiana. He was also a Research Fellow in Criminal Justice at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. Mayor Goldsmith earned a law degree with honors at the University of Michigan.

*Jimmy Gurulé (See keynote speeches)*

Jimmy Gurulé was appointed as the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) in August 1990. As Assistant Attorney General for OJP, he establishes and guides OJP policy and priorities; focuses efforts on the priorities established by the President, the Attorney General, and OJP; and promotes and facilitates coordination among the five major bureaus within OJP: Bureau of Justice Assistance, Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Institute of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Office for Victims of Crime. OJP works to form partnerships among federal, state, and local government officials to improve the administration of justice in America, combat violent crime and drug abuse, meet the needs of crime victims, and find innovative ways to address problems such as narcotics trafficking, gang-related crime, white-collar crime, and public corruption. Mr. Gurulé was an Associate Professor of Law at Notre Dame Law School and an Adjunct Professor of Law at the University of Utah College of Law from 1983 to 1985. During that time, he also served as a Deputy County Attorney in the Salt Lake County Attorney's Office. He served as an Assistant United States Attorney in the Criminal Division of the Office of the United States Attorney in Los Angeles, California, where he was Deputy Chief of the Major Narcotics Section. Mr. Gurulé was a trial attorney in the Criminal Division of the U.S. Justice Department and has served as Special Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida, and Special Assistant United States Attorney for the District of Columbia. Mr. Gurulé has also served as President of the Hispanic National Bar Association (HNBA). He received his bachelor's and law degrees from the University of Utah.

*Rudy Haapanen (Abstract Section, p. 82)*

Dr. Rudy Haapanen is the Chief of the Parole and Classification Research Bureau of the California Youth Authority (CYA). He is the project director for the NIJ-funded study Drug Testing for Youthful Offenders on Parole: An Experimental Study. He was instrumental in the development of a parole classification system for the CYA and has worked closely with field parole staff



on a number of research projects. Dr. Haapanen has designed and implemented major federally-funded research projects in the areas of classification, prediction, methodology, and criminal careers. He has published a book on the nature and predictability of longitudinal patterns of criminal behavior, titled *Selective Incapacitation and the Serious Offender: A Longitudinal Study of Criminal Career Patterns*. He is currently responsible for designing and developing a comprehensive, automated classification system for youthful offenders committed to the CYA.

*Patricia Hardyman (Abstract Section, p. 82)*

Dr. Hardyman has been with the National Council on Crime and Delinquency since September 1989 and directs the research activities at the East Coast (Newark) office. She has extensive research experience with database development and management, court services, parole decisionmaking, and community supervision innovations.

*Adele Harrell (Abstract Section, p. 96 and p. 102)*

Dr. Harrell is a Senior Research Analyst with the Urban Institute. Her studies on drug abuse include work on four of the National Household Surveys on Drug Abuse, a field test of self-reported drug use data validity, a national telephone survey of knowledge and beliefs about illicit drug use, analysis of the use of arrestee urinalysis results, field tests of procedures for estimating the prevalence of drug use, and an evaluation of systemwide drug testing (in progress). She has also conducted studies of urban decay and crime that includes a study of patterns of opportunity in urban areas. She is currently conducting a comprehensive review of approaches for anticipating and combating community decay and crime. She has a Ph.D. in Sociology from George Washington University.

*Lana D. Harrison (Abstract Section, p. 83)*

Dr. Harrison is a Statistician with the National Institute on Drug Abuse, where she works on the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse. Her research interests center on drug epidemiology and comparative international research on drug use. She completed a Ph.D. in Sociology at the University of Michigan, where she worked on the Monitoring the Future Study and two international epidemiology student drug use surveys. Dr. Harrison was previously employed as a Senior Research Associate at the National Institute of Justice.

*David Hayeslip (Abstract Section, p. 59)*

Dr. David Hayeslip is a Program Manager, Evaluation Division, National Institute of Justice. He is responsible for a variety of police and corrections evaluation initiatives for NIJ. He was formerly an Associate Professor and Graduate Program Director, Department of Criminal Justice, University of Baltimore and a Visiting Senior Research Associate with NIJ. Dr. Hayeslip received his Ph.D. from Michigan State University in multi-disciplinary social science in 1982. He has conducted research in narcotics enforcement, less-than-lethal weapons technology development for law enforcement, criminal justice training, and education and resource adequacy in juvenile justice.

*John Hepburn (Abstract Section, p. 83)*

Dr. John Hepburn is a Professor in the School of Justice Studies at Arizona State University. He has been actively involved in evaluation research of drug treatment programs and efforts to assess the needs of drug-using criminal offenders. He has a Ph.D. in Sociology.

*Janice Hirota (Abstract Section, p. 93)*

Dr. Janice Hirota is an Anthropologist and Documentation Coordinator in the Division of Program Development, Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) at Columbia University. She oversees the documentation research for the Strategic Intervention for High Risk Youth (SIHRY) Program, a joint effort of BJA and CASA.

*Darlanne Hctor (Abstract Section, p. 84)*

Ms. Darlanne Hctor is the Associate Analyst for the San Diego Association of Governments, Criminal Research Division. Her previous and current studies have focused on the criminal justice response to crime, effects of police strategies, jail overcrowding, intensive probation supervision, gang involvement in criminal and drug activity, and the use of automated systems by law enforcement.

*Gwen A. Holden (Abstract Section, p. 84)*

Ms. Holden is Executive Vice President of the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA), a private, non-profit special interest group that represents the states on crime control and public safety matters and provides staff support to the National Governor's Association on criminal justice projects and issues. She directs the organization and serves as a member of the Board of Directors.

Her responsibilities include implementing NCJA's policy, research, and legislative programs to influence national policy in the criminal justice field and to help states address criminal justice-related problems. Ms. Holden has been associated with the NCJA since May 1975. From 1971 to 1975, she served as a corrections and juvenile justice planner for the former Vermont Governor's Commission on the Administration of Justice. A graduate of Tufts University, Ms. Holden is a member of numerous national organizations that represent criminal justice professionals.

*Joan Jacoby (Abstract Section, p. 70)*

Joan Jacoby is the Executive Director of the Jefferson Institute for Justice Studies, a non-profit criminal justice research institute. She was formerly with the Bureau of Social Science Research and was the first Director of the National Center for Prosecution Management. Her expertise is in prosecution, and her interest is in the interfaces between prosecutor, police, and courts. Much of her work is in research and development, management analysis, and criminal justice information systems. She recently completed two nationwide program assessments: Expedited Drug Case Management programs for the courts and Asset Forfeiture. She is the author of *The American Prosecutor: A Search for Identity* and is a co-author of a *Handbook on Artificial Intelligence and Expert Systems for Law Enforcement*. She has a B.A. in Sociology from Boston University and an M.A. in Statistics from American University.

*Edwin Kennedy (Abstract Section, p. 85)*

Dr. Kennedy is a Research Analyst with the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority and editor/publisher of *CourtStats*, a court evaluation newsletter. Prior to this, he was Chief, Statistical Services, Administrative Office of the Courts, Trenton, New Jersey, and Assistant Director, Planning and Research, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts. Publications include a study of national court backlog trends which found that court backlog is most strongly associated with rapid population growth. He has an M.S.W., Criminal Justice Research, University of Pennsylvania, and is a Ph.D. candidate in Social Work Policy and Research at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

*Richard F. Kern (See Workshops, p. 106)*

Dr. Kern is currently Director of the Criminal Justice Research Center, a division within the Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services. He also is the Staff Director to the Virginia Sentencing Guidelines Commission and the newly created Governor's Commission on Violent Crime. He is current

Vice-President of the Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) and Chairman of the JRSA Research Committee. Prior experience includes serving as Research Director for the Florida Sentencing Commission and instructor at the School of Criminology, Florida State University. He has a Ph. D. from the school of Criminology, Florida State University.

*Malcolm W. Klein (Abstract Section, p. 64)*

Malcolm W. Klein is a Professor of Sociology, Senior Research Associate at the Social Science Research Institute and Director of the Center for Research on Crime and Social Control, all at the University of Southern California. He has served on the Board of the American Society of Criminology, as Chair of the criminology section of the ASA and SSSP, as President of the Association for Criminal Justice Research (California), as Chair of NIMH crime and delinquency review committee, and has served on numerous national advisory panels and committees. In 1990, he received the E.L. Sutherland Award, the highest honor of the American Society of Criminology, and is incoming Vice President of that association. He is author or editor of eight books and over 60 articles and chapters on a broad range of areas such as street gangs, diversion, deinstitutionalization, criminal justice planning, police handling of juvenile offenders, and comparative justice systems. His most recent research, with grants from the Centers for Disease Control, Guggenheim Foundation, and National Institute of Justice, involves the nature and control of street gang violence and gang involvement in illegal drug distribution systems.

*John T. Krimmel (Abstract Section, p. 70)*

Mr. Krimmel is currently the Unit Chief for the Grants Monitoring Unit of the New Jersey Division of Criminal Justice. Prior to employment with New Jersey, he was a police officer in Pennsylvania for 14 years. He also holds an adjunct professor position with the Criminal Justice Department at Temple University. He is a doctoral candidate at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York.

*Pamela K. Lattimore (See Workshops, p. 107)*

Dr. Lattimore is a Visiting Research Scholar at the National Institute of Justice. Her current research interests include the study and modelling of criminal behavior. She is particularly interested in the development and application of models in criminal recidivism. Her most recent research appears in *Criminology*, the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Evaluation Review*, and the *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*.

*Paul J. Lavrakas (See Workshops, p. 107)*

Dr. Lavrakas is a Professor at Northwestern University and Director (and founder) of the Northwestern University Survey Laboratory. He teaches research methods and statistical-related courses in journalism, statistics, and political science. Dr. Lavrakas has conducted several large anti-crime evaluation research studies including the Citizen Participation in Crime Prevention Project, Crime Stoppers, Eisenhower Foundation's Neighborhood Anti-Crime Self-Help Program, pilot studies for the National Missing Children's Survey, Community Responses to Drug Abuse Demonstration Program, and McGruff Anti-Crime Public Service Campaign. His publications include *Telephone Survey Methods, Polling and Presidential Election Coverage* (co-editor), and numerous articles on citizens' reactions to crime and crime prevention, and survey research methods. He has an M.A. in Experimental Social Psychology and a Ph.D. in Applied Social Psychology from Loyola University of Chicago.

*Gary Leonardson (Abstract Section, p. 85)*

Dr. Leonardson is a Research Consultant for the South Dakota Attorney General's Task Force on Drugs and Co-Investigator on two National Institute of Health grants. He has been involved in several social, psychological, criminal justice, and medical research projects with federal, state, local, university, and private non-profit sponsorship. He is currently Project Evaluator for two OSAP grants, along with evaluating drug and alcohol treatment programs in South Dakota. In addition, Dr. Leonardson is involved in designing a comprehensive project to evaluate drug treatment programs in the corrections system in South Dakota, including two county jail treatment programs. He holds B.S. and M.A. degrees in social science areas and a Ph.D. in Research and Statistical Methodology.

*Douglas Longshore (Abstract Section, p. 86)*

Dr. Longshore is a Principal Investigator at the Drug Abuse Research Center, Neurosychiatric Institute, University of California, Los Angeles. He previously conducted evaluation research at the U.S. General Accounting Office and the System Development Corporation in Santa Monica, California. He holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from UCLA.

*Brian Lynch (Abstract Section, p. 75)*

Mr. Lynch is a Staff Associate, National Center for State Courts, Washington Office. He conducts national research projects on court management issues and

problems. He has studied procedures used by limited jurisdiction courts for the disposition of felony drug cases. He also has conducted the statistical analysis for national scope projects examining caseflow management, judicial financing, and differentiated case management. Mr. Lynch provides technical assistance to state courts on financial management issues and serves as the coordinator for a trial court management guide series. He has a B.A. in Law and Society and an M.S. in Justice Studies from the American University.

*Doris Layton MacKenzie (Abstract Section, p. 76)*

Dr. MacKenzie is an Associate Professor in the Institute of Criminal Justice and Criminology, University of Maryland. She is currently a Visiting Scientist at the National Institute of Justice. Dr. MacKenzie is the director of a multi-site study of boot camp prisons and has just completed a study examining a boot camp prison in Louisiana. She has also consulted with states considering starting new boot camp prisons and has testified before committees in the United States House and Senate. Other research has focused on corrections and offenders. Dr. MacKenzie has completed research and published papers on inmate adjustment, recidivism, prison crowding, and classification. She has also directed studies in classification, prison programs, and prison population prediction models. She is co-editor of recently published books, *The American Prison: Issues in Research and Policy* and *Measuring Crime: Large-Scale, Long-Range Efforts*, and a forthcoming book, *Drugs and the Criminal Justice System: Evaluating Public Policy Initiatives*.

*Stephen D. Mastrofski (Abstract Section, p. 59)*

Stephen D. Mastrofski is a Visiting Fellow at the National Institute of Justice and an Associate Professor of Administration of Justice at Pennsylvania State University. He has published on a variety of police topics, such as performance measurement, community policing, theories of police behavior, police reform, accreditation, and drunk-driving enforcement. He recently completed a study of drunk-driving enforcement for the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation and is currently engaged in a study supported by the National Institute of Justice on community policing at the street-level. Dr. Mastrofski holds a doctorate in Political Science from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

*Tom McEwen (Abstract Section, p. 52)*

Dr. McEwen is a Principal with the Institute for Law and Justice, Inc. (ILJ). He has more than 20 years experience in the criminal justice field. At ILJ, he has responsibilities for directing evaluations of criminal justice projects. Dr.

McEwen has also performed research in several criminal justice areas, including resource allocation for police departments, use of microcomputers in criminal justice agencies, and simulations of criminal justice systems.

*C. Aaron McNeece (Abstract Section, p. 86)*

Dr. McNeece has 22 years of experience in university teaching and research. He is currently a Professor and Director of the Institute for Health and Human Services Research at Florida State University. Prior experience includes ten years as Assistant Dean, School of Social Work, Florida State University. He is the author of several books and numerous articles. He has an M.S.W. and Ph.D. from the University of Michigan.

*Raymond H. Milkman (Abstract Section, p. 71)*

Raymond H. Milkman is the Principal Investigator on the National Assessment of Sentencing Practices for Drug Offenders for the Lazar Institute. He has carried out criminal justice and drug abuse studies for 19 years. Prior to joining Lazar in 1973, he served as Director of Evaluation Offices at both the White House Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention and the Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce. He also previously served as a lecturer in statistics at John Hopkins University.

*Ethel Mull (Abstract Section, p. 87)*

Ms. Mull is the Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime, Inc. (TASC). She has 20 years experience providing training, direct service, and management in the field of social service and adult criminal justice. Ms. Mull has made numerous national presentations to public and private sectors on social service and criminal justice issues. Prior to coming to TASC, she was Deputy Director for Illinois' Child Welfare System. Ms. Mull has a Master's Degree in Human Relations Services.

*Kenneth W. Nimmich (See Workshops, p. 105)*

Mr. Nimmich is Chief of the Scientific Analysis Section (SAS) of the FBI Laboratory. He has been a Special Agent in the FBI since January 1966 and has had investigative assignments in Cleveland, Ohio, and Alexandria, Virginia. In 1969, he entered the lab as a Forensic Chemist. He was the supervisor of the Northern Resident Office covering O'Hare Airport and territory north to the Wisconsin state line and the Assistant Section Chief for research and training at the FSRTC at Quantico. The SAS has seven units that cover the full range of scientific disciplines.

*Dennis E. Nowicki (See keynote speeches)*

Mr. Nowicki is the Executive Director of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. The Authority is a state agency responsible for research, planning, and information systems development in the criminal justice system. He has more than 28 years experience in the criminal justice field. Prior to being appointed to his current position, Mr. Nowicki was the Chief of Police in Joliet, Illinois. A proponent of community policing, he developed innovative ways to implement the concept throughout the department. He also served 25 years with the Chicago Police Department, with such assignments as beat patrol, area task force, district tactical officer, burglary detective, patrol sergeant, robbery unit sergeant, property crimes lieutenant, and administrative aide to the deputy superintendents in the technical services, investigative services, and operational services bureaus. Mr. Nowicki was also the Deputy Superintendent for the Bureau of Administrative Services. He earned a Bachelor's degree in Personnel Management from Northwestern University and a M.S. in Management of Public Services from DePaul University.

*Hugh Nugent (Abstract Section, p. 53)*

Mr. Nugent is a Principal Associate with the Institute for Law and Justice, Inc. (ILJ) and has over 33 years experience in the practice of law, public administration, and management consulting. He has been Director of Planning and Evaluation for the Department of Justice, Director of Education for the Federal Judicial Center, Director of the Center for the Administration of Justice at The American University, and partner in a law firm specializing in municipal government issues. His consulting experience has covered the full range of criminal justice administration. Mr. Nugent holds law degrees from the University of Missouri at Kansas City and Georgetown, and an M.P.A. from Harvard.

*John (Jack) O'Connell (Abstract Section, p. 71 and p. 96)*

Mr. O'Connell has been Director of the Delaware Criminal Justice Council's Statistical Analysis Center since 1988. Prior to that he held a similar position in Washington State. For over a decade, he has studied and analyzed state criminal justice issues and initiatives. Over the years he has participated in numerous national criminal justice meetings and organizations.



*Garrett J. O'Keefe (Abstract Section, p. 102)*

Dr. O'Keefe is Professor of Agricultural Journalism at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where he received his doctoral degree. He formerly held faculty positions at Colorado State University and the University of Denver. He has conducted research and published widely on the evaluation and impact of public information campaigns, including those related to crime prevention.

*Michael Overton (Abstract Section, p. 53)*

Mr. Overton is the Director of the Statistical Analysis Center for the Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. His work with the Commission has included drug evaluation, jail statistics and planning, juvenile court and facility tracking, UCR/NIBRS conversion, and information systems. He received a B.S. in Mathematics at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

*Antony M. Pate (Abstract Section, p. 59)*

Mr. Pate, Director of Research of the Police Foundation, has more than 20 years of experience in police research. A co-author of the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, he has directed the foundation's studies of response time, apprehension techniques, peer review panels, police stress, foot patrols, community crime prevention, fear reduction, and crime control in public housing. Recently, he has conducted evaluations of the New York City Police Department Cadet Corps program, community policing in Baltimore, and the effectiveness of alternative police responses to domestic violence in Dade County, Florida. He is currently directing research projects concerning police killings, excessive use of force by police, and a school-based drug prevention program. Mr. Pate conducted his graduate work at the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

*Susan Pennell (Abstract Section, p. 87)*

Ms. Pennell is the Director of the Criminal Justice Research Division of the San Diego Association of Governments. The division functions as the clearinghouse for crime and justice information and conducts analysis and impact evaluations of crime and justice-related issues and projects. Ms. Pennell has administered several federally-funded projects associated with drugs, crime, and gangs. She is also the Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program manager for San Diego and a member of the statewide epidemiology workgroup.

*Roger H. Peters (Abstract Section, p. 87)*

Dr. Peters is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Law and Mental Health at the Florida Mental Health Institute (FMHI), University of South Florida in Tampa. He has worked over the past several years to design and evaluate the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Department's Office of Substance Abuse Treatment Programs, one of three in-jail model demonstration projects funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA). Another recent project involved evaluating results of a nationwide survey of in-jail substance abuse treatment services, sponsored by BJA and conducted by the American Jail Association. Dr. Peters is currently working with the Florida Department of Corrections in evaluating substance abuse screening and assessment procedures and in developing an evaluation of mental health services.

*Joan Petersilia (Abstract Section, p. 76)*

Dr. Petersilia is Director of RAND's Criminal Justice Program in Santa Monica, California. She is a past president of the Association for Criminal Justice Research in California and the American Society of Criminology. She is a Fellow of both the American Society of Criminology and the Western Society of Criminology and recipient of awards for her research from the American Probation and Parole Association and the California Probation, Parole, and Corrections Association. Her current work involves evaluating intensive probation and parole programs in 14 jurisdictions. She has an M.A. in Sociology from Ohio State and a Ph.D. in Social Ecology from the University of California, Irvine.

*Robert E. Peterson (Abstract Section, p. 102)*

Robert Peterson was appointed Director of the Office of Drug Control Policy by Governor John Engler. He previously served as an attorney and top level advisor at the federal, state, and local levels, and provided input into three national drug control strategies. His experience includes private practice counsel to business and government agencies on drug matters, service as Executive Director under two Pennsylvania attorneys general, special detail to the U.S. Department of Justice and Assistant District Attorney in Buffalo, New York. He has been involved with numerous state and national anti-drug volunteer groups.

*Roger K. Przybylski (Abstract Section, p. 103)*

Mr. Przybylski is the Director of the Drug Information and Analysis Center and a Senior Analyst at the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. He has

conducted research, published, and lectured on a variety of justice issues including homicide, recidivism, electronic monitoring, and substance abuse. He currently directs all drug-related research and policy analysis for the Authority; manages Illinois' drug strategy impact program, a statewide initiative to evaluate drug and violent crime control projects; and serves as a consultant on substance abuse and justice system issues to numerous national, state, and local agencies. He holds an M.S. in the Administration of Justice from Southern Illinois University.

*Suzanne Pullen (Abstract Section, p. 76)*

Ms. Pullen is a Senior Research Analyst with the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice. This project represents her third drug control evaluation study; she was co-principal investigator of two evaluations of Colorado's Drug Law Enforcement Task Forces. She produces state prison population projections that are used for planning by the General Assembly and the Department of Corrections. She also analyzes all proposed legislation that affects sentencing and inmate movement and reports back to the legislature with fiscal impact statements. She also serves as a research consultant to a private, community-based sex offender treatment program.

*Emily A. Reed (Abstract Section, p. 77)*

Dr. Reed is a Management Analyst for the Delaware Criminal Justice Council (CJC) where she performs evaluations of criminal justice system programs. These programs include impact evaluations of intensive outpatient drug treatment, halfway houses, and house arrest. She is currently conducting an evaluation of intensive supervision probation in Delaware. She has taught at Ursinus College, LaSalle University and Brandywine College. Dr. Reed is the author of numerous journal articles on criminal justice issues and the co-author of *Law Policy and Population*. She is currently completing a book entitled *The Penry Penalty: Capital Punishment and the Mentally Retarded*, forthcoming from the University of America Press in January 1993. She has a Masters of Public Administration from the University of Hartford, and a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Massachusetts.

*Christopher Ringwalt (Abstract Section, p. 96)*

Dr. Ringwalt is a Senior Research Health Analyst at the Research Triangle Institute (RTI). He is project director of two studies of the Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.) Project. With CSR, he has a contract with the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention to assess and conduct a meta-analysis of three generations of demonstration programs for high risk youth. Dr. Ringwalt

is also directing a study for the Administration on Children, Youth, and Families concerning drug use among runaway and homeless youth. Prior to coming to RTI, Dr. Ringwalt was the Drug-Free Schools Coordinator with the North Carolina Department of Public Institutions.

*Marilyn M. Roberts (Abstract Section, p. 71)*

Ms. Roberts is the Deputy Director of the Washington Office of the National Center for State Courts. She has extensive experience with court management, developed over 15 years of employment at the National Center. In addition to management responsibilities, her most recent project work includes: Project Manager, National Conference on Substance Abuse and the Courts; Project Director, Handbook of Racial/Ethnic Bias in the Courts; Principal Investigator, Improving the Court Response to Drug Cases: A Program Assessment; Project Consultant, Second National Conference on Gender Bias in the Courts. Ms. Roberts holds a B.A. in Sociology from the University of Denver and an M.P.A. from the University of Colorado.

*Jorge Rodriguez (Abstract Section, p. 71)*

Mr. Rodriguez is a Research Specialist III at the Delaware Statistical Analysis Center. His research has focused on anti-drug trafficking legislation in the State of Delaware and its impact on the criminal justice system; and mandatory sentencing statutes, their implementation, structure, and impact on prison and jail admissions and populations.

*Janice A. Roehl (Abstract Section, p. 60 and p. 97)*

Dr. Roehl is the Vice President of the Institute for Social Analysis. Over the past 15 years, she has conducted a variety of field research studies in the areas of drug abuse prevention, crime and arson prevention, other criminal justice areas, and alternative dispute resolution. Her areas of special interest and expertise are community-based anti-crime and anti-drug research and studies of the processes of alternative dispute resolution, particularly of procedural justice, disputant satisfaction, and system impact. She received a Ph.D. in Social Psychology at The George Washington University in Washington, D.C.

*Dennis P. Rogan (Abstract Section, p. 47)*

Dr. Rogan is presently the Vice President in Charge of Research for the Crime Control Institute. He is also a Project Director for the University of Maryland's Weed and Seed Evaluation Project. Dr. Rogan received his Ph.D. from the University of Maryland.

*Thomas Rueter (Abstract Section, p. 48)*

Since 1985, Mr. Rueter has served as an Assistant United States Attorney in Philadelphia, where he is Chief of the Narcotics Section and lead attorney for the Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force. He is currently detailed to the Executive Office for Weed and Seed, U.S. Department of Justice, where he is serving as an Assistant Director for Law Enforcement. In 1988, Mr. Rueter received a special commendation from the Department of Justice for outstanding service as an Assistant United States Attorney. He is a member of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Bars. He graduated *summa cum laude* from the University of Scranton and received his J.D. from the Dickinson School of Law.

*Susan Sadd (Abstract Section, p. 60)*

Dr. Sadd has been with the Vera Institute since 1977. She is currently the Project Director for Vera's NIJ-funded evaluation of the Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing programs. Prior to that project, she was responsible for the household survey component of Vera's NIJ-funded research on the community effects of the New York City Police Department's (NYPD) Tactical Narcotics Teams. Dr. Sadd also shared major responsibility for Vera's study of the NYPD's Community Patrol Officer Program, which initiated the NYPD's movement toward community policing. She has also directed studies on employment training for youth and detoxification for homeless alcoholics. She received her Ph.D. in Social Psychology from New York University.

*Judy Schiff (Abstract Section, p. 88)*

Ms. Schiff has 12 years of experience with the Georgia Department of Corrections. She is currently serving as project leader for two major evaluations in the Georgia site: for the national NIJ multi-site study of shock incarceration and for the NIJ-funded study of the Department's new prison setting therapeutic communities. In her primary position as a counselor, she has assisted in the development and implementation of the Sex Offender Treatment Program. Ms. Schiff has spent the last several years working in the Evaluation and Statistics Section, where she has evaluated prison drug treatment programs.

*Timothy J. Shea (See keynote speeches)*

Timothy Shea is the Associate Deputy Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice. Prior to his appointment to this position, he served as the Professional Minority Staff Member for the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of

Representatives. From 1982 to 1984, he was the Legislative Director for Congressman Silvio O. Conte (R-MA). Mr. Shea is a member of the Massachusetts State Bar. He graduated from Boston College *magna cum laude* with a B.A. and earned a law degree from Georgetown University.

*Richard C. Sonnichsen (Abstract Section, p. 103)*

Dr. Sonnichsen is the Deputy Assistant Director for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in charge of the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Audits. He has been a Special Agent for 28 years and served as the Director of the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Audits for 10 years. He holds a doctorate in Public Administration from the University of Southern California where he is a member of the adjunct faculty.

*Robert L. Stephenson*

Mr. Stephenson is the Special Assistant to the Director of the Division of Applied Research, National Institute on Drug Abuse. His research projects include a hair analysis research program with the National Institute of Justice and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and human impairment detection research including the police officer based Drug Recognition Expertise, drug testing laboratory results, and implementation of state demonstration programs for interstate trucking with the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation. He recently concluded staffing a Federal Interagency Task Force on on-site drug testing programs. Mr. Stephenson has a Masters in Public Health from Johns Hopkins University.

*Michele Sviridoff (Abstract Section, p. 53)*

Ms. Sviridoff is currently a Research Scientist at the Substance Abuse Strategy Initiative Program (SASIP) at the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service at New York University. Previously, as a Senior Research Associate at the Vera Institute of Justice, she conducted research on New York City's Tactical Narcotics Teams; innovative neighborhood-oriented police programs in eight cities, targeted at drug demand reduction; New York City's Civilian Complaint Review Board; and relationships between employment and crime in high-risk populations.

*Faye S. Taxman (Abstract Section, p. 88)*

Dr. Taxman is Acting Director of the Montgomery County, Maryland, Criminal Justice Coordinating Commission. She is responsible for research and planning, evaluation of programs, coordination of interagency planning efforts and programs, and development of new program initiatives. Dr.

Taxman has implemented several interagency programmatic efforts for first offenders (drug possessors and drunk drivers). She has conducted numerous evaluations of criminal justice programs. She recently completed a first year analysis of a pretrial release program which analyzed the impact of the program on jail bed space and pretrial release rates. Dr. Taxman is currently the Research Director for a jail-based treatment program funded by the Office of Treatment Improvement. Her research interests include corrections, evaluations, program development, and addiction treatment. Dr. Taxman received her Ph.D. from Rutgers University Newark School of Criminal Justice.

*James M. Tien (Abstract Section, p. 104)*

Dr. Tien is a Vice President of Queues Enforth Development, Inc., and is also the Chairman of the Department of Decision Sciences and Engineering Systems at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. He has worked at Bell Telephone Laboratories and RAND Corporation, and he has been a Visiting Lecturer at MIT. His areas of research interest include the development and application of computer and system analysis techniques to information and decision systems. He is listed in several *Who's Who* publications and is an Associate Editor of the *Transaction on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics* and the *Journal of Information and Decision Technologies*. He has received several teaching- and research-related awards, including election as a Fellow of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Dr. Tien received his advanced degrees in systems engineering and operations research from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

*Jackson Toby (Abstract Section, p. 77)*

Jackson Toby, Professor of Sociology and Director of the Institute for Criminological Research at Rutgers University, is the principal investigator of an NIJ-sponsored evaluation of the three federally financed correctional boot camps for adjudicated juvenile offenders. He is active in criminological research, specializing in intermediate sanctions and the causes of and remedies for violence in American public schools. Dr. Toby has been listed in *Who's Who in America* since 1966. He has a Ph.D. in Sociology from Harvard University.

*Susan Turner (Abstract Section, p. 78 and p. 89)*

Dr. Turner is a Social Psychologist with the RAND Corporation's Criminal Justice Program. Her research areas have included selective incapacitation, racial discrimination, evaluations of private sector correctional alternatives for

high risk youth, and the effectiveness of intensive supervision probation and parole for adult offenders. She is currently directing projects that investigate work release in the state of Washington, the impact of intensive supervision for drug-involved offenders, and the implementation and impact of structured fines in four jurisdictions nationwide. Dr. Turner has just completed a chapter on intensive supervision for drug offenders, which will appear in the forthcoming book, *Smart Sentencing: The Emergence of Intermediate Sanctions*, edited by Byrne, Lurgio, and Petersilia. She has a Ph.D. in Social Psychology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

*Craig D. Uchida (See keynote speeches)*

Craig D. Uchida is the Acting Director of the Office of Criminal Justice Research at the National Institute of Justice. He is responsible for developing and implementing a comprehensive research program that examines issues in criminal justice and criminology. He also develops, manages, and coordinates the Community Policing Program at NIJ. Dr. Uchida received his Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Albany's School of Criminal Justice in 1982. In addition, he has two Master of Arts degrees -- one in American History from SUNY Stony Brook (1977) and one in Criminal Justice from SUNY Albany (1978). For the last 13 years he has conducted research in law enforcement in a number of settings (e.g., Los Angeles, Denver, Baltimore County, New Orleans) and on a variety of topics (police use of deadly force, assaults on police, and the use of search warrants by detectives). Most recently he has completed two studies on controlling street-level drug trafficking in Oakland, California, and Birmingham, Alabama. Dr. Uchida has published articles in *The American Sociological Review*, *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *The American Journal of Police*, and other criminal justice-related journals. In addition, he has edited two books and written chapters for books on law enforcement statistics, the history of police, and search warrants.

*Christy A. Visher (See Workshops, p. 107)*

Christy A. Visher is the Deputy Director, Office of Criminal Justice Research at the National Institute of Justice. Her interests include ways in which social science research can inform criminal justice policy, especially in the areas of drugs and crime, violence, and criminal careers. Her recent research on pretrial arrest and drug testing has appeared in the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* and the *Journal of Criminal Justice*. She received her Ph.D. in Sociology from Indiana University.



*Deborah Lamm Weisel (Abstract Section, p. 54)*

Ms. Weisel is a Senior Research Associate with the Police Executive Research Forum and is based in Chicago. She is currently engaged in two projects related to youth gangs: BJA's Comprehensive Gang Initiative and NIJ's Case Studies of Police Decisionmaking: Police Responses to Drugs and Gangs. She also served as the Assistant Director for the BJA-funded Problem-Oriented Approach to Drug Enforcement project and has studied extensively police responses to drug problems. In addition, Ms. Weisel has worked in the public housing field addressing problems related to both drugs and gangs. She is author of *Tackling Drug Problems in Public Housing: A Guide for Police*, published by PERF. Before coming to PERF, Ms. Weisel was a government reporter for *The Raleigh Times*. She holds a Master of Public Affairs degree from North Carolina State University and is enrolled in the doctoral program of Policy Analysis at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

*Rachel Whipple (Abstract Section, p. 54)*

Ms. Whipple is a Captain with the Kansas City, Missouri, Police Department. She has more than 12 years in the department. Her assignments have included patrol, intelligence, and narcotics. In addition, she is licensed to practice law in Missouri. She has a Bachelor of General Studies degree from the University of Kansas and a Juris Doctorate from the University of Missouri at Kansas City, School of Law.

*Dennis Wiggins (Abstract Section, p. 55)*

Mr. Wiggins is a Program Planner in the Iowa Department of Human Rights, Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning and Statistical Analysis Center. He provides research and other technical assistance to the Iowa Governor's Alliance on Substance Abuse and drug law enforcement task forces. He received a B.A. in Criminology from the University of Northern Iowa and has been involved in a number of research and planning projects including his role as principal researcher and author of *Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Law Enforcement Task Forces: A Description and Implementation Guide*.

*Robert E. Worden (Abstract Section, p. 55)*

Dr. Worden is an Assistant Professor in the School of Criminal Justice and in the Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University at Albany, State University of New York. His primary research interests include developing theories of police decisionmaking and behavior, and evaluating the outcomes of police policies and strategies. Currently he is co-principal investigator for an

**NIJ-funded evaluation of police drug crackdowns, and he is also engaged in a study of police use of force. He holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.**

---

## APPENDIX B

### Addresses of Speakers and Moderators

**Thomas F. Albrecht**  
Program Manager for  
Evaluation Division  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Room 805  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-514-6236

**James Austin**  
Executive Vice President  
National Council on Crime  
and Delinquency  
685 Market Street  
Suite 620  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415-896-6223

**Geoffrey P. Alpert**  
Professor  
College of Criminal Justice  
University of South Carolina  
Columbia, SC 29208  
803-777-6424

**Allan R. Barnes**  
Professor  
Alaska Statistical Analysis  
Unit  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska  
Anchorage, AK 99508  
907-786-1810

**Sampson O. Annan**  
Deputy Director of Research  
Police Foundation  
1001 22nd Street, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-833-1460

**Sheila Barton**  
Director of Law and Policy  
SEARCH Group, Inc.  
7311 Greenhaven Drive  
Suite 145  
Sacramento, CA 95831  
916-392-2550

**Diane Biallargeon**  
Deputy Director  
Center on Addiction and  
Substance Abuse  
Columbia University  
915 Broadway Street  
New York, NY 10010  
212-420-0700

**William Braniff**  
United States Attorney  
Southern District of California  
940 Front Street, Room 5N19  
San Diego, CA 92189  
619-557-5610

**Elliott A. Brown**  
Acting Director  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.,  
Room 1044-A  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-514-6278

**Timothy Bynum**  
Professor  
School of Criminal Justice  
Michigan State University  
560 Baker Hall  
East Lansing, MI 48824  
517-355-2197

**Mary Causey**  
Detective  
Pittsburgh Department of  
Public Safety  
1600 West Carson Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
412-255-8600

**David P. Cavanagh**  
Technical Director  
Botec Analysis Corporation  
1698 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
617-491-1277

**Marcia Chaiken**  
Research Director  
LINC  
P.O. Box 406  
Lincoln, MA 01773  
617-259-9218

**Todd Clear**  
Vice President  
National Council on Crime  
and Delinquency  
15 Washington Street  
Room 403  
Newark, NJ 07102-0000  
201-643-5805

**James R. Coldren, Jr.**  
Director of Research  
Justice Research on Statistics  
Association  
444 North Capitol St., NW  
Suite 606  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-624-8560

**Mark Cunniff**  
Director  
National Association of  
Criminal Justice Planners  
1511 K. Street, N.W.  
Suite 445  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-347-0501

**Royer Cook**  
President  
Institute for Social Analysis  
201 North Union Street  
Suite 360  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-739-0880

**Christine Curtis**  
Assistant Director  
Criminal Justice Research Unit  
San Diego Association of  
Governments  
San Diego, CA  
619-421-6417

**Ernest L. Cowles**  
Assistant Professor  
Crime Studies Center  
Southern Illinois University  
Carbondale, IL 62901  
618-453-5701

**Lynn A. Curtis**  
President  
Milton S. Eisenhower  
Foundation  
Suite 200, 1660 L Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
202-429-0440

**Kenneth Coyle**  
Research Analyst  
American Prosecutors  
Research Institute  
1033 N. Fairfax Street  
Suite 200  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-549-4401

**Charles M. Daly**  
Faculty  
Institute for Health and  
Human Services Research  
Florida State University  
2035 E. Divac Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32310  
904-644-2710

**Robert Davis**  
Research Director  
Victim Service Agency  
2 Lafayette Street  
New York, NY 10007  
212-571-2660

**James Donnelly**  
Lieutenant  
Hartford Police Department  
50 Jennings Road  
Hartford, CT 06120  
203-527-6300

**Robert DeGeorge**  
Assistant Attorney General  
New Jersey Department of  
Law and Public Safety  
CN181 25 Market Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
609-530-3401

**Terence Dunworth**  
Project Director  
RAND Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
P.O. Box 2138  
Santa Monica, CA 90406  
310-393-0411

**Charles B. DeWitt**  
Director  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Room 846  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2942

**John Eck**  
Associate Director of  
Research  
Police Executive Research  
Forum  
2300 M. Street, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-466-7820

**Thomas Diggs**  
Research Associate  
National Center for State  
Courts  
300 Newport Avenue  
Williamsburg, VA 23187-8798  
804-253-2000

**Kim English**  
Manager of Research  
Colorado Department of  
Public Safety  
Division of Criminal Justice  
700 Kipling Street, Suite 1000  
Denver, CO 70215  
303-239-4453

**Deane Evans**  
Director of AIA  
AIA/ACSA Council on  
Architectural Research  
1735 New York, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-785-2324

**Tony Fabelo**  
Executive Director  
Criminal Justice Policy  
Council  
P.O. Box 13332  
Austin, TX 78711-0000  
512-463-1810

**Greg Falkin**  
Senior Researcher  
National Drug Research  
Institute  
11 Beach Street  
New York, NY 10013  
212-966-8700

**Joseph R. Farmer**  
Drug Program Coordinator  
Arizona Criminal Justice  
Commission  
1501 W. Washington  
Suite 207  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
602-542-1928

**Marcus Felson**  
Professor  
Social Science Research  
Institute  
University of Southern  
California  
1014 Childs Way Two –  
MC0591  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1111  
213-740-4282

**Frank Gajewski**  
Captain  
Jersey City Police Department  
280 Grove Street  
Jersey City, NJ 07302  
201-547-4310

**James Garofalo**  
Director  
Center for the Study of Crime,  
Delinquency, and Corrections  
Southern Illinois University,  
Faner Hall  
Carbondale, IL 62901  
618-453-5701

**Kimberly Glenn**  
Associate Planner  
San Diego Association of  
Governments  
401 B. Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
619-595-5300

**Stephen Goldsmith**  
Mayor  
City of Indianapolis  
Suite 2501  
City County Building  
200 East Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204  
317-327-3600

**Patricia Hardyman**  
Director of Research  
National Council on Crime  
and Delinquency  
15 Washington Street  
Suite 403  
Newark, NJ 07102  
201-643-5805

**Scott H. Green**  
Vice President  
Government Affairs  
Twenty-First Century  
Technologies, Inc.  
1945 Old Gallows Road  
Suite 580  
Vienna, VA 22182

**Adele Harrell**  
Senior Research Analyst  
Urban Institute  
2100 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-857-8738

**Jimmy Gurulé**  
Assistant Attorney General  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531

**Lana Harrison**  
Statistician  
National Institute on  
Drug Abuse  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockwall II  
Rockville, MD 20857  
301-443-6637

**Rudy Haapanen**  
Research Program  
Specialist II  
Parole and Classification  
Research Bureau  
California Youth Authority  
4241 Williamsborough Drive  
Sacramento, CA 95823  
916-427-4829

**David Hayeslip**  
Program Manager  
Evaluation Division  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531



**Fred Heinzelmann**  
Director  
Crime Prevention and  
Enforcement Division  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2949

**Gwen A. Holden**  
Executive Vice President  
National Criminal Justice  
Association  
444 North Capitol, N.W.  
Suite 608  
Washington, DC 20001  
202-347-4900

**John Hepburn**  
Director  
School of Justice Studies  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, AZ 85287  
602-965-7085

**William M. Holmes**  
Director of the Statistical  
Analysis Center  
Massachusetts Committee on  
Criminal Justice  
100 Cambridge Street  
Room 2100  
Boston, MA 02202  
617-727-0237

**Janice Hirota**  
Documentation Study  
Coordinator  
Center on Addition and  
Substance Abuse  
Columbia University  
915 Broadway Street  
New York, NY 10010  
212-420-0700

**Joan Jacoby**  
Executive Director  
Jefferson Institute for  
Justice Studies  
1910 K. Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
202-659-2882

**Darlanne Hoctor**  
Assistant Research Analyst  
Criminal Justice Research Unit  
San Diego Association of  
Governments  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
619-595-5375

**Edwin Kennedy**  
Senior Analyst  
Drug Information Analysis  
Center  
Illinois Criminal Justice  
Information Authority  
120 S. Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, IL 60606  
312-793-8516

**Robert Kern**  
Director  
Criminal Justice Research  
Center  
Virginia Department of  
Criminal Justice Services  
805 East Brad Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
804-225-4565

**Robert Kirchner**  
Chief of Program Evaluation  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-5974

**Malcolm W. Klein**  
Professor  
Social Science Research  
Institute  
University of Southern  
California  
Los Angeles, CA 90089-1111  
213-740-3605

**John Krimmel**  
Chief  
Grants Monitoring Unit  
Division of Criminal Justice  
25 Market Street, CN-085  
Trenton, NJ 08625  
609-292-2874

**Pamela Lattimore**  
Senior Research Associate  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Room 868  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2961

**Paul Lavrakas**  
Director  
Northwestern University  
Survey Laboratory  
625 Haven Street  
Evanston, IL 60208

**Gary Leonardson**  
Research Consultant  
South Dakota Department of  
Corrections  
2505 Turkey Red Lane  
Bozeman, MT 59715  
406-587-2697

**Douglas Longshore**  
Adjunct Professor  
UCLA Neuropsychiatric  
Institute  
Drug Abuse Research Group  
1100 Glendon Avenue  
Suite 763  
Los Angeles, CA 90024-3511  
310-825-9057

**Brian Lynch**  
Staff Associate  
National Center for  
State Courts  
1110 N. Glebe Road  
Suite 1090  
Arlington, VA 22201  
703-841-0200

**Stephen Mastrofski**  
Visiting Fellow  
Evaluation Division  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2959

**Doris MacKenzie**  
Associate Professor  
University of Maryland  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-0500

**J. Thomas McEwen**  
Principal  
Institute for Law and Justice  
1018 Duke Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-684-5300

**Michael Maltz**  
Professor  
Department of Criminal  
Justice  
University of Illinois at  
Chicago  
Box 4348, M/C 141  
Chicago, IL 60680  
312-413-2473

**C. Aaron McNeece**  
Director  
Institute for Health and  
Human Services Research  
Florida State University  
2035 E. Divac Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32310  
904-644-2710

**Jay Marshall**  
Chief, Comprehensive  
Programs Branch  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-514-5943

**Raymond Milkman**  
Director  
The Lazar Institute  
6726 Lucy Lane  
McLean, VA 22101  
703-821-0900

**Arnold Mills**  
Public Health Advisor  
National Institute on Drug  
Abuse  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockwall II  
Rockville, MD 20857  
301-443-6637

**Lois Mock**  
Social Science Analyst  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-0693

**Ethel Mull**  
Vice President  
Treatment Alternatives for  
Special Clients  
1500 N. Halsted  
Chicago, IL 60622  
312-787-0208

**S. Ricardo Narvaiz**  
Deputy Assistant Attorney  
General  
Office of the Justice Programs  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Room 1300  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-5933

**Kenneth Nimmich**  
Special Agent/Section Chief  
FBI Laboratory  
10th and Pennsylvania  
Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20535  
202-324-4416

**Dennis Nowicki**  
Director  
Illinois Criminal Justice  
Information Authority  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, IL 60606

**Hugh Nugent**  
Principal Associate  
Institute for Law and Justice  
1018 Duke Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-684-5300

**Jack O'Connell**  
Director  
Delaware Statistical Analysis  
Center  
60 The Plaza  
Dover, DE 19901  
302-739-4846

**Garrett J. O'Keefe**  
Professor  
Department of Agricultural  
Journalism  
440 Henry Hall  
Madison, WI 53706  
608-262-4902

**Jimmy O'Neal**  
Chief  
Governor's Office of Criminal  
Justice Planning  
1130 K. Street, Suite 300  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
916-324-9112

**Joyce O'Neil**  
DUF Project Director  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-514-5981

**Michael Overton**  
SAC Director  
Nebraska Crime Commission  
301 Centennial Mall South  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
402-471-2194

**Tony Pate**  
Director of Research  
Police Foundation  
1001 22nd Street, N.W.  
Suite 200  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-833-1460

**Susan Pennell**  
Director  
Criminal Justice Research Unit  
San Diego Association  
of Governments  
401 B Street, Suite 800  
San Diego, CA 92101  
619-595-5383

**Roger Peters**  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Law and  
Mental Health  
Florida Mental Health Institute  
University of South Florida  
13301 N. Bruce D. Downs  
Boulevard  
Tampa, FL 33612-3899  
813-974-4510

**Joan Petersilia**  
Director of Criminal Justice  
Programs  
RAND Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica  
CA 90407-2138  
213-393-0411

**Robert E. Peterson**  
Director  
Office of Drug Control Policy  
P.O. Box 30026  
Lansing, MI 48909  
517-373-4700

**Christopher Ringwalt**  
Senior Health Analyst  
Research Triangle Institute  
3040 Cornwallis Road  
P.O. Box 12194  
RTP, NC 27709-2194  
919-541-6252

**Roger Przybylski**  
Director  
Drug Information  
Analysis Center  
Illinois Criminal Justice  
Information Authority  
120 S. Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, IL 60606  
312-793-8516

**Marilyn M. Roberts**  
Deputy Director  
Washington Office  
National Center for  
State Courts  
1110 N. Glebe Road  
Suite 1090  
Arlington, VA 22201  
703-841-0200

**Emily Reed**  
Management Analyst  
Delaware Criminal Justice  
Council  
820 North French Street  
4th Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
302-577-3430

**Janice Roehl**  
Vice President  
Institute for Social Analysis  
201 Hoffman Avenue  
Monterey, CA 93940  
408-655-1513

**Winifred Reed**  
Social Science Analyst  
Evaluation Division  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-0649

**Dennis Rogan**  
Project Director  
School of Criminal Justice  
University of Maryland  
7010 Wake Forest  
College Park, MD 20740  
301-864-1036

**Dennis P. Rosenbaum**  
Director  
Center for Research in Law  
and Justice  
University of Illinois  
at Chicago  
P.O. Box 4348 (M/C 2222)  
Chicago, IL 60607  
312-996-4632

**Tom Rueter**  
Assistant United States  
Attorney  
Eastern District of  
Pennsylvania  
Philadelphia, PA  
202-616-1152

**Joseph Ryan**  
Visiting Fellow  
Evaluation Division  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2964

**Susan Sadd**  
Project Director  
Vera Institute of Justice  
377 Broadway  
New York, NY 10013  
212-334-1300

**Judy Schiff**  
Senior Evaluator  
Georgia Department of  
Corrections  
2 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive  
Atlanta, GA 30334  
404-656-4609

**Timothy J. Shea**  
Associate Deputy Attorney  
General  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Washington, DC 20530

**Richard Sonnichsen**  
Deputy Assistant Director  
Office of Program Evaluation  
and Audits  
Federal Bureau of  
Investigation  
9th and Pennsylvania, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20535  
202-324-2905

**Bob Stevenson**  
Special Assistant for the  
Division of Applied Research  
National Institute on  
Drug Abuse  
5600 Fishers Lane  
Rockwall II  
Rockville, MD 20857  
301-443-6637

**Michele Sviridoff**  
Research Scientist  
Substance Abuse Strategy  
Initiative Program  
Robert Wagner School of  
Public Service  
915 Broadway Street  
New York, NY 10010-0000  
212-420-0700

**Faye Taxman**  
Acting Director  
Montgomery County Criminal  
Justice Commission  
101 Monroe Street  
Rockville, MD 20850  
301-217-7748

**James M. Tien**  
Vice President/Treasurer  
Queues Enforth Development  
432 Columbia Street  
Cambridge, MA 02141  
617-225-2510

**Jackson Toby**  
Professor of Sociology  
Rutgers State University of  
New Jersey  
Administration Service  
Building, Room 3  
P.O. Box 1089  
New Brunswick, NJ 08855  
908-932-3329

**Susan Turner**  
Senior Researcher  
RAND Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica, CA 90406  
213-393-0411

**Craig D. Uchida**  
Director, Evaluation Division  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Room 869  
Washington, D.C 20531  
202-307-2959

**Christy Visher**  
Deputy Director  
Office of  
Criminal Justice Research  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-0694

**Barbara Webster**  
Principal Associate  
Institute for Law and Justice  
1018 Duke Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-684-5300



**Deborah Lamm Weisel**  
Senior Research Associate  
Police Executive Research  
Forum  
2300 M. Street, N.W.  
Suite 910  
Washington, DC 20037  
202-466-7820

**Rachel Whipple**  
Captain  
Kansas City Police  
Department  
1125 Locus Street  
Kansas City, MO 64106  
816-482-8223

**Dennis Wiggins**  
Principal Researcher  
Division of Criminal and  
Juvenile Justice Planning  
Department of Human Rights  
Des Moines, IA 50319  
515-242-5823

**Robert E. Worden**  
Assistant Professor  
School of Criminal Justice  
University at Albany  
State University of New York  
Albany, NY 12222  
518-442-5225

**Edwin W. Zedlewski**  
Staff Economist  
Planning and  
Management Staff  
National Institute of Justice  
U.S. Department of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-307-2953