



PROPERTY OF  
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)  
Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

**Strategic Planning Meeting on Crime and Justice Research in Indian Country**

**October 14-15, 1998**

**Portland, Oregon**

**Sponsored by the National Institute of Justice, the American Indian and Alaska Native  
Affairs Office, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention**

196170

196170

***Strategic Planning Meeting  
on Crime and Justice Research in Indian Country***

Portland Columbia River Doubletree Hotel, Portland, Oregon  
October 14-15, 1998

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**

Karen Artichoker  
Cangleska, Inc.  
Kyle Jail Road  
P.O. Box 638  
Kyle, SD 57752  
Phone: (605) 455-2244  
Fax: (605) 455-1245  
E-mail: karen@gwtc.net

Matthew Beccio  
Staff Assistant  
American Indian & Alaska Native Affairs  
Office  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 514-1251  
Fax: (202) 514-7805  
E-mail: becciom@ojp.usdoj.gov

Asa Begaye  
Director  
William Holmes Begaye, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1871  
Window Rock, AZ 86515  
Phone: (520) 737-9473  
Fax: (520) 737-9473

Phil Bluehouse  
Peacemaker Division  
Navajo Nation Judicial Branch  
Window Rock Monument Park  
Window Rock, AZ 86515  
Phone: (520) 871-6118  
Fax: (520) 871-7016

Donovan D. Brown, Sr.  
Acting Chief Prosecutor  
Navajo Nation Office of the Prosecutor  
Window Rock Blvd.  
Window Rock, AZ 86515  
Phone: (520) 871-6994  
Fax: (520) 871-6688

Susan Cameron  
Associate Professor  
Department of Education  
University of New Mexico  
Simpson Hall, Room #19  
Albuquerque, NM 87131  
Phone: (505) 277-5324  
Fax: (505) 277-8361  
E-mail: scameron@unm.edu

Marcia R. Chaiken  
Director of Research  
LINC  
P.O. Box 924  
Alexandria, VA 22313  
Phone: (703) 549-8222  
Fax: (703) 836-5941  
E-mail: linc@radix.net

Betty Chemers  
Director of Research & Program  
Development Division  
Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency  
Prevention  
800 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-3651  
E-mail: bchemers@ojp.usdoj.gov

Michelle Chino  
716 Solano Dr. SE  
Albuquerque, NM 87108  
Phone: (505) 764-0036  
Fax: (505) 764-0446  
E-mail: mchino@flash.net

Vincent Craig  
Consultant  
State Route 73  
Whiskey Flats #16  
Whiteriver, AZ 85941  
Phone: (520) 338-5298

Michael Dever  
Assistant to the Deputy Director  
Corrections Program Office  
U.S. Department of Justice  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-9188  
Fax: (202) 307-2019

Randy Doucet  
Chief Judge  
Lummi Tribal Court  
2616 Kwina Rd.  
Bellingham, WA 98226  
Phone: (360) 384-2306  
Fax: (360) 384-4543

Christine W. Duclos  
1700 Niagara St.  
Denver, CO 80220  
Phone: (303) 399-8315  
Fax: (303) 388-1168  
E-mail: chris\_duclos@msn.com

Gail Elias  
EKM, Inc.  
201 E. Simpson St.  
Lafayette, CO 80026  
Phone: (303) 673-0366  
Fax: (303) 665-8059

Len Foster  
Coordinator  
National Native American Prisoners'  
Rights Advocates Coalition  
Division of Health/DBHS  
Administration Bldg., #2  
Window Rock, AZ 86515  
Phone: (520) 871-6234  
Fax: (520) 871-6255

Laurence French  
Department of Social Sciences  
Western New Mexico University  
1000 W. College Street  
Silver City, NM 88061  
Phone: (505) 538-6422  
Fax: (505) 538-6178  
E-mail: frenchl@silver.wnmu.edu

Carole Goldberg  
Professor of Law  
UCLA School of Law  
American Indian Studies Center  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476  
Phone: (310) 825-4429  
Fax: (310) 206-6489  
E-mail: goldberg@law.ucla.edu

J. Phillip Gossage  
Senior Research Scientist  
Education/Prevention & Research Division  
Center on Alcoholism, Substance Abuse  
and Addictions (CASAA)  
2350 Alamo SE  
Albuquerque, NM 87106-3202  
Phone: (505) 768-0104  
Fax: (505) 768-0113  
E-mail: jgossage@unm.edu

D. Elen Grigg  
Program Manager, Research &  
Program Development Division  
Office of Juvenile Justice & Delinquency  
Prevention  
800 K Street, NW, Room 3158  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-3651  
E-mail: elen@ojp.usdoj.gov

Eric Kenneth Gross  
415 E. Church Road  
#B11  
Elkins Park, PA 19027  
Phone: (215) 782-1272  
E-mail: ericgross@worldnet.att.net

Norena Henry  
Director  
American Indian & Alaska  
Native Affairs Office  
Office of Justice Programs  
U.S. Department of Justice  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-3205  
Fax: (202) 514-7805  
E-mail: henry@ojp.usdoj.gov

Sally Hillsman  
Deputy Director  
Office of Research & Evaluation  
National Institute of Justice  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 307-2958  
Fax: (202) 616-0275  
E-mail: hillsman@ojp.usdoj.gov

Patricia Hinrichs  
Native American Project Coordinator  
Oregon Commission on Children and  
Families  
1331 Central  
Coos Bay, OR 97420  
Phone: (541) 269-1068  
(541) 756-4980  
Fax: (541) 267-0154

Eileen Hudon  
Apt. 414  
2000 W. Main Street  
Red Wing, MN 55066-1963  
Phone: (651) 646-6177  
Fax: (651) 646-1527

Dionne Johnson  
Program Manager  
Drug Courts Program Office  
Office of Justice Programs  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 305-9003  
Fax: (202) 305-9075

Martin Kamen  
Program Manager  
Program Development Division  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20531  
Phone: (202) 305-1745  
E-mail: [kamenm@ojp.usdoj.gov](mailto:kamenm@ojp.usdoj.gov)

June B. Kress  
Grants Administration  
Office of Community Oriented Policing  
Services  
1100 Vermont Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: (202) 616-2915  
Fax: (202) 616-9612

Teresa La Fromboise  
Associate Professor  
Counseling Psychology  
School of Education  
485 Lasuen Mall  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305-3096  
Phone: (650) 723-1202  
(415) 723-1202  
Fax: (650) 725-7412  
(415) 725-7412  
E-mail: [lafrom@leland.stanford.edu](mailto:lafrom@leland.stanford.edu)

Robert Langworthy  
Director/Professor  
Justice Center  
University of Alaska  
3211 Providence Drive  
Anchorage, AK 99508-0389  
Phone: (907) 786-1812  
Fax: (907) 786-7777  
E-mail: [afrhl@uaa.alaska.edu](mailto:afrhl@uaa.alaska.edu)

Warren LeBeau  
Ak-Chin Tribe  
42507 W. Peters Andnall Rd.  
Maricopa, AZ 85239  
Phone: (520) 568-2227, Ext. 35  
Fax: (520) 568-0021

Hayes Lewis  
Assistant to Tribal Council  
Pueblo of Zuni  
Office of the Governor  
1203 B, State Hwy. 53  
Zuni, NM 87327  
Phone: (505) 782-4481  
Fax: (505) 782-2700

Christine T. Lowery  
University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee  
Criminal Justice Department  
School of Social Welfare  
Enderis Hall  
2400 E. Hartford Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53211  
Phone: (414) 229-4735  
Fax: (414) 229-5311

Carol Lujan  
Special Assistant to the Assistant  
Secretary of Indian Affairs  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Department of Interior  
1849 C Street, NW MS-4140  
Washington, DC 20240  
Phone: (202) 208-7324  
Fax: (202) 208-6334  
E-mail: [Carol\\_Lujan@IOS.DOI.gov](mailto:Carol_Lujan@IOS.DOI.gov)

Philip May  
Executive Director  
Education/Prevention & Research Division  
Center on Alcoholism, Substance Abuse  
and Addictions (CASAA)  
2350 Alamo SE  
Albuquerque, NM 87106-3202  
Phone: (505) 768-0104  
Fax: (505) 768-0113  
E-mail: pmay@unm.edu

Ada Pecos Melton  
Executive Director  
American Indian Development Associates  
2401 12th Street NW, Suite 212  
Albuquerque, NM 87104  
Phone: (505) 842-1122  
Fax: (505) 842-9652  
E-mail: aidainc@flash.net

Arvo Q. Mikkanen  
Assistant U.S. Attorney and Special  
Assistant for Tribal Relations  
USAO-Western District of Oklahoma  
210 West Park Ave., Suite 400  
Oklahoma City, OK 73102  
Phone: (405) 553-8737  
Fax: (405) 553-8888

Ed Naranjo  
BIA, Criminal Investigation Section  
911 N.E. 11th Avenue  
Portland, OR 97232  
Phone: (503) 872-2855  
Fax: (503) 872-2884

Richard Nichols  
ORBIS Associates  
1411 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: (202) 628-4444  
Fax: (202) 628-2241

Lisa Poupart  
Associate Professor  
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay  
Humanistic Studies Dept.  
Theater Hall 395  
2420 Nicolet Dr.  
Green Bay, WI 54311  
Phone: (920) 465-2185  
Fax: (920) 465-2890

Winifred Reed  
Social Science Analyst  
National Institute of Justice  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 307-2952  
Fax: (202) 616-0275  
E-mail: winnie@ojp.usdoj.gov

Edward Reina, Jr.  
Chief of Police  
Reno-Sparks Indian Colony  
98 Colony Rd.  
Reno, NV 89502  
Phone: (702) 785-8776  
Fax: (702) 785-9162

Rick Robinson  
Executive Director  
Boys and Girls Club of  
The Northern Cheyenne Nation  
101 Cheyenne Avenue  
Lame Deer, MT 59043  
Phone: (406) 477-6654  
Fax: (406) 477-8646  
E-mail: ncbgclub@men.net

Cathy Sanders  
Program Manager  
Office for Victims of Crime  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-3578

Tim Simmons  
Assistant U.S. Attorney,  
Tribal Liaison  
1000 S.W. Third Avenue, Suite 600  
Portland, OR 97204  
Phone: (503) 727-1000  
Fax: (503) 727-1117

Andrea Smith  
123 Felix St. #4  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Phone: (408) 460-1856  
Fax: (408) 457-3209  
E-mail: andysm@cats.ucsc.edu

Soo Song  
Deputy Director  
Office of Tribal Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Room 2229  
Washington, DC 20530  
Phone: (202) 616-9040  
Fax: (202) 514-9078

Timothy Taylor  
Health Researcher  
Indian Health Service  
5300 Homestead Road, N.E.  
Albuquerque, NM 87110-1293  
Phone: (505) 248-4125  
Fax: (505) 248-4129

Henry Thompson  
Victim/Witness Director  
P.O. Box 374  
St. Johns, AZ 85936  
Phone: (520) 337-4364  
Fax: (520) 337-2427  
E-mail: hthompson@apache.co.az.us

Yvonneda Thompson  
Community Development Coordinator  
Dull Knife Memorial College  
101 College Drive  
Lame Deer, MT 59043  
Phone: (406) 477-6215  
Fax: (406) 477-6219

Pamela Jumper Thurman  
Tri-Ethnic Center  
Department of Psychology  
Colorado State University  
Fort Collins, CO 80523-1879  
Phone: 1-800-835-8091  
Fax: (970) 491-0527  
E-mail: pjthurman@aol.com

Tracy Toulou  
Assistant U.S. Attorney  
District of Montana  
2929 3rd Avenue, N., Suite 400  
Billings, MT 59103  
Phone: (406) 657-6101  
Fax: (406) 657-6989

Stewart Wakeling  
Office of the County Administrator  
222 East Weber Street  
Room 707  
Stockton, CA 95202-2709  
Phone: (209) 468-9563  
Fax: (209) 468-2875

Eidell Wasserman  
5241 Hutchinson Rd.  
Sebastopol, CA 95472  
Phone: (707) 824-8308  
Fax: (707) 824-8308

Jenifer Wood  
Social Science Analyst  
National Institute of Justice  
810 7th Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: (202) 616-5191  
Fax: (202) 616-0275  
E-mail: wood@ojp.usdoj.gov

Mary T. Wynne, Vice President  
National American Indian Court Judges  
Association  
P.O. Box 150  
Nesplem, WA 99155  
Phone: (509) 634-2508  
Fax: (509) 634-8566  
E-mail: wynne@televar.com

**Strategic Planning Meeting on Crime and Justice Research in Indian Country:  
Day One**

**Opening Prayer**

**Mr. Phil Bluehouse** began the meeting with a morning prayer, first spoken in Navajo and then translated into English.

*Ms. Norena Henry, Director, American Indian and Native Affairs Office,  
Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice*

**Ms. Norena Henry** welcomed participants and provided an overview of the meeting's agenda. On behalf of the planning group, Ms. Henry thanked all participants for coming to Portland. Ms. Henry introduced members of the core planning group who were present including **Ms. Winnie Reed, Ms. Elen Grigg, and Mr. Matt Beccio**. Other members of the planning group from the Department of Justice were also introduced.

Ms. Henry explained that the purpose of the meeting was to build an agenda on crime and justice research in Indian Country. She explained that several tribal people had requested information on what was going on in Indian Country and that she would be better prepared to answer their questions after this meeting. She also stated that Attorney General Reno shares these concerns and wants to know what works for tribal people. Ms. Henry mentioned her sense of outrage at some of the current research about Indian communities that was being shared with the public. She stressed that the U.S. Department of Justice wants the active participation of those attending this meeting. Ms. Henry added that **Mr. Asa Begaye** will be the facilitator for the two-day meeting and then introduced **Dr. Sally Hillsman**.

*Dr. Sally Hillsman, Deputy Director, Office of Research  
and Evaluation, The National Institute of Justice*

Dr. Hillsman is the Deputy Director of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), the research arm of the Department of Justice (DOJ). NIJ has been excited about working with Norena Henry to put this strategic planning meeting together. For the first time in a long time, different components of DOJ are working together, particularly in the areas of research. One of the things NIJ has learned is that collaboration in Washington, D.C. is hard to achieve, but in recent years, the DOJ has put an increased emphasis on collaboration. This Office's constituency is focused on what is going on at the state and local level. Something different has also been happening during the last few years in regard to research: NIJ has taken lessons from the communities with regard for the need to collaborate with communities, states, and tribes. The issue of collaboration has been taken seriously, and much of the best research is done collaboratively working with people at the community level. In order to develop research that would produce scientific

knowledge rooted in the needs and perspectives of the people who need the knowledge, NIJ started a collaboration effort a few years ago with the COPS Office to encourage researchers to reach out and partner with police departments. Much of DOJ's research has benefitted from collaboration, and there has been an increasing recognition that to look at crime and justice issues one must go to the communities. To understand crime, you must look at where the crime is happening—at the neighborhood level. It is important to remember that while NIJ is engaged in this research, there is a need to create networks of information systems that build the capacity of communities to develop and use their own information. This leaves the community with the capacity to continue to gather knowledge after the researchers have left.

There is an amazing group of people here today. It was humbling to realize how many people wanted to get involved in the issue of how research might be a helpful tool in Indian Country. NIJ is glad you are here to share your voices with us. NIJ does have some important plans after this meeting. One thing is to try to bring together the papers from this meeting—and the discussions from this meeting—and provide a publication that NIJ can circulate. Research will move forward if people suggest ways to increase the demand for this type of research. NIJ is also hoping to use some of the ideas that come out of this meeting to put out targeted solicitations.

NIJ is very concerned about communicating research findings, and there is an extensive publications program. In Indian Country, NIJ would like your thoughts on what are the best mechanisms for communicating NIJ findings back to Indian communities.

***Ms. Betty Chemers, Director of Research and Program Development Division,  
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention***

Ms. Betty Chemers introduced herself as the Director of the Research and Program Development Division at OJJDP but said that she was representing not only her own division but other programmatic divisions at OJJDP as well. OJJDP as a mission agency oversees programs involving direct funding of juvenile justice programs by state and local governments, implementation of demonstration programs, and training and technical assistance to the juvenile justice field. As a co-sponsor of this meeting, she extended a warm welcome to the attendees. OJJDP's co-sponsorship reflects the importance it ascribes to improving the quality and relevance of research in Indian Country.

Twelve years ago, OJJDP's Juvenile Justice State Advisory Group recognized the importance of identifying critical issues around the treatment of Indian youth by the juvenile justice system and obtained support for OJJDP to sponsor a national study of Indian tribes and their handling of juvenile offenders. The results were not very successful because of the paucity of Indian-specific state and federal data. Ms. Chemers emphasized the importance of learning from these past research activities. OJJDP's goals for this meeting are to identify the following: pertinent issues and problems in Indian Country affecting Indian youth that research can inform;

steps that need to be taken to improve the conduct of research around these issues; and activities to increase the participation of Native American researchers and practitioners in advising and conducting research in Indian Country. Ms. Chemers concluded by saying she was excited to be participating in the meeting and gave special thanks to the papers' authors.

***Ms. Winifred Reed, Social Science Analyst,  
The National Institute of Justice***

Ms. Reed gave an overview of the genesis of this meeting. When Jeremy Travis became Director of NIJ in 1994, he initiated a series of strategic planning meetings. Papers written on relevant topics preceded these strategic planning meetings. NIJ has used a variety of mechanisms to decide on paper topics. For this meeting, 12 papers were commissioned with input from the larger Department of Justice planning group, whereas usually, only about four papers are commissioned for a strategic planning meeting. Ms. Reed then introduced Mr. Asa Begaye, the facilitator for the meeting.

***Mr. Asa Begaye, Director, William Holmes Begaye, Inc.  
Window Rock, Arizona***

Mr. Begaye welcomed participants and explained that he would be facilitating a strategic planning process known as the Technology of Participation (the TOPs Method). After this explanation, all the participants at the meeting briefly introduced themselves. The paper writers then presented the individual papers commissioned for the meeting.

***Dr. Lisa Poupart, Associate Professor,  
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay  
Humanistic Studies Department***

**Paper Topic: *Social and Economic Links to Crime and Justice in American Indian Communities***

Prior to contact with Europeans, crime in the Indian community was nonexistent. This paper discusses the way EuroAmerican culture and colonization have contributed to problems in Indian communities. This includes high rates of poverty and the normalization of violence arising from cultural and historical domination. Mainstream research has not examined power relationships or the way in which historical events have contributed to crime in Indian Country. Mainstream criminology has used data to look at Indian involvement in crime and differential crime rates. Mainstream research has also focused on examining the decision making practices of justice system officials. However, research should not just be narrowly focused on available criminal justice data.

This paper suggests that crime and other social problems in American Indian communities must be examined and understood in light of the historical economic, political, and social relationships of power and domination between American Indian nations and the U.S. federal and state governments. Crime in American Indian communities today can be understood as a response to continued economic deprivation and dependency, as well as an expression of historical trauma, historical unresolved grief, and normalized violence. Thus, in order to effectively address crime in American Indian communities, it is imperative that policy makers and justice systems officials address power inequities within the U.S. political, economic, and social structures. In addition, concerted efforts to reaffirm American Indian tribal sovereignty are critical to impacting the present status of Indian Nations today. There is a need for research that examines the factors of colonization and the history of genocide. There has been consistent resistance from criminal justice researchers to consider social history questions when researching American Indian communities.

***Dr. Michelle Chino***  
***Albuquerque Area Indian Health Board***

**Paper Topic: *Research and Data Collection in Indian Country***

**Dr. Michelle Chino** began by stating that her paper discusses the overarching issues of conducting research in Indian Country. The most important message is to communicate how to conduct research on Indian communities. Indian communities have been over-researched; Dr. Chino said, that in her view, the most important research need is to develop a process for community discourse for the purpose of building collaborative efforts and ensuring that research benefits the tribes. This process will build relationships and maximize the benefits of research while minimizing the risks of research. A process of community discourse also empowers the tribes. Key issues with regard to conducting research in Indian Country include:

- 1) Developing a collaborative relationship between researcher and community
- 2) Determining the impact of the research on the community—the risks and the benefits
- 3) Building upon earlier research

In summary, conducting research in Indian communities requires the consideration of geographic, social, and political issues; community attitudes; poverty; jurisdiction; culture and tradition; modernization and assimilation; limited resources; community size and structure; and the history of Indian research. Knowledge of the community—its needs, its attitudes, its history, and its culture—can only come from interaction and dialog. This knowledge is essential to understanding cause and effect—and problems and solutions—in the context of the community and the individuals impacted by the issues.

*Ms. Gail Elias  
EKM, Inc.  
Lafayette, Colorado*

**Paper Topic: *Criminal Justice Data Collection Issues in Indian Country***

**Ms. Gail Elias** said that the purpose of her paper was to examine quantitative data collection issues in Indian Country. One basic assumption in criminal justice research that is not fulfilled in Indian Country is the assumption that data will be collected in a systematic and uniform way. As a result, it is difficult to compare one tribe to another because of varying methods. A second significant challenge is the multiplicity of concurrent and overlapping jurisdictions that apply to Indian Country. Data collection efforts must span multiple jurisdictions, which frequently have not worked collaboratively in the past.

Resources are another very significant barrier to data collection efforts. Most law enforcement agencies routinely collect information as a by-product of the normal work process. As a result, there is a vast amount of data that is available. However, it is not easy to get. Many tribal jurisdictions lack even the most basic forms of automation that could assist in data gathering. The information is seldom assembled in the neatly defined packages, e.g., the Uniform Crime Reports, that criminal justice researchers have come to expect. Researchers need to make an effort to work with criminal justice agencies in tribal communities to learn where and how information has been stored. Once good sources of information have been identified, researchers then need to provide for collaborative, manual data collection efforts. It is also critical to engage communities in the analysis of the information so that the researcher and the community understand the meaning behind the statistics.

*Dr. J. Phillip Gossage and Dr. Philip A. May  
Center on Alcoholism, Substance Abuse and Addictions  
University of New Mexico  
Albuquerque, New Mexico*

**Paper Topic: *Substance Abuse and Crime in Indian Country***

**Dr. Philip May** stated that his and Dr. Gossage's paper provides an overview of the existing literature and research on substance abuse and crime among native U.S. populations. It also provides analyses of criminal justice systems at the federal, tribal, and community level and their responses to substance abuse and crime. The paper also examines the approaches used by service providers in prevention, intervention, treatment, rehabilitation, etc. to address substance abuse and crime. There were 106 references (most from the academic arena) found on the topic, but the existing literature does not provide a complete picture, and most of the literature was published in the 1970s. A majority of these studies were conducted in the Southwest and are primarily alcohol-related crime research.

Most existing research contains arrest statistics. However, many of the studies have small sample sizes and only a few have subject interviews. Furthermore, few of the previous studies address the issue of recidivism or examine individual factors when trying to determine causes. A key recommendation for future research would be to focus on a particular cultural area and include Indian customs and practices. With regard to alcohol and substance abuse treatments, it is necessary to determine what treatment modalities work best for Indian communities. Dr. May went on to discuss nine points about Indian drinking that clarify the existing knowledge on the "drunken Indian" stereotype:

- 1) Alcoholism alone is not the leading cause of death among Indians; alcohol abuse (binge drinking) causes more deaths than chronic drinking.
- 2) Indians are identical to other races with regard to metabolizing alcohol. They are not biologically more susceptible to alcohol problems.
- 3) In most tribes a lower percentage of adults drink when compared to the overall adult population in the U.S. However, drinking rates are higher for Indians in the age 15 to 30 group. These are abusive peer clusters. Research needs to focus on these clusters before making generalizations about Indian drinking.
- 4) Alcohol consumption patterns differ from tribe to tribe.
- 5) Alcohol abuse is a greater problem among Indian males than among the general male population and the same is also true for Indian females, yet Indian males have a much higher incidence of alcohol-related problems than Indian females.
- 6) The majority of Indians do not get arrested for alcohol-related behavior.
- 7) Child abuse and neglect in Indian Country is alcohol related in the majority of cases.
- 8) Fetal Alcohol Syndrome (FAS) is not rampant in Indian communities, although overall average FAS rates for Indians exceed the national estimates.
- 9) Alcohol abuse prevention programs have been undertaken by Indian tribes, and in many tribes, an effective public health approach to alcohol problems is being implemented.

*Ms. Andrea Smith  
Santa Cruz, California*

**Paper Topic: *Sexual Assault in Indian Country***

**Ms. Andrea Smith** discussed her draft of a paper on sexual assault in Indian Country. With regard to the contextual issue, sexual assault is closely related to the historical genocide of Indians. The sense of shame accompanying sexual assault makes it difficult to conduct research on this topic, and there is massive under-reporting among victims of sexual assault. Rape is usually not reported unless it is extremely violent. People in Indian communities need to be encouraged to speak out about sexual assault. From a research perspective, there is also a need to develop models to look at the impact sexual assault has on Native American women. Another issue is the need to find out what sexual assault programs are available and what is being done in

other tribes. Some of the recommendations for further research on sexual assault in Indian Country include:

1) Historical Research. In order to dispel the notion that violence is "traditional," it would be helpful to support research that documents how sexual assault was addressed in Native communities prior to colonization. This information may also provide new tribally-specific avenues for addressing sexual violence within Native communities today.

2) Needs Assessment. Before developing sexual assault programs, needs assessment surveys should be developed to determine what the community identifies as its needs in terms of addressing sexual violence.

3) Accurate Statistics on Sexual Assault. Data is needed on the incidence and prevalence of sexual assault. However, many tribes without sexual assault programs do not keep these statistics at all. Generally the only information available is the number of cases reported to the police. Given that most survivors do not report rape, these numbers are very low. In particular, there is very little information on the prevalence of marital rape because even victims of marital rape do not recognize marital rape as a crime.

4) Assessment of Effectiveness of Sexual Assault Programs in Reducing Sexual Violence. Studies on the effects of suppression and incarceration on crime rates have generally focused on crimes of poverty rather than on crimes of violence against women. Will improving federal and tribal justice systems' responses to sexual assault actually lead to a decrease in sexual assault? Are there alternative modes for addressing these crimes? How effective are they and why? Similarly, it would be useful to assess the effectiveness of educational programs in changing community consciousness about sexual assault. One study, for instance, found that dating violence curricula did not significantly change participants' attitudes about dating violence. Are the educational models on sexual violence the most effective? Are there other models available that might be more effective?

5) Survey of Existing Sexual Assault Programs. Many interviewees requested information on what other tribes are doing to address sexual assault. A survey of all the existing programs, including an assessment of which aspects of the program are effective and which are not, would be helpful for tribes developing or strengthening sexual assault programs.

6) Statistics on Stalking Behavior in Sexual/domestic Violence Cases. Stalking is often not included in tribal codes on sexual/domestic violence. More research on stalking behavior could help encourage the incorporation of stalking within tribal codes on sexual/domestic violence.

7) Survey on the Psychological Impact of Sexual Assault. Many interviewees noted that communities often do not realize how destructive sexual assault is psychologically. Consequently, only those survivors who endure the most severe physical injuries from a sexual assault even try to report the crime. Surveys of the psychological impact of sexual assault on

survivors might help demonstrate that sexual assault is always a very traumatic event that needs to be taken seriously.

*Ms. Eidell Wasserman  
Sebastopol, California*

**Paper Topic: *Issues in Conducting Research on Crime Victimization***

**Ms. Eidell Wasserman** discussed her paper on victimization issues in Indian Country. It is important to emphasize the idea of the community benefitting from any research that it supports and in which it participates. Often, people who are victimized do not want to talk about things that are shameful or embarrassing. Ms. Wasserman mentioned a Senate hearing in the late 1980's where it was difficult for people to testify before the Senate about sexual abuse. Because people are reluctant to talk about victimization, it can hamper funding for victim's services programs. There is a need to examine the impact of crime on the community, not just from a family or a victim's perspective, but from the perspective of the entire community. There is a need to get out information about successful programs and to look at the common factors of successful programs. There is also a need to look at the needs of victim services providers. Finally, the integration of victimization issues with other agencies and with other entities needs to be examined—victimization is often seen as a separate entity.

*Ms. Ada Pecos Melton  
Executive Director  
American Indian Development Associates  
Albuquerque, New Mexico*

**Paper Topic: *Native American Juvenile Justice System Research Issues***

**Ms. Ada Pecos Melton** discussed the lack of political support for Native American children in the juvenile justice system. A difficult problem is that history is often ignored, and not knowing the legacy of history hampers the ability to accomplish things in the present. There are a lot of statistics, but there is not a good plan on how to use these statistics. The poorest of the poor are Indian children. With regard to the way national public policies affect our children, money is not being spent on children or juvenile justice systems. There is disproportionate minority confinement in the juvenile justice system. People tend to look at data that is easily available, but arrest data do not tell a lot about Indian children. There is a need to look at how kids are received by the Indian community after they are released from the system.

Research on tribal codes has been limited. Indians have an oral history tradition. Indians do not value research because they feel they already understand what their communities need. There is a need to understand what kinds of screening criteria tribes are using for Indian youth

entering the juvenile justice system, i.e, what makes a child a high security risk, which children are being referred for formal processing by the juvenile justice system, which children are being sentenced to institutions. There is also a need to look at public policy, such as federal codes from the FBI, BIA, etc., and there is a need to look at how federal, state, county, and municipal governments coordinate their juvenile justice activities.

***Mr. Warren LeBeau  
AK-Chin Tribe  
Maricopa, Arizona***

***Paper Topic: Juvenile Justice Detention Issues in Indian Country***

**Mr. Warren LeBeau** introduced himself by saying that he was not a researcher but a practitioner working in juvenile detention facilities in Indian Country. His 10 years of experience working with Indian jails led him to believe that confinement is not an acceptable form of punishment in Indian Country and that it overlooks the community's rights. Speaking as an ex-BIA employee, Mr. LeBeau said the federal relationship to tribes is very important. Some of the other papers addressed the historical issues, and these are also important when examining the current conditions of jails in Indian Country.

Jails evolve differently on reservations. There are no lawsuits to force the building of new jails and as a result, the conditions of Indian jails are very poor. The housing of juveniles is a low priority in Indian Country. Overcrowding is also a problem in Indian jails, particularly on the weekend when the rates of incarceration increase. Often, the jail is the only resource on the reservation for people in need, and they go to the jail for mental health services, etc. The jail, however, is not equipped to deal with these issues. Mr. LeBeau expressed his view that jails were needed on reservations.

Mr. LeBeau characterized Indian jails as a microcosm of an Indian community. In one Indian jail he knew, it was not the jail's responsibility to detain people but a community's decision. This jail is well run, and the jail is viewed as a community tool. However, this jail would never meet accreditation standards.

Mr. LeBeau identified two specific research needs—accurate data on Indian jails and analyses comparing Indian jails to jails in the non-Indian world. Mr. LeBeau concluded by stating that the U.S. Congress needs to get a true picture of Indian tribes before dealing with the soaring problems of crime and the housing of offenders on reservations. To accomplish this, there is a need for more research on the problems tribes face regarding the adequate and proper detention of offenders. If the majority of Indian tribes have inadequate resources to address the incarceration of adult offenders, then they have far fewer resources to deal with juvenile offenders. Equally important is avoiding costly lawsuits that may arise through the improper detainment and housing of offenders that other non-Indian jurisdictions are currently

experiencing. The contemporary push in the field of detention and correction has been to accredit programs according to nationally recognized standards. This endeavor is a commendable effort by those jurisdictions that can afford accreditation and have the resources to correct deficiencies. Reservation jails, however, are lucky to afford a full complement of staff to adequately provide supervision to the inmates 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Additionally, standards used for accreditation, including the Bureau of Indian Affairs' own detention standards, are based on non-Indian cultural expectations, principles, and ideas.

Indian jails should meet national detention/correction standards, but in doing so Indian cultures should be protected and maintained as well. Protecting the offender's rights is important, but protecting the community's rights is also a concern for Indian people. It is hoped that new research will look at the Indian detention problem holistically. The conflict is forcing non-Indian detention/correction methodologies onto tribes who have traditional beliefs and expectations governing the punishment of an individual who has violated the community's laws and values.

***Ada Pecos Melton***  
***Executive Director***  
***American Indian Development Associates***  
***Albuquerque, New Mexico***

**Paper Topic: *Research of Indigenous Justice Systems***

Ms. Pecos Melton's paper on indigenous justice systems emphasizes the need to understand the importance of the oral tradition. Researchers often do not understand this and the contribution indigenous justice has made to mainstream society. In the Indian community, guilty pleas are treated differently than in the American justice system. If a person acknowledges that he or she has done something, the connotation of responsibility is different. There is a need to pay attention to how language is used and to promote the appropriate use of language.

Often, Indians are not clear about community expectations. Mainstream efforts in community justice are similar to the Indian oral tradition. How do you evaluate an indigenous justice system? It is important that researchers interpret data in a very sensitive fashion. In concluding her paper, Ms. Melton listed some of the key benefits research in Indian Country can achieve:

- Assist in making expectations more clear for Indian people, especially for young people.
- Assist in identifying ways for strengthening culturally-based justice values, philosophies, and perspectives.
- Identify ways to learn about indigenous justice using the oral tradition.
- Describe the structure of indigenous justice systems.

- Promote comparative research and analysis of indigenous justice approaches from other ethnic and cultural groups.
- Compare and differentiate between mainstream approaches that use similar approaches from other ethnic and cultural groups.
- Research and evaluate indigenous justice systems.

***Ms. Pamela Jumper Thurman  
Tri-Ethnic Center  
Department of Psychology  
Colorado State University***

**Paper Topic: *"What Works" in Crime Prevention and Control: Promising Models in Indian Country***

**Ms. Pamela Jumper Thurman** stated that her paper placed an emphasis on initiatives that work. For instance, the inhalant abuse problem in the 1970's was effectively dealt with by the Indian community because Indians are the only ones that paid attention to this issue in the 1970's and 1980's. This is now less of a problem in the Indian community than the non-Indian community. It is important to look at some of the things that have already been done. There is a need for qualitative work.

There are multiple research needs that may vary from tribe to tribe. Also, historical issues cannot be overlooked, and the individual history of each community should be considered. There is a need for the research as well as the specific program intervention to be community-driven.

***Ms. Carole Goldberg  
Professor of Law  
UCLA School of Law  
American Indian Studies Center***

**Paper Topic: *Law Enforcement in Public Law 280 States***

**Ms. Carole Goldberg** presented a paper on Public Law 280. Ms. Goldberg commented that this issue is usually invisible in discussions. It is invisible in the research community and also in federal law enforcement programs. Public Law 280, however, affects 70 percent of all federally recognized tribes and 23 percent of the Indian Country population. There is anecdotal evidence that Public Law 280 causes enormous problems.

Public Law 280 was instituted 45 years ago and states have used different rationalizations—lawlessness in Indian Country, etc.—to justify Public Law 280. There has been

no research done on how Public Law 280 affects Indian communities. There is a need to take stock of how this law has been operating and its adverse affects. Research is also needed on the number of different ways states have responded to Public Law 280 and the impact this law has had on tribal courts, etc. This research has to make a difference to the tribes. To conclude her paper, Ms. Goldberg listed seven priorities for research on Public Law 280:

- 1) Quantitative research regarding crime rates in Indian Country affected by Public Law 280.
- 2) Quantitative studies bearing on the quality of law enforcement under Public Law 280.
- 3) Documentation and evaluation of federal law enforcement funding and services to tribes subject to Public Law 280 jurisdiction.
- 4) Qualitative assessment of law enforcement under Public Law 280.
- 5) Evaluation of retrocession and concurrent tribal jurisdiction.
- 6) Cooperative agreement in Public Law 280 states.
- 7) Possible federal administrative and legislative responses to Public Law 280.

**-Working Lunch-**

***Mr. Eric Gross***  
***Elkins Park, Pennsylvania***

**Paper Topic: *Evaluation of the Navajo Peacemaker Court***

**Mr. Eric Gross** presented slides on his evaluation of the Navajo Peacemaker Court. Mr. Gross provided an overview of Navajo peacemaking and discussed problems associated with conducting academic research in Indian Country, such as obtaining the participation and cooperation of research participants in Indian communities and failing to disseminate the results of research so that communities can benefit from the information.

The evaluation was designed to assess the relative effectiveness of Navajo peacemaking. The control population was the Chinle District Family Court, while the test population was the Chinle District Peacemaking Division. The evaluation found that Navajo peacemaking is not associated with traditionalism, and that self-reported traditionalism fails to associate with any socio/cultural variable (gender, age, education, income, or religious identification).

The evaluation found that Navajo peacemaking is effective across all sectors and is also effective when it comes to perceptions of fairness, successful case settlement, and allowing people to voice feelings. Potential applications for peacemaking include:

- Substance abuse rehabilitation
- Increasing sentencing options
- Working programmatically with probation/parole

- Community justice
- Reintegrating offenders into their communities after serving their sentence

Mr. Phil Bluehouse also addressed the group and emphasized that, just as everyone took a different route to get to Portland, there are different routes to researching Indian issues.

### Afternoon Discussions

The afternoon discussions started with the full group framing key issues regarding research in Indian Country. Mr. Begaye led the group through a series of exercises designed to clarify topics that need to be addressed to enhance the quality of future research in Indian Country and to create research with practical value to Indian communities. These topics were divided into four broad categories—**Practical Vision**, **Underlying Contradictions**, **New Directions**, and **Strategic Directions**. Each of these categories contained a series of subcategories. Appendix A includes the full summary of these discussions.

#### **Practical Vision**

The Practical Vision Category was divided into 12 subcategories:

**1) Critical Research Topics.** Topics included measures of the performance/quality of the juvenile justice/criminal justice system—has it improved over time? Comprehensive and coordinated approaches to gender violence; due process (the separation of powers); revising tribal criminal justice codes/regulations; user-friendly technology implementation; the FBI’s role in Indian crime; longitudinal studies of traditional versus western juvenile justice processing and reintegration strategies for youthful offenders; developing treatment modalities for alcohol and substance abuse; longitudinal studies of Indian adolescents’ development in the context of their community; cross-cultural multilingual criminogenic studies; historic research of gender violence; the role of judges as problem solvers; a focus on Indian women’s issues.

**2) Culturally Relevant Research Methods.** Topics included more complete methodologies; reliable data collection within Indian Country; developing a research process for Indian Country; Helix approach; tribal support for research; problems treated as interrelated (e.g. substance abuse, domestic violence); linking economic development with violence reductions strategies; assuring that history is not discounted when undertaking research; stressing that the qualitative is quantitative.

**3) Native Justice Research Center.** Topics included trans-tribal research application communication; a sourcebook for Indian Country; more forums for communicating; a data clearinghouse (quantitative and qualitative); collaborative multi-disciplinary research activities; an inter-tribal computerized criminal justice network; a forum for tribal information exchange; a

Native research center; research that is deeply informed by history and culture; a clearinghouse for research and resources.

**4) Native Driven Research.** Research focused on tribal priorities; community-initiated research; increasing community ownership of criminal justice institutions; emphasizing that tribes should regulate research and benefit from research; community-driven federal assistance; an evolutionary process approach directed by the community and integrating research into applied, concrete solutions to criminal justice issues.

**5) Native Researcher Development.** Topics included strengthening tribal analysis capacity; conducting Native research conferences; creating a research/evaluation think tank; Indian people conducting research; more fellowships for Native scholars; nurturing Indian researchers.

**6) Action-Oriented Research.** Topics included evaluating collaborative efforts; best practice reports; research linked to policy development and legal change; research that informs practitioners about needs.

**7) Native Justice Data and Technology.** Topics included data collection groundwork for research in communities; data that is useful for decision-making; workable data across service units; ADAM in Indian Country; centralized center for Indian crime statistics; computerized tribal database; access to databases; concurrent jurisdiction database repository; data on crime and tribal justice systems.

**8) Reclaiming Native Justice Rights.** Topics included measuring the types and magnitude of jurisdictional gaps and successful strategies for dealing with them; assessing Public Law 280 quantitatively and through case studies; repealing Public Law 280; removing federal laws that are racist.

**9) Research Resources.** Topics included creating individual research grants; funding community-control responsiveness; increasing funding resources; improving technology.

**10) Cultural Model of Care.** Topics included continuing care for parolees; confining fewer Indian children; utilizing youth; alternatives to incarceration; adequate resources for youths (education, training, mentoring, funding); culturally relevant disposition alternatives.

**11) Building Lasting Partnerships.** Topics included emphasizing collaborative relationships; stronger reservation partnerships; partnerships building on prior successes.

**12) Strengthening Application of Oral Traditions.** Topics included emphasizing qualitative aspects (oral traditions, elders); promoting the oral tradition of "respect"; creating an oral history project.

## Underlying Contradictions

The Underlying Contradictions Category was divided into 11 subcategories:

**1) Inadequate Resources.** Topics included being "boxed in" by limited funding and program initiatives; shifting funding priorities; inequities in the funding process; a lack of tribal resources (funding, education); competitive funding process; economic barriers to change; no support or funding for Indian Country research.

**2) Political Barriers.** Topics included complex jurisdictional schemes; the opposition of state/local organizations to the loss of revenue and control; uninformed and resistant policy makers (federal and state); Indians not in positions to influence policy and funding decisions; erosion of tribal sovereignty (by the federal government and states); federal and state legal and political obstacles; Politics (federal, tribal, and presidential).

**3) Organizational Challenges.** Topics included difficulty translating ideas into action; information that is lodged in people, not systems; overemphasis on expediency; addressing reluctance to change attitudes; staff turnover; Tribes are crisis-oriented.

**4) Cultural Barriers.** Topics included linguistic interpretations; contemporarizing Native traditions; culturally-biased measures; Indian versus non-Indian perceptions of research; insistence upon "standard" American research methods; cultural protocols that are not valued and respected; culturally relevant reservation models that are not valued by the mainstream.

**5) Legacy of Oppression.** Topics included ignorance and denial of history and culture; the continuing impact of the colonial legacy; impact of historical Indian policies; issues of internalized oppression.

**6) Insufficient Educational Opportunities.** Topics included the underutilization of Native knowledge and abilities; inadequate understanding about research; insufficient support for tribal colleges; limited Native access to technical resources and opportunities; educational inequities.

**7) Inability to Reach Consensus.** Topics included developing a tribally-supported national agenda; conflicting community and institutional interests; lack of consensus on direction and guidelines; absence of community awareness and consensus regarding the value of research.

**8) Absence of Coordination.** Topics included communication/coordination issues; no tribal coordination; no federal coordination.

**9) Complexities of Cultural Diversity.** Topics included tribal versus inter-tribal; diversity of tribes and cultural diversity.

**10) Issues of Mistrust.** Topics included mistrust of research within tribal communities and issues of historical mistrust.

**11) Turf Issues.** Topics include politics/turfism; turf problems between agencies and research projects and services.

### **New Directions**

The New Directions Category was divided into nine subcategories:

**1) Promote Effective Leadership.** Topics included bringing Indian professionals back to their communities and promoting strong leadership with a vision.

**2) Develop and Expand Comprehensive Education.** Topics included providing incentives to higher education institutions to retain and promote Indian researchers and enhancing educational opportunities.

**3) Expand Resource Opportunities.** Topics included supporting tribal economic development and lessening restrictions on economic development in Indian Country. Also, increasing funding and expanding funding initiatives.

**4) Strengthening Communities through Traditional Values.** Topics included building on community strengths, restoring pride through traditional values, and supporting and valuing traditional strengths.

**5) Use Media Effectively.** Topics included expanding tribal access to the media, taking issues to the (national) media, and dispelling negative images.

**6) Strengthen and Enhance Political Activism.** Topics included fostering stronger lobbying efforts at the tribal, state, and federal level; inter-tribal lobbying; increasing political empowerment; mobilizing and supporting Native political empowerment; participating in the political process; using research to advocate for political change; clarifying and redefining jurisdictional relationships; and developing a political action agenda.

**7) Encourage Creative and Proactive Solutions.** Topics included thinking creatively and starting immediately; repealing the Major Crimes Act; protecting and reaffirming sovereignty; using new tools; developing a think tank; systematic change, and developing tribal research protocols.

**8) Promote Effective Communication.** Topics included coalition building and actively building consensus and community.

**9) Building Community Consensus.** Solicit consenting approval at every level of research; communicate, educate, and mandate; communicate appropriately; create opportunities for dialog; learn better ways to communicate needs, and create inter-tribal cross-cultural forums.

### **Strategic Directions**

The participants agreed that the strategic directions would be:

- 1) Community Capacity Building
- 2) Developing Communication and Education
- 3) Increasing Political Clout
- 4) Acquiring and Using Resources Creatively

**- First Day Adjournment -**

**Strategic Planning Meeting on Crime and Justice Research in Indian Country:  
Day Two**

Mr. Begaye opened the second day of the meeting and told the group that there would be several people addressing the group today, some who were originally scheduled to speak to the group on the first day of the meeting.

*Dr. Jenifer Wood  
Social Science Analyst  
National Institute of Justice*

**Topic: *Assessment of Indian Country Law Enforcement Agencies***

**Dr. Jenifer Wood** discussed the results and findings of a recent assessment of Indian Country law enforcement agencies. This assessment was initiated by the Manpower Subcommittee of the DOJ/DOI FY 1999 Initiative to Improve Indian Country Law Enforcement. The survey represented 197 law enforcement efforts in Indian Country, including seven departments in California and 20 departments in Alaska. The survey also represented approximately 250 tribes. The areas covered by the survey included manpower and training, calls for service and arrests, equipment and technology, and detention services. Findings showed:

- The median number of officers currently employed per law enforcement department is seven (range: 0-179, 75<sup>th</sup> percentile = 11).
- The median number of COPS positions filled = 1 (range: 0 - 97; 75<sup>th</sup> percentile = 4).
- The median annual number of calls for service = 1,522 (range: 0 - 154,274; 75<sup>th</sup> percentile = 5,560).
- The median number of adult arrests in 1997 = 109 (range: 0 - 46,571; 75<sup>th</sup> percentile = 747).
- The median number of juvenile arrests = 26 (range: 0 - 4,658; 75<sup>th</sup> percentile = 212).
- 26.4 percent of law enforcement agencies report that not all of their vehicles are equipped with 2-way radios.
- 45.7 percent of law enforcement agencies do not have access to a 911 system.
- 41.6 percent of law enforcement agencies are not able to provide radio dispatch services.
- 26.4 percent of law enforcement agencies are not able to supply body armor.
- Fewer than 40 percent of law enforcement agencies have access by computer to NCIC or criminal history records.
- 29.4 percent of law enforcement agencies (N = 58) operate their own adult detention facilities.
- 17.3 percent (N = 34) of agencies operate their own juvenile detention facilities.

- For agencies without their own detention facilities:
  - The median number of miles to nearest adult facility = 25 (range: up to 700 miles).
  - The median number of miles to nearest juvenile facility = 50 (range: up to 1,100 miles).

***Mr. Richard Nichols***  
***ORBIS Associates***  
***Washington, D.C.***

***Topic: Evaluation of the Tribal Strategies Against Violence Initiative***

**Mr. Richard Nichols** discussed the evaluation of Tribal Strategies Against Violence (TSAV), a Bureau of Justice Assistance initiative which is based on community policing and alternatives to incarceration. It has developed a wide variety of partnerships with police, schools, churches, etc. TSAV tries to develop initiatives between tribal courts, tribal schools, etc. The initiative is a pilot program. The evaluation sites include the Turtle Mountain Chippewa, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Fort Peck and Grand Traverse Band tribes. These sites were selected in conjunction with the National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

TSAV is based on the assumption that it is not a direct services program. It tries to develop a core planning process among tribal agencies. There is a core planning and oversight team. TSAV tries to assess crime and violence in the Indian community, and the aim is to develop cross agency strategies. The grant periods are six months for planning and 12 months for implementation. Two of the original TSAV sites experienced problems, but the funding has evolved and there is now a cluster training concept. One of the things that also occurred is that the phase one process, which was supposed to take six months, has taken much longer in many of the communities. Phase one has usually lasted about nine months. The grant period for TSAV has also been extended; it was originally an 18-month grant, but now there is a third year of funding.

The evaluation goals of the TSAV initiative includes documenting how TSAV approaches have evolved at each site and documenting how each site has implemented its comprehensive strategies. Evaluation issues include factors that influence the selection of particular strategies and the participation of various partners of the local TSAV planning team. The evaluation was conducted as a process evaluation. Interviews were conducted with courts, victims services, youth services, and law enforcement. Interviews were designed to look for the extent of the problem in local communities and the characteristics of offenders. The interviews were looking for potential stumbling blocks that the sites may have experienced.

***Dr. Carol Lujan***  
***Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs***  
***Bureau of Indian Affairs***  
***Washington, D.C.***

***Topic: Evaluation of Indian Country Justice Initiative***

**Dr. Carol Lujan** started by saying she would like to recognize **Mr. Rick Robinson** and **Mr. Tracy Toulou**, who were both involved with the Indian Country Justice Initiative. Also, Winnie Reed and Lisa Poupart deserve thanks. The report is more than 200 pages long. The Indian Country Justice Initiative was spearheaded by Attorney General Reno in 1993. The Initiative was created to improve the criminal justice system in Indian Country. It was intended to encourage innovative approaches to justice, improve communication, strengthen offenders through treatment, expand prevention intervention programs, and enforce laws against major crime. A Steering Committee was created, and the Laguna Pueblo and Northern Cheyenne were the two Indian nations chosen to participate in this initiative and to receive a Weed and Seed grant. This process opened up a dialogue between the DOJ and Indian governments. DOJ provided a Native American probation officer liaison. Dr. Lujan then showed the group an excerpt from a videotape.

Findings and conclusions showed that the problems of American Indian governments include racism, unemployment, funding shortages for law enforcement and the courts, and poor relationships with state governments. The internal concerns include a historical distrust for the federal justice system and a hesitancy to report crime. Solutions to community problems can be found within the community. Also, since the federal government does provide funding, one of the challenges is to extend the existence of these programs beyond the end of federal funding.

Recommendations include having the federal government support the sovereign rights of Indian nations, improving the relationship between the federal and Indian governments, returning criminal jurisdiction to Indian courts, and increasing federal funding. Dr. Lujan mentioned a northern Cheyenne Tribe that only had 5 policemen to cover an area consisting of 455,000 acres with 5,000 residents. There is also a need to support education that emphasizes Indian culture and history and promote knowledge (especially about legal systems) on reservations.

Another recommendation is to hold federal trials on the reservation where the crime occurred. The perception among Indians is that the justice system is biased. There is a need to work with American Indian nations to clarify their courts and support the integration of traditional justice into the current system. There is also a need to employ more Indians in the Department of Justice system. There should be more internships and fellowships for American Indian scholars within DOJ. Other recommendations include formalizing and defining the role of site managers, improving ill-defined job descriptions, enhancing communication, promoting prevention programs and victim survivor support groups, and creating a public information system.

## -Break-

Before breaking into group discussions, Mr. Begaye told participants that, just as Lewis and Clark wanted to chart their own course, DOJ has brought researchers and practitioners from Indian Country together to chart a new course. Mr. Begaye said he appreciates the hard work that has been done by everyone and is happy to see people coming together.

Ms. Norena Henry said she wanted to remind the group that she had met with people who wanted to address the whole gamut of issues facing Indian Country. This meeting is designed to focus on criminal justice and juvenile justice issues. Ms. Henry also mentioned that she would be summarizing this meeting within the next week for Assistant Attorney General Laurie Robinson.

Ms. Ada Pecos Melton added that it was important for the paper writers' messages to get out to the public, and she would welcome commentary from participants about the papers.

### **Group Breakout Sessions**

Each participant was assigned to one of four discussion groups based on the strategic directions derived from the previous day's discussions:

#### **1) Community Capacity Building**

- Building Community Consensus
- Promoting Effective Leadership
- Strengthening Communication Through Traditional Values

#### **2) Developing Communication and Education**

- Promoting Effective Communication
- Developing and Expanding Comprehensive Education

#### **3) Increasing Political Clout**

- Strengthening and Enhancing Political Activism
- Using the Media Effectively

#### **4) Acquiring and Using Resources Creatively**

- Expanding Resource Opportunities
- Encouraging Creative and Proactive Solutions

Each working group discussed various strategic directions regarding the future of crime and justice research in Indian Country. Each group was asked to address the following questions:

- 1) What are the research topics that will promote the practical vision?
- 2) What are the research processes that can be used to achieve these goals?
- 3) What are the components of the federal research agencies' agendas?
- 4) What activities can tribal communities engage in to promote research?

After the breakout sessions, each group made a presentation of key issues based on their discussions.

### **Group One—Community Capacity Building**

- Developing tribal researcher partnerships.
- Creating a national survey of strategic data elements.
- In-depth pilot studies of a small number of tribes.
- Streamlining the grant making process.
- Recognizing that research resources are necessary for dimensions of research (including the training of data collectors).
- Improving the infrastructure of approval for research in Indian Nations.

### **Group Two—Developing Communication and Education**

This group developed initial responses to the four questions while keeping communication and education in mind. The order of the list is not a ranking of items.

#### **Research Topics**

1. Research on how information should be shared inter/intra tribe.
2. More evaluations of criminal and juvenile justice efforts - and what are the most effective methods for the communication of results.
3. Research on collaboration models including those useable in P.L. 280 jurisdictions.
4. Sustainment of criminal and juvenile justice efforts beyond Federal funding.

## **Research Processes**

1. Get information out on Federal resources available for criminal and juvenile justice research.
2. Communicate information about current justice research being done in Indian Country.
3. Encourage community and Federal agency collaboration through multiple forums - e.g., research days and summit meetings. This collaboration could include sharing information, deciding on research topics and developing and/or agreeing on research protocols.
4. Create partnerships with local colleges to support the development of researchers in the form of fellowships and small grants for beginning researchers.
5. Partnerships with local colleges and universities to conduct research.
6. Conduct a needs assessment for technical assistance in Indian Country.
7. Create a directory of researchers working in Indian Country.

## **Federal Components of the Research Agenda**

1. Support an additional Strategic Planning Meeting in six months to refine the research agenda.
2. Support researchers to provide technical assistance to tribes and tribal members regarding collaboration on research.

## **Tribal Community Activities to Promote Research**

1. Create a clearinghouse that includes directories of Indian researchers, research projects and research needs.
2. Establish research committees to guide research methods and train community members in collaborative techniques.

## **Group Three—Increasing Political Clout**

- Protecting human subjects while doing research.
- Historical meta-analysis of what makes for successful grant writing in Indian Country.
- Evaluating program protocols and the regulatory review process.
- Encouraging community ownership of the research process.
- Providing research and access to literature reviews during the RFP process.
- Developing Native American Research Institutions (including web sites).

- Fully utilizing tribal colleges.
- A menu of contextual information/issues to be considered for all grants/research.
- Researching the effect of the political economy on crime.
- Researching the effect of colonization on tribes.
- Increasing research on Native American women.
- Focusing on integrating research between agencies.
- Further research on incarceration programs (including model treatment and after care).
- Improving community readiness for change processes, including information given to tribes on how to "change"/evolve.
- Improving information dissemination of best practices and principles.
- Commission a study to evaluate the impact of the denial of religious freedoms in federal and state prisons and jails.
- Examine indigenous models of justice.
- Researching the intersection of agency roles (prosecutors, victim's services, courts, probation, etc.) on the community (lag time), and its impact on the criminal justice system.
- Examining the role of racism.
- Researching the use of media; studying the content analysis of the media.
- Examining why non-Indians fear tribal criminal jurisdictions and exploring what tribal governments can do to reduce these fears.
- Researching which facilities reduce inappropriate behavior in Indian Country.
- Developing regional forums to determine issues of interests across tribes.
- Streamlining the funding process for research.
- Assessing tribal government needs from a victim's perspective.

### **Group Four—Acquiring and Using Resources Creatively**

#### **Research Topics**

The group first generated a **list of potential resources** in order to stimulate thinking about research topics. The (non-exhaustive) list included the following: human resources; dollar resources; cultural resources (e.g., traditions and practices); community resources; federal, state, local, and tribal resources; private foundations; educational institutions; existing criminal justice institutions; existing offices for grants, and research within Indian Country.

(1) **Producing a catalogue of resources.** This includes listing existing resources and finding new sources of support that can be tapped. Also, sources that have fallen into disuse that might be revived (e.g., indigenous justice approaches). Efforts should be broader than just looking at criminal justice resources, and should include both discrete (time-limited) and continuous funding streams. The catalogue should detail which institutions are eligible for the resources (e.g., educational, criminal justice, etc.), identifying gaps and lost opportunities to integrate resources. How has the use of non-renewable resources impacted crime and justice in Indian

Country? How much money (resources) actually gets to the tribes? Tracing funding dollars to their actual benefit, and issues of overhead rates and other administrative costs should also be considered.

(2) **Relationship between economics and crime.** Support research that explores the link between tribal economic development (or lack thereof) and the crime problem (e.g., the impact of tribal enterprises such as gaming and forestry on crime and justice). Also study the relationship between expanded economic development (or restrictions on economic development) and criminal justice activities/resources. How does economic development impact the criminal justice system? Are new resources generated, and do they go to criminal justice activities? For example, how do gaming revenues impact the system? Are there models for the use of this discretionary money that benefit communities? Are there untapped sources of revenue? What are the barriers that keep people from acquiring and developing resources? How has the transition to self-governance impacted crime and justice issues?

(3) **What works?** Identify existing innovations at the tribal level and how these innovations are being funded. What are some of the successful new approaches? What are people doing to solve some of the problems with existing resources? What works? Alternative strategies? What are people doing that others can implement using existing resources, including data resources and educational resources?

(4) **Research into dissemination issues.** How do tribes access, use, and disseminate information? For example, how many have internet access? Are there conferences or meetings that could be used as vehicles for dissemination?

(5) **Research with youth.** Gathering their perspectives/perceptions of criminal justice issues. They are an underutilized resource.

### **Research Processes**

(1) **Better methodologies.** Including multi-site projects (which leverage resources across a larger number of researchers and have greater statistical power). Utilizing more collaborative, action-oriented approaches.

(2) **Help Indian Nations set up funding consortiums.** This would assist Indian Nations in handling the creative leveraging of funds from federal and private sources. Leveraging local university resources—getting them to be more responsive. For example, asking them to build on Indian scholarships.

(3) **Establishment of a research clearinghouse.** Providing data on national and regional trends—this kind of information is useful for Indian Nations.

(4) **Systematic review of "What Works?"** Review existing prevention literature to determine what might be applicable and germane to Indian Country.

(5) **Tribally-initiated research partnerships.** In order to do this, tribal governments must see that this kind of research is useful and valuable. Marketing is necessary, and it is more difficult for non-Indian researchers to partner with tribal governments.

### **Federal Components**

(1) **Better dissemination and follow-through regarding research opportunities.** For example, a feedback process is needed so that Indian Nations can find out what work has been done, by whom, and how to use the results. Many practitioners do not hear about solicitations because they are distributed only to a select research community (in fact, the use of the term "practitioner" might not appeal to tribal government people). Use alternative organizations/conferences to disseminate information, e.g., Tribal Chairmans Association, IACP Indian Section, Indian Country Today, NIJA, and state offices of Indian Affairs. Developing Solicitations in a different way (VAWGO has been successful at getting information out; they may have some ideas about how to write in a way that is more appealing to Indian people). Multimedia distribution of solicitation information—making it more personal, more oral, and more visual. For example, video solicitation. It is important to pace the information to allow time for translation.

(2) **Improve the grant-making process through pre-application seminars.** COPS got a good response with these regional meetings. Seminars targeted at tribal research, for instance, bringing people to Washington, D.C. to educate them about how to apply for grants. Also, set up a clearinghouse that assists in grant writing—this is done by the U.S. Department of Education, which provides funds to a clearinghouse to assist tribes in getting funds. *Alliance 2000*, currently located at Vanderbilt, was located at University of New Mexico. Emphasize things like notifying people once a solicitation is released. There are a number of these kinds of seminars happening; they could be videotaped and distributed widely, or held as a video conference.

(3) **Website** (could build on Office of Tribal Justice website). Putting information (innovations/successful strategies in different topic areas) on the website with lists of contact people.

(4) **Development of an awards process.** To reward creative problem-solving (this has been done by COPS and by HUD).

(5) **Funding set aside for Indian Country.** Nation-to-Nation relationship necessitates setting aside funds for Indian Country (similar to aid to a foreign nation with some continuity). Minimize the extent to which Indian nations must compete against one another for grants.

## Activities for Tribal Communities to Engage In

- (1) **Form Criminal Justice Research (or more broadly defined?) Steering Committees at the tribal level.**
- (2) **Engage tribal leadership.** This requires lobbying tribal governments to use profits from economic development for research purposes and educating leaders and encouraging them to approach universities (especially state universities which have an obligation to the Native community.) Encouraging, facilitating, and creating incentives for tribal governments to initiate research. Native researchers may have a prominent role in educating tribal leaders about advocating for their interests. Encourage tribal councils to include research activities in their normal budget process.
- (3) **Teaching ethical advocacy to practitioners (e.g., tribal judges and law enforcement).** Teach practitioners how to get their messages across and help them become lobbyists.
- (4) **Promote activities that will stimulate young people to become interested in research and research careers.** Possibly through legal education—tribal law. Using Indian researchers as role models. Encouraging science and research activities in schools.
- (5) **Engage tribal colleges and universities.**

Before adjourning, **Mr. Vincent Craig** addressed the group and said he was honored to be at this meeting. Mr. Craig stressed that it was important to keep thinking about how important it was for each participant at this meeting to consider the issues that have been discussed. Mr. Craig told the group he was a cartoonist and illustrator and has drawn close to 2,000 cartoons. Mr. Craig told the story of how one of his cartoons (showing a young Navajo boy observing an orangutan at the zoo) was subject to widespread cultural interpretations and misunderstandings. Mr. Craig said he appreciated that NIJ has invited Indians to their "trading post" to discuss issues. Indian Country is already so far behind and needs to address things that will help immediately.

Mr. Begaye thanked all participants for a productive meeting. Dr. Hillsman thanked everyone for sharing their wisdom, history, stories, and humor. Mr. Craig closed the meeting with a Navajo prayer.

**-Adjournment-**