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PREFACE

Murder, rape, aggravated assault. Vicious crimes which, upon conviction, can carry stiff and substantial sentences. Unless, that is, the perpetrator happens to be a juvenile—then the scenario changes entirely.

According to recent statistics, juveniles are responsible for about one third of all serious crime committed each year in the United States. That in itself is astounding. Further, as noted by Alfred S. Regnery, Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), every year nearly 2,000 juveniles are arrested for murder, 4,000 are arrested for rape, and more than 34,000 are arrested for aggravated assault.

The United States courts operate on what has become known as the two-track system of justice. From the moment a juvenile commits a crime, his trek through the justice system differs substantially from that of an adult who may have committed the same crime.

When juvenile courts were first established in the United States in 1899, they were under the doctrine of parens patriae—hence they were not designed to be criminal courts, but rather civil courts in which children were viewed in a supportive and protective manner. The new courts were established on the belief that children could be
steered away from criminal activity. The purpose was not to punish the child but to provide help and guidance.

For the vast majority of juvenile delinquents, the juvenile justice system is entirely appropriate. Most adolescent crime is not serious, and such adolescents do not develop into career criminals. In fact, many adults can remember their own adolescent actions which may not have been within the boundaries of the law. Thus, some adolescent criminal behavior is tolerated because it is not violent and because there is a widely held belief that children are not mature enough to be responsible for their own actions.

On the other hand, research has shown that there also exists a small core of serious, chronic offenders who repeatedly commit crimes while suffering little or no serious consequences. It is in order to deal with these juveniles that the Serious Habitual Offender/Drug Involved program (SHO/DI) was formed.
1. INTRODUCTION

SHO/DI is a law enforcement information and case management initiative for police, schools, probation, prosecutors, social services, and corrections authorities, developed to respond to the growing problem of serious juvenile crime. The program enables the juvenile justice system to give additional, focused attention to juvenile offenders, with particular attention given to providing relevant case information for more informed sentencing dispositions.

When the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) first funded SHO/DI in May 1983, it provided one of the earliest systematic responses to the growing problem of juvenile crime. Developed as a research, test, and demonstration program, SHO/DI was funded in five cities nationwide: Colorado Springs, Colorado; Jacksonville, Florida; Oxnard, California; Portsmouth, Virginia; and San Jose, California. In brief, the SHO/DI program builds upon the organizational development process first created under the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's Integrated Criminal Apprehension Program (ICAP), which sought to provide a more systematic approach to data gathering, analysis, planning, and integration of police activities. Based on the ICAP process, SHO/DI is designed to increase the effectiveness of the various authorities to reduce serious, habitual juvenile criminal activity.

Although landmark research describing serious juvenile offenders had been conducted in the early 1970s, the Office
of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention focused most of its efforts and resources on status offenders and on programs to divert juvenile offenders out of the juvenile justice system. Lately attention has been turned to this small cohort of chronic serious offenders who commit the majority of juvenile crime. It is this population for which the SHO/DI program was developed.

In recent years, members of the juvenile justice community have come to recognize that, when dealing with serious, chronic offenders, the safety of the community must be considered. Additionally, for most juvenile offenders, the point of initial contact with the system is the police department. Thus, the SHO/DI program was designed as a law enforcement response to serious juvenile offenders. However, even in the planning stages of the program the need for cooperation and information-sharing among agencies was recognized. Thus, the major goals of the SHO/DI program reflect this need for interagency cooperation.

As the program has evolved, practitioners from various agencies involved in the SHO/DI effort have recognized that such interaction is necessary in order to effectively address this small core of juvenile offenders. Consequently, even though SHO/DI is a law enforcement program, the key to successful implementation is an interagency approach in which the juvenile-related agencies work together to develop a coordinated, comprehensive response to juvenile crime.
2. THE NEED FOR SHO/DI

2.1 Conceptual Model

Their numbers are small—very small. Yet their crimes are many and severe. They are the career criminals, the serial murderers, rapists, and child molesters. Until recently they have, for the most part, been allowed to remain free. Only since law enforcement agencies have begun sharing information has the extent of their criminality come to light.

Programs such as the Violent Criminal Apprehension Program (VICAP) have been developed as a criminal justice response to this type of offender. VICAP focuses on multijurisdictional serious crime. It encourages law enforcement agencies across the country to exchange information in an attempt to identify these serious, chronic offenders.

However, programs such as VICAP focus largely on adult offenders. Yet the histories of these criminals share several factors. Many of these offenders were abused and/or neglected as children. They exhibited behavioral difficulties in school. Many were chronic runaways or chronic truants. Additionally, many were criminally active as juveniles. Even though these various indicators were present early in life, such criminals were allowed to "fall through the cracks" of the justice system.
Part of this problem may be due to the fact that the United States has a two-track criminal justice system. Juvenile criminal records are automatically sealed or expunged at the age of majority, to protect the youth whose illegal behavior is considered to be the result of immaturity or lack of judgment. However, the system also protects chronic offenders who, like their more innocent counterparts, enter into adulthood with no record of their repeated illegal activities. Thus, while criminal activity peaks between the ages of 16 and 17, most career criminals are not identified until approximately age 22. This is reflected in Figure 2-1 in the program gap between ages 18 and 22. While the two-track system tends to camouflage chronic, serious offenders, so does the lack of system-wide cooperation in the current juvenile justice system.

Historically, the system has developed a number of responses to juvenile involvement in crime. Some programs, such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC), focus on the child as a victim. Others, like the National School Safety Center (NSSC) and Police Operations Leading to Improved Child Youth Services (POLICY), focus on juveniles both as victims and perpetrators. The NSSC was developed to provide a central headquarters to assist school boards, educators, law enforcers, and the public to restore schools as safe, secure, and tranquil places of learning. The Center facilitates information-sharing and
FIGURE 2-1

CONCEPTUAL MODEL:
SERIOUS HABITUAL CRIMINAL EVOLUTION*

IT IS IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER THAT ALTHOUGH THIS TYPE OF INDIVIDUAL REPRESENTS A VERY SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE OFFENDER POPULATION, HE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR A LARGE PERCENTAGE OF CRIMINAL OFFENSES.

**ALTHOUGH THE TYPES OF CRIMINAL ACTIVITY ARE IDENTIFIED ACCORDING TO AGE GROUP, THIS DIVISION IS FOR GENERAL PURPOSES. OBVIOUSLY THERE IS ACTIVITY OVERLAP BETWEEN AGE GROUPS.
training related to school crime and violence prevention. Similarly, POLICY provides training for personnel from law enforcement and other juvenile-related agencies and focuses on strengthening police juvenile services. These programs address children who may be at risk—that is, they may be neglected or abused or they may be in families which exhibit criminal behavior.

2.2 Background Research

Serious juvenile crime is not new. In the classic study conducted by Wolfgang, Figlio, and Sellin, a cohort of Philadelphia boys was followed to record juvenile delinquent behavior. The researchers concluded that 6.3 percent of the total population could be considered "chronic recidivists" (committing five or more offenses). Although the total number of chronic recidivists was small, over half (51 percent) of all the juvenile crimes committed by the entire cohort can be attributed to that small faction of the population.

Although this study was published over 12 years ago, the results have been supported time and again by additional studies. Columbus, Ohio, was the site of another cohort study which included all juveniles born between 1956 and 1960 who had been arrested at least once for a violent offense. Thirty-one percent of the population committed a violent offense, with 31.6 percent of the cohort committing at least five violent offenses by age 18. These results are consistent with the findings of the original study.

---

cohort were identified as chronic recidivists. These habitual offenders accounted for 44.8 percent of the crimes against persons committed by the cohort.

Juvenile involvement in crime is also apparent when one looks at the number of crimes committed by youths. In 1981, juvenile arrests comprised 17 percent of all arrests for violent crime and 32 percent of all property crime arrests. Additionally, juveniles were arrested for 14 percent of reported forcible rapes, 27 percent of reported robberies, and 12.7 percent of reported aggravated assaults.

Similarly, in the 1983 Report_to_the_Nation_on Crime_and_Justice, the Bureau of Justice Statistics noted that serious crime arrests are highest in young age groups. For example, arrests for property crimes peak at 16 years and drop in half by age 20, and violent crime arrests peak at age 18.

It is interesting to note that the characteristics of violent juvenile offenders are similar to adult felons. The Bureau of Justice Statistics notes that these juveniles (and adult felons): 1) are overwhelmingly male; 2) are usually economically disadvantaged; 3) experience(d) behavioral problems in school; and 4) often come from families that exhibit conflict.

---


3 1981 Uniform Crime Reports, p. 171.
instability, and inadequate supervision of children. In light of these similarities between the two groups, it has been argued that the two-track justice system would be more effective if it were based on severity of offense rather than solely on age of the offender.

In examining the problem of serious juvenile offenders, researchers have recently focused attention on the system that responds to the juveniles. In April 1984, a State-of-the-Art conference was co-sponsored by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). Researchers at the conference noted the lack of cooperation and coordination between agencies:

The social worker or attendance specialist for the school system doesn't share information with the social worker assigned to deal with health care or other kinds of assistance. The police officer and the juvenile court officer don't have the benefit of linking the offender's prior record of offenses with the current offense. It's not a very pleasant picture, and in the middle of it all is a troubled young person. We seem to be so caught up in the systemic perpetuation business that the raison d'etre for our existence slides out of view.

The youth we are talking about--the "juvenile delinquents with alcohol, drug abuse,

---


5 Richard R. Clayton, Multiple Problem Youth: Defining the Problem and Searching for a Solution, 1984, p. 35.
and mental disorder problems"--fall between the cracks. Often they barely get the minimum of attention they need, instead of the comprehensive collection of services that cuts across systemic boundaries.

The National Advisory Committee (NAC) for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention concluded in a 1984 report that "most serious juvenile crime is committed by a small core of chronic offenders." The NAC suggested a redirection in juvenile justice. Its first recommendation was that any federal effort in the area of juvenile delinquency should focus primarily on the serious, violent, or chronic offender.

Juvenile and family court judges have also recently addressed the problem of the serious juvenile offender. At a meeting of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges in Colorado Springs, Colorado (July 1984), the Council endorsed 38 recommendations concerning serious juvenile offenders. As the Council noted,

"only about five percent of the juvenile delinquency adjudications in this country involves what has been labeled the 'serious violent offenders,' those charged with the most serious personal crimes and those about whom the public justifiably is most concerned."


3. THE SERIOUS HABITUAL OFFENDER/DRUG INVOLVED PROGRAM

3.1 Current Practices

The current juvenile justice system is designed on the practice of true rehabilitation. For the great majority of juvenile offenders—the one-time offenders and those who are rehabilitated away from or mature out of criminal activity—this system works well. However, difficulties arise when dealing with a juvenile who not only is not rehabilitated, but also knows how to beat the system.

Discretion and diversion are two mainstays of the juvenile justice system, and both play into the hands of a juvenile serious habitual offender. An officer can exercise discretion when a juvenile is stopped on the street. That same juvenile may have been stopped by other officers on other shifts, yet if the officers choose not to write any type of report, then no one else in the system is even aware that any action has taken place. Just as police officers practice discretion, so do prosecutors and court intake workers (whether or not to file, reduce charges, etc.); judges (to accept a plea, to dismiss charges, etc.); and corrections personnel (choosing type of facility, permitting home visits and furloughs, etc.). Such discretion, however well-intentioned, allows juveniles to fall through the cracks of the system.
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Like discretion, the diversion built into the juvenile justice system was meant to benefit the youths involved in it, yet the impact reaches beyond the juveniles. When a serious juvenile offender is diverted out of the system and returned to the community, the victim may feel little sense of justice. In fact, the victim may be subjected to further abuse by the juvenile.

Juveniles are also amazingly quick at learning the system, and it does not take them long to realize there are really very few sanctions against committing crimes. An experienced juvenile offender knows that he can often avoid arrest, but even if he is arrested, he knows there is a good chance that he will be released without a formal referral to juvenile court or any other agency. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, in 1981 over a third of those juveniles arrested were released without a referral of any kind. This applies to repeat offenders as well as to those who commit a single offense. Such handling of serious juvenile offenders serves as a poor model for other youths to observe.

Additionally, because 80-90 percent of all arrested children are diverted or dropped from the judicial process, serious juvenile offenders are seldom truly held accountable for their actions. This aspect of diversion has often frustrated law enforcement personnel. Juvenile arrests typically involve a great
deal of paperwork. The officer who arrests a juvenile may have to spend several hours with the offender and complete all the additional paperwork, only to find that the juvenile is diverted and actually beats the officer back out on the street.

Perhaps the most significant difficulty in dealing with juvenile serious habitual offenders is the lack of information-sharing and cooperation among juvenile-related agencies. These agencies have long perceived that information cannot or should not be shared; thus agencies have maintained separate, usually incomplete files. This lack of information-sharing has had a major impact on the system response to chronic, serious offenders.

3.2 Program Background and Goals

In the past decade, federal efforts in the area of juvenile justice have focused primarily on delinquency prevention and on social efforts to rehabilitate juvenile offenders. While such programs appear to be successful with most juveniles, research has shown that they have little impact on those juveniles who repeatedly commit serious crimes.

Critics also argue that the focus on protection and rehabilitation has left little room for accountability, especially for juveniles who are arrested time and again only to be diverted out of the system.
Some states and localities have passed more stringent legislation concerning certain types of juvenile crime. However, this is usually a localized response or reaction to the problem, often brought on by recent cases in the juvenile justice system, rather than a comprehensive, proactive plan leading to a solution.

SHO/DI, on the other hand, is based on the hypothesis that a national effort is required to address the problem of chronic serious juvenile crime. The goals of the program require police agencies to:

1. Establish an accurate and useable data base focusing on the juvenile habitual offender.

2. Develop operationally acceptable standards for identifying the juvenile serious habitual offender. These standards must be acceptable to police officials, juvenile authorities, prosecutors, court administrators, judges, and appropriate community groups.

3. Develop procedures for the early identification of the SHO/DI useable to uniformed patrol officers and criminal investigators.

4. Develop and refine, through crime analysis, criminal information files that focus on the method of operation (MO) of the SHO/DI.

5. Improve the linkage and flow of information between street uniformed patrol officers, crime prevention officers, and criminal investigations officers.

6. Develop in concert with the prosecutor, courts and aftercare agencies a process to eliminate or reduce pre-trial delays, case dismissals, plea bargaining, and sentence reductions for SHO/DIs.

7. Establish support among the appropriate criminal justice agencies and community groups for the program.

8. Develop a technical assistance cadre to transfer program knowledge, operations, and development to other agencies.
3.3 The SHO/DI Population

When the program was first developed, little data was available on habitual, serious juvenile offenders. Consequently, the police departments first had to identify their population and then develop procedures to address this population. One of the first steps in identifying the SHO/DI population was to look at the entire spectrum of juvenile delinquent behavior. Figure 3-1 shows the range of juveniles involved in criminal activity.

Juvenile offenders are either serious offenders or they are not. Similarly, they are habitual or not, and they are drug-involved or not. By combining and recombining these various factors, the matrix depicts eight basic types of juvenile delinquents. In the SHO/DI program, efforts are focused on Category 1 (serious, habitual, and drug-involved) and Category 2 (serious, habitual, but not drug-involved). In addition, juveniles who fall into Categories 3, 4, and 5 may potentially become SHO/DIs. For such juveniles, the SHO/DI program attempts to intervene and prevent such juvenile from moving into Category 1 or Category 2. On the other hand, the program does not focus efforts on juveniles who fit the descriptions of Categories 6, 7, and 8. Although they are involved in criminal activity, the current juvenile justice system usually is successful at turning these kids away from further criminal behavior.
**FIGURE 3-1**

**JUVENILE OFFENDER MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Habitual</th>
<th>Not Habitual</th>
<th></th>
<th>Habitual</th>
<th>Not Habitual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Drug-Involved</td>
<td>Not Drug-Involved</td>
<td>Drug-Involved</td>
<td>Not Drug-Involved</td>
<td>Drug-Involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Habitual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Serious, habitual, drug involved
2. Serious, habitual, not drug involved
3. Serious, not habitual, drug involved
4. Serious, not habitual, not drug involved
5. Not serious, habitual, drug involved
6. Not serious, habitual, not drug involved
7. Not serious, not habitual, drug involved
8. Not serious, not habitual, not drug involved
Although there was little data available at the outset of the program, a great deal has been learned about the kinds of juveniles with which the program is concerned. Early data collection indicated that the typical SHO/DI is male, between the ages of fifteen and sixteen, with an average of nine arrests—the first at approximately age ten. Sixty percent of these juveniles have parents with a criminal history; 73 percent have siblings with criminal histories. In addition, it was found that six-tenths of the SHO/DIs live with only one parent, almost thirty-one percent live with both, and about 10 percent are in the custody of a guardian or other authority.

The SHO/DI population is generally very small, ranging from 0.6 percent to 2 percent of the entire juvenile offender population. Although their numbers are few, they are responsible for large numbers of crimes. Figure 3-2 presents the arrest history of the active SHO/DI population in one city; 53 SHO/DIs are responsible for 281 felony arrests, 391 misdemeanor arrests, and 141 status offenses.

Additionally, the SHO/DI populations share several other similar characteristics. There appears to be a high incidence of child abuse, neglect, and violence in the history of the SHO/DI juveniles. Many of these juveniles also come from families with criminal histories. Finally, a surprising number of these juveniles are still in public schools.
**FIGURE 3-2**

**COLLECTIVE ARREST HISTORY**

*(February 20, 1985)*

53 SHO/DIs = 2% of the juvenile offender population  
813 Arrests = 18% of the juvenile arrests  
281 Felonies = 43% of the juvenile felony arrests

### MISDEMEANOR ARRESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petty theft</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor assaults</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of weapon</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting arrest</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbing</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampering with vehicle</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of burglary tools</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandishing a weapon</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting at a vehicle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit and run</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecent exposure</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewd conduct</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruelty to animals</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbing human remains</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of probation</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>244</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FELONY ARRESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony assault</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child molest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extortion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving stolen property</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand theft</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto theft</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. drugs to another</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening witness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Narcotics or Alcohol Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drunk</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of alcohol</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunk driving</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhalation of toluene</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of marijuana</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under influence of heroin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under influence of cocaine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under influence of PCP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATUS OFFENSE ARRESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curfew</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual truant</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL MISDEMEANOR ARRESTS

391

### TOTAL ARRESTS

813
4. THE POLICE AGENCY

4.1 Program Implementation

Much of the early program implementation takes place within the police department. The SHO/DI program requires the Integrated Criminal Apprehension Program (ICAP) as an organizational development base. The ICAP process is designed to focus on (1) the development of a system of operations management; (2) the improvement of resource allocation; (3) the expansion of uniformed patrol capabilities and responsibilities; and (4) the integration of police order maintenance functions with crime prevention, crime repression, and apprehension.

ICAP represented a process of police service delivery based on data collection, analysis, planning and service delivery (Figure 4-1). Many cities and states adopted various parts of the ICAP process, and more communities, both small and large, could benefit by implementing the ICAP model. Using ICAP as the organizational development base, various divisions within the police agency play a role in the SHO/DI process.

4.2 The_Crime_Analysis_Unit

The principles of crime analysis underlie all SHO/DI programs and operations and are the key to SHO/DI. SHO/DI is a specific application of basic crime analysis. Crime analysis is defined as a
FIGURE 4-1

ICAP MODEL AND LOGIC FLOW

DATA COLLECTION → ANALYSIS → PLANNING → SERVICE DELIVERY

FEEDBACK
set of systematic, analytical processes directed at providing timely and pertinent information relative to crime patterns and trend correlations. This information will assist operational and administrative personnel in planning the deployment of resources for prevention and suppression of criminal activities, aiding the investigative process and increasing apprehensions and clearances of cases.

Generally, crime analysis focuses on those offenses that are amenable to analysis and have a high probability of recurrence. The crime analysis unit has the most comprehensive picture of crime patterns in the community as well as individual modi operandi (MO). Consequently, a SHO/DI's operation/pattern may be evaluated by an analyst to obtain a complete picture of a suspect for dissemination to line officers. The SHO/DI project relies heavily on crime analysis capabilities (manual or automated).

A summary of crime analysis procedures is outlined below:

1. **Collection**: identification, receipt, and sorting copies of all resource documents in the department that contain information relevant to the crime analysis procedure.

2. **Collation**: a) examination and extraction of crime element information from all source documents; b) arrangement of this information into a set format for subsequent retrieval and analysis (Recaps).

3. **Analysis**: a) identification of crime patterns to provide leads for prevention and suppression of crime; b) assistance in providing leads for iden-
tification of the criminal perpetrator; c) early identification of crime trends for the purposes of patrol and administrative planning.

4. Dissemination: communication of target crime information to user groups, especially patrol and investigations.

a. Directed patrols initiated via crime analysis unit.

b. Officer-initiated direct patrol.

c. Crime Stoppers' (Crime Line) directed patrol.

d. Robbery/Burglary, etc., details with investigations and patrol.

e. Narcotics/Special Investigations unit information requests.

f. Other information requests (Crime Prevention, Neighborhood Watch, special units)

5. Feedback and Evaluation

a. Assessment of the crime analysis products and activities by user groups.

b. Self-evaluation of the unit's ability to satisfy ongoing user group needs.

The SHO/DI project would be difficult to accomplish without crime analysis capabilities, and these capabilities have created invaluable resources through research and analysis of data. A SHO/DI juvenile does not live in a vacuum; rather, he interfaces with adults and/or adult career criminals. His behavior patterns are often prompted by adult associates or other juveniles. Consequently, involvement with other criminal constituents appears in crime analysis products via FIRs/suspect information, and link analysis.
Crime Analysis Operations When a case report enters the data system, the crime analysis unit assumes responsibility for reducing the data into the specific categories required for pattern detection and suspect correlations. In Colorado Springs, for example, burglary, robbery, and sexual assault crime categories are prioritized for analysis and the development of profiles. If the profile includes a suspect description, a search is made of available data for correlation with previous offenders.

If the suspect is a juvenile or the pattern suggests a juvenile offender, a search is made for juvenile offender data correlations. Associate data is provided in a link analysis chart. Link analysis serves to develop valid inferences and relationships from available information and to focus further investigations by providing leads or association links. Types of link analysis include associate links and telephone toll analysis. Links are provided when a directed patrol is initiated if suspect information is applicable, and are also utilized with profiles. They can be used for crime specific information, intelligence, or long-term associates. Associate information is updated on the link diagram when new information is provided via crime analysis.

SHO/DI Suspect Once the profiles have been updated and the SHO/DI is deemed a suspect in an unsolved crime, probation reports and detention rosters are
checked to determine if he is at large in the area. If FIRs and other evidence support activity in a target area, a directed patrol is initiated. Once a SHO/DI is apprehended, the profile is provided to Juvenile Investigations for filing.

**SHO/DI Crime Analysis Information Output**

The crime analysis workload is primarily compiled manually (approximately 75-80 percent). The computer files serve as data sources, expediting the preparation of crime analysis products. The crime analysis information outputs are all related to juveniles previously identified as SHO/DI subjects; all juveniles on record who meet the established criteria are candidates for inclusion in SHO/DI profiles. These updated profiles are the primary data base used to answer requests for specific crime-related information. SHO/DI analysis also provides overviews on crime trends and developing criminal patterns.

There are several types of information requests petitioned by patrol, investigations, and special operations that include SHO/DI data: directed patrol enhancement, case recaps for pattern detection, FIRs, associates link analysis, and intelligence data.

Profiles are provided as a tool to aid officers/investigators in detection of offenders, as well as for case filing and prosecution. The District Attorney's office files the case and reviews the profile for assistance in prosecution. Juvenile Probation may use
the profiles in evaluation reports. The juvenile judge may get access upon request or case assignment.

**Crime Analysis Information Utilization** The primary users of SHO/DI data are patrol and investigations. The DA's office and detention depend heavily on SHO/DI profiles for case filing and presentation. Secondary users are support agencies/special operations units such as Crime Stoppers, Crime Prevention, Narcotics/Vice, and Intelligence.

Crime analysis information also provides the means to gauge the results of the program. Figures 4-2 and 4-3 present two quarterly pin maps which represent criminal activity in one neighborhood. Figure 4-2 indicates criminal activity occurring while five SHO/DI juveniles resided in the neighborhood. In Figure 4-3, criminal activity decreased substantially once four of the juvenile offenders were taken into custody. Figure 4-4 provides a further update on the reductions in criminal activity in the neighborhood.
FIGURE 4-2

JANUARY 1, 1984 TO MARCH 31, 1984

NOTE: Five SHO/DI's resided in the above neighborhood during the period of January 1, 1984, through March 31, 1984. One was in custody since January 25, 1984, and three others were arrested (and detained) the last week of March, 1984.

S/D-R SHO/DI's Residence
R Robbery
A Assault
RB Residential Burglary
CB Commercial Burglary
AB Auto Burglary
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NOTE: Only one SHO/DI still resided in the above neighborhood during the period of April 1, 1984 through June 30, 1984. He was detained on 5/28/84 and all five SHO/DIs were subsequently sentenced, and are now serving time.

The pin maps depicting criminal activity in this area show a substantial reduction in Part I crime from the first quarter of 1984, to the second.
UPDATE ON CRIME IN SHO/DI NEIGHBORHOOD

(February 20, 1985)

A one and one-third square mile area in the city was monitored for criminal activity during the four quarters of 1984, because in the first quarter five SHO/DIs resided there. The area is approximately 75 percent residential and 25 percent commercial, and has about 7,400 residents.

During the first three-month period, while all five SHO/DIs were living there, there were 69 serious crimes reported. The criminal activity declined 61 percent to a total of 27 offenses in the second quarter, after four SHO/DIs were incarcerated and only one remained. The third quarter reflected an increase to 36 crimes, but was still down 48 percent from the first quarter. During that period, the fifth SHO/DI was taken off the streets, but two more SHO/DIs (none of the original five) were released from custody and lived in the area. These two were arrested during the fourth quarter, which shows a total of 28 serious crimes reported, a reduction of 59 percent from the first quarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Quarter</th>
<th>Second Quarter</th>
<th>Third Quarter</th>
<th>Fourth Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Burglary</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Burglary</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Burglary</td>
<td><em>15</em></td>
<td><em>9</em></td>
<td><em>5</em></td>
<td><em>6</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of SHO/DIs living in the area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.3 Uniform Patrol Management

Whether the patrol operation is gauged by the number of personnel or the cost of the operation, it is the mainstay and muscle of any law enforcement agency. Between 50 and 70 percent of sworn personnel are generally assigned to patrol. The police—especially the patrol operation—is very labor-intensive. As much as 89 percent of many police budgets is devoted to labor costs.

Yet historically, the patrol function in police departments has not been well-managed. While supervisory and command personnel were often preoccupied with manning all the beats, making sure all equipment was accounted for, and staving off or quieting citizen complaints about police service, little or no systematic attention was given to defining or pursuing specific objectives in the various neighborhoods patrolled. Watches were turned out, and officers, provided with little or no information or direction, conducted patrol in their own highly individualized manner. With this state of affairs in patrol—the police department's largest organizational element and the group responsible for primary delivery of police services—police agencies were delivering low productivity at high costs.

The primitive state of police patrol organizations nationwide has become better understood in recent years.
as research has begun to study patterns of operation and payoff. Such examinations have generated a renewed emphasis on patrol, not only because of obvious needs for improved productivity, but also because of a recognition of the enormous potential of patrol to deliver more effective crime control and public safety services.

Establishing police patrol operations which are flexible yet responsive to community needs requires a number of changes in police management and operations. One of the most critical areas of change is that patrol must be managed (Figure 4-5). Specifically,

1. workloads must be clearly defined;
2. resources must be effectively scheduled and carefully husbanded;
3. decision-making systems must operate to quickly identify community needs and define precise objectives and appropriate strategies; and
4. the organizational capability must exist to quickly and effectively mount defined field responses.

In 1975 the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) administered a survey to determine if implementation was being made with regard to the recommendations of the 1975 National Advisory Report's Standards and Goals Committee. A survey of 20 police departments servicing populations ranging from 80,000 to 450,000 citizens showed that there was only one department which allowed the patrol officer to conduct a thorough preliminary investigation. Another department had a crime analysis unit which served the patrol
FIGURE 4-5

ROLES OF PATROL MANAGER

RESOURCE ALLOCATION/CONSIDERATIONS
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PATROL STRATEGIES AND TACTICS

PATROL AND THE COMMUNITY
operation, and that department was retraining its patrol force in preliminary investigations and drastically revising the offense report that had been used by the department for over 10 years. In 1975, that crime analysis unit was only one year old. Another major department with over 1,500 sworn personnel required its patrol officers to stand by at the scene of a crime until two detectives arrived. In many cases, the patrol officer had to wait forty minutes for the arrival of detectives, and was instructed to take only rudimentary data regarding the crime.

A survey of readings in police field practices reinforces the need to develop a more productive role for the patrol force. In the early 1970s, many departments began experimenting with team policing as a means for restoring responsiveness and responsibility to the patrol operation. Specialized policing forms, such as task forces and tactical units, had taken most of the responsibility of general police services away from the patrol operations. Given the importance of the patrol function, it would seem reasonable that more should be expected from the patrol officer than to be a watchman at the scene of a crime.

The Integrated Criminal Apprehension Program (ICAP) makes the preliminary investigation report by the on-scene patrol officer the major and most important initial investigation report precipitating identification of career criminal activity. The crime
analysis unit assures that the patrol offense report is utilized to its best advantage in developing the principal tactical strategy for the criminal apprehension process.

Through the development of more responsibilities for the patrol officer, ICAP has been altering the availability of information developed by the patrol operation for criminal apprehension and follow-up investigation needs. Patrol responds to all crimes and makes up to 95 percent of all arrests made by a police department. The information gathered, witnesses interviewed, and evidence observed, protected, and developed by the patrol officer is, without any doubt, the most vital factor contributing to establishing a suspect identification or apprehension possibility. Far too many departments have allowed the responding patrol officer to do little more than take the report on who made the complaint and why.

The enhanced investigative role of the patrol officer is described in Figure 4-6. This model gives the patrol officer a greater role in the initial investigation and in the follow-up of cases.

4.4 Directed Patrol

Background to Directed Patrol Contemporary police methods have been limited essentially to patrol officers handling calls for service (CFS) and detectives
FIGURE 4-6

ENHANCED INVESTIGATIVE ROLE OF PATROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patrol Responsibility</th>
<th>Case Referral Procedure</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Management Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Investigate crimes in increased number of categories | - Refer only those cases which require high level of skill or which are of an exceptional nature | - Maximal use of detectives by assigning them to follow up only those cases with high probability of solution and/or those which require specialized skills  
- Maximal use of patrol resources in all investigations  
- Improved relationships between public and police  
- New roles and opportunities available for detectives | - Establish policies detailing the differing authority and relationships between patrol and detectives  
- Adopt case screening system which incorporates early, on-scene, case-closure criteria |
handling criminal cases. Preventive patrol became a
catchall for officer-initiated activities and other ad
hoc functions performed by patrol officers when they
were not responding to CFS. Special problems or pro-
grams were handled by special units, and task forces
were formed any time a problem got out of control.

Improved concepts of time management have iden-
tified the need to create periods of time in which a
patrol officer may concentrate on one assignment.
Operations analysis studies have indicated that the
largest number of activities or tasks that police need
to do are one to three hours in duration. These tasks
cover the range of crime, crisis, and order maintenance
functions of police. Yet, no one does these jobs
presently. Special units and task forces tend to focus
on shift-long or multiple-person day assignments and
tactics. Conversely, patrol officers function in 20-
minute spans of time, which are controlled by the
perceived need to be available for CFS. The jobs which
fall in-between (the one- to three-hour tasks) are often
too mundane for a special unit to handle and too time-
consuming for patrol.

Directed patrol has emerged as a means for
releasing patrol officers from CFS, for short periods
of time, to conduct special activities. Directed
patrol is now being used to increase police produc-
tivity by taking time recovered from preventive patrol
and expanding it on a useful service or activity.
The most successful uses of directed patrol have the following common characteristics:

1. Directed patrol is a one- to three-hour assignment, usually involving only one officer.

2. Directed patrol may be used for any bona fide police activity or service.

3. Directed patrol is a pre-planned activity (before shift), as distinguished from an officer-initiated activity (OIA) which occurs on an ad hoc basis during a shift.

4. Directed patrol may be used to:
   - respond to a single problem statement
   - respond to an ongoing problem statement
   - document time spent planning a series of directed patrols
   - document time spent preparing for a series of directed patrols
   - account separately for each in a series of directed patrols

5. Directed patrol emphasis is on a high volume of assignments which are basic (instead of a low volume of highly complex, time-consuming jobs that conflict with special unit objectives).

6. Directed patrol normally requires that an officer be relieved of CFS assignment.

7. Directed patrol is mostly a "bottom-up" activity (officer-conceived), in lieu of a "top-down" (management-conceived) assignment; this creates an incentive for greater volume and performance.

8. Directed patrol planning is oriented around a patrol squad, and officers are involved directly in planning for the balancing of CFS coverage and directed patrol activities.

**Initiating Directed Patrol** The request for a directed patrol assignment should be initiated based on a problem or service need from one of the following sources, in order of importance:
1. patrol officer
2. special unit or detective
3. management

The order of importance reflects the experience of departments which have implemented directed patrol programs. It is now a rule of thumb that the desired volume of directed patrol will come if patrol initiates at least 66 percent of the assignments from the bottom up. Directed patrol referrals from special units or detectives may represent another 20-30 percent. The remaining directed patrol assignments may come top down with a reasonable expectation of patrol compliance.

The directed patrol request form may be designed in many ways, whichever is most preferable for each department. Some agencies have elected to require an elaborate and time-consuming format. However, these tend to suppress the volume of requests. Many others prefer to keep the format simple, requiring only the most pertinent information.

Some designs combine the directed patrol request and the post-action report (results) on one form. A few departments separate the two so that multiple or repeat directed patrols may be used against the same general problem statements. However, it is simpler to combine the forms to avoid the risk of becoming stale.

A common mistake of many departments has been to imply, in directed patrol guidelines, that something
more than street intelligence or officer perceptions is required to justify a directed patrol. Another mistake is to require that a problem statement be verified or approved by someone other than the first-line supervisor. This tends to suppress volume and does little to improve quality.

**Patrol Task Schedule** A task schedule is the simplest means of assuring that CFS, directed patrol, and special assignments are balanced properly. A patrol task schedule helps to substantiate that first-line supervisors are managing their resources, instead of merely supervising officers. (Supervisors enforce the rules of an organization, but managers are held accountable for the use of resources.) The patrol task schedule supports field managers—usually sergeants—who take the initiative to plan the workday of their officers.

The primary purpose of a task schedule is to show how CFS will be covered and how the remaining resources left to the patrol supervisor will be expended. For instance, a typical patrol squad may have eight officers. Each works an eight-hour shift, which means that the supervisor has been given 64 hours of paid-for police time to use. CFS will normally consume about 35 percent of this time, leaving about 48 hours. At least 50 percent of the remaining time is lost to the normal downtime between CFS. So it is not unreasonable to assume that 24 hours are available for discretionary
assignments. By filling out a task schedule, the supervisor is forced to acknowledge an awareness of how time is being spent.

Shift commanders may gauge the performance of supervisors better by comparing their input to patrol planning with what actually happens. This helps to spot the sergeants who plan their whole eight-hour shift based on the worst hour that is expected. It also helps to spot the sergeants who need remedial assistance, because every day is planned the same, regardless of the actual day-to-day variance that is predictable. It also protects those sergeants who did everything right, but were the victims of unusual circumstances which were beyond their control.

Patrol task schedules vary by department, mostly due to local preferences or to an administrator's perception of the present capability and remedial needs of the first-line supervisors. The optimum task schedule should include:

1. The required number of CFS response units for each time segment; this may be broken down into one-, two-, or four-hour blocks.

2. The time periods that are projected to be uncommitted for each officer.

3. The directed patrol or administrative activities that will be assigned for completion during uncommitted time periods.

4. The relative priority for cancellation of each assignment when CFSs exceed expectations.

5. The optimal times to relieve personnel for meals or relaxation.
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Management Standards For Directed Patrol

Many administrators assume that police officers will automatically know how to do directed patrol. The experience of others has shown that officers, left to their own devices, will probably limit their directed patrol activity to stake-outs for crime problems and radar for traffic. Since their only role models for tactics have been special units, patrol officers will tend to develop directed patrol plans that are labor-intensive.

It is advisable to publish a list of directed patrol examples. These management standards for directed patrol are provided as a guide of pre-approved responses to problems, which may be used as the need arises. The list has an educational value, and it stimulates more creativity in the development of directed patrol plans. The list also helps patrol officers to confine their planning to the one-to-three hour time blocks that avoid serious conflict with special units or investigators.

Each department should develop its own list based on the potential range of problems and services that it faces. A sheriff's office may differ from a municipal police agency. Rural, suburban, and urban law enforcement agencies vary as well. Therefore, the lists should be as broad as possible and avoid the tendency to lump directed patrols under general categories.

It is in the best interests of a department to break down every potential category of directed patrol.
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Otherwise, many officers will miss the value and personal reward of carrying out what may have been considered a mundane activity in the past, which now takes on greater significance.

**Examples of Directed Patrol Categories and Management Standards** Directed patrol may be used to provide any bona fide police activity or service encompassing the crime, crisis and order maintenance functions of law enforcement. Figure 4-7 provides a general breakdown of the categories of directed patrol and a sample list of management standards which may be utilized.

**Directed Patrol for Juvenile Problems** Juvenile law enforcement matters account for a minimum of 50 percent of patrol officer time. About 95 percent of all police-youth contacts are made by patrol officers, with less than 5 percent handled by youth specialists. Therefore, it is obvious that patrol or field officers handle the bulk of juvenile services.

One of the keys to an improved juvenile service program must be the commitment to a directed patrol program. Directed patrol will increase the quality of patrol services to juveniles through its structure, formality, and effect on positive performance. Moreover, it provides a vehicle for juvenile officers and specialists to communicate the needs of juvenile programs more effectively with patrol and general assignment investigations.
FIGURE 4-7

CATEGORIES OF DIRECTED PATROL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRIME</th>
<th>CRISIS</th>
<th>ORDER MAINTENANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deterrence</td>
<td>disturbance follow-up</td>
<td>traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apprehension</td>
<td>interventions</td>
<td>complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prevention</td>
<td>positive contacts</td>
<td>major events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection</td>
<td>victim assistance</td>
<td>maintenance of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigation</td>
<td>referral services</td>
<td>public conveyances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td>pedestrian access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigation follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warrant packaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warrant teleservice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warrant service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warrant sweeps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor drug busts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stake-outs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bar checks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>block club meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.I. (juvenile &amp; adult)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teleservice rotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveillance of known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.I. &amp; saturation patrol of problem areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business reference card updates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school liaison meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disturbance follow-ups</td>
<td>traffic problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>senior victim follow-ups</td>
<td>preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and checks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>child neglect case field visits</td>
<td>traffic enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teleservice for victims</td>
<td>- radar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; disturbance complaints</td>
<td>- stakeout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>business checks &amp; high visible</td>
<td>- roadblocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>surveillance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intervention and referral</td>
<td>accident prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service for family disturbances</td>
<td>- slowdowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhood dispute</td>
<td>- saturations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resolution meetings</td>
<td>- teleservice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>joint pick-up &amp; transport of</td>
<td>follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>homeless/indigent persons</td>
<td>programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pedestrian safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- stop &amp; walks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- intersection control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>parking control in problem areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>point control planning for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>major events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traffic signal/meter checks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management standards for juvenile directed patrols may be subdivided initially between the following categories: prevention, protection, positive contact, enforcement, and intelligence. Each of these categories may be developed into an exhaustive list of juvenile directed patrol standards.

A specific type of directed patrol may fit into several categories, depending on its unique objective. For instance, a truancy-oriented directed patrol may be aimed at reducing neighborhood offenses (prevention), school attendance (enforcement), or picking up local runaways (protection). Likewise, a directed patrol tactic aimed at the arrest of public drunks may be more acceptable if its objective is to protect juveniles who obtain alcoholic beverages through drunks who hang out near video arcades and liquor stores. The tactic would, therefore, focus on public drunks who "inhabit" certain areas where juveniles are likely to make contact. The primary objective is to protect juveniles rather than to arrest drunks.

4.5 Criminal Investigations

The SHQ/DI program incorporates the Managing Criminal Investigations design to increase the rate of felony arrests and convictions by enhancing the role of patrol officers in crime scene investigations and by improving the management of follow-up investigations.
The MCI design (Figure 4-8) contains six components:

1. **Enhancement of Investigative Role of Patrol Officers.** While this program design does not seek to eliminate specialized investigators, it does attempt to maximize the utilization of patrol officers who typically respond to calls for service and complete crime reports. The thrust of this component is to fully utilize the time currently spent by patrol officers in securing crime scenes to conduct preliminary formatted investigations which need not be repeated by investigators.

2. **Case Screening.** This program element is intended to assess crimes in terms of solvability and seriousness factors to determine which cases initially investigated by patrol officers warrant further investigation by detectives. A case screening officer is utilized to determine cases requiring follow-up by detectives. Patrol officers may also be involved in this screening through their incident reports. Solvability and seriousness are determined by using a scale developed by the grantee police agency. These screening scales must be based on the Sanford Research Institute "Felony Investigation Decision Model" or other similar analysis of solvability. Individual variations are permitted to include local crime priorities and departmental experience in solving various crimes.

3. **Management of Continuing Investigations.** This component is intended to provide police administrators
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THE CRIMINAL INVESTIGATION SYSTEM AND OUTCOMES
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with improved management control over follow-up investigations by detectives. It involves the continued application of seriousness and solvability factors to the investigative workload and periodic reporting on case progress to develop improved supervision of investigators.

4. Police-Prosecutor Liaison. In this program element, a prosecutor liaison officer is responsible for obtaining feedback from the prosecutor's office in order to apprise police administrators of inconsistencies between prosecutorial changing policies and police investigative priorities. The prosecutor liaison officer also provides police administrators with timely information concerning completeness and quality of investigations offered for prosecution. The prosecutor liaison officer may, as a local option, exercise a screening of cases for seriousness and quality of preparation, prior to presentation to the prosecutor.

5. Monitoring-Evaluation. This component involves the development of an ongoing assessment of work quality and case prioritization for the investigative function, and the development of data necessary for decisions concerning the allocation of resources between patrol and investigative (follow-up) functions, and between specialist and general investigators.

6. Police Agency Organization and Allocation Decisions. The examination of existing organizational arrangements and the allocation of police resources
should lead to the formulation of policies and procedures that promote the successful performance of the initial investigation, establish a meaningful case screening, expedite the continuing investigation, and encourage a working relationship between the police executive and the prosecutor.

Management of criminal investigations for SHO/DI will lead to the following results:

- complete preliminary investigations by patrol officers;

- greater attention by detectives to cases with highest probability of solution;

- development of a case screening method which will more accurately identify solvable crimes

- retention of existing response capability of patrol officers;

- improved efficiency of detectives through improved management and case control;

- increased rate of case acceptance by prosecutors through improved police/prosecutor relations; and

- increased conviction rates for cases prosecuted as a result of more thoroughly prepared cases.

4.6 Crime_Prevention

Crime prevention personnel play a key role in the interagency approach of SHO/DI as part of the early warning system of the program. This early warning system, made up of individuals from the police department, schools, social services, etc., is designed to identify children at risk in order to intervene and interrupt their illegal conduct.
Approximately half of all juvenile serious habitual offenders are enrolled in public schools, but quite often the schools are unaware of these offenders or their criminal history. Crime prevention officers work closely with schools in responding to SHO/DI juveniles enrolled in the schools. For example, if an officer completes a field interview on a truant SHO/DI, he can then make the schools aware of that juvenile's whereabouts during school hours. Crime prevention officers can also work with school personnel to make them aware of how to recognize and respond to children at risk. Because juveniles often commit crimes against other juveniles, the crime prevention unit and other officers can work with the schools to increase awareness among all juveniles and to promote schools as safe and secure institutions of learning.

Most serious, chronic juvenile offenders commit crimes in their own neighborhoods. Crime prevention officers can work with neighborhood groups on crime awareness and crime prevention techniques. Also, in recent years there has been a growing public awareness that juveniles are involved with drug and alcohol use. Many community groups have responded by increasing their involvement in such issues. Crime prevention officers can provide a law enforcement perspective to such groups.
5. THE INTERAGENCY APPROACH

5.1 Introduction

One of the difficulties in dealing with juveniles who are serious, habitual offenders is that the juvenile justice system was never designed to address such offenders. Rather, the philosophy of the system is based on protection and rehabilitation. This system, built on the premise that all juveniles can be successfully rehabilitated, must then address juveniles who repeatedly commit crimes and are not rehabilitated.

With protection of the juvenile as one of the highest priorities, most agencies extend this philosophy to protection of records. Consequently, often agencies do not fully share information with one another. Bizarre behavior patterns in school are not related to police agencies or social services. For a serious juvenile offender, pieces of his behavioral history may be spread out among several agencies with no comprehensive, accurate picture of his entire range of behavior.

SHO/DI is dramatically demonstrating (through cooperative policies and procedures) that the individuality of information, if shared and analyzed, can provide the whole system with the collective information that will allow for better decisions to be made with regard to the juvenile who is showing the warning signs of requiring very serious concern and attention.
What follows is a brief description of the contribution of each agency to the program. Figure 5-1 portrays this information graphically.

5.2 Prosecutors

In most states, the components of the juvenile justice system are the police, the prosecutor, the judge, and probation/parole/social services. The prosecutor, in most jurisdictions, interfaces with all of these agencies on a daily basis; thus, prosecutors are in a unique position to bridge gaps in the system and to introduce the people in agencies who do not usually work together. The prosecutor can also encourage them to support and cooperate with the SHO/DI project goals.

Prosecution of SHO/DIs Most often SHO/DI cases are handled by the same prosecutor from beginning to end. That prosecutor reviews the case, makes the filing decisions, and makes all court appearances. Each time the juvenile comes back to court on other cases, that same prosecutor will handle him. In this way, the prosecutor gets to know the minor, his family, his associates, and his patterns, and develops expertise about that particular juvenile to better handle the case. In addition to vertical prosecution, the minor must plead to every provable charge. In this way the court has the maximum ability to sentence the minor, and he will soon learn that if he commits four
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crimes, he will be charged with and plead to, or go to trial on, four crimes. At each stage of the proceedings, the prosecutor tries to keep the SHO/DI detained (because of his danger to the community) and does everything possible to expedite the case through the system.

Officers can also come to court to testify in SHO/DI cases in non-trial situations when necessary. A live witness testifying in a detention hearing, a sentencing hearing, a restitution hearing, or a probation progress review hearing can be far more effective than a few written lines in a report. In cases where the issue is a closed one, having the officer available to speak to the judge can sometimes make a difference in the ruling.

5.3 Social Services/Probation/Aftercare

When SHO/DI was first developed, many professionals in social service agencies questioned whether the program would have any value for them. In fact, the information-sharing that has resulted from SHO/DI allows both social services and the police to obtain more accurate information on serious juvenile offenders.

SHO/DI police departments, for example, can provide probation officers with copies of field interview (FI) cards on juveniles. Such information can aid
probation personnel in determining if and when probation violations occur. Similarly, crime prevention officers can work with social service professionals to address the needs of neighborhoods where serious juvenile crimes are occurring.

Aftercare agencies, on the other hand, can provide police with information concerning pending releases of SHO/DI juveniles from secure care facilities. Such constant contact between the agencies ensures that juveniles will not so easily fall through the cracks of the system.

5.4 Corrections

Juvenile justice is realized when the juvenile offender is properly processed through the judicial and correctional systems and as an adult remains at liberty without further criminal violations. This implies that the various components of the justice system, i.e., police, prosecutor, judge, probation, correctional counselor, and parole, must function as a unit which will enable the consistent application of the judicial/correctional process. The major failure of the juvenile justice system is the breakdown in communications inherent in each of the components, and there is a history of these segments not communicating with one another to collectively assure swift, fair, and sure correction of the serious, habitual juvenile offender.
The role of corrections to rehabilitate and return the juvenile to the community with the ability and attitude to remain at liberty is no more or less important than the investigation and apprehension by law enforcement that first brought the juvenile into the judicial/correctional process. The attitude of law enforcement and the tone of prosecution establishes the foundation for rehabilitation and has as much to do with turning around a juvenile delinquent as does the therapy of the sentence and the work of the correctional agent. Each juvenile justice professional must realize his responsibility to serve and protect.

The involvement of corrections in the SHO/DI program has intensified the communications with the police agency. The SHO/DI juveniles require coordinated police work, special prosecution, immediate judicial response, and protection of the community. Following adjudication, the placement of a juvenile in a correctional environment should enhance the probability of altering his behavior.

5.5 Schools

When records showed that over half of all SHO/DIs were still in school, it became impossible not to include the schools in the SHO/DI process. Through the interagency approach, the law enforcement agencies work closely with the schools to address not only the
SHO/DIs, but also the potential SHO/DIs, children at risk, and school safety in general.

**Early Warning Signals** Teachers often have more contact with juveniles than any person other than family members. Because teachers have this daily contact with juveniles, they are in a prime position to observe the early warning signals of a child they believe is a victim of abuse, neglect, or drug involvement, or if they become concerned that a juvenile is beginning to victimize others. Through the SHO/DI program, the schools and the police agencies work together to develop coordinated policies and procedures to address these issues.

The agencies are also coordinating efforts on issues of school safety. Traditionally, crimes which are committed in school are handled internally and the police are never made aware of the incidents. This, in turn, contributes to the lack of comprehensive histories of troubled juveniles. SHO/DI suggests that schools share such information with law enforcement personnel, and by doing so, the entire range of a juvenile's behavior, rather than just bits and pieces, is known. A valuable by-product of the exchange of information among the agencies is the growth of mutual respect, the discovery that all agencies are working toward the same goal where SHO/DIs are concerned, and the realization that each agency can help the others reach that goal.
6. PHASE II--PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

6.1 Functional Model

As stated earlier, the SHO/DI program builds on the organization development process first created under the ICAP program. Each of the major goals of the SHO/DI program falls within the components of the ICAP process (see Figure 6-1).

The eight SHO/DI goals can be divided between Identification processes and Action-oriented tasks. Thus, the first four objectives involve identifying and formalizing the SHO/DI population as well as the functions within the department necessary to address that population. The final four tasks speak to various activities which should take place among the juvenile-related agencies in order to implement a successful SHO/DI program.

6.2 Operational Model

While the Conceptual Model explains the "why" and the Functional Model explains the "what" of the program, the Operational Model illustrates the "how" of SHO/DI (see Figure 6-2). The model describes each of the program tasks, the procedures required for each task, and the outcomes which can be expected.

Task One: Establish the Data Base  Unlike adult criminal information, juvenile records are often incom-
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complete or inaccessible. One of the first tasks in the program is to review all of the department's juvenile files. This accomplishes two major objectives. First, a comprehensive review provides the opportunity to analyze the entire range of juvenile criminal behavior in the community. Second, such a review allows the department to scrutinize the information it is currently collecting on juveniles. If the data is incomplete, responses such as future training programs, roll call briefings, or form revisions can be based on the needed modifications.

The establishment of a juvenile data base can be accomplished in a number of ways. In one of the initial SHO/DI sites, department volunteers were used in the Crime Analysis Unit. The volunteers reviewed 4,000 juvenile records, and then an analysis of the records was conducted. Another city had most of its information more readily available; however, the department found that some necessary information was not being collected. Thus, the youth cards were revised to correct the situation. In another city, absolutely no juvenile records were available, hence the SHO/DI coordinator had to begin from scratch in establishing a data base.

In order for the SHO/DI program to be successful, it is essential to establish an accurate data base. In addition to all current juvenile records, information can be collected on informal contacts, from investiga-
tive report contacts, and also from police department personnel. Once the data is collected and analyzed, the worst-of-the-worst juveniles will be identified. The Task One output will lead to Task Two.

**Task Two: Establish Criteria** The SHO/DI program is designed to be specifically tailored by each jurisdiction. Thus, the criteria for deciding which youth should be included as SHO/DIs will vary somewhat from city to city. Once the data base is established, the department can begin to formulate its criteria.

A frequency distribution and an analysis of seriousness can be conducted. This will lead to the completion of a content analysis of the juvenile records. The analysis must then be validated through other agencies and also through other departments within the police agency. As the analysis yields different levels or groups of juvenile activity, the descriptors (a given number of arrests, given types of crime, etc.) of the worst behaviors will provide the basis for the criteria. If necessary, the criteria can then be refined through system validation.

As the criteria are established, it is also necessary to conduct a System Capacity Analysis. It does little good to identify SHO/DI juveniles and process them through the system only to find that there are inadequate facilities to handle them.

In order to have meaningful criteria, top-level policy commitment is recommended. Such commitment will
enhance the department's ability to stimulate system-wide cooperation. The end product of this task will be the program criteria.

Task Three: Establish Process For Early Identification  As stated previously, one of the difficulties in responding to chronic, serious offenders is that each juvenile-related agency keeps separate records on juveniles and there is little sharing of specific information among agencies. Similarly, each juvenile-related agency has a good deal of discretion in dealing with juvenile offenders. These are the cracks in the system through which serious juveniles often fall. The SHO/DI program attempts to tighten up the system in order that such serious, chronic offenders can be more readily identified.

Thus, this task involves not only the police department, but also other agencies. First, it is necessary to provide ready access to the data base in order to give uniformed patrol and detectives timely, accurate juvenile-related information. This means the identification of a consistent point of access for detectives and patrol officers. Second, linkages between uniformed patrol and detectives should be established so that there is a continual flow of SHO/DI information between them. Links must also be established with other juvenile-related agencies. These various linkages can best be implemented at this point if peer level commitment has been fostered.
Task Four: Specialized Crime Analysis Functions

In the majority of the SHO/DI jurisdictions, program data is housed and analyzed in the Crime Analysis Unit. Program implementation has required some specialized crime analysis functions. In addition to offense reports, the SHO/DI program recommends that Crime Analysis assess other data, including informal contacts (FIRs), dispositions, and conditions of probation. Other information which should be analyzed includes suspect information, activity areas, associate information, and victim information. Academic and school discipline information is also especially helpful in providing a comprehensive picture of a juvenile's activity.

The analysis of this information will yield several products. The first outcome will be the specialized procedures for SHO/DI data collection. These procedures will enable the department to develop the enhanced case profiles which are built for each SHO/DI juvenile. Additionally, Crime Analysis can use the specialized data for link analysis activities on juvenile offenders.

The first four program tasks (establishing a database, criteria development, early identification, and crime analysis) were established as identification process tasks. They provide the means for identifying chronic, serious juvenile offenders. They also serve as the basis for the final four tasks, which are more
action-oriented. These tasks provide the structure for moving the juveniles through the system.

Task Five: Linkage and Flow of Information

The completion of this task is crucial to successful implementation of the program. The department must establish a flow of information not only within the police agency but also with other juvenile-related agencies.

Within the department, once a juvenile is apprehended and has met the SHO/DI criteria, a pre-set process is implemented. Upon contact, the juvenile unit or officer is notified immediately, as is the Crime Analysis Unit. This activates the completion of the enhanced case profile.

Police operations should also coordinate efforts with other related agencies. This involves establishing procedures for interagency information-sharing and ensuring that this is conducted on a regular basis. The department may also choose to share SHO/DI-related data with surrounding jurisdictions, which would involve establishing and coordinating this inter-jurisdiction information-sharing process.

Finally, it is necessary to provide continual feedback to all of those involved in the process. For example, uniformed patrol should receive regular feedback on case outcomes.

Task Six: Establish Specialized Criminal Justice Procedures This task identifies the crux of the SHO/DI program. The overall goal is to facilitate cooperation
and information-sharing among juvenile-related agencies who address chronic serious offenders. For each agency, specialized procedures are recommended which enhance the likelihood that a SHO/DI juvenile offender will be held accountable for his conduct throughout the entire system. For example, within the police agency, officer discretion can be limited.

Procedures can be established so that prosecutors file on every provable charge. Prosecutors can also request pre-trial detentions and speedy trials. In addition, prosecutors can appear at sentencing and seek the highest possible sentence and also can make presentations at parole hearings. Intake Services can require mandatory referrals to court rather than diversion.

Probation officials can be encouraged to share terms and conditions of probation with the police and schools, and also can recommend such things as drug/alcohol testing and intensive supervision. Corrections can use the enhanced case profile to help determine appropriate treatment and level of services. Similarly, Aftercare programs can use a case profile to determine the level of supervision necessary for a particular juvenile.

By working more closely with the police department, social service agencies can take special action on a SHO/DI juvenile when they have original jurisdiction. The enhanced case profile can be used by such agencies to assist them in making placement decisions.
Finally, SHO/DI procedures can be established in school districts to assist them in responding to chronic serious offenders as well as children at risk. Program information can be used to assist in classroom placement, counseling needs, etc. By sharing truancy and discipline information with police, the schools can aid in putting together an accurate, comprehensive juvenile history. Such a history will allow the juvenile justice system to respond more effectively.

Task Seven: Interagency and Community Support

One of the long-term goals of the program is to institutionalize the SHO/DI procedures in all juvenile-related agencies. In the initial SHO/DI sites, the police agencies first used informal contacts to develop SHO/DI procedures. As these contacts were made, the police also inventoried and assessed the information needs of the other agencies in order that cooperative procedures could be established. Appropriate staff and coordination mechanisms were also identified.

Once the procedures have been developed and implemented, a decision can be made as to whether or not formal policies need to be developed to achieve institutionalization of the process.

Appropriate community group support can also be pursued, again initially through informal contacts. For example, Crime Prevention Officers can work with neighborhood groups or civic organizations to respond to neighborhood crimes perpetrated by juveniles.
Task Eight: Organization Development and Technical Assistance

This task, designed to address both intra-agency and interagency needs, is an ongoing process which builds on the successes of the program. Within the police agency, SHO/DI fosters organization development in a number of ways. For example, the program requires stepped-up records and recording. Information support is improved, and the Crime Prevention role is expanded. The analytical processes in Crime Analysis are also improved and a good deal more emphasis is placed on the juvenile unit (or function).

Additionally, technical assistance is provided to other agencies in an ongoing manner. In the five original SHO/DI cities, the police agencies worked to create an environment in which the specialized juvenile justice procedures and information-sharing could take place. Several of the five cities have since established a working group of juvenile justice agency representatives who meet on a regular basis. Initially these groups emphasized program coordination; however, they have expanded their focus to include support activities, policy development, children at risk, and other relevant topics.

Finally, agencies involved in the SHO/DI program can provide technical assistance to other jurisdictions interested in implementing the SHO/DI program. This has already occurred and will continue to increase as the program spreads across the country.
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7. CONCLUSION

7.1 Program Summary

The first phase of SHO/DI produced two areas of focus for implementation. First is the overwhelming necessity for system-wide information-sharing and cooperation—a "systems" response to the problem of handling chronic juvenile offenders. This need has also been addressed by other practitioners and researchers, including the National Advisory Committee for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges.

Second, the data collected during Phase I and the interaction which developed between the agencies involved underlined the need to focus efforts on children at risk before they become SHO/DI juveniles. Thus far, the program has demonstrated that this preventive measure in conjunction with a system-wide response to youngsters who are already chronic, serious offenders will result in a tremendous decline in juvenile crime.

7.2 Future Directions

While the first eighteen months of the SHO/DI project focused on researching juvenile data and consequently developing the program in each of the cities, actual program implementation did not begin until Phase II in early 1985.
In the year since the program was first implemented, however, the impact on the juvenile justice system has been substantial. From the beginning, the law enforcement agencies in the SHO/DI sites sought to gain the support of other juvenile-related agencies, including prosecutors, courts, probation, corrections, social services, and schools. During the first phase of the program, police worked at establishing informal agreements on sharing information among the various agencies. The agreements varied from agency to agency, but their overall purpose was to prevent serious, habitual offenders from falling through the cracks of the justice system. By sharing case information on such juveniles, each component in the system would have complete, comprehensive profiles of these juveniles' activities.

During Phase II of the program, the agencies have been formalizing these agreements and incorporating them into policies and procedures. It is important to remember that these policies and procedures relate to a very small number of juveniles--less than 2 percent of the entire juvenile population. However, these offenders are responsible for a large amount of juvenile crime.

There has not yet been a comprehensive, quantitative evaluation of the impact of the program on the offenders. Such data is currently being collected for analysis; this will be the first time such a population