Review of best practices
for ICJI program areas and funding streams

Justice Assistance Grants (JAG)

A research partnership between the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute and the Indiana University Center for Criminal Justice Research

ICJI/CCJR Research Partnership

For more than a decade, the Indiana University Center for Criminal Justice Research (CCJR) has partnered with the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) to address critical issues related to Indiana's justice systems including: *crime prevention; drug and alcohol abuse associated with crime; law enforcement; sentencing and corrections;* and, *traffic safety*. On behalf of ICJI, CCJR conducted program assessments of 12 federal grant programs between January 2006 and June 2008. In an effort to further assist ICJI in improving criminal justice programming and policy development in Indiana, CCJR entered into a two-year research partnership (beginning in June 2011) to perform critical data collection and analytical tasks in two broad research areas identified as priorities by ICJI. The scope of work includes 1) a review of best practices for all Victims Services division programs and primary program areas under ICJI's Drug and Crime Control division and Youth Services funding streams, and 2) a statewide justice data records assessment that will serve as a first step in developing a statewide crime and justice data collaboration that could emulate the nationally recognized traffic safety records collaboration facilitated by ICJI. This work will result in a series of technical reports and topical briefs.

Indiana Unversity Center for Criminal Justice Research

The Center for Criminal Justice Research (CCJR), one of two applied research centers currently affiliated with the Indiana University Public Policy Institute, works with public safety agencies and social services organizations to provide impartial applied research on criminal justice and public safety issues. CCJR provides analysis, evaluation, and assistance to criminal justice agencies; and community information and education on public safety questions. CCJR research topics include traffic safety, crime prevention, criminal justice systems, drugs and alcohol, policing, violence and victimization, and youth.

Indiana University Public Policy Institute

The Indiana University Public Policy Institute is a collaborative, multidisciplinary research institute within the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA). Established in the spring of 2008, the Institute serves as an umbrella organization for research centers affiliated with SPEA, including the Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, and the Center for Criminal Justice Research. The Institute also supports the Indiana Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (IACIR).

Table of Contents

Authors

JOICE CHANG, visiting assistant professor, School of Public and Environmental Affairs

KATE KISER, research associate, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute

GARRETT MASON, research associate, Indiana Criminal Justice Institute

SARAH SMITH, research assistant, School of Public and Environmental Affairs

THOMAS D. STUCKY, associate director, Center for Criminal Justice Research; associate professor, School of Public and Environmental Affairs

ADRIENE TYNES, graduate research assistant, School of Public and Environmental Affairs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In an effort to assist the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) in improving criminal justice programming and policy development in Indiana, the Center for Criminal Justice Research (CCJR) entered into a two-year research partnership (beginning in June 2011) to perform critical data collection and analytical tasks in two broad research areas identified as priorities by ICJI. The scope of work includes 1) a review of best practices for each ICJI program area and ten major funding streams, and 2) a statewide criminal justice data assessment.

The goal of the best practices portion of the project is to develop tools to help guide ICJI funding decisions and strategic investment of federal awards. For each best practices report, CCJR researchers review ICJI's current funding and grant-making processes, examine federal guidelines and priorities for each funding stream, and conduct literature reviews of best practices for each funding stream. CCJR then synthesizes this research to develop lists of programs or program characteristics that are considered best practices.

This report, the third in a series of 7 across 10 ICJI funding streams, describes best practices for subgrants awarded under the Justice Assistance Grants (JAG) funding stream administered by ICJI. JAG subgrants must be used to address specific federally defined purpose areas, which include the following:

1. Law enforcement programs
2. Prosecution and court programs
3. Prevention and education programs
4. Corrections and community corrections programs
5. Drug treatment and enforcement programs
6. Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs

Each fiscal year, ICJI identifies key *priority areas* for Indiana JAG grants. Priority areas have historically been the same for state and local programs. For 2012, ICJI identified discrete state and local priority areas on which to focus funds in accordance with the Indiana JAG Strategic Plan for those programmatic levels. ICJI identified the following as state *priority areas* for 2012 (ICJI 2012 *State Priority Areas* document):

- Multi-jurisdictional task forces and interdiction teams
- Reentry and sentencing policy reform implementation and initiatives
- Enhancement of statewide criminal justice information sharing efforts

The following is a list of local *priority areas* for 2012 (ICJI 2012 *Local Priority Areas* document):

- Multi-jurisdictional task forces and interdiction teams
- Reentry and sentencing policy reform implementation and initiatives
- Problem-solving court programs
- Prosecution of drug and violent offenders
- Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
- Programs to reduce DNA forensic casework backlogs[1]

This report describes research findings pertaining to best practices for subgrants awarded under the JAG funding stream administered by ICJI. The report first describes the history of the federal JAG program and ICJI's history, documenting the federal JAG purpose areas, and the ICJI state and local priority areas. Then, we discuss recent JAG subgrants awarded through ICJI, focusing on both amounts and types of funding awarded from 2010 through 2012. Finally, the report includes best practices "sheets" for 6 ICJI state and local priority areas:

- Multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTFs) and interdiction teams
- Reentry initiatives[2]
- Problem-solving court programs
- Prosecution of drug and violent offenders
- Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative
- Statewide criminal justice information sharing initiatives, technology, and training[3]

Each priority area "sheet" includes: a brief description of the goal of the activity as it relates to the purpose/priority area, best practices recommendations/programming considerations, examples of successful or promising programs, key metrics/evaluation methods, and key resources. The report concludes with the following recommendations in each area.

Multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTFs) and interdiction teams

1. Require that subgrantees implement all 12 elements considered critical for task forces.
2. Require that subgrantees clearly define the program goals and objectives and methods used to evaluate goals and objectives.

---

[1]The decision was made not to focus a best practices sheet on this priority area for this report.

[2]Because sentencing policy reform is a very broad category, it was determined in consultation with ICJI personnel that it would be extremely difficult to derive best practices in this area.

[3]This category includes some helpful discussions for technology and training grants, which do not appear to fit well in any other areas.

3. Encourage network sharing between participating task force agencies.

4. Encourage subgrantees to attend trainings.

Reentry initiatives

1. Require that subgrantees document the degree to which they are following evidence-based practices in providing reentry programming.

2. Encourage the use of The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI-2000) to assess the degree to which programs are implementing Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) principles in their programs.

3. Request subgrantees to document the goals, nature, and scope of services they provide to address criminogenic needs or barriers to success.

4. Request subgrantees document the sanctions and incentive systems they have in place and encourage that these programs focus on rewards rather than punishment.

Problem-solving courts

1. Require that subgrantees document qualifications of treatment providers.

2. Clearly identify the type and length of treatment services being provided.

3. Require that subgrantees document the degree to which they are following evidence-based practices in providing programming.

4. Request that subgrantees document the structure of the problem-solving court model they are using, including the members of the team, the structure and function of the court, as well as the sanctions and incentive systems they employ.

Prosecution of drug and violent offenders

1. Require subgrantees to document whether and/or how they are following evidence-based practices in the prosecution of violent and drug crimes.

2. Require subgrantees to document whether and/or how they focus on high-risk offender deterrence and reduced recidivism.

3. Require subgrantees to evaluate, document, and improve the effectiveness (i.e., increased care and knowledge with which a case is pursued) and efficiency (i.e., reduced redundancy of investigations, data requests, and other related efforts for a single case) of case administration.

Juvenile Detention Alternatives initiaitve (JDAI)

1. Require subgrantees to clearly define reform goals.

2. Require subgrantees to document ways they are following all 8 JDAI core strategies.

3. Require subgrantees to provide the Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) used to assess youth (It is not recommended for a JDAI site to create their own RAI).

4. Require subgrantees to document the types of evidence-based alternatives that are used.

5. Require subgrantees to track all of the specified performance metrics and analyze and track the metrics for trend identification and comparison.

6. Require subgrantees to make programmatic changes based on needs identified through data analysis.

7. Encourage subgrantees to consult with the Statewide JDAI Coordinator before beginning the earliest stages of JDAI need determination.

8. Encourage subgrantees to use the numerous resources found at www.jdaihelpdesk.org

Statewide criminal justice information sharing initiatives, technology, and training

1. Require that subgrantees document their use of best practices in planning, implementation, and evaluation of criminal justice information sharing (CJIS) initiatives.

2. Request that subgrantees document the degree to which they are following evidence-based practices in the technology they are requesting.

3. Require that subgrantees document that they have conducted a technology needs assessment if they are requesting new technology.

4. Require subgrantees to document that they have searched for existing technologies and whether existing technologies will or will not fit needs.

5. Require subgrantees to document that they have attempted to reduce the costs of new technology, through collaboration, use of existing programs/technologies developed for other jurisdictions, or through cost-sharing.

General—Best Practice Considerations Across Priority Areas

1. Encourage subgrantees to focus on continuous improvement of evaluation of their programs. In addition to required performance metrics, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement provides resources for enhancing the quality of evaluations across a spectrum of criminal justice programming (https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/index.html).

ICJI RESEARCH PARTNERSHIP PROJECT SUMMARY

The Center for Criminal Justice Research (CCJR), part of the Indiana University Public Policy Institute, has partnered with the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute (ICJI) to address critical issues related to Indiana's justice systems across a variety of areas; including program assessments of 12 federal grant programs conducted by CCJR between January 2006 and June 2008. In late 2009, CCJR and ICJI staff identified the next steps in this partnership, including two broad research areas identified as priorities by ICJI that will be addressed over a 2-year period (June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2013):

1. *A statewide justice data records assessment, and*

2. *A review of best practices for each ICJI program area and 10 major funding streams (see Table 1).*

The first broad research area in the project is a statewide crime and justice data assessment. One of the main goals of this assessment is to enhance ICJI's research capabilities in its role as Indiana's Statistical Analysis Center. The assessment will focus on the data needs of ICJI and its partners, and CCJR will build awareness of issues pertaining to justice data by seeking input from local agencies/organizations.

The second broad research area in the project is a best practices review of major ICJI funding streams. The goal of the best practices portion of the project is to develop tools to help guide ICJI funding decisions and strategic investment of federal awards. For each best practices report, CCJR researchers will review ICJI's current funding and grant-making processes, examine federal guidelines and priorities for each funding stream, and conduct literature reviews of best practices for each funding stream. CCJR will then synthesize this research to develop lists of programs or program characteristics that are considered best practices.

This report is related to the second broad research area and describes research findings pertaining to best practices for subgrants awarded under the Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) funding stream administered by ICJI. The report first describes the history of the federal JAG program and ICJI's history, documenting the federal JAG purpose areas, and the ICJI state and local priority areas. Then, we discuss recent JAG subgrants awarded through ICJI, focusing on both amounts and types of funding awarded from 2010 through 2012. For this assessment, CCJR obtained copies of 61 JAG subgrantee applications from ICJI funded in 2012, and reviewed proposals with particular attention to the following areas: purpose and priority areas identified, agency type and location, funding amounts requested and received, whether the applicant was applying for funds for the first time or was applying for continuing funding, and the number of years of previous funding.

The report also includes best practices "sheets" for 6 ICJI state and local priority areas:

- Multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTFs) and interdiction teams

- Reentry initiatives[4]

- Problem-solving court programs

- Prosecution of drug and violent offenders

- Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)

- Statewide criminal justice information sharing initiatives, technology, and training[5]

Each priority area sheet includes: a brief description of the goal of the activity as it relates to the purpose/priority area, best practices recommendations/programming considerations, examples of successful or promising programs, key metrics/evaluation methods, and key resources. We conclude with a list of recommendations.

Table 1: ICJI research partnership best practices reports

Funding stream	ICJI division	Report order	Publication date
Juvenile Accountability Block grants (JABG)	Youth services	1	October 2011
Victims of Crime Act grants (VOCA)	Victims' Services	2	April 2012
Byrne/JAG	Drug and Crime Control	3	July 2012
Sexual Assault Services Program (SASP)	Victims' Services	4	
Sexual Assault Services Block Grant (SSBG)			
Sexual Assault Services (SAS/SOS)			
Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors (STOP) grants	Victims' Services	5	
Title II Formula grants	Youth services	6	
Domestic Violence Prevention and Treatment (DVPT)	Victims' Services	7	
Federal Family Violence Grant (FFV)			

[4]Because sentencing policy reform is a very broad category, it was determined in consultation with ICJI personnel that it would be extremely difficult to derive best practices in this area.

[5]This category includes some helpful discussions for technology and training grants, which do not appear to fit well in any other areas.

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND ICJI FUNDING HISTORY

Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) funds are administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) within the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. JAG funds are the largest source of federal criminal justice funding to state and local jurisdictions and are authorized under Public Law 109-162. The JAG Program supports a range of program areas including "law enforcement, prosecution and courts, crime prevention and education, corrections and community corrections, drug treatment and enforcement, planning, evaluation, technology improvement, and crime victim and witness initiatives," excluding compensation pace (BJA website). Funds may be used for "state and local initiatives, technical assistance, training, personnel, equipment, supplies, contractual support, and information systems for criminal justice, as well as research and evaluation activities that will improve or enhance law enforcement programs related to criminal justice" (BJA Website, JAG FAQ sheet, 6-7). States have 4 years to expend an award. Grants not fully expended by the end of the 4-year period may request an extension from BJA or return any existing balances. Consequently, the funds expended in a given year may not exactly match the funds received in a given year.

Through its Drug and Crime Division, for the 2010, 2011, and 2012 operating periods, ICJI awarded more than $13 million in JAG subgrants.[6] As shown in Table 2, in 2010, applicants in 26 counties received JAG program awards and 26 received equipment funds. In 2011, 18 counties received JAG equipment funds and 26 counties received JAG program awards. In 2012, the number of counties that received programs awards increased to 29 but the number of counties have received equipment funds thus far.

Several subgrantees had multi-county service areas. In 2010, 9 JAG grants were awarded for statewide purposes, followed by 11 in 2011 and 13 in 2012. In 2010, 83 JAG grants that totaled nearly $4.8 million were awarded to Indiana subgrantees. The overall award amount to 74 subgrantees fell slightly to just below $4.2 million in 2011. In 2012 so far, 61 grants totaling approximately $4 million have been awarded.

Marion County subgrantees received by far the highest total dollar amount of JAG awards during the period, at almost $2.8 million, followed by Lake and Henry counties with approximately $750,000 each. The average size of individual grants awarded in 2010 was $57,706, $56,698 in 2011, and $65,289 in 2012. The majority of JAG subgrantees have previously received grants. The average number of years of previous JAG funding among 2012 subgrantees is 9 years. Sixty-six percent (40 out of 61) of 2012 subgrantees were previously awarded JAG grants.

JAG PURPOSE AREAS

JAG grants must be used to address specific federal JAG purpose areas. Potential subgrantees must select from 1 or more of these purpose areas that match the program for which they are requesting funding. These areas include the following:

1. Law enforcement programs

2. Prosecution and court programs

3. Prevention and education programs

4. Corrections and community corrections programs

5. Drug treatment and enforcement programs

6. Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement programs

7. Crime victim and witness assistance

JAG funds may not be used for security enhancements or equipment to nongovernmental entities not engaged in criminal justice or public safety. In addition, JAG funds may not be used for the following without BJA certification and authorization: "vehicles (excluding police cruisers); vessels (excluding police boats); aircraft (excluding police helicopters); luxury items; real estate; construction projects (other than penal or correctional institutions); and any similar matters" (BJA Website, JAG FAQ Sheet, 7). According to the ICJI solicitation for 2012, "JAG funded projects may address crime through the provision of services directly to individuals and/or communities and by improving the effectiveness and efficiency of criminal justice systems, processes, and procedures" (ICJI, 2012).

Each fiscal year, ICJI identifies key *priority areas* for Indiana JAG grants. Priority areas have historically been the same for state and local programs. For 2012, ICJI identified discrete state and local priority areas to focus funds in accordance with the Indiana JAG Strategic Plan for those programmatic levels. ICJI identified the following as state *priority areas* for 2012 (ICJI *2012 State Priority Areas*):

- **MJTFs and interdiction teams** with a collaborative and comprehensive strategy that includes: undercover investigation, direction and control of confidential informants, interdiction efforts, and prosecutorial support. Task forces and teams are required to include at least three jurisdictions within at least two counties.

- **Reentry and sentencing policy reform implementation and initiatives** for offenders returning from prison to local communities.

- **Enhancement of statewide criminal justice information sharing efforts** that will also advance the state's data exchange in

---

[6]For 2012 grants, information is current as of March 21, 2012.

Table 2: Allocation of JAG grants by county and year, 2010-2012

County	2010					2011					2012					Total award amount per county 2010-2012
	# of equip grants	Equip grant amount	# of JAG grants	JAG grant amount	Total annual amount	# of equip grants	Equip grant amount	# of JAG grants	JAG grant amount	Total annual amount	# of equip grants	Equip grant amount	# of JAG grants	JAG grant amount	Total annual amount	
Allen			1	$40,000	$40,000			1	$40,000	$40,000			1	$28,000	$28,000	$108,000
Benton	1	$7,836			$7,836	1	$9,520			$9,520						$17,356
Boone	1	$8,100			$8,100											$8,100
Carroll	2	$11,831			$11,831	1	$4,039			$4,039						$15,870
Clark	1	$9,450	1	$46,516	$55,966	1	$9,500	3	$142,323	$151,823	1	$29,750	3	$104,278	$134,028	$341,817
Clinton	1	$6,068			$6,068											$6,068
Crawford								1	$21,296	$21,296			1	$54,912	$54,912	$76,208
Decatur						1	$9,984			$9,984						$9,984
DeKalb			1	$37,700	$37,700			1	$41,000	$41,000			1	$32,800	$32,800	$111,500
Dubois			1	$27,832	$27,832											$27,832
Elkhart	1	$8,271			$8,271											$8,271
Fayette			1	$20,000	$20,000			1	$20,000	$20,000			1	$20,000	$20,000	$60,000
Fountain						1	$527			$527						$527
Franklin						1	$9,599			$9,599						$9,599
Grant	1	$10,000	2	$140,286	$150,286			2	$140,287	$140,287			3	$130,908	$130,908	$421,481
Greene	1	$10,000			$10,000						1	$15,500			$15,500	$25,500
Hamilton	1	$4,342			$4,342											$4,342
Hancock			1	$31,024	$31,024			1	$30,131	$30,131			1	$16,626	$16,626	$77,781
Hendricks	1	$9,332			$9,332						1	$24,485	1	$25,780	$50,265	$59,597
Henry	1	$7,300	2	$451,064	$458,364	1	$10,000	2	$244,000	$254,000			1	$30,800	$30,800	$743,164
Howard			1	$51,789	$51,789			1	$51,789	$51,789			1	$25,895	$25,895	$129,473
Jackson	1	$9,273			$9,273											$9,273
Jennings	2	$19,171			$19,171	1	$10,000			$10,000						$29,171
Johnson			1	$50,506	$50,506			1	$50,506	$50,506			1	$40,405	$40,405	$141,417
Kosciusko	2	$17,064			$17,064											$17,064
Lake			2	$174,292	$174,292	1	$8,889	2	$299,600	$308,489			3	$262,992	$262,992	$745,773
Lawrence	1	$5,144	1	$69,847	$74,991	1	$8,666	1	$59,101	$67,767			1	$84,503	$84,503	$227,261
Madison			2	$130,159	$130,159			2	$110,635	$110,635			2	$253,147	$253,147	$493,941
Marion			8	$928,015	$928,015	2	$20,000	10	$940,933	$960,933			11	$910,209	$910,209	$2,799,157
Miami													1	$98,455	$98,455	$98,455
Monroe			1	$65,369	$65,369	1	$10,000	2	$75,564	$85,564			1	$50,008	$50,008	$200,941
Montgomery	3	$15,894			$15,894											$15,894
Noble	2	$13,680	1	$77,911	$91,591											$91,591
Parke			1	$23,903	$23,903			1	$23,903	$23,903			1	$19,777	$19,777	$67,583
Perry	3	$29,196			$29,196											$29,196
Pike						1	$9,616			$9,616						$9,616
Porter			1	$49,685	$49,685	1	$3,599	1	$30,066	$33,665			1	$24,000	$24,000	$107,350
Pulaski								1	$150,000	$150,000						$150,000
Putnam	1	$10,000			$10,000											$10,000
Randolph			1	$51,789	$51,789			1	$51,552	$51,552			1	$25,776	$25,776	$129,117
Ripley	1	$9,026			$9,026											$9,026
Scott			1	$34,500	$34,500	2	$13,535	1	$34,500	$48,035			1	$27,600	$27,600	$110,135
Shelby													1	$208,335	$208,335	$208,335
St. Joseph	2	$12,466	1	$135,594	$148,060			1	$115,254	$115,254			1	$25,000		$288,314
Sullivan						1	$4,171			$4,171						$4,171
Tippecanoe			3	$117,506	$117,506	1	$10,000			$10,000			1	$36,400	$36,400	$163,906
Vanderburgh			1	$53,637	$53,637			2	$74,466	$74,466			1	$42,910	$42,910	$171,013
Vigo								1	$37,021	$37,021			1	$36,000	$36,000	$73,021
Warren	1	$5,823			$5,823											$5,823
Warrick	1	$8,235	1	$71,585	$79,820			1	$60,847	$60,847			1	$30,424	$30,424	$171,091
Washington	1	$8,500	1	$20,000	$28,500			1	$15,971	$15,971						$44,471
Wayne	1	$10,000			$10,000								1	$50,000	$50,000	$60,000
Wells	1	$7,965	1	$17,647	$25,612			1	$20,652	$20,652			1	$13,600	$13,600	$59,864
Whitley						1	$10,000			$10,000						$10,000
Statewide	2	$190,309	7	$1,407,127	$1,597,436	3	$180,403	8	$972,228	$1,152,631	1	$34,300	11	$1,234,347	$1,268,647	$4,018,714
Total	**37**	**$464,276**	**46**	**$4,325,283**	**$4,789,559**	**23**	**$342,048**	**51**	**$3,853,625**	**$4,195,673**	**4**	**$104,035**	**57**	**$3,943,887**	**$4,047,922**	**$13,033,154**

Source: 2010, 2011, 2012 ICJI JAG award documents; accurate as of March 2012

alignment with the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM 2.0).

The following is a list of local priority areas for 2012 (ICJI 2012 *Local Priority Areas* document):

- **MJTFs and interdiction teams** with a collaborative and comprehensive strategy that includes: undercover investigation, direction and control of confidential informants, interdiction efforts, and prosecutorial support. Task forces and teams are required to include at least three jurisdictions within at least two counties.

- **Reentry and sentencing policy reform implementation and initiatives** for offenders returning from prison to local communities.

- **Problem-solving court programs** that provide comprehensive treatment services and monitoring of offenders.

- **Prosecution of drug and violent offenders.**

- **Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)** program advancement for projects which also support disproportionate minority contact (DMC) initiatives.

- **Programs to reduce DNA forensic casework backlogs** including forensic DNA sample turnaround time and increases in the throughput of public DNA laboratories.

Both the state and local priority areas fall under federal purpose areas. As shown in Table 3, some priority areas fall under more than one federal purpose area.

For this assessment, CCJR obtained copies of 61 JAG subgrantee applications funded in 2012 from ICJI, and reviewed proposals, paying particular attention to the following areas: purpose and priority areas identified, agency type and location, funding amounts requested and received, whether the applicant was applying for funds for the first time or was applying for continuing funding, and number of years of previous funding. Appendix 1 provides these details for all 61 subgrantees.

Table 3: JAG federal and Indiana state and local priority areas

Federal purpose areas	State/ICJI priority areas	Local/ICJI priority areas
A. Law enforcement	MJTFs and interdiction teams	MJTFs and interdiction teams
B. Prosecution and court		Problem-solving court programs; Prosecution of drug and violent offenders
C. Prevention and education		Problem-solving court programs; JDAI
D. Corrections and community corrections	Reentry and sentencing policy reform	Reentry and sentencing policy reform; JDAI
E. Drug treatment and enforcement	MJTFs and interdiction teams	MJTFs and interdiction teams
F. Planning, evaluation, and technology improvement	Statewide criminal justice information sharing	

Sources: ICJI 2012 State and Local Priority Area documents

The number of local JAG subgrants awarded per priority area from 2010 to 2012 is shown in Table 4a. Regarding 2012 awards, for the 49 JAG grants awarded to local programs in 2012 through March 21, *Problem-solving courts* received the most awards at 15, or 31 percent. Thirteen or 27 percent went to *MJTFs and interdiction teams* and *Reentry* and *sentencing policy reform initiatives* received 4 awards, or 8 percent. *Prosecution of drug and violent offenders* programs received 8 percent of the 2012 local grants with 4 awards and JDAI programs were awarded 3 grants, or 6 percent. Three equipment grants were awarded to local subgrantees. One effort to reduce DNA forensic casework backlogs was awarded a local grant and 6 *Other* programs received JAG funding.

When equipment grants are excluded, over the last 3 funding cycles, the percentage of total number of JAG grants that were awarded to *MJTFs and interdiction teams* dropped from 31 percent in 2010, to 28 percent in 2011 and 2012. *JDAI* programs dropped slightly as well, from 10 percent in 2010 to a low of 5 percent in 2011, and increased to 7 percent in 2012. *Problem-solving courts* rose sharply from 31 percent in 2010 to 37 percent in 2011, then declined to 33 percent in 2012. *Reentry and sentencing policy reform* declined slightly from 5 percent in 2010 to 5 percent in 2011, then increases to 9 percent in 2012. *Prosecution of drug and violent offenders* programs were relatively stable, moving from 8 to 9 percent in 2011 and

2012. *Efforts to reduce DNA forensic casework backlogs* increased from 0 percent in 2010 to 2 percent in 2011 and 2012.

When equipment grants are included, over the last three funding cycles, the percentage of total number of local JAG grants that were awarded to *MJTFs and interdiction teams* increased from 16 percent in 2010 to 27 percent in 2012. *JDAI* programs ranged from 5 percent in 2010 to a low of 3 percent in 2011, and increased to 6 percent in 2012. *Problem-solving courts* rose sharply from 16 percent in 2010, 25 percent in 2011, and 31 percent in 2012. *Reentry and sentencing policy reform* increased from 3 percent in 2010 and 2011 to 8 percent in 2012. *Prosecution of drug and violent offenders* programs increased over time, moving from 4 percent in 2010, 8 percent in 2012. *Efforts to reduce DNA forensic casework backlogs* increased from 0 percent in 2010 to 2 percent in 2011 and 2012.

The number of state JAG subgrants awarded per priority area from 2010 to 2012 is shown in Table 4b. Of the 12 state programs that received JAG funds in 2012, 4, or 33 percent, were under the *Statewide criminal justice information sharing* priority area. *Reentry and sentencing policy reform* made up 25 percent of the awards with 3 funded programs. Two *MJTFs and interdiction teams* and 2 *Other* programs also received JAG funds, 17 percent each of the total number of state awards. One statewide equipment grant was awarded. MJTF and interdiction teams were awarded the same

Table 4a: JAG local subgrant by priority area by year, 2010-2012

Local priority area	2010		2011		2012		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
MJTFs and interdiction teams	12	16%	12	19%	13	27%	37	20%
Reentry and sentencing policy reform	2	3%	2	3%	4	8%	8	4%
Problem-solving court	12	16%	16	25%	15	31%	43	23%
Prosecution of drug and violent offenders	3	4%	4	6%	4	8%	11	6%
Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)	4	5%	2	3%	3	6%	9	5%
Reduce DNA forensic casework backlogs	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	2	1%
Equipment	35	47%	20	32%	3	6%	58	31%
Other	6	8%	6	10%	6	12%	18	10%
total	74	100%	63	100%	49	100%	186	100%

Source: ICJI federal fiscal years 2010-2012 Award Control Reports provided to CCJR.

Table 4b: JAG state subgrant by priority area by year, 2010-2012

State priority area	2010		2011		2012		Total	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
MJTFs and interdiction teams	2	22%	2	20%	2	17%	6	19%
Reentry and sentencing policy reform	2	22%	1	10%	3	25%	6	19%
Statewide criminal justice information sharing	1	11%	3	30%	4	33%	8	26%
Equipment	2	22%	3	30%	1	8%	6	19%
Training	2	22%	1	10%	2	17%	5	16%
total	9	100%	10	100%	12	100%	31	100%

Source: ICJI federal fiscal years 2010-2012 Award Control Reports provided to CCJR.

Note: MJTF refers to Multi-jurisdictional task force

number of grants from 2010 to 2012, but the percentage of total state grants declined from 22 percent in 2010, to 20 percent in 2011, and 17 percent in 2012. *Reentry and sentencing policy reform* grants accounted for 22 percent of state awards in 2010, 10 percent in 2011, and 25 percent in 2012. *Statewide criminal justice information sharing* awards jumped from 11 percent of the annual state grants in 2010 to 30 percent in 2011 and 33 percent in 2012. Twenty-two percent of the state grants in 2010 were for *Equipment* purchases, 30 percent in 2011, and 8 percent in 2012. *Training* grants made up 22 percent of the state grants that were awarded in 2010, 10 percent of the awards in 2011 and 17 percent of 2012.

Table 5a shows the total and average funding requested and received by local priority area for JAG subgrantees from 2010 through 2012. The per-

centage of annual JAG grant funds (state and local combined) that were awarded to local *MJTFs and interdiction teams* dropped from 23 percent ($1,108,910) in 2010 to 18 percent ($736,062) in 2012. Local *reentry and sentencing policy reform* total amount received declined from $205,286 (6 percent of local annual awards, 4 percent of annual total) in 2010 to $158,015 (5 percent local, 4 percent total) in 2011, then increased to $207,648 (7 percent local, 5 percent total) in 2012. The total amount of JAG funds received by *Problem-solving courts* rose sharply from $652,379 (20 percent local, 14 percent total) in 2010 to $974,980 (32 percent local, 23 percent total) then declined slightly to $894,318 (32 percent local, 22 percent total) in 2012. *Prosecution of drug and violent offenders* programs increased in JAG funding amounts, from $101,016 (3 percent local, 2 per-

Table 5a: JAG total and average funding requested and received by local priority area, 2010-2012

Local priority area	Year	Subgrant count	Request average	Received average	Request total	Received total	% of annual local award $ to local priority area	% of annual award $ (state and local)
MJTFs and interdiction teams	2010	12	$140,486	$92,409	$1,685,829	$1,108,910	35%	23%
	2011	12	$129,110	$78,231	$1,549,317	$938,777	31%	22%
	2012	13	$124,434	$56,618	$1,617,637	$736,032	26%	18%
Total		**37**	**$394,030**	**$227,258**	**$4,852,783**	**$2,783,719**		
Reentry and sentencing policy reform	2010	2	$160,231	$102,643	$320,463	$205,286	6%	4%
	2011	2	$98,181	$79,007	$196,361	$158,015	5%	4%
	2012	4	$147,724	$51,912	$590,897	$207,648	7%	5%
Total		**8**	**$406,136**	**$233,562**	**$1,107,721**	**$570,949**		
Problem-solving courts	2010	12	$67,789	$54,365	$813,465	$652,379	20%	14%
	2011	16	$111,679	$60,936	$1,786,869	$974,980	32%	23%
	2012	15	$119,428	$59,621	$1,791,413	$894,318	32%	22%
Total		**43**	**$298,896**	**$174,922**	**$4,391,747**	**$2,521,677**		
Prosecution of drug and violent offenders	2010	3	$33,672	$33,672	$101,016	$101,016	3%	2%
	2011	4	$41,035	$30,785	$164,140	$123,141	4%	3%
	2012	4	$74,030	$43,977	$296,120	$175,906	6%	4%
Total		**11**	**$148,737**	**$108,434**	**$561,276**	**$400,063**		
Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI)	2010	4	$57,421	$57,421	$229,685	$229,685	7%	5%
	2011	2	$38,783	$38,783	$77,566	$77,566	3%	2%
	2012	3	$41,083	$29,758	$123,250	$89,275	3%	2%
Total		**9**	**$137,287**	**$125,962**	**$430,501**	**$396,526**		
Reduce DNA forensic casework backlogs	2010	0	$0	$0	$0	$0	0%	0%
	2011	1	$194,361	$118,519	$194,361	$118,519	4%	3%
	2012	1	$212,620	$142,000	$212,620	$142,000	5%	4%
Total		**2**	**$406,981**	**$260,519**	**$406,981**	**$260,519**		
Equipment	2010	35	$8,804	$7,828	$308,124	$273,967	9%	6%
	2011	20	$8,082	$8,082	$161,645	$161,645	5%	4%
	2012	3	$46,490	$23,245	$139,470	$69,735	3%	2%
Total		**58**	**$63,376**	**$39,155**	**$609,239**	**$505,347**		
Other	2010	6	$124,944	$103,480	$749,663	$620,879	19%	13%
	2011	6	$135,011	$81,733	$810,067	$490,399	16%	12%
	2012	6	$106,929	$77,394	$641,571	$464,361	17%	11%
Total		**18**	**$366,884**	**$262,607**	**$2,201,301**	**$1,575,639**		

Source: ICJI federal fiscal year 2010-2012 Award Control Reports provided to CCJR.

cent total) in 2010 to $175,906 (6 percent local, 4 percent total) in 2012.

JDAI funding totals dropped significantly from $229,685 (7 percent local, 5 percent total) in 2010 to a low of $77,566 (3 percent local, 2 percent total) in 2011, increasing to $89,275 (3 percent local, 2 percent total) in 2012. JAG funding for efforts to *Reduce DNA forensic casework backlogs* increased from $0 in 2010 to $118,519 (4 percent local, 3 percent total) in 2011 and $142,000 (5 percent local, 4 percent total) in 2012. The total amount awarded for local *Equipment* grants declined from $273,967 (9 percent local, 6 percent total) in 2010, to $69,735 (3 percent local, 2 percent) in 2012. The average local award for *Equipment*, however, increased from $7,828 in 2010, to $8,082 in 2011, to $23,245 in 2012.

Table 5b shows the total and average funding requested and received by state priority areas for JAG subgrantees from 2010 through 2012. *MJTFs and interdiction teams* received a total of $1,305,019 in awards during the 3-year period, with $472,541 (30 percent of state awards, 10 percent of total awards) in 2010, $416,239 (36 percent state, 10 percent total) in

2011, and $416,239 (33 percent state, 10 percent total) in 2012. *Reentry and sentencing policy reform* state grants dropped from $362,668 (23 percent state, 8 percent total) in 2010 to $123,581 (11 percent state, 3 percent total) in 2011, then increased to $283,043 (22 percent state, 7 percent total) in 2012. Average awards, however, dropped over the 3 years from $181,334 to $123,581 to $94,348.

The average amount received for *Statewide criminal justice information sharing* awards dropped also from $383,306 in 2010, to $133,053 in 2011, to $119,332 in 2012. Due to the number of awards granted, the total amount awarded for this priority area rose from $383,306 (24 percent state, 8 percent total) in 2010, to $477,328 (38 percent state, 12 percent total) in 2012. *Equipment* purchases fell from $190,309 (12 percent state, 4 percent total) in 2010, to $180,403 (16 percent state, 4 percent total) in 2011, to a low of $34,300 (3 percent state, 1 percent total) in 2012. *Training* grants totaled $279,589 over the 3 years, with $188,612 awarded in 2010, $33,240 in 2011, and $57,737 in 2012.

Table 5b: JAG total and average funding requested and received by state priority area, 2010-2012

State priority area	Year	Subgrant count	Request average	Received average	Request total	Received total	% of annual state	% of annual total
MJTFs and interdiction teams	2010	2	$291,271	$236,271	$582,541	$472,541	30%	10%
	2011	2	$282,490	$208,120	$564,979	$416,239	36%	10%
	2012	2	$226,840	$208,120	$453,680	$416,239	33%	10%
Total		**6**	**$800,600**	**$652,510**	**$1,601,200**	**$1,305,019**		
Reentry and sentencing policy reform	2010	2	$310,329	$181,334	$620,658	$362,668	23%	8%
	2011	1	$123,581	$123,581	$123,581	$123,581	11%	3%
	2012	3	$273,076	$94,348	$819,227	$283,043	22%	7%
Total		**6**	**$706,986**	**$399,263**	**$1,563,466**	**$769,292**		
Statewide criminal justice information sharing	2010	1	$383,306	$383,306	$383,306	$383,306	24%	8%
	2011	3	$197,969	$133,053	$593,906	$399,158	35%	10%
	2012	4	$168,693	$119,332	$674,772	$477,328	38%	12%
Total		**8**	**$749,968**	**$635,691**	**$1,651,984**	**$1,259,792**		
Equipment	2010	2	$95,155	$95,155	$190,309	$190,309	12%	4%
	2011	3	$60,134	$60,134	$180,403	$180,403	16%	4%
	2012	1	$108,950	$34,300	$108,950	$34,300	3%	1%
Total		**6**	**$264,239**	**$189,589**	**$479,662**	**$405,012**		
Training	2010	2	$94,306	$94,306	$188,612	$188,612	12%	4%
	2011	1	$39,106	$33,240	$39,106	$33,240	3%	1%
	2012	2	$46,411	$28,869	$92,821	$57,737	5%	1%
Total		**5**	**$179,823**	**$156,415**	**$320,539**	**$279,589**		

Sources: ICJI federal fiscal year 2010-2012 Award Control Reports provided to CCJR.

BEST PRACTICE ASSESSMENTS BY JAG PRIORITY AREA

In this section we discuss best practices for JAG subgrantees across 6 broad categories including: MJTFs and interdiction teams; reentry; problem-solving courts; prosecution of drug and violent offenders; JDAI; and statewide criminal justice information sharing (CJIS) initiatives, technology and training). Each priority area sheet includes: a brief description of the goal of the activity as it relates to the purpose/priority area, best practices discussions/programming considerations, examples of successful or promising programs, key metrics/evaluation methods, and key resources.

MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL TASK FORCES AND INTERDICTION TEAMS

This section discusses MJTFs and interdiction teams; each is discussed separately beginning with MJTFs.

MJTFs

MJTFs are, "*[c]ooperative law enforcement efforts involving two or more criminal justice agencies, with jurisdiction over two or more areas, sharing the common goal of impacting one or more aspects of drug control and violent crime problems*" (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2000, p. 80). The goal of MJTFs is to "address drug control and/or violent crime problems by allowing law enforcement agencies in different jurisdictions to work together as a single enforcement entity with the ability to improve communication, share intelligence, and coordinate activities." (Stucky, Newby, & Nunn, 2007, p. 1)

Best Practices Recommendations/Programming Considerations

Model programs cannot be identified due to the lack of outcome evaluations of MJTFs. However, according to the Bureau of Justice Assistance (2000), for MJTFs to maintain successful management, performance, and future sustainability, research shows that MJTFs should contain the following 12 elements:

1. Written interagency agreements establishing broad objectives and funding methods

2. Prosecutor involvement, either as the lead agency or a participant, to assist with investigations, asset forfeitures, and other legal questions

3. Computerized information/intelligence databases and network systems

4. Determining specific criteria describing offenses and types of offenders sought for apprehension and investigative and prosecutorial tactics

5. Frequent communication between task force participants, sponsoring agencies, and outside agencies to share information and ensure goals and objectives are being met

6. Promoting coordination between all local, state, and federal stakeholders within the jurisdiction to acquire resources and gain long-term acceptance of task force efforts

7. Establishing a sustainable budget

8. Identifying goals, objectives, and performance measures

9. Monitoring and evaluation throughout the implementation process and lifetime of the task force

10. Experienced leadership

11. Effective asset seizure and forfeiture activities

12. Technical assistance and training programs

Key Metrics/Evaluation Methods

Commonly Used Performance Measures provided by BJA (https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-law-enforcement/forces5.htm) include:

Output measures[7]:

- Target population (number of cases filed, agencies assisted, fugitives arrested, illegal aliens identified)

- Training (type of training received, the number of enforcement personnel trained, hours of training provided, training sessions provided)

- Operations (number of personnel dedicated to task force efforts, level of agencies' involvement, degree of communication, types of operations undertaken, number of search warrants executed, number of surveillance operations initiated)

- Collaboration (number of active cases, cases dropped, cases involving multiple task forces, closed/terminated cases, new cases)

- Community support (number of citizens providing affidavits, community meetings held, community referrals, level of community support)

- Other (including accurate data submissions and positive media coverage)

Outcome Measures[8]:

- Actions taken (arrests; seizures of controlled substances; assets seized/value of seized assets; buys/busts; dismantled marijuana-growing operations, drug labs, packing, processing, and distribution locations identified/destroyed; properties forfeited; properties sealed without forfeiture; weapons confiscated/firearms seized; prosecutions/successful prosecutions, trials, pleas, convictions, or acquittals)

- Change in crime/activity (closed drug houses, police calls for service in a particular area, crime in a targeted area, residential and commercial narcotics locations identified, reduction in supply of drugs)

- Other (years per sentenced target, perceived satisfaction of leaders and community, resident attitudes about perceived change in activity/change in fear of crime, level of safety felt by community members, community attitudes about task force effectiveness)

---

[7]According to McDavid and Hawthorne (2006), output measures represent the amounts of work that is completed during the implemented program.

[8]According to McDavid and Hawthorn (2006), outcome measures represent the intended results linked to the program objectives.

Hayeslip and Russell-Einhorn (2002) also developed a list of recommended research questions and performance measures for State Administrating Agencies (SAAs) and task forces to use when evaluating MJTFs (see Hayeslip and Russell-Einhorn (2002) for list of questions), including the following:

- Background

- Operations and tactics

- Implementation process

- Effects on core task force member law enforcement agencies

- Effects on other law enforcement agencies

- Effects on drug markets

- Effects on drug use

Interdiction Teams

Increasing crime rates, drug use, and traffic fatalities and injuries has caused traffic law enforcement to "look beyond the ticket" (NHTSA, n.d.). By being trained to recognize key indicators of suspected illegal activity through human behavior and physical vehicle alterations during routine traffic stops, these officers can detect the transportation of illegal drugs on roadways (NHTSA, n.d.).

Best Practice Recommendations/Programming Considerations

Common training topics include the following:

- Aggressive patrol/interdiction

- Roadside interviewing

- Drug recognition/impaired driver detection

- Search and seizure procedures

- Vehicle contraband concealment

- Human behavior and body language

- Developing reasonable suspicion

Examples

Examples of interdiction trainings include the following:

- Counter Drug/Interdiction: www.streetsoldier.net/CounerDrug.htm

- Criminal Addiction: www.criminaladdiction.com

- Desert Snow: http://www.desertsnowtraining.com/

- Drug Interdiction Assistance Program (DIAP): http://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/documents/diap.pdf

- Federal Law Enforcement Training Center: www.fletc.gov/rpi/export/drug-interdiction

- Highway Interdiction Training Specialists: http://hits-training.com/

- Motor Vehicle Criminal Interdiction (MVCI) Training and Intelligence Sharing Meeting: www.mvci-association.com

Key Resources for MJTFs and Interdiction Teams

Bureau of Justice Assistance Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement. *Commonly used measures of task force performance.* Retrieved from https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-law-enforcement/forces5.htm

Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2000). *Creating a new criminal justice system for the 21st century: Findings and results from state and local program evaluations.* Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bja/178936.pdf

Hayeslip, D., & Russell-Einhorn, M.L. (2002). *Evaluation of Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces Project: Phase I final report.* Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/200904.pdf

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (n.d.) *Looking beyond the ticket: Traffic law enforcement and beyond.* Retrieved May 7, 2012 at http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/enforce/Beyond/index.htm

National Institute of Justice. (2003). Evaluating multijurisdictional drug enforcement task forces. *NIJ Journal, 250*, 40-42.

Rhodes, W., Chapman, M., Shively, M., Dyous, C., Hunt, D., & Wheeler, K. (2009). Evaluation of the Multijurisdictional Task Forces (MJTFs), Phase II: Project summary. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/228943.pdf

Rhodes, W., Dyous, C., Chapman, M., Shively, M., Hunt, D., & Wheeler, K. (2009). *Evaluation of the Multijurisdictional Task Forces (MJTFs), Phase II: MJTF performance monitoring guide.* Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/228942.pdf

Smith, B. W., Novak, K. J., Frank, J., & Travis III, L. F. (2000). Multijurisdictional drug task forces: An analysis of impacts. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 28*, 543-556.

Stucky, T.D., Newby, W., & Nunn, S. (2007). *Analysis of Byrne/JAG Programs administered by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute: Multi-jurisdictional (drug) task forces, 2006 and 2007.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Center for Criminal Justice Research.

REENTRY INITIATIVES

Reentry refers to the return of offenders to the community from jail or prison. Reentry is a process rather than a specific program (Mease, n.d.). This activity has become a major area of concern in criminal justice in recent years, as is evidenced by the Federal Second Chance Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-199).[9] The goal of reentry programs is to enhance the likelihood of successful reintegration of the offender into society by providing services to address the barriers to their success, while monitoring their progress. JAG reentry grants fit within the Federal Corrections and community corrections programs purpose area and within the ICJI state and local priority areas *Reentry and sentencing policy reform.*

Best Practices Recommendations/Programming Considerations

As noted above, reentry is a process rather than a specific set of clearly, identifiable programs that are universally employed. To date, there is no broad-based consensus on which combinations of reentry programming elements constitute the most effective reentry programming. Part of this stems from the limited number of multi-jurisdictional reentry programs that have been empirically evaluated (for an exception see Lattimore, Steffey, & Visher, 2012). There is, however, a long history of research on the common components of reentry programming (see Seiter & Kadela, 2003, for a review). Therefore, the recommendations listed below present a portrait of current best practices. Additional research is needed to examine which specific combinations of these elements produce the most effective reductions in recidivism and increases in public safety (Lattimore et al., 2012). Although these elements lean toward community-based programs, many suggestions are relevant for institutionally-based programs as well. Recommendations below were derived from Petersilia, 2004; Taxman, Young, Byrne, Hosinger, and Anspach, 2003; and Visher, 2007.

1. **For new programs, focus on properly starting a reentry initiative**
   This includes a rational planning process, developing effective collaborations with key stakeholders, effective case management, and evaluation. For additional assistance see Kemper and Gibel (2010) and the National Reentry Resource Center (NRRC).[10] This also likely requires a comprehensive strategy involving collaboration at the state and local level.

2. **Ensure effective evaluation of both the process (implementation of the program as intended) and outcomes (e.g., recidivism, employment, substance abuse)**
   One key component of any evidence-based program is evaluation, including measurement of program integrity (implementation as intended) and program outputs, and short- and long-term outcomes. Successful evaluation begins with creating a data collection plan prior to the start of programming. Where possible, evaluations should include random assignment or at least a comparison group of similar offenders not receiving programming. Research designs should be longitudinal and track offenders for at least one year, and three years if possible. A list of key performance metrics is included below. For additional reading on evaluating reentry programming see Rossman and Winterfield (2009).

3. **When possible, pre- and post-release programming should be coordinated**
   Behavioral change interventions beginning within a facility and continuing with matched post-release interventions are most likely to have the largest impact on offender behavior. For example, prison-based therapeutic communities (TCs) with aftercare in the community have been shown to reduce recidivism (Aos, Miller, & Drakes, 2006).

4. **Intensive services should be delivered immediately after release**
   The first weeks and months after release present numerous challenges for offenders including securing food, clothing, housing, and employment. Therefore, it is critical to connect the offender with services and supports immediately upon release.

5. **Program resources should be focused on high-risk individuals as determined by actuarial risk assessment tools**
   Programs should apply the Risk/Need/Responsivity (RNR) principle that is widely considered to be the gold standard for effective correctional programming (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990) and has been argued should be applied to reentry (Petersilia, 2004). The RNR principle states that the greatest impact occurs with higher-risk offenders and that too much intervention with low-risk offenders may actually *increase* the likelihood of recidivism.

6. **Programs should address criminogenic needs and barriers to offender success, using multimodal, integrated, and flexible programs**
   The second component of the RNR principle says that effective programs should identify and address individual offenders' needs that are considered criminogenic. These include static factors such as criminal history, anti-social personality, pro-criminal attitudes, social supports for crime, and dynamic factors such as substance abuse, employment, and family issues. Programs that can meet the dynamic needs of offenders have the greatest potential to reduce recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 1998). A related conceptualization is

---

[9] The Second Chance Act provided federal grants to agencies and nonprofit organizations to assist offenders returning from prisons and jails. Assistance addressed housing, substance abuse treatment, employment assistance, family support and other services designed to reduce recidivism (http://www.nationalreentryresourcecenter.org/about/second-chance-act).

[10] http://www.nationalreentryresourcecenter.org/topics/starting-reentry-initiative

to ensure that programs address specific barriers to offenders' success. These barriers include, but are not limited to (see Kemper & Gibel, 2010, 7-8; Berg & Huebner, 2011; Naser & Lavigne, 2006; Visher, 2007):

- Education,

- Homelessness/housing stability,

- Employment,

- Substance abuse and addiction,

- Family stability/reunification and caring for children, and

- Social ties/community reintegration.

Programs should be sufficiently flexible and comprehensive enough to effectively address the specific combinations of offender needs and barriers.

7. **Programs should respond to offenders' needs with individualized cognitive-behavioral approaches that focus on positive reinforcement rather than punishment**
   Applying the responsivity component of the RNR principle, where possible, cognitive-behavioral treatment approaches should be used that match treatment/therapist type to learning styles of offenders. Research consistently shows that programs with a rehabilitative focus, particularly cognitive behavioral approaches, are more effective at changing behavior than are punishment-oriented approaches (see review of meta-analyses in Lipsey & Cullen, 2007).

8. **Communication of expectations of accountability and responsibility to the offender is critical**
   There needs to be an effective system of sanctions and incentives in place to help shape offender behavior. Sanctions can include a brief stint in jail and rewards can include praise or small benefits.

9. **Programs should have sufficient duration and dosage/intensity**
   Although the length of time that provides sufficient duration varies by the type of activity, programs should last at least 6 months (Petersilia, 2004). There is general consensus that low intensity programs (particularly for low-risk offenders) do not appear to be effective.

10. **Program integrity is critical to success**
    Programs must be fully implemented as intended because there is generally a strong correlation between program integrity and program effectiveness (See Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005).

11. **Consider that gender differences affect needs and likelihood of success of offenders**
    Research generally suggests that the needs and predictors of recidivism of male and female offenders vary (Stalans, 2009). Therefore, gender-specific programming is critical.

Examples of Successful/Promising Programs

Although no widespread agreement exists on which combinations of reentry programming are most effective, several individual programs have been shown to be effective through evaluation. The resources listed below document current best practices in reentry.

- **National Reentry Resource Center** (http://nationalreentry resourcecenter.org/what_works)
  This site describes "what works" in reentry programming including both named reentry programs and several focus areas such as housing, employment, and mental health. As of June 2012, the site is currently under construction with additional resource areas coming soon.

- **Crime Solutions.gov** (http://crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails. aspx?ID=36)
  This site lists 14 programs deemed promising, as evidenced by at least one outcome evaluation showing statistically significant reductions in recidivism for program participants.[11]

- **Reentry courts**
  Hamilton (2010) found that the Harlem Parole Reentry Court was associated with significant reductions in rearrests, reconviction, and revocation, especially for those completing the program.

Key Metrics/Evaluation Methods

Rossman and Winterfield (2009) provide an excellent overview of key issues and metrics for evaluating a reentry program. In addition to basic performance measures required by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, a sample list of performance metrics for reentry evaluation includes the following (Rossman & Winterfield, 2009, 20):

- Number of program participants

- Number/percent of risk assessments completed

- Number/percent of offenders placed in supervision levels to match their risk level

- Number/percent of offenders placed in services that match their risk level

- Number/percent of medium and high risk offenders placed in programs that address their top three criminogenic needs

---

[11]This website lists four reentry programs as having "no effects" including Project Greenlight, Transitional Case Management, and the Serious and Violent Offender Reentry Initiative.

- Number/percent of program slots filled by medium and high risk offenders

- Number/percent of offenders who comply with program requirements

- Number/percent of offenders who successfully complete program requirements

- Number/percent of offenders who comply with terms and conditions of supervision

- Number/percent of offenders who are violation free after one year on supervision

- Number/percent of offenders who are free of new arrests after one year on supervision

Key Resources

- National Reentry Resource Center (NRRC)
  The NRRC provides a wide range of resources relating to reentry as well as links to other resources. (http://www.nationalreentry resourcecenter.org

- Reentry Policy Council (RPC)
  The RPC is a project of the Council of State Governments, and the website (http://www.reentrypolicy.org/government_affairs/national _initiatives) includes discussions of the following national reentry initiatives:

  o   Prisoner Reentry Policy Academy

  o   Reentry Roundtable

  o   Transition from Prison to Community Initiative[12]

  o   Transition from Jail to Community Initiative[13]

- Center for Effective Public Policy (CEPP)
  The CEPP has a large number of extremely valuable resources, including a series of coaching packets for reentry providers on a wide range of issues relating to the implementation of reentry programs (http://www.cepp.com/re-entry-products).

- Federal Interagency Reentry Council (FIRC)
  FIRC was convened in 2011 by Attorney General Eric Holder to bring federal agencies together to address reentry issues (http://www.nationalreentryresourcecenter.org/reentry-council).

- Reentry resources for further reading

  Drake, E. B., & LaFrance, S. (2007). *Findings on best practices of community re-entry programs for previously incarcerated persons.* Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.eisenhower-foundation.org/docs/Ex-Offender%20Best%20Practices.pdf

  Goldsmith, S., & Eimicke, W. B. (2008). Moving men into the mainstream: Best practices in prisoner reentry assistance. *Civic Bulletin, 51*, 1-14.

  Kempker, G. (2010). *A framework for offender reentry.* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.cepp.com/documents /A%20Framework%20for%20Offender%20Reentry.pdf

  Lattimore, P. K., Steffey, D. M., & Visher, C. A. (2010). Prisoner reentry in the first decade of the twenty-first century. *Victims and Offenders, 5*(3), 253-267.

  Mease, T. (n.d.). *Finding out 'what works' in reentry: Discovering evidence-based practices.* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.american.edu/spa/publicpurpose/upload/ Finding-Out-What-Works-in-Reentry.pdf

  O'Brien, K., & Lawrence, S. (2007). Implementing a reentry program according to best practices. *Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety Research and Policy Analysis Division.* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.mass.gov/ eopss/docs/eops/publications/eops-grantee-tools.pdf

  Severson, M. E., Bruns, K., & Veeh, C. (2011). Prisoner reentry programming: Who recidivates and when? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 50*(6), 327-348.

  Turner, S., & Petersilia, J. (2012) Putting science to work: How the principles of risk, need, and responsivity apply to reentry. In J. A. Dvoskin, J. L. Skeem, R. W. Novaco, & K. S. Douglas (Eds.), *Using social science to reduce violent offending* (179-198). New York: Oxford University Press.

---

[12]See also http://nicic.gov/TPCModel

[13]See also http:/nicci.gov/jailtransition

PROBLEM-SOLVING COURT PROGRAMS

The goal of problem-solving courts is to apply a therapeutic justice model to provide services to address the problems that lead to offending—such as drug abuse, mental health issues, or domestic violence—in a community setting, while monitoring offenders' progress through the court (for an overview, see Berman & Feinblatt, 2001). These courts typically address one type of offense or offender and the judge plays a key supervisory role.[14] JAG problem-solving court grants fit within the Federal Prosecution and Court Programs purpose area, and within the ICJI state and local priority areas *Problem-solving courts.* Drug courts have been in existence for over two decades, thus, a myriad of research studies have examined which program components or practices are associated with the greatest reductions in recidivism or cost savings (see Marlowe, 2011; and Shaffer, 2011). Because the bulk of the research on problem-solving courts has been conducted on drug courts and the majority of problem-solving courts funded by ICJI are drug courts, this review primarily focuses on drug courts. Additional resources for some other common problem-solving courts, such as domestic violence courts and mental health courts, are included.[15]

Best Practices Recommendations/Programming Considerations

Based on extensive research (see Carey, Finigan, & Pukstas, 2008; Huddleston & Marlowe, 2011; Marlowe, 2011; Rossman, Roman, Zweig, Rempel, & Lindquist, 2011; Shaffer, 2011; Wilson & Mckenzie 2006), the following elements have been shown to be associated with more effective drug courts:

1. **Following the 10 key components** (*see National Association of Drug Court Professionals, 1997*):

   - Drug courts integrate alcohol and other drug treatment services with justice system case processing.

   - Using a non-adversarial approach, prosecution and defense counsel promote public safety while protecting participants' due process rights.

   - Eligible participants are identified early and promptly placed in the drug court program.

   - Drug courts provide access to a continuum of alcohol, drug, and other related treatment and rehabilitation services.

   - Abstinence is monitored by frequent alcohol and drug testing.

   - A coordinated strategy governs drug court responses to participants' compliance.

   - Ongoing judicial interaction with each drug court participant is essential.

   - Monitoring and evaluation measure the achievement of program goals and gauge effectiveness.

   - Continuing interdisciplinary education promotes effective drug court planning, implementation, and operations.

   - Forging partnerships among drug courts, public agencies, and community-based organizations generates local support and enhances drug court program effectiveness.

2. **Program resources should be focused on high risk individuals**
   Consistent with the RNR principle for correctional programming (Andrews et al., 1990), drug court research shows that the largest impact is for higher-risk offenders.

3. **Programs should employ individualized approaches that are adaptable**
   Treatment and supervision should be matched to the needs of the offender. Treatment or services should also be adjusted as offender performance improves or declines.

4. **Programs should employ both sanctions and rewards**
   Sanctions should be swiftly applied for violations and in a graduated fashion. Rewards should be tailored to the individual.

5. **The Judge matters**
   Research consistently shows that regular interaction with a committed, well-trained, firm but fair judge who treats offenders with respect increases program success.

6. **A properly assembled, functional team is critical**
   In addition to the judge, the prosecutor, defense attorney, community corrections, treatment providers, and community resources act as a coordinated team, making coordinated decisions.

7. **Employment of a single case management entity enhances success**
   A single case management agency that oversees participant assessment, referrals to service providers and treatment, and progress reports to the judge is especially helpful.

8. **Treatment/services quality matters**
   Success of program participants is much greater when they receive high quality drug treatment that is consistent with a cognitive behavioral approach. Relapse prevention is also critical.[16]

---

[14] Crime Solutions.gov (http://crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails.aspx?ID=49). Retrieved May 3, 2012.

[15] Problem-solving courts have become very common and now address a wide variety of issues. We address the three most common here.

[16] The Crime Solutions.gov website lists 12 effective and 24 promising drug treatment programs, as well as 7 deemed to have no effects (http://crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails.aspx?ID=59 retrieved May 6, 2012). Programs are deemed *effective* if more than one outcome evaluation shows statistically significant reductions in recidivism for program participants, and *promising* based on a single program evaluation showing reductions in recidivism.

9. **Program integrity is critical to success**
   As shown in correctional programming (Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005), full implementation of programs is crucial to have the greatest impact on recidivism.

Examples Of Successful/Promising Programs

The Crime Solutions.gov website lists 6 drug courts at effective and 6 as promising. For additional details and descriptions of those programs visit: (http://crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails.aspx?ID=36)

Key Metrics/Evaluation Methods

One key component of any evidence-based program is evaluation, including measurement of program integrity (implementation as intended) and program outputs such as number of drug tests performed or number of treatment sessions, and short- and long-term outcomes such as time remaining drug free, employment, and avoidance of contact with the criminal justice system. Successful evaluation begins with creating a data collection plan prior to the start of programming. Where possible, evaluations should include random assignment or at least a comparison group of similar offenders not receiving programming. Research designs should be longitudinal and track offenders for at least one year, and three years if possible. Heck (2006) provides an excellent overview of key issues and metrics for evaluating a drug court program (see also Bureau of Justice Assistance Office of Justice Programs, 2011). In addition to basic performance measures required by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (JAG federal performance metrics document), a sample list of performance metrics adapted from these sources for drug court evaluation includes the following:

- Number of program participants
- Number of new program participants
- Number/percent of risk assessments completed
- Number/percent of program slots filled by medium and high risk offenders
- Number/percent of participants receiving evidence-based treatment
- Number of hours of outpatient substance abuse treatment delivered
- Number/percent of participants tested for alcohol or illegal substances
- Number/percent who tested positive for alcohol or illegal substances
- Number/percent of offenders complying with program requirements

- Number/percent of offenders who successfully complete program requirements
- Number/percent of offenders who comply with terms and conditions of supervision
- Number/percent of offenders who are drug and alcohol free after one year post program completion
- Number/percent of offenders who are free of new arrests after one year post program completion

Key Resources

- Drug Court Resources

  o National Association of Drug Court Professionals http://www.nadcp.org/nadcp-home/
  o National Drug Court Institute (NDCI) www.ndci.org/ndci-home
  o NIJ's Research on Drug Courts www.nij.gov/nij/topics/courts/drugcourts/welcome.htm
  o Adult Drug Court Research to Practice Initiative http://research2practice.org/
  o National Drug Court Resource Center (NDRC) http: ndcrc.org

- Mental Health Court Resources[17]

  o Council of State Governments Criminal Justice Mental Health Consensus Project http://consensusproject.org/
  o Center for Court Innovation http://www.court innovation.org/topic/mental-health
  o Bureau of Justice Statistics Mental Health Courts Program https://www.bja.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?Program_ID=68

- Domestic Violence Court Resources

  o National Institute of Justice http://www.nij.gov/nij/topics/courts/domestic-violence-courts/welcome.htm
  o Center for Court Innovation http://www.courtinnovation.org/topic/domestic-violence

---

[17]The Crime Solutions.gov website also lists the San Francisco Behavioral Health Court as promising [http://crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails.aspx?ID=49].

- For additional reading:

Almquist L., & Dodd, E. (2009). *Mental health courts: A guide to research-informed policy and practice.* New York: Council of State Governments. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/Publications/CSG_MHC_Research.pdf

Berman, G., & Feinblatt, J. (2001). Problem solving courts: *A brief primer. Law & Policy, 23*(2), 125-140.

Council of State Governments (2005). *A guide to mental health court design and implementation*. New York: Council of State Governments. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from http://www.consensusproject.org/mhcourts/Guide-MHC-Design.pdf

Gover, A. R., MacDonald, J. M., & Alpert, G. P. (2003). Combating domestic violence: findings from an evaluation of a local domestic violence court. *Criminology & Public Policy, 3*(1), 109-132.

Heck, C. (2006). *Local drug court research: Navigating performance measures and process evaluations.* National Drug Court Institute. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/Publications/Local_Drug_Court_Research.pdf

Huddelston, W., & Marlowe, D. B. (2011). *Painting the current picture: A national report on drug courts and other problem-solving court programs in the United States.* Alexandria, VA: National Drug Court Institute. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.ndcrc.org/sites/default/files/pcp_report_final_and_official_july_2011.pdf

Karan, A., Keilitz, S., & Denaro, S. (2009). Domestic violence courts: What are they and how should we manage them? *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 50*(2), 75-86.

Labriola, M., Bradley, S., O'Sullivan, C. S., Rempel, M., & Moore, S. (2009). *A national portrait of domestic violence courts.* New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/national_portrait.pdf

Marlowe, D. B. (2011). Adult and juvenile drug courts. In C. Leukefeld, T. P. Gullotta, & J. Gregrich, (Eds.), *Handbook of evidence-based substance abuse treatment in criminal justice settings* (123-142). New York: Springer.

Mazur, R., & Aldrich, L. (2003). What makes a domestic violence court work? Lessons from New York. *Judges Journal 42*(2), 5-9; 41-42.

Osher, F.C., & Levine, I.S. (2005). *Navigating the mental health maze: A guide for court practitioners.*

Council of State Governments. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://consensusproject.org/mhcp/Navigating-MHC-Maze.pdf

Rossman S. B., Roman, J., Zweig, J. M., Rempel, M., Lindquist, C. (2011). *The multi-site adult drug court evaluation: Executive summary*. Washington, D.C. Urban Institute. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237108.pdf

Rossman, S. B., Willison, J. B., Mallik-Kane, K., Kim, K., Debus-Sherill, S., & Downey, P. M. (2012). *Criminal justice interventions for offenders with mental illness: Evaluation of mental health courts in Bronx and Brooklyn, New York, Executive summary.* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/238264.pdf

Steadman, H. J. (2005). *A guide to collecting mental health court outcome data.* Retrieved May 3, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/Programs/MHC-Outcome-Data.pdf

Shaffer, D. K. (2011). Looking inside the black box of drug courts: A meta-analytic review. *Justice Quarterly: JQ, 28*(3), 493- 521.

Steadman, H.J., Redlich, A., Callahan, L., Robbins, P. C., & Vesselinov, R. (2011). Effect of mental health courts on arrests and jail days: A multisite study. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 68*(2), 167-172.

Visher, C. A., Harrell, A.V., & Newmark, L.C. (2007). *NIJ Research in Practice: Pretrial Innovations for Domestic Violence Offenders and Victims.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/216041.pdf

PROSECUTION OF DRUG AND VIOLENT OFFENDERS

One of the JAG purpose areas is prosecution and court activities which may include prosecution and/or defense activities such as hiring of personnel (investigators, prosecutors, and public defenders), training personnel, and paying for overtime to diminish a backlog of cases. Within this purpose area, ICJI has identified the priority areas as the prosecution of drug and violent crimes. In particular, the main foci are on: 1) enhancing the ability of prosecutors to create new laws or use existing laws more effectively against drug and violent crime offenders; 2) aggressive prosecution of drug and violent criminal offender; and 3) prosecution of drug and violent offenders.

Best Practices Recommendations/Programming Considerations

1. **Provide prosecutors with additional tools to pursue justice in drug crimes and violent crimes**

   - Implement vertical prosecution—the practice of assigning one prosecutor to handle the same case from filing to sentencing—to promote continuity and uniformity

   - Develop new protocols to allow for increased prosecutorial presence at sentencing

   - Enable prosecutors in such cases to have authority to work across jurisdictions

   - Enable state and local prosecutors to transfer certain qualifying cases (e.g., drug-related firearm arrests) for federal prosecution

   - Develop specialized prosecution units, such as domestic violence and gang crimes

2. **Create and strengthen partnerships with relevant stakeholders to prosecute drug and violent offenders**

   - Allocate personnel and resources from the prosecutor's office to engage the community to:
     - Increase community presence,
     - Increase understanding of relevant community characteristics,
     - Solicit and regularly respond to community input and concerns,
     - Increase community confidence in the prosecutor's office, and

   - Improve coordination with related agencies and law enforcement to:
     - Improve communication, information sharing, and collaboration with law enforcement agencies.
     - Utilize partnerships to develop and implement diversion programs and alternatives to incarceration.

3. **Focus on reducing recidivism and deterring high-rate violent offenders from criminal activity**

   - Identify moderate- to high-risk offenders

   - Adopt an actuarial risk/needs assessment tool to: 1) determine the offender's level of risk and 2) identify factors that can be changed and have been shown to be associated with recidivism (e.g., employment skills, family dysfunction, poor problem-solving skills)

   - Implement recidivism-reduction programs[18] that:
     - Focus on integration of treatment and community-based sanctions
     - Target moderate- and high-risk offenders
     - Keep low-risk offenders and higher-risk offenders in separate programs
     - Consider accurate assessment of an offender's level of risk
     - Are rooted in social learning theory
     - Use positive reinforcement rather than sanctions

4. **Improve the effectiveness and efficiency of case administration**

   - Enhance intra-office communication

   - Reduce redundancies and time spent on a case

   - Identify chronic offenders through measures, such as up-to-date chronic offender lists, risk/needs assessment tools (see above), use of criminal history and related data (e.g., ties to other known drug and/or violent offenders)

   - Implement or increase vertical prosecution (see above)

   - Improve conviction rates to demonstrate increased public safety to constituencies

---

[18]Programs that have been used extensively in correctional settings that have been proven to not work include: boot camps, punishment-oriented programs, control-oriented programs, non-directive psychological interventions, and self-esteem programs.

Examples of Successful/Promising Programs

- *Downtown 100 Initiative (Minnesota)*

    This holistic prosecution project is a partnership between local government, business, nonprofits, and the community that focused on open-air drug dealing and property crimes in the Minneapolis downtown area through prosecution, probation, social services, and housing. The program targeted the area's most chronic property and drug crime offenders. In 2010—its first year—serious crime in the downtown business area decreased by 11 percent. By the end of the year, 50 percent of the offenders were housed, 36 percent received chemical dependency services, and 32 percent received mental health services. In addition, recidivism by the targeted offenders decreased by 74 percent (http://www.apainc.org/html/Downtown%20100% 20Implementation%20Guide%20Final%202.pdf).

- *Maryland Violence Prevention Initiative (VPI)*

    The state's Division of Parole and Probation uses a common sense risk assessment tool to identify violent offenders under current state supervision with high risks of re-offending. Data and resources are shared with various state and local agencies to reduce offender recidivism. Local prosecutors are key partners in the VPI (http://www.dpscs.state.md.us/initiatives/one_sheets/ VPI-Gains-Public-Recognition-Jan10.pdf).

- *North Carolina Safe Communities (NCSC) Initiative to Reduce Group and Gang Violence*

    NCSC pursues and promotes focused-deterrence strategies to reduce group and gang violence. Based on research that most violence is closely associated with groups of high-rate offenders, this program uses a data-driven process to identify, work with, and change the behaviors of such groups. The key players include: district attorneys, research partners, law enforcement, and community "moral voices" (http://www.ncja.org/CMDownload.aspx?Content Key=a6f025d9-b86a-4e21-9475-613aa670bc66& ContentItemKey=0ae37bb7-101b-4755-9f3d-540 cc699c837).

Key Metrics/Evaluation Methods

- Number of cases prosecuted

- Conviction rate by offense

- Percent of cases prosecuted by a single attorney (vertical prosecution)

- Number of agencies and community partners with whom the prosecutor collaborates (e.g., information sharing, meetings, consultations)

- Nature of interagency partnerships

- Nature of community engagement

- Number and nature of programs or initiatives implemented using evidence-based practices

Key Resources

American Prosecutors Research Institute. (2005). *Drug-linked firearms cases: A primer for prosecution.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from: www.ndaa.org/pdf/drug_linked_firearms_cases_05.pdf

Association of Prosecuting Attorneys. (2011). *Innovations in criminal justice summit: 2011 conference report.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from: http://www.apainc.org/html/2011+Summit+Report.pdf

Decker, S.H. (2007). *Responding to gangs, guns, and youth crime: Principles from strategic problem solving approaches.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from: http://www.melissainstitute.org/documents/Gangs_Guns_ Youth-Crime.pdf

Porter, R. (20011). *Choosing performance indicators for your community prosecution initiative.* Retrieved April 17, 2012, from: http://www.apainc. org/files/DDF/Choosing%20Performance%20Indicators-final.pdf

Warren, R.K. (2007). *Evidence-based practice to reduce recidivism: Implications for state judiciaries.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative

One of the programs to recently receive JAG funds is the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI). This initiative seeks to achieve "overall juvenile justice system improvement . . . using detention as an entry point" and has been "proven to reduce unnecessary and inappropriate secure detention, reduce costs, increase system fairness and improve the juvenile justice system without compromising public safety" (JDAI Help Desk: About JDAI, n.d.).

ICJI funds JDAI programs with the intent of providing "seed" monies that fund a Program Coordinator tasked with getting JDAI properly implemented in the funded jurisdiction. JDAI can only loosely be categorized as a program given its intended purpose. More accurately, JDAI should be considered "a process, not a conventional program, which means JDAI helps restructure policy and practice to create system improvements that reach far beyond detention alone" (JDAI Help Desk: About JDAI, n.d.).

Please note that all of the bulleted and enumerated information below has been taken directly from various documents included in the *Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform* series created by the Annie E. Casey Foundation which established JDAI. These bulleted and enumerated items are purposely replicated exactly as presented or are a presentation of section headings regarding important concepts and aspects of JDAI. Accordingly, these items can be found throughout the *Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform* series. The entirety of the series can be found at http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/SitePages/jdai-pathways-series.aspx

The purpose of JDAI is to reduce the number of unneeded juvenile detentions while not creating a risk to public safety. The specific goals of the program are to (JDAI Help Desk: About JDAI, n.d.):

- Decrease the number of youth unnecessarily or inappropriately detained,

- Reduce the number of youth who fail to appear in court or re-offend pending adjudications,

- Redirect public funds towards effective juvenile justice processes and public safety strategies,

- Reduce the disproportionate minority confinement and contact with the juvenile justice system, and

- Improve the juvenile justice system overall

Annie E. Casey has identified the steps through which a jurisdiction can determine whether alternatives to detention are warranted. These steps should be followed in the order listed below (Steinhart, n.d.):

1. Collect accurate information regarding the current juvenile justice system through quantitative analyses, system analyses (detention policies and procedures), conditions analyses (conditions of confinement), and cost analyses to show a clear picture of detention caseloads, procedures, policies, and conditions.

2. Identify and articulate local juvenile detention goals.

3. Define reform strategies based on data analysis. Key reform strategies include:

    a. Objective screening practices through the use of risk assessment instruments

    b. Eliminating delays in detention referral, intake procedures, and court procedures

    c. Establishing alternatives to detention

    d. Addressing conditions of confinement (i.e., program availability, classification procedures, and staffing procedures)

    e. Evaluating disproportionate minority confinement

    f. Adding bed space

4. Identify the cost of reforms, resources needed, and barriers to reform.

5. Finalize and draft the action plan. The action plan should include:

    a. A description of the current juvenile detention system, which will serve as the problem statement and foundation for proposed reforms

    b. Juvenile detention goals

    c. A description of the reformed system, including all reform components such as risk assessment, changes to court processes, and alternatives to detention

    d. The cost and budget of each reform component

    e. The delegation of implementation responsibilities

    f. A timeline of implementation of each component

    g. A communications strategy that identifies spokespersons who will provide information about detention reform to local government councils or agencies

Best Practices/Programming Considerations: JDAI Core Strategies

To effectively reach the above goals, JDAI is in the midst of developing best practices which closely mirror the JDAI Core Strategies shown in Table 6. At the time of this report, scientifically designed and academically reviewed studies on the efficacy of JDAI had not yet been undertaken. The core strategies discussed in the following sections are derived from the *Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform* series authored by various juvenile justice practitioners and experts as a project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Due to JDAI being a "process" and not a traditional program, the JDAI Core Strategies that are outlined below should not be considered a step-by-step guide by which to implement JDAI. As previously specified, the Annie E. Casey Foundation has identified a time-ordered series of actions which will assist a jurisdiction in determining whether JDAI is needed.

Table 6: JDAI core strategies

Collaboration among juvenile justice agencies, community organizations and other government agencies
The use of data in making policy and case-level decisions
Objective instruments to guide detention decisions
Operation of a continuum of non-secure detention alternatives
Case processing efficiencies to reduce time between arrest and case disposition; improvement of conditions of confinement
Safe reductions of special populations (e.g., violations of probation, warrants and cases awaiting placement)
Racial/ethnic fairness in policy and case-level decision-making
Improving conditions of confinement

Once a determination is made that JDAI is needed, a jurisdiction must implement all of the 8 JDAI Core Strategies below, regardless of the order of implementation, to achieve a complete JDAI process. If all of the core strategies are not implemented, the process is not considered to be JDAI.

1. **Collaboration among juvenile justice agencies, community organizations and other government agencies**
   Collaboration allows for key, political stakeholders to determine failures of the current juvenile justice system, develop a vision of what reform should take place, and develop and implement a plan of action. To successfully influence reform in the juvenile justice system, it is recommended that the following policy-level representatives get involved (Feely, n.d.):

   - Juvenile court judges
   - Prosecutor
   - Public defender
   - Police/probation officers
   - Detention agency
   - Representatives from mayor's office or governor's office
   - Representatives from education, health, mental health, and child welfare system, including child advocates and victim advocates.

   Due to a large number of participants, it is recommended that stakeholders be divided into a steering or executive committee and work groups. Steering committees, composed of juvenile justice policymakers, have authority and decision-making abilities. Work groups address specific areas of detention and reform. Examples of work groups include (Feely, n.d.):

   - Pre-disposition,
   - Warrants,
   - Post-adjudication,
   - Probation violation,

   - Detention alternatives, and
   - Case processing.

2. **The use of data in making policy and case-level decisions**
   Specific data are required when planning and monitoring reform. To determine the proper use or misuse of juvenile detention, JDAI suggests analyzing the following (Busch, n.d.):

   - Who is coming into the juvenile justice system
   - Who is in detention
   - How long it takes to process cases
   - What happens to youth when they enter the system
   - How minorities and non-minorities are treated
   - Results expected to come from reform
   - Do results match expectations
   - New issues to address
   - Is public safety affected

   Obtaining and using data to plan, assess, or replace information systems include the following (Busch, n.d.):

   - Taking a systemic view – think about how changes would affect groups of youth, not just individuals
   - Sharing data between stakeholders
   - Clearly define reform goals
   - First analyze areas of concern (i.e., specific populations) to identify problems, then develop policies and programs, and finally, monitor the success of the policies and programs
   - Begin with data already collected
   - Keep data sets readily available
   - Analyze data as soon as possible to eliminate errors
   - Find consultants to guide data collection and monitoring

3. **Objective instruments to guide detention decisions**

Juvenile detention should be used to ensure alleged delinquents appear in court and to minimize the risk of youth reoffending while cases are in the adjudication process. Detention should not be used as a sanction. Admission policies should be based on the following (Orlando, n.d.):

- Using the least restrictive alternative to ensure that youth appear in court and remain arrest-free during adjudication

- Relying on objective criteria (i.e., seriousness of the delinquent act, absconding history, pending warrants, and criminal history) to identify youth who are at risk of committing new crimes or failing to appear at court

- Structured decision making processes to ensure timely, consistent screening:
    - o Designation of responsibility
    - o Time frames
    - o Supervisory review
    - o High-quality documentation

- Data used to design and monitor objective risk assessment instruments that identify low- and high-risk youth

- Support from stakeholders and line staff

- Monitoring and quality control through automated screening instruments, routine data analysis, and supervisory oversight.

Once a youth is ordered to be detained, a risk assessment should be completed to determine which alternative is the least restrictive in preventing the minor from reoffending or absconding. The Risk Assessment Instrument (RAI) is a checklist of weighted objective criteria that are applied to rate each youth for specific risks. The overall score of the instrument is used to guide intake officers in determining whether the youth should be detained. Two core factors, most serious offense and delinquency history, are used to determine a youth's eligibility for detention. Measured variables include (Orlando, n.d.):

- Most serious offense,

- Prior arrests or adjudication,

- Prior escapes or failures to appear,

- Pending cases or petitions, and

- Legal or supervision status (Steinhart, 2006).

4. **Operation of a continuum of non-secure detention alternatives**

Judges have two options when a juvenile has been arrested, release them to a parent or another adult or detain them in a secure facility. Due to overcrowding and detaining low-risk youth, using alternatives to detention assures that only those who are a threat to the community or at risk for failing to appear to court are placed in a secure facility. To develop alternatives, JDAI recommends practicing the 7 following principles (DeMuro, n.d.):

- View detention as a legal status on a continuum of options of supervision

- Agree on the purpose of detention and its alternatives

- Use data to guide programmatic changes

- Include a continuum of alternatives, including the varying levels of supervision, based on the youth's assessed risk to the community

- Alternatives are culturally relevant and reflect the youth referred to them. Programs should be placed in neighborhoods where youth reside and staffed by people who can relate to the youth.

- Match the degree of restriction to the risk posed by the youth, using the least restrictive alternative possible

- The use of alternatives should decrease the use of detention (e.g., home or community detention, day or evening reporting centers, and shelter or foster care)

5. **Case processing efficiencies to reduce time between arrest and case disposition; improvement of conditions of confinement**

Delays in pending adjudication correlates with increased rates of failures to appear, increased costs, distorted program outcomes undermining alternatives to adjudication, and weakening sense of accountability and responsibility felt by the juvenile. Three ways to reduce delays during pending adjudication include (Henry, n.d.):

- Schedule timely hearings,

- Ensure the juvenile is notified of the court date, and

- Limit the number of allowed continuances.

Inefficiency often occurs in cases where youth in detention facilities are waiting for transfer to court-ordered placement. This is due to limited space in a particular facility, inadequate follow-up to ensure quick transfers when open spots are available, and inattention by the court, defense counsel, or probation. There are several strategies to reduce detention time for youth with out-of-home placement orders (Henry, n.d.):

- Conducting caseload analysis of post-disposition minors in detention

- Developing programmatic alternatives to out-of-home placements

- Increasing placement speed and efficiency by imposing detention time limits, improving pre-placement assessments, conducting earlier dispositional planning, and improving data collection procedures

- Expanding placement variety and capacity

- Focusing on placement failures

6. **Safe reductions of special populations (e.g., violations of probation, warrants and cases awaiting placement)**
As JDAI seeks to reduce the population of detained youth, special emphasis is placed on "special" cases. These cases, which include children detained on warrants, children detained for probation violations, and children in post-adjudication or post-disposition detention waiting for placement, have been found to account for at least one-fifth of youth detained at some of the Model Sites during the initial years of JDAI implementation (Steinhart, n.d.).

Children Detained on Warrants. JDAI has identified specific strategies to assist implementation sites in reducing unneeded detentions due to warrants.

1. Gather adequate data

2. Adopt written guidelines

3. Implement mandatory risk screening

4. Provide supervisory review of detention recommendations

5. Seek non-judicial handling of technical violations

6. Provide alternative programs for juvenile probation violators

7. Create interagency coordination strategies

8. Consider a non-detention policy for technical probation violators

9. Consider ways to deal with mandatory detention laws

Children in Post-Adjudication Waiting for Placement. JDAI has identified specific strategies to assist implementation sites in reducing unneeded detentions due to children awaiting placement post-adjudication.

1. Analyze the caseload

2. Establish detention time limits

3. Create efficiency measures to reduce delays

4. Provide alternatives for post-adjudication and pre-disposition minors

Children in Post-Disposition Detention Waiting for Placement. JDAI has identified specific strategies to assist implementation sites in reducing unneeded detentions due to children awaiting placement post-disposition.

1. Analyze the caseload

2. Provide alternatives to out-of-home placement

3. Improve placement speed, efficiency, and coordination

4. Reduce placement failures through reassessment

5. Expand placement variety and capacity

6. Reduce transfer delays for minors committed to state training schools

Due to the previous experience with these issues, JDAI sites have created several strategies that specifically address improved handling of special populations (Steinhart, n.d.);

1. Remedies must be linked to adequate data and analysis of the problem population.

2. Detention goals, policies, and procedures should be clearly articulated in writing.

3. Remedies for special detention cases are most likely to succeed in a context of comprehensive detention reform.

4. Detention reform jurisdictions have produced models worth replicating.

5. Strategies for the control of special detention cases are not necessarily costly.

6. The needs of the children on special detention caseloads should drive the solutions.

7. Juvenile justice stakeholders must collaborate on special detention strategies.

8. Stakeholders need patience and persistence to deal with special detention cases.

7. **Racial/ethnic fairness in policy and case-level decision-making**
Reducing disproportionate minority contact (DMC) is a concept central to JDAI. Reports from JDAI cite numerous studies showing African American youth are arrested and adjudicated at a much higher rate than their white counterparts. To stress the importance of reducing DMC, the Annie E. Casey Foundation released a memo to all JDAI sites listing 10 general implementation strategies for successfully reducing DMC (Hoytt, Schiraldi, Smith, & Ziedenberg, n.d.):

1. Formulate a vision and related policy goals

2. Create structures (e.g., task forces) charged with sustaining a focus on DMC

3. Collect data and conduct research to document where disparity occurs

4. Build coalitions and alliances with communities and people of color

5. Diversify the composition of the system's work force

6. Diversify the service delivery system by contracting with organizations located in neighborhoods and managed by people of color

7. Provide cultural and racial sensitivity training for staff at all levels of every agency of the system

8. Minimize opportunities for discriminatory decisions by creating objective instruments and guidelines free of racial bias

9. Improve defense representation to increase advocacy for youth of color

10. Change the policies and practices of other systems (e.g., mental health, child welfare) to prevent "dumping" youth better served by those systems into secure detention

Additionally, several Lessons Learned from attempts at reducing DMC at JDAI sites have been identified. Using the above 10 implementation strategies along with the following Lessons Learned will provide JDAI sites the best possibility at DMC reduction success (Hoytt et al., n.d.):

1. Without a commitment to juvenile detention reform in general, reducing racial disparities is unlikely.

2. An explicit focus on reducing racial disparities is essential.

3. Reducing racial disparities requires authoritative leadership.

4. Define the problem in terms that can be changed.

5. Emphasize action, not just discussion or training.

6. Broad, diverse coalitions can facilitate DMC reduction.

7. Individual agencies can make a difference.

8. Keep the police in the work (As the entry point to the criminal justice system, police policies and procedures can have a substantial impact on disproportionality throughout the system).

9. Data really help.

10. It is possible to reduce racial disparities in juvenile detention.

8. **Improving conditions of confinement**
   Addressing the conditions of a detention facility can create a safer, more sanitary environment for all detainees. To improve confine-

ment conditions in juvenile detention facilities, JDAI states a pre-inspection document review must occur, a conditions assessment team selected, an assessment instrument created, and training the assessment team and conducting the assessment must occur. Improving detention facility conditions can be achieved by addressing the following essential items (Burrell, n.d.):

- Merging policy and practice

- Ensuring uniformity in systems

- Using data to improve conditions

- Developing knowledgeable facility administrators

- Changing behavior of key players

- Responding to changing conditions

- Establishing reasonable expectations and sustaining results

As a guide for facility conditions and practices assessment, the Youth Law Center (YLC), a technical assistance contractor for JDAI, developed the below tool (Burrell, n.d.):

C lassification and separation issues

H ealth and mental health care

A ccess to counsel, the courts, and family

P rogramming, education, exercise, and recreation

T raining and supervision of institutional staff

E nvironment, sanitation, overcrowding, and privacy

R estraints, isolation, punishment, and due process

S afety issues for staff and confined children

Examples of Successful/Promising Programs: JDAI Model Sites[19]

- Bernalillo County, New Mexico

- Cook County, Illinois

- Multnomah County, Oregon

- State of New Jersey

- Santa Cruz, California

Key Metrics/Evaluation Methods

JDAI sites should track as much information as possible. This will allow for easy identification of trends, program successes, and areas for improvement. ICJI recommends that each JDAI site track at least the following metrics at no less than quarterly intervals. These metrics should be

---

[19]More information for each of the JDAI Model Sites can be found at http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/SitePages/jdai-modelsites.aspx.

tracked in a manner that allows for cross tabulation of each metric by every other metric:

- Sex (Gender)

- Race

- Age

- Offense type (at screening)

- Detainment decision

  o Detained
  o Detained with conditions
  o Released

- Overrides (detainment decision does not match RAI recommendation)

  o Override up reason
  o Override down (Underride) reason

- Average daily population

- Average length of stay

- Alternative program entries by program

- Alternative program average length of stay

- Alternative program average daily population

- Failure to appear (FTA) rate by each alternative type

- Re-offense rate

Key Resources

Burrell, S. (n.d.). *Improving Conditions of Confinement in Secure Juvenile Detention Centers.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdai-helpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2006%20Improving%20COnditions%20of%20Confinement%20in%20Secure%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Centers.pdf

Busch, D. (n.d.). *By the Numbers: The role of data and information in detention reform.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdai helpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2007%20By%20the%20Numbers%20The%20Role%20of%20Data%20and%20Information%20in%20Detention%20Reform.pdf

DeMuro, P. (n.d.). *Consider the Alternatives: Planning and implementing detention alternatives.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2004%20Consider%20the%20Alternatives%20Planning%20and%20Implementing%20Detention%20Alternatives.pdf

Feely, K. (n.d.). *Collaboration and Leadership in Juvenile Detention Reform.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2002%20Collaboration%20and%20Leadership%20in%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Reform.pdf

Hoytt, E. H., Schiraldi, V., Smith, B. V., & Ziedenberg, J. (n.d.). *Reducing Racial Disparities in Juvenile Detention.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2008%20Reducing%20Racial%20Disparities%20in%20Juvenile%20Detention.pdf

JDAI Help Desk: Home. (n.d.). Retrieved April 25, 2012, from JDAI Help Desk: http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/default.aspx

JDAI Help Desk: About JDAI. (n.d.). Retrieved April 25, 2012, from JDAI Help Desk: http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/SitePages/about.aspx

Orlando, F. (n.d.). *Controlling the Front Gates: Effective admissions policies and practices.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdai-helpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2003%20Controlling%20the%20Front%20Gates%20Effective%20Admissions%20Policies%20and%20Practices.pdf

Steinhart, D. (n.d.a). *Special Detention Cases: Strategies for handling difficult populations.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from http://www.jdai helpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2009%20Special%20Detention%20Cases%20Strategies%20for%20Handling%20Difficult%20Populations.pdf

Steinhart, D. (n.d.b). *Pathways to Juvenile Detention Reform: Planning for Juvenile Detention Reforms A Structured Approach.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2001%20Planning%20for%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Reforms%20A%20Structured%20Approach.pdf

Steinhart, D. (2006). *Juvenile Detention Risk Assessment: A Practice Guide to Juvenile Detention Reform.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Practice%20Guides/JDAI%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Risk%20Assessment%20Practice%20Guide.pdf

STATEWIDE CRIMINAL JUSTICE DATA SHARING, TECHNOLOGY, AND TRAINING

As criminal justice becomes increasingly complex and inter-connected, the ability to share criminal justice data effectively becomes exponentially more important. The Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group (2004, ii) identified the following vision, "Any member of the justice community can access the information they need to do their job at the time they need it, in a form that is useful, regardless of the location of the data." JAG criminal justice information sharing (CJIS) grants generally are designed to work toward this goal. JAG CJIS grants fit within the Federal *Planning Evaluation and Technology Improvement Programs* Purpose Area and within the ICJI *Statewide CJIS* priority area. We also briefly consider technology more generally and training in this section.

Best Practices Recommendations/ Programming Considerations

Documenting best practices in CJIS is difficult because grants can cover such a tremendous range of activities and technologies. Additionally, enumeration of best practices for technology across areas from DNA testing to information sharing is beyond the scope of this report. However, the Bureau of Justice Assistance has developed a resource for CJIS initiatives through its Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement (CPEPM).[20] This website documents some of the lessons learned in development and evaluation of CJIS initiatives that can be applied across many types of technology development or criminal justice information sharing initiatives. Training is considered separately below.

For CJIS/ technology

1. **According to the BJA's CPEPM, "several factors are associated with the implementation success of information sharing/ integration initiatives**[21]**:**

   - Encouraging top-level commitment to the initiative

   - Promoting active participation of stakeholders/users in the initiative

   - Properly training stakeholders/users on the initiative

   - Developing a comprehensive planning process for the initiative

   - Modeling and testing current processes to determine the type of initiative needed and adjustments required once the system has been implemented

   - Clearly defining performance measures at the start of the project

   - Staying informed about other information sharing/ integration initiatives that may affect the proposed initiative"

2. **Ensure compliance with all federal standards**
   There are potentially multiple standards for CJIS initiatives that must be considered.[22] For example, the National Information Exchange Model (NIEM) is a federal model for information sharing that provides a foundation for the development of high quality CJIS initiatives.[23]

3. **Reduce costs where possible**
   In an era of scarce resources, it is especially critical to try and reduce costs wherever possible. This may mean using existing products that have already been developed for other agencies and can be obtained for free or at a reduced cost. This may mean collaboration across agencies to bear the cost of a product.

4. **Implement in stages where possible**
   Even with extensive testing prior to implementation, issues are likely to arise during implementation that will require adjustments. Therefore, wherever possible, implement the new CJIS or technology in stages and learn from the phased implementation.

5. **Have a sustainability plan**
   Implementation of a new CJIS initiative or technology requires that system maintenance plans be implemented. Anticipation of costs and time required to maintain a system is crucial.

For Training

1. **Clearly document the need for training, and specifically how it will increase the ability, efficiency, or effectiveness of the agency in meetings its goals**

2. **Consider a range of possible trainers that can provide the training needed**

3. **Use existing training if possible before attempting to create your own training program**

4. **Take advantage of economies of scale where possible by combining agency trainings**

5. **Minimize costs by taking a train the trainer approach**

6. **Evaluate the training**

---

[20]https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-information-sharing/isii-index.htm

[21]https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-information-sharing/isii3.htm

[22]See The Justice Standards Clearinghouse for various standards relating to architecture, and data exchange languages among others. http://www.it.ojp.gov/default.aspx?area=implementationAssistance&page=1017

[23]https://www.niem.gov/Pages/default.aspx

One can evaluate short-term knowledge gains from training through pre- and post surveys on the day of the training. If only post surveys are possible, ask training attendees which parts were helpful to their learning and which parts could be improved to engage in continuous improvement of training and to be responsive to the needs of trainees.

Examples of Successful/Promising Programs

As noted, the range of CJIS initiatives, technologies, and trainings that could be funded using ICJI JAG funds is enormous and current best practices in technology are evolving at a rapid rate. Therefore, enumeration of specific examples of successful programs that would serve as useful guides for subgrantees is difficult, but the resources below are a good beginning.

- **Crime Solutions.gov**
  (http://crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails.aspx?ID=90)
  This site lists five technology programs deemed effective and three deemed promising.

- **Publication list from BJA's Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement**
  (https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-information-sharing/isii6.htm)
  This site lists CJIS process, outcome, and usability evaluations as well as numerous other CJIS initiative reports.

Key Metrics/Evaluation Methods

Groff and McEwen (2008) discuss assessment of information technologies in terms of three E's: efficiency, effectiveness, and enabling. Efficiency refers to increased speed in case processing or reduced activity time due to the technology, effectiveness refers to being able to do a better job to produce an intended outcome, and enabling refers to the ability to do something that could not be done before. Whether evaluating CJIS initiatives, the purchase of equipment, implementation of technology, or training, focusing on measurement of the three E's seems to be a worthwhile approach. These principles are certainly consistent with the approach suggested by the BJA Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement. To date, most evaluations of CJIS initiatives have focused on usability or case studies. Long-term outcome evaluations are difficult but should be a goal. In addition to basic performance measures required by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (JAG federal performance metrics document) a sample list of performance metrics for CJIS and training evaluation includes:

For CJIS initiatives:
(adapted from https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-information-sharing/isii5.htm)

Process Measures

- Number of search tasks completed

- Amount of time for completing search tasks

- Number of jurisdictions/agencies using the system

- Type of data available on system

- Training provided on system

- Number of cases with missing data when data should exist

Outcome Measures

- Change in user job performance

- Change in productivity level (e.g., decrease in time to search for information)

- Change in accuracy of information obtained

- Effectiveness of information (e.g., in reducing crime)

- Change in time to obtain information

- Change in time for case processing

- Change in ability to apprehend suspects or close cases

Usability Measures

- Level of satisfaction concerning interaction with the system

- Efficiency of computer screen design use for task completion

- Organization of information on the computer screen

- Ability to find information

- Level of effort required to use system (e.g., the amount of time taken to complete a task)

- Level of ease in learning how to use the information sharing system

- Navigation ease for obtaining information

- Time to complete a task

For technology

- How much JAG funding was used for equipment or technology purchases?

- What types of equipment or technology were purchased (by type)?

- What cost efficiencies or savings were realized as a result of the purchase?

For training

- How much training funding has been allocated?

- How many training hours were completed?

- How many individuals were trained?

- How many training materials were developed?

- How many training materials were disseminated?

- Number and percent of participants completing an evaluation

- Number and percent of participants completing a pre- and post-test

- Number and percent of participants completing a post test that achieved an improved score over the pretest

Key Resources
For CJIS Initiatives and Technology

- Bureau of Justice Assistance Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement, Information Sharing
  https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-information-sharing/isii-index.htm

- U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs: Justice Information Sharing website
  http://www.it.ojp.gov/default.aspx

- National Institute of Justice: Standards and Testing Website
  http://www.nij.gov/nij/topics/technology/standards-testing/welcome.htm

- National Information Exchange Model
  https://www.niem.gov/Pages/default.aspx

- National Criminal Justice Reference Service: Information Systems and Technology
  https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Topics/Topic.aspx?topicid=120

- Justnet: National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center
  https://www.justnet.org/cpl.html

- National Institute of Justice: Technology and Tools Website
  http://www.nij.gov/topics/technology/welcome.htm

- Center for Technology in Government (University at Albany, State University of New York)
  http://www.ctg.albany.edu/projects/

For Training

- National Institute of Justice: Training overview
  http://www.nij.gov/training/welcome.htm

For further reading

Atabakhsh, H., Larson C., Petersen, T., Violette, C., & Chen, H. (2004). Information sharing and collaboration policies within government agencies. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 3073,* 467-475. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.springerlink.com/content/xbq553h26nwqdqte/fulltext.pdf

Cresswell, A.M., Pardo, T.A., & Hassan, S. (2007). *Assessing capability for justice information sharing: Proceedings of the 8th annual international conference on digital government research: Bridging disciplines & domains.* May 20-23, 2007, Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://delivery.acm.org/10.1145/1250000/1248479/p122-cresswell.pdf?ip=134.68.131.113&acc=ACTIVE%20SERVICE&CFID=81144398&CFTOKEN=46772359&__acm__=1336408833_4260c4db2237880f7adec3f83f79cf87

Kaza, S., & Chen, H. (2008). Public safety information sharing: An ontological perspective. In H. Chen, L. Brandt, V. Gregg, R. Traunmuller, S. Dawes, E. Hovy, A Macintosh, & C. A. Larson, (Eds.), *Digital government: E-government research, case studies, and implementation* (263-282). New York: Springer. Retrieved May 7, 2012 from http://www.springerlink.com/content/vr56175247805377/fulltext.pdf

Koper, C. S., Taylor, B. G., & Kubu, B. E. (2009). Law enforcement technology needs assessment. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum in Association with Lockheed Martin. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.policeforum.org/library/technology/Lockheed%20Martin%20Report%20Final%203-16-2009.pdf

Pardo, T. A., Gil-Garcia, J. R., & Burke, G. B. (2006). *Building response capacity through cross-boundary information sharing: The critical role of trust.* Paper presented at the eChallenges Conference, Barcelona, Spain. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.icegov2007.icegov.net/publications/journals/e-2006_building_response/e-2006_building_response.pdf

Pardo, T. A., Gil-Garcia J. R., & Burke, G. B. (2008a). Governance structures in cross-boundary information sharing: Lessons from state and local criminal justice initiatives. *Proceedings of the 41st Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences 2008.* Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=4438915

Pardo, T. A., Gil-Garcia J. R., & Burke, G. B. (2008b) Sustainable cross-boundary information sharing. In H. Chen, L. Brandt, V. Gregg, R. Traunmuller, S. Dawes, E. Hovy, A Macintosh, & C. A. Larson, (Eds.), *Digital government: E-government research, case studies, and implementation* (421-438). Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.springerlink.com/content/l017612261007474/fulltext.pdf

Pardo, T. A., Nam T., & Burke, G. B. (2012). E-Government interoper-
ability: Interaction of policy, management, and technology dimen-
sions. *Social Science Computer Review, 30*(1), 7-23.

Reglia, J. V., McKnight, L. W., Kuehn, A., Ramnarine-Rieks, A. U.,
Venkatesh, M., & Bose, T. (2011). Interoperability by 'edgeware':
Wireless grids for emergency response. *Proceedings of the 44th
Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (1-10). January 4-
7, 2011. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from
http://wigit.ischool.syr.edu/assets/publications/HICSS2011_Emerge
ncy_Services_Edgeware_FinalSubmission.pdf

RECOMMENDATIONS

The current assessment of JAG subgrantee materials and best practices across the state and local priority areas leads to the following recommendations.

MJTFs and interdiction teams

1. Require that subgrantees implement all 12 elements considered critical for task forces.

2. Require that subgrantees clearly define the program goals and objectives and methods used to evaluate goals and objectives.

3. Encourage network sharing between participating task force agencies.

4. Encourage subgrantees to attend trainings.

Reentry Initiatives

1. Require that subgrantees document the degree to which they are following evidence-based practices in providing reentry programming.

2. Encourage the use of The Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI-2000) to assess the degree to which programs are implementing RNR principles in their programs.

3. Request subgrantees to document the goals, nature, and scope of services they provide to address criminogenic needs or barriers to success.

4. Request subgrantees document the sanctions and incentive systems they have in place and encourage that these programs focus on rewards rather than punishment.

Problem-solving court programs

1. Require that subgrantees document qualifications of treatment providers.

2. Clearly identify the type and length of treatment services being provided.

3. Require that subgrantees document the degree to which they are following evidence-based practices in providing programming.

4. Request that subgrantees document the structure of the problem-solving court model they are using, including the members of the team, the structure and function of the court, as well as the sanctions and incentive systems they employ.

Prosecution of drug and violent offenders

1. Require subgrantees to document whether and/or how they are following evidence-based practices in the prosecution of violent and drug crimes.

2. Require subgrantees to document whether and/or how they focus on high-risk offender deterrence and reduced recidivism.

3. Require subgrantees to evaluate, document, and improve the effectiveness (i.e., increased care and knowledge with which a case is pursued) and efficiency (i.e., reduced redundancy of investigations, data requests, and other related efforts for a single case)of case administration.

Juvenile Detention Alternatives Invitiative (JDAI)

1. Require subgrantees to clearly define reform goals.

2. Require subgrantees to document ways they are following all eight JDAI core strategies.

3. Require subgrantees to provide the RAI used to assess youth (It is not recommended for a JDAI site to create their own RAI).

4. Require subgrantees to document the types of evidence-based alternatives that are used.

5. Require subgrantees to track at least all of the specified performance metrics and analyze and track the metrics for trend identification and comparison.

6. Require subgrantees to make programmatic changes based on needs identified through data analysis.

7. Encourage subgrantees to consult with the Statewide JDAI Coordinator before beginning the earliest stages of JDAI need determination.

8. Encourage subgrantees to use the numerous resources found at www.jdaihelpdesk.org

Statewide criminal justice information sharing initiatives, technology, and training

1. Require that subgrantees document their use of best practices in planning, implementation, and evaluation of criminal justice information sharing (CJIS) initiatives.

2. Request that subgrantees document the degree to which they are following evidence-based practices in the technology they are requesting.

3. Require that subgrantees document that they have conducted a technology needs assessment if they are requesting new technology.

4. Require subgrantees to document that they have searched for existing technologies and whether existing technologies will or will not fit needs.

5. Require subgrantees to document that they have attempted to reduce the costs of new technology, through collaboration, use of existing programs/technologies developed for other jurisdictions, or through cost-sharing.

General—Best Practice Considerations Across Priority Areas

1. Encourage subgrantees to focus on continuous improvement of evaluation of their programs. In addition to required performance metrics, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement provides resources for enhancing the quality of evaluations across a spectrum of criminal justice programming https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/index.html.

REFERENCES

Almquist L., & Dodd, E. (2009). *Mental health courts: A guide to research-informed policy and practice.* New York: Council of State Governments. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/Publications/CSG_MHC_Research.pdf

American Prosecutors Research Institute. (2005). *Drug-linked firearms cases: A primer for prosecution.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from: www.ndaa.org/pdf/drug_linked_firearms_cases_05.pdf

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1998). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology, 28*(3), 369-404.

Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). Evidence-based adult corrections programs: *What works and what does not.* Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/06-01-1201.pdf.

Association of Prosecuting Attorneys. (2011). *Innovations in criminal justice summit: 2011 conference report.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from: http://www.apainc.org/html/2011+Summit+Report.pdf

Atabakhsh, H., Larson C., Petersen, T., Violette, C., & Chen, H. (2004). Information sharing and collaboration policies within government agencies. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 3073,* 467-475. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.springerlink.com/content/xbq553h26nwqdqte/fulltext.pdf

Berg, M. T., & Huebner, B. M. (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly, 28*(2), 382-410.

Berman, G., & Feinblatt, J. (2001). Problem solving courts: A brief primer. *Law & Policy, 23*(2), 125-140.

Bureau of Justice Assistance (2011). Adult drug court discretionary grant program FY 2011 competitive grant announcement. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/pm-solicitations/FY11_Adult_Drug_Court_Discretionary_Grant_Program.pdf

Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2000). *Creating a new criminal justice system for the 21st century: Findings and results from state and local program evaluations.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bja/178936.pdf

Bureau of Justice Assistance, Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement. (n.d.). *Commonly used measures of task force performance.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/program-law-enforcement/forces5.htm

Burrell, S. (n.d.). *Improving conditions of confinement in secure juvenile detention centers.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdai-helpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2006%20Improving%20COnditions%20of%20Confinement%20in%20Secure%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Centers.pdf

Busch, D. (n.d.). *By the numbers: The role of data and information in detention reform.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2007%20By%20the%20Numbers%20The%20Role%20of%20Data%20and%20Information%20in%20Detention%20Reform.pdf

Carey, S.M., Finigan M.W., & Pukstas, K. (2008). *Exploring the key components of drug courts: A comparative study of 18 adult drug courts on practices, outcomes and costs.* Portland, OR: NPC Research. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/223853.pdf

Council of State Governments. (2005). *A guide to mental health court design and implementation.* New York: Council of State Governments. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from http://www.consensusproject.org/mhcourts/Guide-MHC-Design.pdf

Cresswell, A.M., Pardo, T.A., & Hassan, S. (2007). *Assessing capability for justice information sharing: Proceedings of the 8th annual international conference on digital government research: Bridging disciplines & domains.* May 20-23, 2007, Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://delivery.acm.org/10.1145/1250000/1248479/p122-cresswell.pdf?ip=134.68.131.113&acc=ACTIVE%20SERVICE&CFID=81144398&CFTOKEN=46772359&__acm__=1336408833_4260c4db2237880f7adec3f83f79cf87

Decker, S. H. (2007). *Responding to gangs, guns, and youth crime: Principles from strategic problem solving approaches.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from: http://www.melissainstitute.org/documents/Gangs_Guns_Youth-Crime.pdf

DeMuro, P. (n.d.). *Consider the Alternatives: Planning and implementing detention alternatives.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2004%20Consider%20the%20Alternatives%20Planning%20and%20Implementing%20Detention%20Alternatives.pdf

Drake, E. B., & LaFrance, S. (2007). *Findings on best practices of community re-entry programs for previously incarcerated persons.* Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.eisenhowerfoundation.org/docs/Ex-Offender%20Best%20Practices.pdf

Feely, K. (n.d.). *Collaboration and leadership in juvenile detention reform.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2002%20Collaboration%20and%20Leadership%20in%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Reform.pdf

Global Infrastructure/Standards Working Group. (2004). *A framework for justice information sharing: Service Oriented Architecture (SOA).* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.it.ojp.gov/default. aspx?area=globalJustice&page=1235

Goldsmith, S., & Eimicke, W. B. (2008). Moving men into the mainstream: Best practices in prisoner reentry assistance. *Civic Bulletin, 51,* 1-14.

Gover, A. R., MacDonald, J. M., & Alpert, G. P. (2003). Combating domestic violence: findings from an evaluation of a local domestic violence court. *Criminology& Public Policy, 3*(1), 109-132.

Groff, E., & McEwen, T. (2008). *Identifying and measuring the effects of information technologies on law enforcement agencies: The making officer redeployment effective program a guide for law enforcement.* Alexandria VA: Institute for Law and Justice. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.ilj.org/publications/docs/Measuring_Effects_ IT_Law_Enforcement.pdf

Hamilton, Z. (2010). *Do reentry courts reduce recidivism?* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/ Reentry_Evaluation.pdf

Hayeslip, D. W., & Russell-Einhorn, M. L. (2002). *Evaluation of multi-jurisdictional task forces project: Phase I final report.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/ 200904.pdf

Heck, C. (2006). *Local drug court research: Navigating performance measures and process evaluations.* National Drug Court Institute. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/Publications/ Local_Drug_Court_Research.pdf

Henry, D. A. (n.d.). *Reducing unnecessary delay: Innovations in case processing.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/ JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2005%20Reducin g%20Unnecessary%20Delay%20Innovations%20in%20Case%20P rocessing.pdf

Hoytt, E. H., Schiraldi, V., Smith, B. V., & Ziedenberg, J. (n.d.). *Reducing racial disparities in juvenile detention.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%2 0Pathway%2008%20Reducing%20Racial%20Disparities%20in%20 Juvenile%20Detention.pdf

Huddleston, W., & Marlowe, D. B. (2011). *Painting the current picture: A national report on drug courts and other problem-solving court programs in the United States.* Alexandria, VA: National Drug Court Institute. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.ndcrc.org/ sites/default/files/pcp_report_final_and_official_july_2011.pdf

JDAI Help Desk: Home. (n.d.). Retrieved April 25, 2012, from JDAI Help Desk: http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/default.aspx

JDAI Help Desk: About JDAI. (n.d.). Retrieved April 25, 2012, from JDAI Help Desk: http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/SitePages /about.aspx

Karan, A., Keilitz, S., & Denaro, S. (2009). Domestic violence courts: What are they and how should we manage them? *Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 50*(2), 75-86.

Kaza, S., & Chen, H. (2008). Public safety information sharing: An ontological perspective. In H. Chen, L. Brandt, V. Gregg, R. Traunmuller, S. Dawes, E. Hovy, A Macintosh, & C. A. Larson, (Eds.), *Digital government: E-government research, case studies, and implementation* (263-282). New York: Springer. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.springerlink.com/content/vr56175247805 377/fulltext.pdf

Kempker, G. (2010). *A framework for offender reentry.* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.cepp.com/documents/A%20Framework %20for%20Offender%20Reentry.pdf

Koper, C. S., Taylor, B. G. and Kubu, B. E. (2009). *Law enforcement technology needs assessment.* Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum in Association with Lockheed Martin. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.policeforum.org/library/ technology/Lockheed%20Martin%20Report%20Final%203-16- 2009.pdf

Labriola, M., Bradley, S., O'Sullivan, C. S., Rempel, M., & Moore, S. (2009). *A national portrait of domestic violence courts.* New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/national_ portrait.pdf

Lattimore, P. K., Steffey, D. M., & Visher, C. A. (2010). Prisoner reentry in the first decade of the twenty-first century. *Victims and Offenders, 5*(3), 253-267.

Lipsey, M.W., & Cullen, F.T. (2007). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: A review of systematic reviews. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science, 3*, 297-320.

Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2005). Developing successful reentry programs: Lessons learned from the "what works" research. *Corrections Today, 67*(2), 72-77.

Marlowe, D. B. (2011). Adult and juvenile drug courts. In C. Leukefeld, T. P. Gullotta, & J. Gregrich, (Eds.), *Handbook of evidence-based substance abuse treatment in criminal justice settings* (123-142). New York: Springer.

Mazur, R., & Aldrich, L. (2003). What makes a domestic violence court work? Lessons from New York. *Judges Journal, 42*(2), 5-9; 41-42.

McDavid, J. C. & Hawthorn, L.R. (2006). *Program Evaluation & Performance Measurement: An Introduction to Practice.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mease, T. (n.d.). *Finding out 'what works' in reentry: Discovering evidence-based practices.* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.american.edu/spa/publicpurpose/upload/Finding-Out-What-Works-in-Reentry.pdf

Naser, R. L., & Vigne, N. G. (2006). Family support in the prisoner reentry process: Expectations and realities. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 43*(1), 93-106.

National Association of Drug Court Professionals. (1997). *Defining Drug Courts: The Key Components.* U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Drug Court Programs Office.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. *Looking beyond the ticket: Traffic law enforcement and beyond.* Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/enforce/Beyond/index.htm

National Institute of Justice. (2003). Evaluating multijurisdictional drug enforcement task forces. *NIJ Journal, 250,* 40-42.

O'Brien, K., & Lawrence, S. (2007). Implementing a reentry program according to best practices. *Massachusetts Executive Office of Public Safety Research and Policy Analysis Division.* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://www.mass.gov/eopss/docs/eops/publications/eops-grantee-tools.pdf

Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Center for Program Evaluation and Performance Measurement. (n.d.). Welcome to BJA's Online Evaluation Tools. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/evaluation/index.html

Orlando, F. (n.d.). *Controlling the front gates: Effective admissions policies and practices.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2003%20Controlling%20the%20Front%20Gates%20Effective%20Admissions%20Policies%20and%20Practices.pdf

Osher, F.C., & Levine, I.S. (2005). *Navigating the mental health maze: A guide for court practitioners.* Council of State Governments. Retrieved May 6, 2012, from http://consensusproject.org/mhcp/Navigating-MHC-Maze.pdf

Pardo, T. A., Gil-Garcia, J. R., & Burke, G. B. (2006). *Building response capacity through cross-boundary information sharing: The critical role of trust.* Paper presented at the eChallenges Conference, Barcelona, Spain. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.icegov2007.icegov.net/publications/journals/e-2006_building_response/e-2006_building_response.pdf

Pardo, T. A., Gil-Garcia J. R., & Burke, G. B. (2008a). Governance structures in cross-boundary information sharing: Lessons from state and local criminal justice initiatives. *Proceedings of the 41st Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences- 2008*. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=4438915

Pardo, T. A., Gil-Garcia J. R., & Burke, G. B. (2008b) Sustainable cross-boundary information sharing. In H. Chen, L. Brandt, V. Gregg, R. Traunmuller, S. Dawes, E. Hovy, A Macintosh, & C. A. Larson, (Eds.), *Digital government: E-government research, case studies, and implementation* (421-438). Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://www.springerlink.com/content/l017612261007474/fulltext.pdf

Pardo, T. A., Nam T., & Burke, G. B. (2012). E-Government interoperability: Interaction of policy, management, and technology dimensions. *Social Science Computer Review, 30*(1), 7-23.

Petersilia, J. (2004). What works in prisoner reentry? Reviewing and questioning the evidence. *Federal Probation, 68*(2), 4-8.

Porter, R. (2011). Choosing performance indicators for your community prosecution initiative. Retrieved April 17, 2012 from: http://www.apainc.org/files/DDF/Choosing%20Performance%20Indicators-final.pdf

Reentry Council. (2011). The Federal Interagency Reentry Council. Accessed May 4, 2012 at http://nationalreentryresourcecenter.org/reentry-council

Reglia, J.V., McKnight, L. W., Kuehn, A., Ramnarine-Rieks, A. U., Venkatesh, M., & Bose, T. (2011). Interoperability by 'edgeware': Wireless grids for emergency response. *Proceedings of the 44th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (p. 1-10). January 4-7, 2011. Retrieved May 7, 2012, from http://wigit.ischool.syr.edu/assets/publications/HICSS2011_Emergency_Services_Edgeware_FinalSubmission.pdf

Rhodes, W., Chapman, M., Shively, M., Dyous, C., Hunt, D., & Wheeler, K. (2009). *Evaluation of the multijurisdictional task forces (MJTFs), Phase II: Project summary.* Retrieved April 15, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/228943.pdf

Rhodes, W., Dyous, C., Chapman, M., Shively, M., Hunt, D., & Wheeler, K. (2009). *Evaluation of the multijurisdictional task forces (MJTFs), Phase II: MJTF performance monitoring guide.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/228942.pdf

Rossman S. B., Roman, J., Zweig, J. M., Rempel, M., Lindquist, C. (2011). *The multi-site adult drug court evaluation: Executive summary.* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/237108.pdf

Rossman, S. B., Willison, J. B., Mallik-Kane, K., Kim, K., Debus-Sherill, S., & Downey, P. M. (2012). *Criminal justice interventions for offenders with mental illness: Evaluation of mental health courts in Bronx and Brooklyn, New York, Executive summary.* Retrieved May 6, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/238264.pdf

Rossman, S.B., Winterfield, L. (2009). *Coaching packet: Measuring the impact of reentry efforts.* Silver Spring Maryland: Center for Effective Public Policy, retrieved May 3, 2012 from http://www.cepp.com/documents/Measuring%20the%20Impact.pdf

Seiter, R. R., & Kadela, K. R. (2003). Prisoner reentry: What works, what does not, and what is promising. *Crime & Delinquency, 49*(3), 360-388.

Severson, M. E., Bruns, K. & Veeh, C. (2011). Prisoner reentry programming: Who recidivates and when? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 50*(6), 327-348.

Smith, B. W., Novak, K. J., Frank, J., & Travis III, L. F. (2000). Multijurisdictional drug task forces: An analysis of impacts. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 28*(6), 543-556.

Stalans, L.J., (2009). Women's offending behavior: Evidence-based review of gender differences and gender responsive programs. *Victims & Offenders 4*(4): 405-411.

Steadman, H. J. (2005). *A guide to collecting mental health court outcome data.* Retrieved May 3, 2012, from https://www.bja.gov/Programs/MHC-Outcome-Data.pdf

Steadman, H.J., Redlich, A., Callahan, L., Robbins, P. C., & Vesselinov, R. (2011). Effect of mental health courts on arrests and jail days: A multisite study. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 68*(2), 167-172.

Steinhart, D. (n.d.a). *Special detention cases: Strategies for handling difficult populations.* Retrieved April 25, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2009%20Special%20Detention%20Cases%20Strategies%20for%20Handling%20Difficult%20Populations.pdf

Steinhart, D. (n.d.b). *Pathways to juvenile detention reform: Planning for juvenile detention reforms a structured approach.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Pathway%20Series/JDAI%20Pathway%2001%20Planning%20for%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Reforms%20A%20Structured%20Approach.pdf

Steinhart, D. (2006). *Juvenile detention risk assessment: A practice guide to juvenile detention reform.* Retrieved April 26, 2012, from http://www.jdaihelpdesk.org/JDAI%20Practice%20Guides/JDAI%20Juvenile%20Detention%20Risk%20Assessment%20Practice%20Guide.pdf

Stucky, T. D., Newby, W., & Nunn, S. (2007). *Analysis of Byrne/JAG Programs administered by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute: Multi-jurisdictional (drug) task forces, 2006 and 2007.* Indianapolis: Indiana University Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Taxman, F. S., Yong, D., Byrne, J. M., Hosinger, A., & Anspach, D. (2003). *From prison safety to public safety: Innovations in offender reentry.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Turner, S., & Petersilia, J. (2012) Putting science to work: How the principles of risk, need, and responsivity apply to reentry. In J. A. Dvoskin, J. L. Skeem, R. W. Novaco, & K. S. Douglas (Eds.), *Using social science to reduce violent offending* (179-198). New York: Oxford University Press.

Visher, C. A. (2007). Returning home: Emerging findings and policy lessons about prisoner reentry. *Federal Sentencing Reporter, 20*(2), 93-102.

Visher, C. A., Harrell, A.V., & Newmark, L.C. (2007). *NIJ Research in Practice: Pretrial innovations for domestic violence offenders and victims.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved May 3, 2012, from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/216041.pdf

Warren, R.K. (2007). *Evidence-based practice to reduce recidivism: Implications for state judiciaries.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

Wilson, D. B., Mitchell, O. & MacKenzie, D. L. (2006). A systematic review of drug court effects on recidivism. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 2*(4), 459-487.

Appendix 1: JAG subgrants in calendar year 2012 by priority area

Priority area	Prior funding	Requested	Received	Years prior funding	Applying agency	Funded project
Forensic	-----	$212,620	$142,000	-----	Indianapolis/Marion County	Improved Efficiency and Backlog Reduction
JDAI	$47,500	$41,250	$28,875	2	Marion County	Reducing Disproportionality in JDAI
	$30,066	$30,000	$24,000	2	Porter County	JDAI- Porter County
	$50,000	$52,000	$36,400	1	Tippecanoe County	Tippecanoe County JDAI Project
MJTF and interdiction teams	$40,000	$40,000	$28,000	26	Allen County	Allen County Drug Task Force
	$41,000	$41,400	$32,800	18	City of Auburn	IMAGE Drug Task Force
	$40,000	$20,000	$20,000	17	City of Connersville	RUFF Drug Task Force
	$60,000	$60,000	$48,000	23	Grant County	Joint Effort Against Narcotics/Wabash Drug Task Force
	$36,829	$68,943	$25,780	10	Hendricks County	United Drug Task Force
	$44,000	$44,000	$30,800	7	Henry County	Henry/Wayne County Drug Task Force
	$51,789	$234,186	$25,895	22	City of Kokomo	Howard-Miami Co. Multi-Jursidictional Drug Task Force
	$386,700	$174,015	$121,811	20	Lake County	Lake County Drug Task Force
	$110,052	$72,263	$50,584	6	City of Anderson	Madison/Delaware Counties Task Force
	-----	$281,773	$200,000	-----	Marion County	Multi-Jurisdictional Offender Strategy Team (MOST)
	$161,408	$497,238	$112,986	18	City of Indianapolis	Metro Drug Task Force
	$51,552	$66,819	$25,776	17	Randolph County	Tri-County Drug Task Force
	$20,652	$17,000	$13,600	21	City of Bluffton	DETECT Drug Task Force
Other		$59,500	$29,750	-----	City of Charlestown	Project SHARE
	$59,832	$61,220	$41,882	1	Clark County	Clark County Crisis Intervention Team
	-----	$26,683	$18,678	-----	City of Marion	Traffic/Crime Enforcement Project 2012
	-----	$31,000	$15,500	-----	Green County	Prosecutors Office Prosecutorial Support
	-----	$48,970	$24,485	-----	Pittsboro Police Department	In Car Digital Camera
	-----	$112,873	$79,011	-----	Marion County	Prosecutor Case Management
	-----	$35,550	$18,000	-----	City of Indianapolis	Annual Law Enforcement Conference, US Attorney's Office - Southern District
	-----	$196,910	$98,455	-----	Miami County	IDEA Statewide Narcotics Training Program
	-----	$208,335	$208,335	-----	Shelby County	Shelby County Data Sharing Initiative
Problem-solving courts	$35,975	$106,888	$25,183	7	Clark County	Clark County Superior Court 2 Drug Treatment Court Program
	$60,262	$20,782	$16,626	6	Hancock County	Hancock County Drug Court
	$50,506	$66,951	$40,405	7	City of Greenwood	Greenwood Recovery Court
	$106,250	$430,498	$85,000	1	Lake County	Lake County Community Transition Court
	$118,202	$93,892	$84,503	7	Lawrence County	Lawrence County Drug Court
	-----	$289,375	$202,563	-----	Madison County	Unified Problem Solving Court
	$87,550	$130,728	$70,040	12	Marion County	Marion Co. Drug Treatment Court
	$125,000	$189,037	$100,000	3	Marion County	Marion Co. Re-Entry Court
	$56,423	$97,113	$45,138	3	Marion County	Juvenile and Adult Alternative Placement Program
	$57,176	$73,837	$45,741	6	Indianapolis/Marion County	Community Court
	$55,564	$83,779	$50,008	7	Monroe County	Monroe County Drug Court
	$23,903	$21,974	$19,777	6	Parke County	Parke County Drug Court
	$40,000	$40,000	$36,000	8	Vigo County	Vigo County Drug Court
	$60,847	$70,598	$30,424	7	Warrick County	Warrick County Drunk Driving and Drug Court Program
	$53,637	$75,961	$42,910	9	Vanderburgh County	Vanderburgh County Day Reporting Drug Court
Prosecution	$46,516	$76,522	$37,213	3	Clark County	Clark County Drug/Narcotics Prosecutor
	-----	$104,840	$54,912	-----	Crawford County	The Crawford/Perry Joint Drug Prosecution Program
	-----	$80,258	$56,181	-----	Lake County	Lake County Drug Market Intervention
	$34,500	$34,500	$27,600	5	Scott County	Scott County Drug Prosecutor
Reentry and sentencing policy reform	$80,287	$80,287	$64,230	2	Grant County	Re-Entry Court
	$42,761	$85,523	$68,418	5	Marion County	Duvall Residential Center Addictions Treatment Program
	$115,254	$137,237	$25,000	6	St. Joseph County	Project Roots
	-----	$287,850	$50,000	-----	Wayne County	2011 LAP Expansion
State MJTFs and interdiction teams	$219,336	$225,000	$219,336	22	Indiana State Police	Drug Enforcement Section
	$393,806	$228,680	$196,903	6	Indiana State Police	Meth Suppression Section
State other	$33,240	$22,652	$22,652	2	IN Department of Correction	Restorative Justice Expansion Project
	-----	$70,169	$35,085	-----	Indiana Judicial Center	Probation Workload Measures
State reentry	-----	$670,230	$134,046	-----	IN Dept. of Workforce Development	Ex-Offender Employment Initiative
	-----	$31,268	$31,268	-----	IN Department of Correction	Systemic Improvements for Trainistioning Offenders with Mental Health Issues
	$123,581	$117,729	$117,729	4	IN Department of Correction	Family and Community Reintegration Specialist (FCRS) Continuation
State technology	$165,000	$185,000	$165,000	3	IN Public Defender Council	Defender Performance Improvement Project
	-----	$342,953	$171,477	-----	Indiana Supreme Court, JTAC	Odyssey Deployment - Elkhart & Two other counties
	-----	$107,819	$101,851	-----	Indiana State Police	IN Gang Information Exchange Portal & Federated Search Project
	-----	$39,000	$39,000	-----	IN Department of Correction	IRIS Enhancement
	-----	$108,950	$34,300	-----	IN Department of Correction	ISA Sex Offenders Registry Sytemic Improvement

Source: 2012 ICJI Award Documents; accurate as of March 2012

Note: JDAI refers to Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative; MJTF refers to Multi-jurisdictional task force