

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice



NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE

137001



Research and Evaluation Plan 1992

About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice is the research and development agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, established to prevent and reduce crime and to improve the criminal justice system. Specific mandates established by Congress in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, and the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 direct the National Institute of Justice to:

- *Sponsor special projects and research and development programs* that will improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and reduce or prevent crime.
- *Conduct national demonstration projects* that employ innovative or promising approaches for improving criminal justice.
- *Develop new technologies* to fight crime and improve criminal justice.
- *Evaluate the effectiveness of criminal justice programs* and identify programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- *Recommend actions* that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments as well as private organizations to improve criminal justice.
- *Carry out research on criminal behavior.*
- *Develop new methods of crime prevention* and reduction of crime and delinquency.

The National Institute of Justice has a long history of accomplishments, including the following:

- Basic research on career criminals that led to development of special police and prosecutor units to deal with repeat offenders.
- Research that confirmed the link between drugs and crime.
- The research and development program that resulted in the creation of police body armor that has meant the difference between life and death to hundreds of police officers.
- Pioneering scientific advances such as the research and development of DNA analysis to positively identify suspects and eliminate the innocent from suspicion.
- The evaluation of innovative justice programs to determine what works, including drug enforcement, community policing, community anti-drug initiatives, prosecution of complex drug cases, drug testing throughout the criminal justice system, and user accountability programs.
- Creation of a corrections information-sharing system that enables State and local officials to exchange more efficient and cost-effective concepts and techniques for planning, financing, and constructing new prisons and jails.
- Operation of the world's largest criminal justice information clearinghouse, a resource used by State and local officials across the Nation and by criminal justice agencies in foreign countries.

The Institute Director, who is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, establishes the Institute's objectives, guided by the priorities of the Department of Justice and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of criminal justice professionals to identify their most critical problems. Dedicated to the priorities of Federal, State, and local criminal justice agencies, research and development at the National Institute of Justice continues to search for answers to what works and why in the Nation's war on drugs and crime.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE



NCJRS

APR 6 1992

ACQUISITIONS

**Research and
Evaluation Plan
1992**

April 1992

National Institute of Justice

Charles B. DeWitt
Director

Michael J. Russell
Deputy Director

This document was prepared by the staff of the National Institute of Justice, with primary responsibilities carried out by:

Coordinators

Christy A. Visher, Ph.D.
Deputy Director
Office of Criminal Justice Research

Carol Petrie
Director
Office of Planning and Management

Editorial and production assistance was provided by Mary G. Graham, Gene Hebert, and Daniel Tompkins, National Institute of Justice; Joseph Foote; and the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

137001

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by

Public Domain/OJP/NIJ
U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the ~~copyright~~ owner.

Foreword

This *Research and Evaluation Plan* sets forth the new directions the National Institute of Justice is taking in 1992 to discover and develop the most promising ideas and approaches for combating crime and drug abuse.

This *Plan* is the result of a comprehensive and systematic process now in place at the National Institute of Justice. We at NIJ listen to what criminal justice professionals tell us they need. Our planning process begins with the framework of NIJ's broad congressional mandate to encourage research, development, evaluation, demonstration, and information sharing to improve law enforcement and criminal justice. It is then guided by the priorities set by the Attorney General and the Office of Justice Programs.

In shaping our 1992 *Research and Evaluation Plan*, we have listened to the needs of the field in focus group meetings with key criminal justice professional associations and organizations representing State and local governments. We have built on the findings of previous NIJ research and benefited from the advice of leading researchers in the field.

This well-reasoned and comprehensive process has given unprecedented focus and direction to the NIJ program. It has enabled the Institute to concentrate its funds on research as never before, a commitment that continues in 1992. Equally important, it has launched NIJ on a long-range planning effort, another first for the Institute. In partnership with criminal justice professionals and researchers, NIJ is setting an agenda for the 1990's, a 5-year plan that will demonstrate how research will contribute to making our Nation safer and enhancing the quality of its justice.

We invite you to join this partnership by responding to this *Plan* with proposals that will provide a solid basis of knowledge to find answers and build programs that work in our Nation's struggle with crime and drugs.

Charles B. DeWitt
Director
National Institute of Justice



U.S. Department of Justice

Office of Justice Programs

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20531

All across America, communities are searching for ways to effectively combat the violent crime, gang activity, and drug trafficking that has turned once-quiet neighborhoods into battle zones where law-abiding residents fear for their lives, families, and property. If our Nation is to win its struggle against this tide of violence, we must determine what works in the fight against crime, how it works, and how to transfer successful techniques to jurisdictions across the country.

The Office of Justice Programs' National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is the Federal Government's principal criminal justice research and development agency. NIJ's critical mission is to find out what strategies are most effective in preventing and suppressing violent crime, and what makes them effective, and to disseminate practical information that criminal justice practitioners throughout the country can use to develop and implement successful crime control initiatives.

The 1992 *National Institute of Justice Research Plan* describes the programs NIJ is undertaking during Fiscal Year 1992 to fulfill its research, development, evaluation, and information-sharing mandate. These programs have been developed to reflect the Office of Justice Programs' priorities in response to the goals established by the Bush Administration, Attorney General William P. Barr, and the President's *National Drug Control Strategy*. These priorities include the Department of Justice's Operation "Weed and Seed," and programs addressing gangs and violent crime, community policing, and the innocent victims of crime.

Working in partnership with the other OJP bureaus, State and local criminal justice agencies, research institutions, academicians, and others, NIJ is supporting programs that are designed to provide the critical knowledge Federal, State, and local decision makers need to develop effective crime control strategies, allocate criminal justice personnel and resources, and improve the administration of justice in America.

I want to commend NIJ Director Charles B. DeWitt and the entire NIJ staff for their leadership and tireless efforts in producing this 1992 *National Institute of Justice Research Plan*. Through the programs outlined in this important document, the National Institute of Justice will continue its proud tradition of service to the criminal justice community and the Nation.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jimmy Gurulé".

Jimmy Gurulé
Assistant Attorney General

Table of Contents

Foreword	iii
Introduction	1
Operation Weed and Seed	7
National Institute of Justice Research and Evaluation Plan: 1992	11
Application Requirements	13
Gangs and Violent Offenders	17
Gangs	18
Gangs and Organized Crime Groups	20
Gangs: Priority Topics	22
Violent Offenders	24
Criminal Assaults	27
Alcohol, Drugs, and Violent Crime	29
Violent Offenders: Priority Topics	33
Victims	35
Utilization of Victim Services by Minority and Low-Income Victims	38
Crimes Against the Elderly	40
Victims: Priority Topics	44
Community Policing and Police Effectiveness	47
Performance Measurement for Community Policing	52
Policing in Rural Areas	56
Community Policing and Police Effectiveness: Priority Topics	60
Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability	63
Management of Special Populations: Female Offenders	66
Management of Special Populations: Sex Offenders	68
Management of Special Populations: Mentally Disabled Offenders	71
Prison Inmate Classification Systems	75
Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability: Priority Topics	77
Drug Prevention	79
Impact of State and Local Drug Laws on Drug Abuse and Related Crime	82
Criminal Justice Drug Treatment Programs for Female Offenders	86
Drug Prevention: Priority Topics	89

Drug Testing	91
Using DUF Findings in Innovative Programs	95
Hair Testing in Probation and Parole	98
Drug Testing: Priority Topics	102
Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication	103
The Nature and Extent of Environmental Crime	106
Eyewitness Recall and Testimony in the Criminal Justice System	109
Justice System Processing of Child Abuse Cases	113
Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication: Priority Topics	116
Money Laundering and Financial Investigation	119
Insurance Fraud	123
Detection and Control of Organized Crime	126
Money Laundering and Financial Investigation: Priority Topics	130
Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology	133
DNA Technology Development	142
Forensic Sciences and Criminal Justice Technology: Priority Topics	145
Annual Review of Justice Research	146
Fellowship Programs	149
Data Resources Program	151
Evaluation	155
Gangs and Targets of Intervention	160
Evaluating the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act	163
Drug Market Analysis: An Enforcement Model	165
Evaluation of Correctional Options Demonstration Program	169
Denial of Federal Benefits Program	172
Operation Weed and Seed	174
Boys and Girls Clubs in Public Housing	178
Evaluation: Priority Topics	181
Requirements for Award Recipients	187
Application Forms	189

Introduction

The 1992 *Research and Evaluation Plan* of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) combines in one document the key elements of the Institute's mission: *research* into promising methods of controlling crime and improving the criminal justice system and *evaluations* of programs to determine what works and why.

As the research and development agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, NIJ's congressional mandate is clear and uncompromising. It is the Institute's task to find out what works for criminal justice professionals and distribute this information to those who need it. By combining its solicitations for research and evaluation, NIJ is focusing as never before on the critical needs of criminal justice officials.

NIJ has been providing timely, useful information to State and local criminal justice professionals for more than 20 years. The Institute examines a wide variety of justice policies, conducts demonstration projects, tests new technology that can be used to combat crime, and distributes its findings across the Nation. NIJ publications are designed to provide new approaches to justice officials at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Long-Range Strategy

The 1992 *Research and Evaluation Plan* represents the first step in the development of a long-range strategy to combat crime and provide useful information to professionals in law enforcement and criminal justice. For this long-range program, NIJ will design and conduct research, evaluations, demonstration projects, and training projects to help:

- Reduce violent crime, drug related crime and victimization.

- Reduce the consequences of crimes for neighborhoods and communities.

- Improve the effectiveness of law enforcement, criminal justice, correctional, and service systems' response to offenses and victimization.

- Develop community, household, school, and workplace crime prevention programs.

At NIJ, these goals will be addressed in research and evaluation activities in a number of program areas, focusing on understanding crime and developing prevention and intervention programs to reduce criminal activities and their consequences.

Research Priorities

In establishing its annual research agenda, NIJ is guided by the priorities of the Attorney General, the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), and the current needs of the criminal justice community. The 1992 priorities established by the Office of Justice Programs are:

- Gangs and Violent Offenders.

- Victims.

- Community Policing and Police Effectiveness.

- Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability.

- Drug Prevention.

- Drug Testing.

- Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication.

- Money Laundering and Financial Investigation.

- Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology.

- Evaluation.

NIJ acts on these priorities through a plan that consists of coordinated projects, each designed to serve a specific role. Several types of projects are funded in the annual planning process, different efforts intended to be mutually complementary. These are:

- Original research projects.
- Comprehensive analyses.
- National assessments of programs and practices.
- Demonstration projects.

This NIJ plan explains how each approach may best suit individual topics and in fiscal year 1992, with more than \$6 million in funds, aims to develop information of direct practical value to criminal justice professionals.

Evaluation Priorities

NIJ's evaluation role was expanded by the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988. Congress charged NIJ to conduct evaluations of drug control programs according to these criteria:

- Whether the program establishes a new and innovative approach to drug or crime control.
- Cost of the program to be evaluated and the number of similar programs funded.
- Whether the program has a high potential to be replicated in other jurisdictions.
- Whether there is substantial public awareness of and community involvement in the program.

In 1992, NIJ established an Evaluation Division, demonstrating the importance of this effort to NIJ's mission. Evaluation projects include community anti-drug initiatives, police crackdowns, new court practices, sanctions targeted at both casual and persistent drug users, and promising approaches to monitoring and controlling the behavior of convicted offenders. In all instances, the Institute seeks objective information on the value of these approaches and their alternatives so that State and

local policy can move in productive directions. The results of these efforts are being directed at officials responsible for Federal, State, and local policy on drug control.

In fiscal year 1992, with more than \$4 million in funds for evaluation projects, the Institute targets concerns of criminal justice agencies as well as specific topics of interest to citizens and local governments.

In selecting topics for evaluation, NIJ is guided by the priorities outlined above in the Office of Justice Programs fiscal year 1992 *Program Plan*.

Elements of the Research and Evaluation Plan

Research

Original Research. Original research projects involve the development and testing of hypotheses through formal research designs. NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies, including case studies, survey research, secondary analyses of existing data sets, and experimental and quasi-experimental designs.

NIJ's statutory obligation under the Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 is to "... give primary emphasis to the problems of State and local justice systems and insure that there is a balance between basic and applied research." The applicant's proposal should develop research questions and issues based on a critical review of the literature within the problem area. A detailed data collection and analysis plan and a schedule of tasks must also be included in the proposal. Expected products from original research projects should include copies of all data collection instruments, data tapes and documentation, a technical report presenting the research design and the results of the research, and a summary of approximately 2,500 words. This summary should highlight the findings of the research and the policy issues that those findings will inform, written to be accessible to policy officials and professionals.

A number of solicitations in fiscal year 1992 call for original research projects, including solicitations on violent criminal behavior, gangs, white-collar crime, organized crime, DNA technology, and forensics.

Comprehensive Analysis. A comprehensive analysis includes both a national assessment of policies and programs and a review and synthesis of research. It is appropriate when there is a substantial body of literature on a problem and when there are extensive projects and practices to review. A comprehensive analysis also includes a new analysis of existing data sets where appropriate, development of a research agenda that builds on past research, the identification and description of promising approaches from existing practice, and the development of model programs where appropriate. A comprehensive analysis must also include site visits.

■ *A critical review of research.* Applicants are directed to examine the criminal justice research literature that addresses a particular problem, literature from other disciplines that focus on some aspects of the problem, or a combination of criminal justice and multidisciplinary research. In addition, expert opinion may be included in this research.

■ *A new perspective on practices.* For some solicitations, applicants are also asked to include identification and further analysis of existing data sets that bear on the problem being addressed. Applicants are asked to examine the current edition of *Data Resources of the National Institute of Justice* for guidance in determining the appropriateness of the data sets for further analysis. The plans for use of the data and their relationship to the problem at hand and other literature to be reviewed are to be described in the proposal.

■ *A research agenda.* The research agenda will build on past research and outline new directions for future research. It should identify: (1) gaps in current knowledge, especially those that relate to operational issues of direct practical utility to criminal justice professionals; (2) controversies in need of resolution, for example, conflicting theories and/or findings regarding a particular concept or practice; and (3) new research ques-

tions—both theoretical and practical—in a particular topic area. The agenda should also describe optimal research approaches for addressing new areas of need.

■ *Model Program Development.* Applicants are asked to identify projects that incorporate lessons of research that have resulted in promising or unique approaches to crime control or the administration of justice. Typically, these programs will have demonstrable impact and will be suitable for replication in other jurisdictions. In addition, they would likely be based on an assessment of site-specific material, onsite review, and interviews with those involved in program design and implementation.

National Assessments. National assessments may involve: (1) survey and analysis of the problem and issues; (2) identification and description of successful programs or practices for further evaluation; and (3) recommendations for future research. In this way, an NIJ project will report on the “state of the art” in criminal justice.

These assessments presume that comparatively little research has been conducted in the particular problem area and that these projects will provide NIJ with a baseline of information on a particular issue. To conduct a national assessment, applicants are directed to include in their proposals a methodology and research design that will survey the appropriate agencies in the field regarding a particular problem and a plan for conducting site visits. Site visits will result in case studies that support study findings and recommendations.

The goal of national assessments is to provide a foundation for NIJ’s action agenda, as such reports seek to answer basic questions that direct future efforts. Accordingly, such a study should identify fundamental issues for inquiry and issues and questions that are of direct practical utility to criminal justice professionals.

Demonstration Projects. NIJ demonstrations support the development and implementation, within a State or local operating agency, of new policies, projects, practices, and service delivery techniques that are grounded in the findings of research, development, and evaluation

studies. NIJ sponsors demonstrations to encourage the use of research and development results in planning and programming decisions and, through assessment of that experience, to learn more about what facilitates or inhibits such use. Such factors may range from characteristics of the implementing organization or the environment in which it operates to characteristics of the research results themselves. Demonstrations, therefore, should include an assessment of the level of implementation achieved, the extent to which policy changes were carried out in operating practice, and the degree to which anticipated outcomes were realized. This assessment should also summarize the problems encountered in order to provide guidance for both criminal justice professionals and the research community.

In some cases, NIJ demonstrations focus on synthesizing and applying the findings of a body of research directly to the development of improved programs in that area. In others, the applicant is asked to examine the results of ongoing research or data collection efforts in order to determine the implications of those findings for program needs or service gaps in other areas and to develop and implement an appropriate response. NIJ is committed to expanding the understanding of a particular problem area and encouraging the use of information to address, resolve, or lessen the problem.

Evaluation

No single method of evaluation is suited to all topics or goals. The NIJ evaluation framework has established four types of research with methodologies of corresponding rigor and complexity.

■ Program assessments answer: *What* are the salient features of a program? Such assessments represent a critical analysis of both positive and negative attributes.

■ Process evaluations answer: *How* was a program implemented? These are studies of program operations and implementations.

■ Impact evaluations answer: *Why* is a program effective? These may include controlled experiments that may reveal specific causes and results.

■ Evaluation reviews answer: *What* did previous studies show and *what* are the future directions?

Program Assessments. Program assessments describe *what* a program's strengths and weaknesses may be; they synthesize and measure the progress made in solving certain classes of problems. They involve the critical examination of the elements of existing solutions and an assessment of their strengths and weaknesses. Extant data, field observations, and available evaluation findings combine to inform expert judgment on the efficacy of various approaches and to develop recommendations for future programs in the topic area. In this way, program assessments are descriptive and retrospective. Program assessments include:

■ Assessment through extant data of recent attempts to solve the problem.

■ Isolation of key dimensions (e.g., effectiveness, fairness, cost control) of apparently successful programs.

■ Recommendations for program change and experimentation.

■ Predicted impediments to implementation of new solutions.

Process Evaluations. Process evaluations describe *how* a program was implemented; they are rigorous evaluations that provide compelling evidence of program effectiveness and a thorough understanding of the processes that are critical to success. These areas are typically in a mature phase of development where goals can be specified clearly and program elements have evolved from lengthy experimentation.

Process evaluations examine similar programs in multiple sites and devote limited resources to understanding program structure and implementation. These evaluations develop broad descriptions of cross-site differences

and experiences, discussing how sites compared. Process evaluations include:

- Information on programs generated by scientific methods that have proven effective.
- Identification of mechanisms that link program activities to stated objectives.
- Verified degrees of program implementation.
- Assessment of program effectiveness in terms of multiple indices of performance.
- Relationship of differences in site environments and implementation to differences in outcome.
- Summary of findings across sites.
- Identification of program development implications.

Impact Evaluations. Impact evaluations explain *why* a program has impact; they expend considerable resources on *why* a program is effective as well as on whether the program has had a significant impact. These evaluations are characterized by the depth of their examination rather than by the breadth of program experiences. They explain how a program produced results—typically through rigorous experimental design and multiple measures of results. These evaluations also depict the specific processes to which outcomes may be attributed. Impact evaluations may involve one site or several sites, depending on the funds available to the study. Impact evaluations include:

- Rigorous design with process and impact components.
- Evidence on causal links between program activities and stated objectives.
- Detailed scientific information on program effectiveness.
- Extrapolated findings to national significance.
- Identified program development implications.

- Summary of findings across sites.

- Identification of program development implications.

Evaluation Reviews. Evaluation reviews examine topics where a number of evaluations are already complete but have never been synthesized for use by the criminal justice system. They examine findings as objectively as possible, explain inconsistencies, and suggest conclusions based on the evidence reviewed. Reviews generate original knowledge about program effectiveness or operations. They also review and synthesize what has already been found in individual studies in an effort to form consensus. Information on the existing evaluation research, the current state of practice, and the issues of law and policy raised by the type of program under review would be included. Projects should document “what works” and should identify the key issues and controversies associated with implementation.

Publications of NIJ

The Institute produces a variety of publications that communicate the results of research and evaluation studies to criminal justice policymakers, professionals, decisionmakers, and members of the law enforcement community. These include:

- **Research in Brief**—concise summaries of significant criminal justice information, presenting findings and policy implications with the latest information from NIJ’s research and evaluations.
- **Research Focus**—a new series designed to highlight current and prior Institute research on issues of importance to criminal justice officials, administrators, and policymakers at the State and local levels.
- **Program Focus**—also a new series, these reports present case studies of innovative programs and practices in criminal justice that show signs of improving criminal justice or representing a unique approach toward crime control or the administration of justice.

■ ***Evaluation Bulletins***—reports that communicate the results of individual evaluations to large audiences and present information on evaluation methods and strategies.

In addition, the Institute annually publishes two congressionally mandated reports: (1) *Searching for Answers: Annual Evaluation Report on Drugs and Crime*, a report to the President, the Attorney General, and the Congress on the results of NIJ evaluations to determine what works in the war against drugs and crime and why it works; and (2) the *National Institute of Justice Annual Report*—a report to the Congress on NIJ research and evaluation results and ongoing programs.

Operation Weed and Seed

Operation Weed and Seed is a new national initiative that marshals the resources of a number of Federal agencies to strengthen law enforcement and revitalize communities. A comprehensive and coordinated approach to controlling drugs and crime in targeted high-crime neighborhoods, Weed and Seed establishes partnerships between government agencies, the community, and the private sector.

As the research and development agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, the National Institute of Justice is supporting the successful development of Weed and Seed projects and assisting with the implementation of model projects at selected sites. NIJ is placing special emphasis on strategies that will help realize the following Weed and Seed objectives:

- Suppression of drugs and crime.
- Police-citizen partnerships to enhance community security.
- Neighborhood revitalization.

Steering committees have been created at the local level to coordinate multiagency leadership. Other elements crucial to the success of **Operation Weed and Seed** include coordination of criminal justice activities with services provided by municipal agencies, businesses, and community groups; and police-community partnerships based on *shared responsibility* for community safety.

Operation Weed and Seed employs suppression activities directed at neighborhood drug abuse and criminal activity; community-based policing that links drug and crime control efforts with neighborhood revitalization; and neighborhood reclamation strategies designed to promote public safety and enhance the quality of neighborhood life.

NIJ's Role in Advancing Operation Weed and Seed

Drug Market Analysis

The NIJ Drug Market Analysis (DMA) system will be deployed in selected Weed and Seed sites. Through DMA, police develop computer mapping capacities that enable them to zero in on neighborhoods with drug trafficking problems, high crime rates, and disorder. Drug Market Analysis computerizes law enforcement information, particularly *location-specific* knowledge regarding street-level drug trafficking enforcement and associated crime. The program also calls for collecting, sharing, and analyzing pertinent data on a real-time basis so law enforcement agencies can use it to guide strategies and tactics.

DMA also enhances evaluation of various drug enforcement strategies, using its computerized information system. And because data are based on citywide information, measuring displacement of drug-related activity from one area to another is also possible.

Drug Use Forecasting Program

NIJ's Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program will also support Weed and Seed cities. DUF provides current information on drug use among arrestees that can reveal and describe particular drug problems and needs in a community. The DUF system can then be used to track changes in the problem areas as new enforcement strategies or social services are introduced.

DUF uses drug test results to provide 24 participating sites with estimates of the levels and types of drug use among booked arrestees. Trend information is developed from DUF data to detect changes in drug use patterns or preferences. Through the quarterly collection of

voluntary and anonymous interviews and urine specimens from arrestees brought to each site's booking facility, the program provides detailed information on recent drug use in this high-risk population. Urine specimens are analyzed for the presence of 10 drugs, and the urinalysis results are then merged with the interview information for analysis by NIJ and the local DUF sites.

DUF is now operating in eight cities that are candidates for participation in **Operation Weed and Seed**.

At the local level, DUF results can be used for determining the need for such efforts as pretrial drug testing programs and special drug courts, assessing the emergence of new drugs like "ice," devising police anti-drug tactics, supporting probation supervision, and designing new drug treatment efforts. (A complete description of the DUF program appears in the chapter on Drug Testing.)

In fiscal year 1992, NIJ will work with Weed and Seed cities to explore options for DUF to focus on target neighborhoods. Training and technical assistance can be provided to help cities establish DUF, and assistance will be available for existing DUF sites that want to extend data collection to the geographic areas targeted in their Weed and Seed programs.

Crime and Public Housing

The combined problems of violence, drug abuse, and drug trafficking are overwhelming many of the Nation's public housing developments and undermining efforts to provide safe, good quality, low-cost housing for those in need. As part of **Operation Weed and Seed**, public housing developments have been targeted for intervention by police and community organizations.

To help policymakers respond to concerns that public housing developments are locations of intense drug-related criminal activity, NIJ has awarded several grants to evaluate drug control strategies in public housing. A five-city study is identifying basic characteristics of the drug problem in public housing developments; identifying the public housing conditions that relate to drug

problems; and developing an inventory of different anti-drug initiatives in public housing developments. Another evaluation has focused on special narcotics enforcement units in public housing. A third NIJ project is reporting on effective strategies in Orlando, Florida; Chicago, Illinois; Baltimore, Maryland; and Alexandria, Virginia.

NIJ will continue to examine the problems of violence, drugs, and crime in public housing, both in Weed and Seed cities and other urban areas.

Evaluation

NIJ's evaluation of **Operation Weed and Seed** will proceed in several stages. In fiscal year 1992, phase I calls for a multisite evaluation. (See the chapter on Evaluation.) This evaluation will provide an understanding of the processes that are critical to the program's effectiveness. In fiscal year 1993, NIJ anticipates that an *impact evaluation* will be launched in three to five sites.

For the process evaluation, research activities should include the following:

- Designing rigorous evaluation methods.
- Determining degrees of program implementation.
- Collecting data to draw inferences about the relationship between program activities and stated objectives.
- Examining the evaluation strategies employed by the program, which are designed to measure effectiveness in terms of multiple indicators of performance.
- Relating differences in community environments and implementation to differences in outcomes.
- Summarizing findings across sites.
- Extrapolating program costs and benefits to the national level.
- Identifying program development potentials.

Comprehensive Neighborhood Intervention Strategies

A comprehensive neighborhood intervention strategy to combat crime and drug use includes the coordinated efforts of police, citizens, and other public and private agencies. Special attention will be given to particular laws, codes, regulations, or policies that can be used effectively to implement strategies that promote neighborhood security.

National Institute of Justice research has highlighted a number of comprehensive neighborhood intervention strategies that have been used in national programs to address neighborhood crime and drug problems. The strategies have particular relevance for Weed and Seed because they are aimed at decreasing criminal behavior (weeding efforts) while simultaneously increasing positive and prosocial forms of behavior (seeding efforts).

Examples include NIJ evaluations of drug enforcement strategies and community policing in Oakland and Birmingham, where police have engaged in proactive enforcement (buy-busts and sting operations) coupled with community policing programs (storefront stations and citizen interviews). Other NIJ research has examined the usefulness of interventions like Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), which applies design principles to enhance security; police drug crackdowns in Detroit and New York City; and community involvement in anti-drug-abuse programs.

The National Institute of Justice plans to develop and test *comprehensive neighborhood intervention strategies* that emerge from the careful analysis of crime problems in selected Weed and Seed program sites. Special attention will be given to strategies that reduce the opportunities for crime and that facilitate the coordination of citizen and police efforts to prevent and control crime, drugs, and neighborhood disorder.

NIJ will focus on the development and testing of appropriate comprehensive neighborhood intervention strategies in selected Weed and Seed sites and their

application to other neighborhood settings around the country. Special attention will be given to the factors that facilitate or constrain the development of comprehensive strategies and their effective use in neighborhood settings. Approximately \$750,000 has been allocated to support this program in fiscal year 1992.

For more information about NIJ's role in advancing **Operation Weed and Seed**, contact Dr. Fred Heinzelmann at 202-307-2949.

National Institute of Justice Research and Evaluation Plan: 1992

Program Area	Funding
Gangs and Violent Offenders	\$ 700,000
Victims	\$ 500,000
Community Policing and Police Effectiveness	\$ 950,000
Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability	\$ 800,000
Drug Prevention	\$ 500,000
Drug Testing	\$ 950,000
Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication	\$ 950,000
Money Laundering and Financial Investigation	\$ 500,000
Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology	\$ 1,175,000
Evaluation	\$ 3,050,000
TOTAL	\$10,075,000

Application Requirements

Projects proposed for funding by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) should have a national impact or have potential relevance to a number of jurisdictions. Because of NIJ's broad national mandate, projects that address only the unique concerns of single jurisdictions will not receive consideration.

Projects that contemplate the provision of services in addition to research are eligible for support, but only for the resources necessary to conduct the research tasks outlined in the proposal.

Eligibility Criteria

NIJ awards grants to or enters into cooperative agreements with educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, individuals, and profitmaking organizations that are willing to waive their fees. Special eligibility criteria, where appropriate, are indicated in the separate solicitations.

How To Apply

The following procedures are required for all applications. Submissions must include the following:

Standard Form 424

A copy of Standard Form (SF) 424, Application for Federal Assistance (with instructions), appears in the back of this document. Please follow the instructions carefully and include all parts and pages.

Certifications

In addition to SF 424, recent requirements involve certification regarding (1) lobbying, (2) debarment, suspension and other responsibility matters, and (3) drug-free workplace requirements. A certification form is attached

to SF 424. This form should be signed by the appropriate official and included in the grant application.

Budget Narrative

Budget narratives should list all planned expenditures and detail the salaries, materials, and cost assumptions used to estimate project costs. Narratives and cost estimates should be presented under the following standard budget categories: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contracts, other, and indirect costs. The total amount requested must include the full amount of NIJ funding for this project. When appropriate, grant applications should include justification of consultants and a full explanation of daily rates for any consultants proposed.

One-Page Abstract

The abstract of the full proposal should highlight the project's purposes, methods, activities, and when known, the location(s) of field research. Abstracts should not exceed one page.

Program Narrative

A program narrative is the technical portion of the proposal. It should consist of:

- A clear, concise statement of the problem, goals and objectives of the project, and related questions to be explored. A discussion of the relationship of the proposed work to the existing literature is expected.

- A statement of the project's anticipated contribution to criminal justice policy and practice. It is important that applicants briefly cite those particular issues and concerns of contemporary criminal justice policy that stimulate the proposed line of inquiry and suggest what their own investigation would contribute to current knowledge.

■ A detailed statement of the proposed research/study design and analytical methodologies. Delineate carefully and completely the proposed data sources, data collection strategies, variables and issues to be examined, and procedures of analysis to be employed. Experimental designs are encouraged, when appropriate, because of their potential relevance to policymaking and the strength of the evidence they can produce.

■ A description of the organizational capability of the potential grantee.

■ The organization and management plan for conducting the study. Include a list of major milestones of events, activities, and products, and a timetable for completion, including the time commitments to individual project tasks. All grant activities, including writing of the final report, should be completed within the award period.

■ The author of the proposal should be clearly identified.

Expected Products

Each project is expected to generate tangible products of benefit to criminal justice professionals, researchers, and policymakers. Applicants must concisely describe the interim and final products under each objective of the program strategy and address the purpose, audience, and usefulness of each product to the field. This discussion should include identifying the principal criminal justice constituency or agency type for each product, and describing how the constituent group or agency officials would be expected to use the product or report. Products may include:

■ Case studies providing examples of how problems arise and how they are handled, as well as the consequences of specific decisions made at various levels in the criminal justice system. Case studies may also describe some of the side effects—or unintended consequences—of particular programs. Case studies should be summarized in 7,500 to 10,000 words, be written for policy officials and criminal justice professionals, and be

suitable for possible publication in the National Institute of Justice *Program Focus* series.

■ A summary of approximately 2,500 words highlighting the findings of the research and the policy issues that those findings will inform, written to be accessible to policy officials and professionals, and suitable for possible publication as a National Institute of Justice *Research in Brief* or chapter in the *Focus on Research* series, as appropriate.

■ A full technical report, including a discussion of the research question(s), a review of the literature, a description of project methodology, a detailed review of project findings, and conclusions and policy recommendations.

■ Clean copies of all automated data sets developed during the research and full documentation prepared in accordance with the instructions in the *Depositing Data with the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice*.

As appropriate, additional interim and final products (e.g., articles, manuals, or training materials) may be specified in the proposal or negotiated at the time of the award.

Successful proposals will clearly identify the nature of the grant products that can reasonably be expected should the project be funded. In addition, schedules delineating delivery dates of products should be included.

Copies of Curriculum Vitae

The applicant's curriculum vitae should summarize education, research experience, and bibliographic information related to the proposed work.

Coordination

Applicants are expected to identify all other Federal, local, or private sources of support, including other NIJ programs, to which this or a closely related proposal has been or will be submitted. This information permits NIJ to consider the joint funding potential and limits the possibility of inadvertent duplicate funding.

Deadlines

Proposal deadlines are indicated in the separate solicitations.

Page Limit

No page limits are enforced. However, authors of proposals are encouraged to keep program narratives to a reasonable length. Technical materials that support or supplement the description of the proposed research should be relegated to an appendix.

Legibility

Proposals that are miscollated, incomplete, or handwritten will be judged as submitted or, at NIJ's discretion, will be returned without a deadline extension. No additions to the original submission are allowed.

Selection Criteria

After all applications for a competition have been received, the Institute selects three or more criminal justice professionals and researchers to serve on the review panel for the program.

The panel members read each proposal and meet to assess the technical merits and the policy relevance of the research proposed. Their assessment of each submission is forwarded to the Director of the Institute.

The review normally takes 6 to 10 weeks, depending on the number of applications received. Each applicant receives written comments from the peer review panel concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. These comments may include suggestions for how a revised or subsequent application to NIJ might be improved.

Panel assessments of the proposals, together with the Program Manager's assessments, are submitted for consideration by the Director, who has sole and final authority over approval and awards.

Review Criteria

The essential question asked for each application is, "If this study were successful, how would criminal justice policies or operations be improved?"

Four criteria are applied in the evaluation process: (1) impact of the proposed project; (2) feasibility of the approach to the issue, including technical merit and practical considerations; (3) originality of the approach, including creativity of the proposal and capability of the research staff; and (4) the economy of the approach.

Applicants bear the responsibility of demonstrating to the panel that the study proposed is addressing the critical issues of the topic area and that *the study findings could ultimately contribute to a practical application in law enforcement or criminal justice*. Reviewers will assess the applicants' awareness of related research or studies and their ability to direct their research or studies toward answering questions of policy or improving the state of criminal justice operations.

Technical merit is judged by the likelihood that the study design would produce convincing findings. Reviewers take into account the logic and timing of the research or study plan, the validity and reliability of measures proposed, the appropriateness of statistical methods to be used, and the applicants' awareness of factors that might dilute the credibility of the findings.

Impact is judged by the scope of the proposed approach and by the utility of proposed products. Reviewers take into account the applicant's understanding of the process of innovation in the targeted criminal justice agency or setting and knowledge of the prior uses of criminal justice research by the proposed criminal justice constituency. Appropriateness of products in terms of proposed content and format are also considered.

Applicant qualifications are evaluated both in terms of the depth of experience and the relevance of that experience to the research or study proposed. Costs are evaluated in terms of the reasonableness of each item and of the utility of the project to the Institute's program.

Gangs and Violent Offenders

Gangs

Gangs and Organized Crime Groups

Gangs: Priority Topics

Violent Offenders

Criminal Assaults

Alcohol, Drugs, and Violent Crimes

Violent Offenders: Priority Topics

OJP Policy Statement — *Federal, State, and local law enforcement must work together in partnership with the community to combat adult and juvenile gang violence and drug trafficking. Gang-related homicides and violent crime are tragically high, and gang members armed with fully automatic weapons pose a problem of national concern. The Office of Justice Programs will initiate a comprehensive agencywide program that will emphasize prevention, intervention, and suppression of illegal gang activity. A broad range of resources will be dedicated across the full spectrum of OJP agency functions, including policy research, evaluation, program development, demonstration, training and technical assistance, and information dissemination.*

Gangs

Violent criminal behavior, whether perpetrated by gangs or individuals, is a top priority for the National Institute of Justice. Criminal violence endangers people in all walks of life and is eroding the quality of life for millions of Americans in cities, suburbs, and even rural areas. NIJ seeks to bring the full range of research, development, and evaluation tools to bear on this problem and assist State and local law enforcement in fighting it. The first part of this chapter addresses NIJ's research program on gangs in an introduction, a solicitation, and priority topics. The second section, similarly organized, addresses NIJ's research program on violent offenders.

Gangs—and the problems associated with their criminal activities—have spread throughout this country. Data from a 1989, 45-city survey suggest that 1,439 youth gangs, with a total of at least 120,636 members, are now established in American cities. The survey also found that blacks and Hispanics account for better than 87 percent of the total gang membership—far out of proportion to their representation in the general population. Surveys in 1991 indicate that gang membership continues to increase in many cities. Most gangs are now involved in serious crimes. Juvenile gang members commit nearly 23 percent of index crimes in the surveyed jurisdictions. Gang members commit violent crimes three times more often than delinquents who do not belong to gangs, and most gang members both sell and use illegal drugs.¹

The Los Angeles-based CRIPS and Bloods are among today's most publicized gangs and serve as examples of the national problem. According to a recent Drug Enforcement Administration report, CRIPS-Bloods conflicts over drug trafficking have taken the form of urban guerilla warfare, with drive-by shootings and the killing of informants as common results of their conflicts. Reports suggest that these gangs have migrated across

State lines to other urban centers. Smaller cities and towns have also become wary and fearful of the incursion of gangs into their jurisdictions.

Although young blacks and Hispanics account for the majority of gang memberships, Chinese, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laotian, and white youths now have established gangs in New York City, Chicago, and Los Angeles. With this trend, gangs now cut across all ethnic and cultural lines.

Another new trend is that youths are now participating in gangs well into their adulthood. In Los Angeles, for instance, the average age of a gang member convicted of homicide is now slightly over 19 years old; in Chicago, nearly 50 percent of the gang members found guilty of homicides are over the age of 19; and in San Diego, half of all gang members are 19 years of age or older. The fact that youths are staying in gangs is of great concern because once they become adults, they will play leadership roles, engage in the worst violence—homicides, aggravated assault, robberies—and encourage drug trafficking activities. The California Department of Justice has documented prison gangs and many serious crimes committed by gang members after they are released from prison. Prison gangs have become a serious problem—particularly in Illinois, New York, California, and Texas.

Evidence further suggests that youth gang members are particularly susceptible to recruitment into larger criminal organizations engaged in drug trafficking. According to media reports, for instance, it was Chinese youth gangs—operating in conjunction with the Asian Triads—who were responsible for the resurgent heroin trade in New York City.

To initiate its program on gangs, NIJ funded six projects in 1991, ranging from the criminal behavior of gang members and gang migration to national assessments of the criminal justice response to gang-related crime.

These projects include three studies that focus on gang behavior: **The Impact of Gang Migration**, which is identifying gangs that have spread from city to city and documenting the number of cities now reporting gang activity, migration patterns, and relationships between gang migrants and their original gangs; **Street Gangs and Drug Sales**, which is comparing gang drug sales with trafficking that does not involve gangs and will document the magnitude of gang involvement in drug sales and violence; and **The Criminal Behavior of Gangs**, which is interviewing gang members in two cities to explore motivation to join, remain in, or leave gangs, and the role of gang life in criminal behavior patterns.

Three projects focus on law enforcement and criminal justice responses to gangs and gang members: a **National Assessment of Law Enforcement Anti-Gang Measures**, which is describing types and levels of police activity to suppress gangs and gang-related criminal activity; **Prosecuting Gang Crime**, which is conducting a nationwide assessment of how gang-related crimes are prosecuted, including legislative strategies that may enhance prosecutions and innovative prosecution methods; and **Gangs in Correctional Facilities**, which is examining the extent of gangs in correctional institutions and will describe how these facilities manage gang activity, including any innovative strategies.

Ongoing Programs for 1992

In 1992 NIJ will further expand the gang initiative to include research on organized crime and criminal youth gangs, gang organizational structures, the effectiveness of gang intervention programs, and the roles of probation and parole in counteracting gang activity. Ongoing 1992 programs are described below.

The Role of Probation and Parole in Gang Prevention and Control: A National Assessment

This study is intended to provide a national assessment of the roles of probation and parole in gang prevention

and control; to synthesize ongoing efforts; and to communicate the general situation to communities, law enforcement agencies, and policymakers throughout the United States.

Delinquent Networks in Philadelphia: Co-Offending and Gangs

This project addresses problems of inner-city violence and gang activities, focusing on patterns of crime among juvenile offenders in Philadelphia in 1985. The youths in this study were followed up through 1991. The project is focusing on the continuity and durability of gang structures and interaction patterns; the stability of structures that affect individual involvement in criminal activities; and criminal justice response to these activities.

New Solicitations for 1992

In 1992, NIJ's program builds on past research and upon recently identified problems and issues. Areas of particular interest in the current year include gangs and organized crime groups, gang-related violence, terminating or maturing out of gang membership, and relationships between community characteristics and the emergence and growth of gangs.

In addition, a concluding solicitation identifies other areas of interest and encourages proposals on other useful research projects relating to gangs.

References

1. See M.W. Klein and C.L. Maxson. "Street Gang Violence," in *Violent Crime, Violent Criminals*, N.A. Weiner and M.E. Wolfgang, eds. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1989. See also I.A. Spergel, "Youth Gangs: Continuity and Change," in *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, v. 12. N. Morris and M. Tonry, eds., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Gangs: Solicitations for 1992

Gangs and Organized Crime Groups

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for an examination and assessment of connections between youth gangs and organized criminal groups—especially connections that involve the sale of illegal drugs, weapons, and stolen property.

Background

The spread of gangs and gang-related violence has become a national concern for citizens, policymakers, law enforcement officials, and criminal justice professionals alike. Gangs have now established themselves in many large and middle-sized cities, and suburbs—neighborhoods where recurring gang problems have never before been reported. Adding to this problem are indications that many youths are retaining their gang affiliations into early adulthood, as well as reported links between youth gangs and organized crime groups—including recently uncovered relationships between Colombian cocaine cartels and American street gangs that distribute crack cocaine.¹

Because organized crime groups can take forms ranging from crime families to organized criminal enterprises, the boundaries between criminal youth gangs, traditional organized crime groups, and newly emerging crime groups are frequently subject to disagreement. Although much is now known about gangs, their membership, and the type of illegal activities in which they are involved, there is little systematic documentation of the structural and organizational dimensions among these groups, the range and volume of their criminal activities, or their operational and financial links. In short, the connections between criminal youth gangs and both traditional orga-

nized crime and newly emerging crime groups are not fully understood. Research that examines evidence of links between these groups is needed if law enforcement is to prevent and control their criminal activities.

Goals

- To understand the extent and nature of the connections between criminal youth gangs and traditional organized crime groups.
- To understand the extent and nature of the connections between criminal youth gangs and newly emerging crime groups.
- To communicate the results of this research; to formulate ways in which Federal, State, and local law enforcement can use those results to prevent organized criminal activities; and to intervene with youth gangs to deter their criminal activities.

Objectives

- Collect and examine evidence on the extent and nature of connections between criminal youth gangs and traditional organized crime groups.
- Collect and examine evidence on the extent and nature of connections between criminal youth gangs and newly emerging crime groups.
- Develop an indepth report, for publication by the National Institute of Justice, for law enforcement agencies, public policymakers, and professionals on the links between and among these groups, and determine ways in which Federal, State, and local law enforcement can use the report findings to prevent and/or control the criminal activities of each of the groups.

Program Strategy

Collect and examine evidence on the extent and nature of connections between criminal youth gangs and traditional organized crime groups.

The grantee will be expected to conduct a thorough review of the theoretical and empirical research. Based on that review, the grantee will be required to define key terms and develop strategies for examining evidence on the nature and extent of the connections between criminal youth gangs and traditional organized crime groups. A survey of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies, followed by an indepth examination and analysis of the evidence of such links in a more limited sample of law enforcement agencies, would be one means for fulfilling this requirement.

The applicant must identify and detail proposed methods for locating and examining evidence of criminal youth gang and traditional organized crime group connections, including study sites; selection methods; means for defining a population for sampling, including the proposed sampling frame and strategy; proposed data collection guides and instruments; an explanation of required organization and planning activities; a schedule of program tasks; and a program implementation plan.

The grantee will be required to produce data collection instruments, a data tape, and a draft report that both discusses preliminary findings on the links between and among these groups and suggests ways in which Federal, State, and local law enforcement can use the findings to counteract the criminal activities of organized crime groups and criminal youth gangs. The grantee will also be required to produce a final report, for possible publication by NIJ, that is appropriate for policymakers, researchers, law enforcement officials, and criminal justice professionals.

Collect and examine evidence on the extent and nature of connections between criminal youth gangs and newly emerging crime groups.

The grantee must examine evidence of the extent and nature of the connection between criminal youth gangs and newly emerging crime groups, and determine whether and to what extent criminal youth gangs have links to domestic and international terrorist organizations.

The applicant should include a detailed discussion of the proposed methodology for locating and examining evidence of connections among criminal youth gangs, newly emerging crime groups, and domestic and international terrorist organizations, including study-site selection methods; means for defining a population for sampling, including the proposed sampling frame and strategy; proposed data collection guides and instruments; an explanation of required organization and planning activities; a schedule of program tasks; and a program implementation plan.

The grantee will be required to produce a written assessment of the theoretical and actual differences between youth gangs, newly emerging crime groups, and traditional organized crime groups. A discussion of the links between criminal youth gangs and domestic and international terrorist organizations must be included in this report.

Develop an indepth report, for publication by the National Institute of Justice, for law enforcement agencies, public policymakers, and professionals on the links between and among these groups, and determine ways in which Federal, State, and local law enforcement can use the report findings to prevent and/or control the criminal activities of each of the groups.

The grantee will be required to produce a report, for possible publication by NIJ, that discusses thoroughly the problem of links between youth gangs, traditional crime organizations, newly emerging crime groups, and domestic and international terrorist groups; reviews the theoretical and empirical research; details the research methodology employed for the project; details study findings; and provides recommendations for the development of model policies, procedures, and practices for preventing the formation of organized crime groups, disrupting their links, or intervening directly in their activities. The grantee must also produce an executive summary that describes the research results in a manner that is appropriate for criminal justice professionals, public policymakers, and researchers, and is suitable for publication as an NIJ *Research in Brief*.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$150,000 to \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Gangs and Organized Crime Groups
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may

write to Ms. Winifred L. Reed, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-307-0649.

References

1. See Lo-lin Chin, *Chinese Subculture and Criminality*, New York: Greenwood Press, 1990. See also C. Ronald Huff, ed., *Gangs in America*, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1990.

Gangs: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research program, including both basic and applied approaches, that involves a large majority of the criminal justice research and professional communities. NIJ conducts annual evaluations of promising criminal justice programs, conducts demonstration projects, assesses the usefulness and effectiveness of advances in technology, and conducts training programs.

NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies including case studies, structured observation, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative research proposals that would bring thinking and research from a variety of disciplines to the study of crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest might include, but are not limited to, the following:

■ **Gangs and violence.** Gang members commit violent crimes three times more often than other delinquents who pass through this Nation's criminal justice system. Law enforcement officials and others fear that as gangs increasingly establish themselves in smaller cities and towns, the seemingly random, drive-by shootings, deadly turf battles, and other forms of violence that are now a part of daily life in urban America may become a nationwide problem. To stem this problem, research is needed on all facets of the connection between gangs and violence.

■ **Terminating or outgrowing gang membership.** Although research shows that some youths are maintaining their gang affiliations into their early adulthood, most either take active measures to terminate their membership or simply mature out of their gang sometime in their teens. If the criminal justice community is to encourage youths to separate from gangs—and the criminal behavior resulting from gang membership—research is needed on the reasons youths give for, and the processes involved in, terminating gang memberships, as well as any consequences of membership termination.

■ **Community characteristics and gangs.** Gangs are increasingly establishing themselves in smaller cities and towns where citizens and criminal justice personnel have never had to deal with gang-related problems before. To help law enforcement officials prepare for and recognize the signs of new gangs and gang-related crime, research is needed on community characteristics that encourage both the emergence and growth of gangs.

■ **Gang organizational structure and crime.** Although many gangs are involved in criminal activities, many are not. Furthermore, gangs involved in crimes are not always involved in the same types of crimes—some gangs may specialize in car thefts, for instance, while others are involved in illegal drug sales. Why then do some gangs engage in crime, while others do not? Some suggest that there is a relationship between gang organizational structure and criminal activity. Research is needed to determine whether this is the case.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Gangs: Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Ms. Winifred L. Reed, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-307-0649.

Violent Offenders

In 1990, police reported that a record 732 of every 100,000 Americans were affected by a violent crime—murder, rape, robbery, or aggravated assault. Compared with 1989 data, murders had increased by 8 percent, rapes had increased 8.1 percent, robberies had risen 10.3 percent, and aggravated assaults were up 10.6 percent.¹

Violent crimes not only inflict great suffering on particular victims, their families, and their communities, but they also adversely affect the quality of life for all Americans. The high rate of violent crime that now prevails in most of this country's major cities, and increasingly in suburban and rural areas, creates an urgent need for new, up-to-date information on its causes, its relationship to alcohol and drug use, the impacts of firearms and other weapons, and policies and practices that show promise in preventing or controlling violent criminal behavior.

Violent criminal behavior, whether manifested through a gang, group, or individual action, has always been a top priority for the National Institute of Justice. In response to a specific mandate from the Congress, NIJ has long supported basic research in the form of projects that increase understanding of criminal behavior, and research and demonstration programs that examine ways to intervene successfully to prevent development of criminal behavior.

NIJ is now collaborating with the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, and the Centers for Disease Control in a critical assessment to understand and control violent crime. This NIJ project has assembled the Nation's leading researchers in neurobiology, psychiatry, criminology, economics, and other disciplines. They are seeking to determine patterns and trends in criminal violence and to assess public policy efforts and the effectiveness of policy options.

A long-term NIJ effort in criminological research is also underway, this one in partnership with the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. Conducted by the Harvard School of Public Health, this NIJ project involves a comprehensive longitudinal study of how delinquent and criminal behavior begins and of what factors promote or prevent criminal behavior. The project is gathering data on more than 10,000 young subjects from communities in urban areas over an 8-year period. This longitudinal study is of a size and complexity without precedent in criminology.

NIJ encourages research and demonstration projects, in addition to those cited here, on a variety of subjects related to violence, especially projects that can produce practical results for law enforcement and criminal justice policymakers and managers.

NIJ has learned a lot about violent crime, and it is apparent that these offenses defy simple classification. Consider the following examples of diversity. Acts of violence are performed both by individuals and groups. They occur between strangers, between casual acquaintances, and between family members. They can involve juveniles both as victims and as offenders. They are sometimes associated with substantial property damage. They are motivated by anger, retaliation, prejudice, a desire to steal, a need to protect drug deals, sexual gratification, and psychopathology—or any combination thereof. Criminal violence is commonly associated with alcohol and/or drug use. Violence occurs in every part of the country and among all ethnic and socioeconomic groups. Perpetrators may commit a violent act frequently or only once or twice in a lifetime. And, finally, persons who commit violent crimes are also often victims of violence themselves.

The complexity of criminal violence has hampered understanding of its causes and impeded the development

of effective strategies for prevention and control. Traditionally, most systematic research on criminal violence has focused on murder. However, murder accounts for only 1 percent of all violent crime reported to the police. Although murder increased nationally in 1990, some major cities experienced a decline in murder, but at the same time *nonlethal* criminal violence increased. These disparate patterns underscore the need to understand and control criminal violence of all types and degrees of harm.

Links between the use of illegal drugs, alcohol, and violent crimes add to the difficulty of examining this topic. Alcohol and drugs affect behavior, including violent crime, through the interaction of biological, individual, and situational mechanisms; however, research shows that although some youths and adults who abuse alcohol and drugs develop patterns of criminal violence, others do not.

Another focus of NIJ work has been the identification and evaluation of prevention, intervention, and law enforcement strategies to reduce specific types of criminal violence. Violence prevention strategies have proliferated in recent years, particularly those focusing on mental health, education, and community crime prevention. A recent report compiled for the Carnegie Foundation identified more than 50 such programs. A soon-to-be published NIJ report, *Preventing Interpersonal Violence Among Youth*, examines programs that show the most promise for teenagers—particularly community prevention efforts, prevention education, and prevention of violence involving firearms.

During the next several years, NIJ's program on criminal violence will be guided by the exhaustive review and synthesis of research and policy on criminal violence now underway at the National Academy of Sciences. The panel of 19 distinguished scholars and policy-makers assembled by the Academy is examining the patterns and trends in interpersonal violence that have emerged over the past 20 years; assessing the adequacy of the available data sources and methodologies commonly used in violence research; reviewing new

theoretical insights and empirical knowledge on the causes of violence; and identifying policies and practices that show the greatest promise of reducing violence in the United States. The report is expected during the summer of 1992.

Ongoing Programs for 1992

Program on Human Development and Criminal Behavior

Building on extensive research sponsored by NIJ in the 1980's on the early antecedents of criminal behavior and violence, the National Institute of Justice and the MacArthur Foundation launched a major longitudinal study of the development of delinquent and criminal behavior patterns.² The program, which is the cornerstone of NIJ's basic research program on the causes and correlates of criminal behavior, employs research approaches from a variety of disciplines and theoretical perspectives to study the individual, family, and community circumstances under which criminal careers develop.

Assessing Risk of Violence to Public Officials

Previous NIJ-supported research has focused on predicting violence, identifying risk factors, and classifying certain types of violent offenders—including a major study of persons who follow and approach well-known individuals, sometimes with the intent to injure.³ For this fiscal year 1992 program NIJ is working with the U.S. Secret Service to study individuals who have actually attempted to attack or assault public officials. The project will provide information about how these types of violence can be anticipated and intercepted by Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials.

SMART—School Management and Resource Teams

This demonstration program helps local school districts establish safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools by providing the technical assistance and support, training,

and evaluation needed to further these goals. Program elements include examinations of school district policies, procedures, and practices; preparation of guidelines for differentiating clearly between criminal and noncriminal incidents; collection and analysis of data on both types of incidents; mobilization of "school resource teams" to solve specific problems; development and evaluation of data-based intervention strategies; and coordination of school board policies with law enforcement and community service agencies. SMART is jointly funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Drug Free Schools and Communities Program and NIJ.

Since its establishment in 1983, SMART has been field tested in more than 100 schools and 7 districts. It has enabled these school districts to develop a unified approach to address discipline, drug abuse and crime in schools, improved school policies, and intervention with high-risk populations. The program is now being coordinated with the Department of Education's America 2000 program and will be evaluated and made available to a number of school systems nationwide.

Media Violence

NIJ began its support for studies of the causal relationship between portrayals of violence in the media and violent and aggressive criminal behavior, through sponsorship of the National Academy of Sciences' 1982 Workshop on Television and Violent Behavior.⁴ Subsequent critical reviews of the literature have concluded that violence on television is positively associated with antisocial and aggressive behavior as well as criminal violence and other illegal activities.⁵ Less is known about the effects of violent portrayals in other media, including movies, music videos, magazines, and newspapers. To fill this research gap, in fiscal year 1992 NIJ will support a comprehensive review and critical synthesis of the existing literature, the development of a research agenda, and the identification of issues relevant to criminal justice policy.

New Solicitations for 1992

In fiscal year 1992, the NIJ violent offender program will extend previous NIJ-sponsored research on violence to support a variety of new and continuing projects on the causes and correlates of criminal violence and identification of strategies for its prevention and control. To provide a more balanced understanding of all levels of physical harm involved in violent crimes, new research will focus attention on nonlethal criminal violence. The multiple links between substance abuse and criminal violence will also be examined. For both these topics, a particular emphasis is the need for a multidimensional approach that reflects the complex nature of violence.

In addition, a concluding solicitation identifies other areas of interest and encourages proposals on other useful research projects within the violent offender program.

References

1. *Uniform Crime Reports 1990*, Federal Bureau of Investigation, U.S. Department of Justice, 1991.
2. For an overview of the design strategy, see Michael Tonry, Lloyd Ohlin, and David Farrington, *Human Development and Criminal Behavior: New Ways of Advancing Knowledge*, New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990.
3. Park E. Dietz and Daniel Martell. *Mentally Disordered Offenders in Pursuit of Celebrities and Politicians*, Final Report. National Institute of Justice, 1989.
4. *Workshop on Television and Violent Behavior, Final Report, National Academy of Sciences*: National Institute of Justice, 1982.
5. George Comstock and Haejung Paik, *The Effects of Television Violence on Aggressive Behavior: A Meta-Analysis*, unpublished report to the National Academy of Sciences Panel on the Understanding and Control of Violent Behavior, Washington, D.C., 1990.

Violent Offenders: Solicitations for 1992

Criminal Assaults

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for original research that advances understanding of the circumstances associated with criminal assault—crimes in which offenders threaten, attempt, or actually inflict physical harm.

Background

Crimes such as homicides, physical and sexual assaults, and robberies are among those most feared by the public. Yet understanding of criminal assaults is limited. Much of what is now known about their circumstances is based on research on homicides—which represent only a small fraction of all criminal assaults.

Knowledge of the circumstances—*both precipitating and situational*—associated with criminal assaults is critical to understanding their occurrence and the degree of physical harm inflicted. Precipitating circumstances are those occurring immediately before the actual assault. Situational circumstances are less immediate and can include the social relationships of the offenders and victims (e.g., strangers, spouses, acquaintances) and characteristics of the places in which social encounters routinely occur. Precipitating and situational circumstances may occur at the individual (biological and psychological) and social (small group, organizational, and social system) levels.

Circumstances can also be *fixed* or *dynamic*. Fixed circumstances are conditions or processes that predate the criminal assault and remain unchanged during the incident, such as the offenders' and victims' social relationships (e.g., combinations of ethnic status, gender, age, and economic group), and personal relationships (e.g.,

family, work, recreational, and social ties). Dynamic circumstances, on the other hand, lead up to the criminal assault and occur during the course of it. They include the behavior of the participants and others that results in confrontations and their escalation and deescalation. Other dynamic circumstances include threatening gestures, the display of weapons, the consumption of alcohol and other drugs, and the actions of bystanders.

The impact of specific precipitating factors and situations and of their static and dynamic qualities appears to differ among types of criminal assaults. Careful examination of these circumstances may lead to new classifications that increase understanding of assaults. How such classifications correspond to criminal law classifications is also of interest.

This solicitation seeks proposals for original research on the *circumstances of criminal assaults*. The proposal should develop and test hypotheses about the risks of criminal assault and the severity of injury. The proposal should formulate research questions and issues based on a critical review of previous research. The critical review should distinguish types of criminal assaults, identify the circumstances to be investigated, and describe the processes by which threats of assault arise and how threats are related to the commission of assaults and the seriousness of injury.

Goals

- To identify specific types of assault, the circumstances associated with them, and the prevalence and frequency of their occurrence and concurrence (separately and jointly).
- To understand how these circumstances influence the risk that a particular type of criminal assault with a particular degree of physical harm will occur.
- To propose or select promising strategies that prevent and control types of criminal assaults or that reduce the degree of physical harm inflicted, which subsequently can be evaluated and tested.

Objectives

■ Select for study several specific types of criminal assaults or assaults that occur in a particular set of circumstances or lines of work (e.g., assaults in bars or in the workplace, assaults on law enforcement officers or prison guards) and justify the selection.

■ Propose a research design that investigates the circumstances affecting the risk that specific criminal assaults with different levels of physical harm will occur.

■ Recommend both short- and long-term strategies that, based on the results of the investigation, show promise of preventing and controlling specific types of criminal assault. Indicate where the strategies might be most effectively implemented and evaluated and recommend those requiring further research.

Program Strategy

Select for study several specific types of criminal assault or assaults that occur in a particular set of circumstances or lines of work (e.g., assaults in bars or in the workplace, assaults on law enforcement officers or prison guards) and justify the selection.

The applicant should select several specific types of criminal assault for comparative analysis and explain in detail the reasons for the selection and comparison. These reasons should include, among others, the frequency, range, and degree of physical harm typically inflicted; the expected feasibility of prevention and control; the potential yield for building or testing current explanations of these assaults; the contribution that different disciplines can make to understanding and control of criminal results; and the way in which the research will build on prior research.

The applicant should pay special attention to the kinds of circumstances examined in prior research and the policy implications of that research, pointing out research gaps and weaknesses and their implications for developing prevention and control policies.

Propose a research design that investigates the circumstances affecting the risk that specific criminal assaults with different levels of physical harm will occur.

The applicant should discuss in detail the customary core research considerations: hypotheses, research design, sampling strategy, kinds of data to be collected, data collection methods, and analysis techniques. Designs that involve explanations from different disciplines and that use a variety of data collection and analysis methods are encouraged. Special emphasis should be given to ensuring that the sample obtained from the selected data sources is representative of the variation in circumstances and degrees of physical harm.

The applicant should justify the use of existing classifications and measures of circumstances and physical harm and the methods for developing new ones. The proposal should indicate how these measures and classifications will be obtained from the data sources. The measurement issue is especially critical for proposals using longitudinal designs.

The applicant should also explain how data collection will permit the research to attribute the physical harm inflicted to the individual participants in the assault. This will enable the analysis to sort out the separate effects of circumstances pertaining to individuals and circumstances pertaining to the incident on the physical injury inflicted.

In view of the multiple levels of study required for analyzing the data adequately, the applicant should also discuss the conceptual relationships among the analytical levels, any plans to use multiple methods to handle the demands of a multilevel approach, and the kinds of expertise needed to conduct the research.

Recommend both short- and long-term strategies that, based on the results of the investigation, show promise of preventing and controlling specific types of criminal assault. Indicate where the strategies might be most effectively implemented and evaluated and recommend those requiring further research.

The grantee will be required to prepare a detailed report, based on the data collected and analyzed, for possible publication by the National Institute of Justice. The report would include a "blueprint" that recommends short- and long-term strategies for preventing and controlling specific types of criminal assaults and suggests strategies suitable for each type of crime. The blueprint will be used to design evaluations of those prevention and control strategies. The grantee should justify the selection of each of the strategies and outline issues pertaining to site selection, projected costs, expected staffing, duration, and so forth. The grantee should also discuss potential implementation problems, including feasibility, funding mechanisms, ethical and legal impediments, and potential negative consequences. The grantee should suggest ways to capitalize on the findings from the proposed evaluation of the prevention and control strategies—for example, how to use the evaluation findings in formulating and designing new research projects.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000 to \$250,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of the proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Criminal Assaults
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Christy Visher, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-307-0694.

Alcohol, Drugs, and Violent Crimes

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for original research on the relationships between alcohol, drugs, and specific types of violent crimes, including methods for measuring their roles in threats of violence, attempted violent acts, and actual physical injury; and alcohol- and drug-related strategies for preventing or controlling specific incidents of violence.

Background

We are learning a great deal about some general relationships among alcohol, drugs, and violent crimes, and the resulting threats, attempts, and incidents involving physical harm. However, our understanding of these relationships is mostly correlational, *not causal*, presenting a major gap in basic knowledge, which needs to be addressed.

Studies of animal and human aggression and violence indicate that the links among alcohol, drugs, and violent crimes are not straightforward but rather entail a complex network of interacting processes that involve *biological, individual, and social factors*. It is unlikely that a unifying causal principle governing these processes underlies all the links among alcohol, drugs, and violent crimes. Rather, these processes appear to operate differently for *different types of violent crimes* and, furthermore, can influence the *degree of physical harm* that is inflicted, ranging from minor injury to death.

Biologically, alcohol and other drugs affect people in different ways depending on the type of alcohol or drug used, dose levels, patterns in short- and long-term consumption and ingestion, and individual neurochemistry and other biological characteristics.¹ Individually, the effects of alcohol and drugs depend, for example, upon personality characteristics; levels of cognitive and effective functioning; the presence, type, and degree of psychopathology; and the intrusion of stressful life events.²

Socially, alcohol and other drugs affect people or groups in different ways and to different extents, depending on factors such as the types and patterns of their use within a community or social group; the reasons for using these substances on specific occasions; the users' expectations of the psychological and behavioral effects of alcohol or drug ingestion; any restrictions—including legal—on availability and consumption; and the places, social settings, and face-to-face encounters in which use typically occurs.³ Other potentially influential circumstances include weapons; the presence of bystanders who can incite, mediate, or otherwise monitor the consumption of

substances and the initiation of violent activities; and the sociodemographic mix of persons present at these places, social settings, and encounters.

For example, it is likely that different biological, individual, and social factors influence physical attacks associated with hostile confrontations (e.g., bar room fights), strategic exchanges (e.g., robberies), sexual desires (e.g., some forcible rapes), and other violent encounters (e.g., fighting to protect a drug distribution site).

In view of these many complex relationships, major gaps remain in *causal* knowledge about how alcohol and drugs are linked to *specific types* of violent crimes. Much more needs to be learned about the specific links *at each descriptive and analytical level and across these levels*. In addition, little is known about how specific types of alcohol and drugs and their use patterns contribute to degrees of inflicted physical harm.

This solicitation seeks proposals for original research that will fill these gaps by connecting specific types of drugs, alcohol, and violent crimes; providing methods for measuring their effects on physical violence; and suggesting strategies to prevent or control specific violent crimes.

Goals

- To determine if ingestion of selected types of drugs and alcohol results in specific types of violent crimes and to document the extent of these relationships.
- To understand how the selected types of drugs and alcohol are linked to selected violent crimes and the degree of inflicted physical harm.
- To propose possible strategies to prevent or control selected types of violent crimes based on the ways alcohol and drugs are known to influence these crimes.

Objectives

- Select specific types of drugs and alcohol for analysis of their relationship to specific violent crimes and justify the selection.
- Propose a research design for analysis of the links between specific types of drugs and alcohol and specific violent crimes.
- Recommend both short- and long-term strategies—based on the data collected and analyzed—for preventing or controlling specific types of violent crimes; evaluating those prevention or control strategies; and designing new research and prevention or control strategies based on the results of the evaluations. Prepare a report that is appropriate for criminal justice professionals, public policymakers, and researchers.

Program Strategy

Select specific types of drugs and alcohol for analysis of their relationship to specific violent crimes and justify the selection.

The applicant should select specific types of drugs and alcohol as well as specific violent crimes for purposes of comparative analysis and explain in detail the reasons for the selection. These reasons might include, among others, the association between the selected substances and violent crimes; the expected feasibility of prevention or control strategies; the potential benefits for theory-building; the availability of key data; prior research that can be drawn from or built on; and the prospects for organizing a multidisciplinary analysis.

The applicant should pay special attention to the specific types of drugs and alcohol examined in prior studies; determine whether those studies had a causal focus, and their policy implications; and point out gaps in knowledge, weaknesses in research designs, and any implications for the development of prevention or control strategies.

Propose a research design for analysis of the links between specific types of drugs and alcohol and specific violent crimes.

The applicant should discuss in detail the customary core research considerations: hypotheses, research design, sampling strategy, kinds of data to be collected, data collection methods, and analytical techniques. Research questions and issues developed within the applicant's proposal should be based on a critical literature review that distinguishes among the specific types of violent crimes, alcohol, and drugs that are most crucial to analyze.

The applicant should also propose and justify methods for measuring alcohol and drug use, focusing on how to measure levels of use prior to and at the time of a violent criminal incident; and measuring both the degree of physical harm inflicted and how alcohol and drug use influenced the degree of harm during the violent incident. NIJ is particularly interested in proposals that link research from disciplines that contribute to knowledge about the effects of alcohol and drugs on human behavior with research from disciplines that contribute to knowledge about violent crimes.

Recommend short- and long-term strategies—based on the data collected and analyzed—for preventing or controlling specific types of violent crimes; evaluating these prevention or control strategies; and designing new research and prevention or control strategies based on the evaluations. Prepare a report that is appropriate for criminal justice professionals, public policymakers, and researchers.

The grantee will be required to prepare a report based on the data collected and analyzed, for possible publication by the National Institute of Justice. The report would include a blueprint recommending short- and long-term strategies for preventing or controlling specific types of violent crimes and relating specific types of alcohol and drugs to these crimes. The blueprint should also include mechanisms for evaluating those strategies.

The grantee will be required to produce a detailed report, for possible publication by NIJ, that examines and justifies these strategies and discusses the basis upon which they were developed; and outlines evaluation issues pertaining, for example, to site selection, costs, staffing, and duration. The report should also include a discussion of potential problems, including feasibility, funding sources, ethical or legal impediments, and potential negative consequences of the recommended strategies. Finally, it should discuss ways to capitalize on the research findings by, for example, using them when formulating and designing new research projects.

The Program Strategy outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000 to \$250,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of the proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Alcohol, Drugs, and Violent Crimes
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Christy Visher, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-307-0694.

References

1. K.A. Miczek, "The psychopharmacology of aggression." In *Handbook of Psychopharmacology, Volume 19: New Directions in Behavioral Pharmacology*, L.L. Iverson, S.D. Iverson, and S.H. Snyder, eds., pp. 183-328. New York: Plenum, 1987.
2. J. Fagan, "Intoxication and Aggression." In *Drugs and Crime*, M. Tonry and J.Q. Wilson, eds., pp. 241-320. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
3. See J.J. Collins, "Alcohol and Interpersonal Violence: Less Than Meets the Eye." In *Pathways to Criminal Violence*, N.A. Weiner and M.E. Wolfgang, eds. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publishers, 1989. See also Mario De LaRosa, Elizabeth Lambert, and Bernard Gropper, *Drugs and Violence: Causes, Correlates, and Consequences*. NIDA Research Monograph 103. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1990.

Violent Offenders: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research program, including both basic and applied approaches, that involves a large majority of the criminal justice research and professional communities. NIJ conducts annual evaluations of promising criminal justice programs, conducts demonstration projects, assesses the usefulness and effectiveness of advances in technology, and conducts training programs.

NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies including case studies, structured observation, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative research proposals that would bring thinking and research from a variety of disciplines to the study of crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **Factors in violence.** Research is needed on specific types of criminal violence, the characteristics of victims and offenders, spatial and time-trend patterns, and short- and long-term risk and protective factors for offenders and victims.
- **Weapons and violence.** Research is needed on the role of weapons in criminal violence and on promising local law enforcement efforts to reduce gun violence and illegal gun transfers.
- **Reducing criminal violence.** Nationwide, law enforcement personnel are attempting to reduce criminal violence. Assessments of the effectiveness of these prevention, intervention, and law enforcement strategies

in reducing specific types of criminal violence are needed if their experiences are to benefit the country as a whole.

Applicants uncertain about whether a project idea falls within the program's scope should consult the Program Manager.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Violent Offenders: Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Christy Visher, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-307-0694.

Victims

Utilization of Victim Services
by Minority and Low-Income Victims

Crimes Against the Elderly

Victims: Priority Topics

OJP Policy Statement — *The criminal justice and juvenile justice systems must strive to implement policies and programs to improve services to crime victims. The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) is committed to helping crime victims and improving the responsiveness of juvenile justice, criminal justice, and victim service systems. This year's Program Plan focuses on minority victims of crime to ensure that services are made accessible to them at the Federal, State, and local levels. In addition, it focuses on ensuring that innocent crime victims are not revictimized by the criminal justice system.*

Resources will be committed to training law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and other criminal justice personnel who work with innocent victims of crime.

Victims

National Institute of Justice research, evaluation, demonstration, and training programs have played a central role in reshaping public policy on victims of crime. Institute research has provided legislators, criminal justice planners, and professionals with new information on the effects of crime on victims, the success of programs in helping victims deal with the impact of crime, and ways to assist victims involved in the criminal justice process.

If crime continues at current rates, five out of every six Americans will fall victim to personal theft at least three times, and violent crime at least once, in their lifetimes. Criminal homicide is now one of the 15 most frequent causes of death for all Americans, and second only to accidents for 15- to 34-year-olds. Half of all urban households will be burglarized two or more times during the next 20 years. For minorities and the poor, crime rates are considerably higher.

Crime against the elderly has emerged as a new area of concern for several reasons. One is that persons aged 65 and older will make up 13 percent of the Nation's population by the year 2000. A second factor is the need for more information on a recently emerging but still largely hidden problem: elder abuse.

In its research on victims of crime, the National Institute of Justice has recently studied changes in State practices since the enactment of the 1984 Victims of Crime Act. NIJ has investigated the incidence, cost, and consequences of criminal victimization, including all crimes in the National Crime Victimization Survey as well as murder, child abuse, kidnaping, bombing, arson, and drunk driving. NIJ research has also examined the relationship between delinquency and victimization in a secondary-school-aged population, focusing on factors that lead to or discourage delinquency.

Bias-motivated crimes in New York City and Baltimore County, Maryland, also have been studied, including the

nature and characteristics of such crimes compared with similar nonbias crimes. NIJ research has examined criminal justice responses to bias-motivated crimes in terms of special procedures used by police departments; the arrests, charging, adjudication, and sentencing in bias crimes compared with nonbias crimes; and the differences between victims of bias and nonbias crimes. Another category of research has assessed the use and credibility of child victims as witnesses in court.

Ongoing Programs for 1992

The Institute plans to continue efforts to understand better what measures can be taken to assist and restore victims' sense of wholeness, security, and justice—particularly minority or poor victims. In 1992, crimes against the elderly and assistance to elderly victims of crime are important subjects for research. NIJ has funded the following ongoing programs:

Reducing Fear Among the Elderly

NIJ, in partnership with the National Sheriffs' Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the American Association of Retired Persons, is providing support for TRIAD, a program to reduce criminal victimization and fear of crime among older persons. The program involves older persons in local law-enforcement-related crime prevention and victim assistance activities. NIJ support will result in a training and implementation manual, a sourcebook of crime prevention and victim assistance resources, and a video presentation.

Victims of Personal Criminal Fraud

This intramural program is developing the first comprehensive national estimates of such personal criminal frauds as telemarketing scams, credit card swindles, fake

Victims: Solicitations for 1992

Utilization of Victim Services by Minority and Low-Income Victims

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for research to determine the use of victim services by minority and low-income crime victims, investigate the reasons for any underutilization that is found, identify the special needs of these victims, and describe methods to better meet these needs.

Background

Those who live in minority and low-income neighborhoods become victims of crime more often than any other segment of this Nation's population. Yet, data from victims services programs¹ suggest that there may be a pattern of underutilization of victim compensation and victim assistance programs in low-income and minority communities.

Thus, there is a need to examine the participation of minority group and low-income victims in victim service programs; to investigate the factors that may explain any patterns of underutilization that are discovered; to understand the special needs of these victims; to specify changes in the design of victim service programs and their delivery that would increase use of these programs by minority and low-income victims as well as better meet their special needs; and to develop strategies to bring about the needed changes.

Goals

- To determine the utilization of victim services by minority and low-income crime victims.
- To investigate reasons for any underutilization that is found.
- To identify the special needs of low-income and minority victims of crime.
- To describe methods to better meet the needs of these victims.

Objectives

- Develop a research instrument to survey the patterns of use of victim services by minority and low-income crime victims compared to other crime victims, the reasons for any underutilization of victim services on the part of minority and low-income crime victims, and the special needs of minority and low-income crime victims.
- Conduct and analyze the results of a survey of victim service utilization, the factors influencing utilization patterns, and the special needs of minority and low-income victims.
- Determine (based on analysis of the results from the survey research, focus groups, and expert opinion) the changes in victim service program design and delivery that would result in better utilization of victim services and more appropriate response to the needs of minority and low-income crime victims.

Program Strategy

Develop a research instrument to survey the patterns of use of victim services by minority and low-income crime victims compared to other crime victims, the reasons for any underutilization of victim services on the part of minority and low-income crime victims, and the special needs of minority and low-income crime victims.

To accomplish this objective, the applicant should review and synthesize relevant research and program experiences. The proposal should demonstrate how the grantee will develop the issues to be explored in the survey through proper use of experts and focus group sessions. Appropriate planning activities might include: (1) convening a panel of experts in victim services, including representatives from minority and low-income populations, to explore the major dimensions of the problem; special attention would be given to the experience of experts and expert views concerning the needs of victims, their use of victim service programs and other resources to deal with their needs, and the victim programs and strategies that have been developed to service these victims; (2) conducting focus group sessions in minority and low-income communities that explore issues such as the victims' definitions of need, their awareness and assessment of available services, and the factors that promote or constrain the use of various resources including victims' programs; (3) discussions with the experts and the focus groups concerning problems in sampling and interviewing minority and low-income populations about victim services, and strategies for overcoming those problems.

The products of this objective will include a draft survey instrument that explores the issues raised by the expert panels and focus groups. This instrument will be reviewed by panels and focus groups that will include members not in the initial pool. The instrument will then be field-tested and any deficiencies revised as appropriate.

Conduct and analyze the results of a survey of victim service utilization, the factors influencing utilization patterns, and the special needs of minority and low-income victims.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee will conduct either a national survey or a multiple community survey. Particular attention will be given to sampling issues, given the target population of minority and low-income crime victims and the particular issues that this research is exploring; to obtaining appropriate control groups;

and to separating low-income effects from those attributed to minority status. The proposal should outline a research management plan and schedule.

The grantee will conduct a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the survey data. The proposal should describe a plan for data analysis to follow the data collection phase of the research.

The products of this objective will include the survey instrument, results from the survey, tabulations of the data, machine-readable data set, and a code book, as well as a description of the statistical methodology and an analysis of the results and findings.

Determine (based on analysis of the results from the survey research, focus groups, and expert opinion) the changes in victim service program design and delivery that would result in better utilization of victim services and more appropriate response to the needs of minority and low-income crime victims.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee will distill and synthesize the products from the earlier stages of the research, review the findings with OVC, and prepare recommendations for improving the types and the delivery of victim services to minority and low-income victims. A draft of the recommendations will be given to the various expert panels and focus groups for review and comment. Revisions as appropriate will be incorporated.

The product from this objective will be a final report for publication by the National Institute of Justice that will address both policy issues and program procedures and practices relating to identifying and serving the needs of minority and low-income victims of crime.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals

of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Special Requirements. Applicants will be expected to augment their own staff resources as necessary to provide necessary expertise in victimization surveys, conducting of focus groups, and minority or low-income populations.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum of 24 months.

Award Amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$150,000 to \$250,000. It is anticipated this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Utilization of Victim Services
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To

obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Richard Titus, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact him at 202-307-0695.

References

1. Unpublished data furnished by Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) compensation and assistance grantees, and subgrantees to the Office for Victims of Crime (OVC).

Crimes Against the Elderly

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for original research that advances our understanding of serious crimes against the elderly, including estimates of the prevalence of elder victimization, attitudes among the elderly about crime and victimization, and availability of programs to prevent victimization and assist elderly victims of crime.

Background

Victimization of the elderly is an NIJ priority for several reasons: (1) the growing percentage of elderly in the population; (2) the need to update and fill the gaps in victimization data related to serious crimes against the elderly; and (3) the need to discover and document innovative law enforcement, crime prevention, and victim service programs for the elderly.

Data sources for estimating the prevalence and describing the nature of serious crimes against the elderly are partial, scattered, and not easily obtained. Neither the Uniform Crime Reports nor the National Crime Victimization Survey, for example, collects data on individual-

or household-level criminal fraud. Similarly, while there is much public concern about elder abuse and neglect, and while some studies have attempted to define and estimate the extent of such abuse, it is believed that this crime is substantially underreported and undetected.

Thus, there is no clear and up-to-date picture of the nature and extent of elderly victimization from serious crimes, law enforcement efforts to combat it, or existing services to remedy it, as a basis for developing more effective programs.

This solicitation seeks proposals for original research projects that will employ formal research designs to develop and test hypotheses about victimization of the elderly as a result of serious crimes. The proposal should formulate research questions and issues based on a critical review of the literature.

The research will include: (1) an updating of information on the prevalence of elder victimization as a result of a variety of serious crimes, as well as the extent to which the elderly know about and/or fear being victimized by such crimes; and (2) an examination of innovative law enforcement programs to prevent and control these crimes, as well as services and programs to inform, involve, and/or treat elderly victims of those crimes. The investigation into crime control, prevention, and treatment will be limited to a specific serious crime or group of crimes that the elderly are particularly vulnerable to or that they fear, as shown by the prevalence and attitude data. The applicant will be responsible for selecting, proposing, and justifying this choice.

Goals

- To understand the extent and nature of serious crimes against the elderly, as well as what the elderly perceive and fear about serious crimes.
- To learn what crime prevention and victim service programs are effective in informing, involving, protecting, and treating the elderly in relation to one or more serious crimes to which they are particularly vulnerable.

- To examine how law enforcement can be more effective in discovering and prosecuting cases of the specified serious crime(s).

- To communicate the results of the studies undertaken and to use them as a basis for developing more effective crime prevention programs and strategies for dealing with crimes against the elderly, as well as for planning further research and demonstrations relating to elderly victimization.

Objectives

- Document and estimate the nature and prevalence of serious crimes against the elderly.

- Document and estimate the kinds of information and levels of fear that the elderly have about serious crimes committed against them.

- Identify and examine current programs and practices to prevent victimization and treat the consequences of one or more serious crimes that the elderly are particularly vulnerable to, and document their effectiveness.

- Identify and examine innovative law enforcement strategies for discovering and prosecuting cases of the specified serious crime(s) against the elderly.

- Develop a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on the study's findings, including implications for current policies and practices and recommendations for improving crime prevention, victim assistance, and crime control programs that could be the subject of further research and demonstration.

Program Strategy

Document and estimate the nature and prevalence of serious crimes against the elderly.

The applicant should propose appropriate methods for determining the nature and prevalence of serious crimes against the elderly. The applicant should specify key

terms, including: (1) serious crimes, whether violent (distinguishing between assault, robbery, and rape on the one hand, and elder abuse and neglect on the other) or property (including various forms of fraud); and (2) distinct segments of the elderly population whose differential characteristics place them at risk of victimization by different types of serious crime. Based on a thorough review of the literature, the applicant should identify and develop strategies for maximizing access to key data sources for the crime(s) being studied. For example, the applicant may propose an analysis of the National Crime Victimization Survey. The applicant should also, when appropriate, specify data collection instruments and develop data analysis plans. A schedule of tasks and an implementation plan for these activities should be included in the proposal.

The products of this objective will include data collection instruments, a data tape, and a draft report that discusses preliminary findings.

Document and estimate the kinds of information and levels of fear that the elderly have about serious crimes committed against them.

Earlier studies revealed clearly that the elderly expressed a fear of crime and victimization by strangers in excess of actual victimization rates. This level of fear inhibited their freedom of movement and thus aggravated the impact of crime on them. Research into current victimization data, whether updated for violent crimes or extended to previously unreported crimes such as fraud and/or elder abuse, should reflect this dual focus: namely, that the actual rate of victimization may be less than the perceived risk among the elderly.

Applicants should specify how the relationship between those elements (prevalence and fear/knowledge) will be examined and what steps will be taken to draw valid comparisons between them.

This entails addressing such questions as: What is currently known about fear and/or awareness of various kinds of serious crime among the elderly? Are available data about levels of fear and/or awareness compatible

with other data sources concerning the prevalence of those crimes among the elderly?

Identify and examine current programs and practices to prevent victimization and treat the consequences of one or more serious crimes that the elderly are particularly vulnerable to; and examine their effectiveness.

The most important focus of this solicitation is to identify and examine current practices to prevent and respond to a specific crime or group of crimes to which the elderly are shown to be particularly vulnerable, as selected and justified by the applicant. Based on a review of empirical research and an assessment of current programs, the applicant should design a study that will provide crime prevention and victim assistance agencies with information about effective strategies against the crime(s) selected.

The applicant should identify a strategy to survey a sample of programs aimed at preventing victimization and/or providing remedial services to victims. A sampling strategy, an outline of data collection instruments, and a data analysis plan should be submitted as part of the proposal. The goal is to: (1) identify programs that are most frequently used and/or contributed to by the elderly; (2) discuss the role that the elderly themselves play in program success; and (3) describe innovative models that promise special effectiveness.

The applicant should specify a method for determining information sources that will be canvassed. Such sources will include: (1) national organizations concerned about crime prevention, victim assistance, and/or the elderly; and (2) State, local, or Federal government units in which a variety of agencies (criminal justice, health, regulatory) are working together to gather information and coordinate programs related to prevention of the selected crime(s).

In examining crime prevention and victim service programs related to the selected crime(s), the applicant should demonstrate an understanding of the elderly as a diverse group with a variety of attitudes, concerns, and needs that may relate to crime prevention programs.

The products of this objective include a review and assessment of existing crime prevention and victim services programs, including lessons learned from particularly effective programs.

Identify and examine innovative law enforcement strategies for discovering and prosecuting cases of the specified serious crime(s) against the elderly.

NIJ also is interested in current crime control practices aimed at the serious crime(s) selected and justified by the applicant. The applicant should identify a strategy to survey a sample of law enforcement agencies at all levels of government for the purpose of discovering innovative ways of overcoming the various obstacles (shame, fear, lack of interagency coordination, etc.) that contribute to the underreporting of the crime(s) and hinder the gathering of evidence and the prosecution of offenders.

As with the previous objective, a sampling strategy, an outline of data collection instruments, and a data analysis plan should be submitted as part of the proposal.

The products of this objective will include a review of existing research and identification and description of innovative crime control programs.

Develop a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on the study's findings, including implications for current policies and practices and recommendations for improving crime prevention, victim assistance, and crime control programs that could be the subject of further research and demonstration.

The grantee is expected to produce a report that thoroughly discusses all aspects of the project—the problem and related research; methodology; findings; and recommendations for further research, development, and demonstrations.

The Program Strategy outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a

project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See Page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding for this topic has been tentatively set at \$150,000 to \$250,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one to two awards. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Crimes Against the Elderly
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to John Thomas, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-514-6206.

Victims: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research program, including both basic and applied approaches, that involves a large majority of the criminal justice research and professional communities. NIJ conducts annual evaluations of promising criminal justice programs, conducts demonstration projects, assesses the usefulness and effectiveness of advances in technology, and conducts training programs.

NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies including case studies, structured observation, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative research proposals that would bring thinking and research from a variety of disciplines to the study of crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest might include, but are not limited to, the following:

■ **Assistance for Crime Victims.** If crime continues to increase at its current rate, nearly every citizen in this country will fall victim to personal theft or violent crime—at least once—during his or her lifetime. Research is needed to assess the consequences of criminal victimization, to determine the types of services crime victims need, and to determine how victim services agencies can more effectively provide those services.

■ **Victims and the Criminal Justice System.** All too often criminals escape punishment because their victims, or others who witnessed their crimes, choose not to identify them or assist in their prosecution. Research is needed both on factors that encourage or constrain victims and witnesses from becoming involved in the criminal justice system, and on steps that

can be taken to increase their involvement in, and/or cooperation with, the criminal justice system.

■ **Causes of Victimization.** Criminals usually select specific types of people and properties as targets for violent acts, personal theft, or burglaries. Research is needed on why particular individuals and households become crime victims, the factors that encourage victimization, and steps that can be taken to reduce or prevent it.

■ **Household Burglary.** Why are some homes in a neighborhood more likely targets for burglary than others? Research is needed on the factors that lead to household burglaries and measures that can effectively prevent those crimes.

Applicants uncertain about whether a project idea falls within the program's scope should consult the Program Manager.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Victims: Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Richard M. Titus, Program Manager, at the noted address, or telephone him at 202-307-0695.

Community Policing and Police Effectiveness

Performance Measurement for Community
Policing

Policing in Rural Areas

Community Policing and Police Effectiveness:
Priority Topics

OJP Policy Statement — *The criminal justice system should assume a primary role in mobilizing communities to develop comprehensive strategies for combating gang violence and preventing illegal drug trafficking. Alliances between community residents and the police are essential for making neighborhoods safe and drug free. Through comprehensive and coordinated activities, police and community leaders, school officials, youth service providers, and church, business, and civic leaders can work together in partnership to "take back the streets." The Office of Justice Program's (OJP's) community policing and police effectiveness activities emphasize the importance of the police and the communities working together in a relationship of trust, cooperation, and partnership to promote safety and security and to rid neighborhoods of thugs and drug pushers.*

OJP will focus on demonstration projects that involve promising approaches such as mini police stations, directed patrols, and police-neighborhood ombudsmen. Community prevention and intervention efforts will be concentrated in public housing complexes, drug-free school zones, recreational parks, alternative education programs, and community centers threatened by drug-related crime and illegal gang activity. This rapidly developing approach to better control crime addresses the need to prevent crime and to respond effectively to crime when it occurs.

Community Policing and Police Effectiveness

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) Community Policing and Police Effectiveness program assists law enforcement and policymakers through research, demonstrations, and experiments that test crime prevention and reduction methods and through the publication of reports on what works and why.

During the next 5 years, this research program will provide information to guide the development and implementation of innovative public safety programs. NIJ will focus its research efforts on community policing, police use of excessive force, rural law enforcement, and drug market analysis.

Community Policing. The community policing approach stresses the importance of a police-citizen partnership in the control of crime and the maintenance of order.

As a result of problems in the 1960's and 1970's, the outlines of a new direction for police, known as "community policing," began to emerge in the early 1980's. Advocates of community policing regard the approach as useful because: (1) officers are freed to engage more directly in proactive *crime prevention*;¹ (2) operations are more visible to the public, increasing police accountability to the *public*;² (3) operations are *decentralized* to meet the needs of various neighborhoods and constituencies;³ citizens become *partners to police*, improving relations between the police and the public; and (4) citizens are encouraged to take *more initiative in preventing and solving crimes*.

Evidence from NIJ field experiments in Houston, Newark,⁴ and Baltimore⁵ tested the theory that closer ties between the police and the citizens of the community, especially in the form of door-to-door contact and foot patrols, raise levels of citizen satisfaction with police

services and quality of community life and lower their levels of fear of crime. In addition, the "problem-oriented" community policing approach⁶ has been tried in several law enforcement programs to control drug trafficking.

In fiscal year 1991, NIJ designed and implemented grants for eight organizations and two Visiting Fellows to examine various facets of community policing. In addition, NIJ is assisting in the implementation and impact evaluations of Bureau of Justice Assistance-funded neighborhood policing projects at 12 sites.

In fiscal years 1992 and 1993, the Institute will build on these efforts by supporting implementation, technical assistance, and training in community policing.

Use of Force by Police. Violence between the police and the public is a critical concern for policymakers, law enforcement officials, community leaders, and the public. Recently, national attention on police use of excessive force has intensified. In several U.S. cities, incidents of alleged police violence have been followed by public demands for more control over police.

Use of force raises complex issues. The establishment and implementation of legal and professional guidelines is challenging to policymakers and administrators. Unfortunately, relatively little is known about this topic, as few researchers have looked systematically at forms of force other than shootings and killings.⁷

To build knowledge about the problem of use of excessive force, NIJ is planning a major initiative. The first step is a national study of the nature and extent of the problem and a review of what is being done about it. Two studies are examining the incidence of excessive force and whether the presence or absence of training programs and internal procedures to deter police misuse of force are effective in doing so. These studies will

determine the nature, extent, and best means of control of the use of force in the Nation's police departments.

The Police Foundation and the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP) will: (1) conduct a national survey of law enforcement agencies to estimate the number, types, trends, and characteristics of police use of excessive force and develop empirical indicators of such force; (2) determine the nature and types of selection procedures, training programs, and internal and administrative controls used by police agencies to restrain the use of force; and (3) define the relationship between these practices and the use of excessive force.

The Police Executive Research Forum, through a separate grant, will produce a report based on a critical review of prior research, on unpublished internal police department studies of use of force problems, and on focus group interviews with representatives of groups concerned about police use of force.

Violence by the police can be related to violence against the police. Though the actual number of officers killed and assaulted has declined in recent years, the rate of violence against the police is alarming and certainly much greater than the violence that occurs within the general population.⁸ Based on previous research and upon public policy analyses of police safety, NIJ has initiated research projects to help prevent and reduce police homicides.

Rural Law Enforcement. Knowledge about crime, disorder, and law enforcement in rural America is limited to impressions from the media and anecdotal accounts from the field. Systematic investigation of the extent, nature, and characteristics of rural crime and disorder and the response of the criminal justice system to it has not been undertaken for a number of years.

In fiscal year 1992, a national needs assessment of the current status of rural law enforcement capabilities will be conducted by NIJ. Although national law enforcement surveys have been conducted in the past, they have overlooked the unique nature of rural law enforcement. Past assessments focused primarily on the large urban

law enforcement agencies. NIJ will conduct an analysis of needs for rural agencies. NIJ research seeks to elicit critical information regarding technical capabilities, education, training, salaries, investigative capabilities, and the status of criminal justice resource sharing in rural areas. Future NIJ research will examine the problems of clandestine laboratories, environmental crimes, drug and alcohol abuse, and family violence as they relate to rural law enforcement.

Drug Market Analysis. The purpose of the Drug Market Analysis program is to computerize law enforcement information, particularly location-specific knowledge regarding street-level drug trafficking, its enforcement, and associated crime. By integrating existing data sources and using computer-generated maps, police agencies will be able to identify drug trafficking patterns throughout their cities. The program also involves the collection, sharing, and analysis of pertinent data on a real-time basis and their use by various police units. Perhaps most important is how the computerized information system may be employed to evaluate drug enforcement strategies.

Police departments in Hartford, Jersey City, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, and San Diego were selected as the grantees to establish the computer information system. Through subcontracts, researchers are evaluating drug enforcement strategies used by these departments. Experiments, quasi-experiments, and case studies are used to measure the effectiveness of the strategies.

Ongoing Programs for 1992

The research program builds on past research and on recently identified problems and issues important to community policing and police effectiveness. Areas of particular interest in the current year include performance measures of community policing and rural law enforcement.

Community Policing: Training and Technical Assistance

The International Association of Chiefs of Police will assist in planning the direction that future training in community policing should take. IACP will develop an outline for curricula and design general training modules for recruits and inservice officers. In addition, it will offer technical assistance to agencies to integrate these curricula and modules into the departments.

Transferring the Community-Oriented Policing Approach

NIJ will continue to provide a series of training workshops to city managers and other municipal chief executives. Currently, four workshops are planned for 1992. A community policing newsletter will be disseminated to the International City Management Association's 7,500 members, and two case studies focusing on the role of the city manager in community policing will be developed.

Community Policing: Learning from Implementation

The Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government will assist NIJ in the development and implementation of community policing. Through a partnership with the Police Foundation, Police Executive Research Forum, International Association of Chiefs of Police, and Michigan State University, the Kennedy School will develop a thorough plan for research, technical assistance, and training within police departments. These organizations and NIJ will guide police in the implementation of community policing. Core elements of community policing and preliminary training guides and curricula will be developed.

Community Policing: Selection and Training of Patrol Officers

Michigan State University National Center for Community Policing will engage in a research project designed to develop selection and training criteria for police

departments. The Center will examine characteristics of the patrol officer in community policing and provide job descriptions, performance measures, and supervisory guidelines for police.

Police Killings: A Comprehensive Analysis

The Police Foundation will describe the circumstances surrounding police homicides in the United States and analyze their causes in the expectation that deeper understanding of this subject can help to prevent and reduce police homicides. This will be accomplished by conducting: (1) a literature review on police killings and assaults; (2) an indepth analysis of incident reports submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI's) Uniform Crime Report on police killings; (3) case studies of five police departments; and (4) a survey of law enforcement agencies regarding the prevention of police deaths by soft body armor. Results of this study will provide information to law enforcement concerning methods to further reduce and prevent police homicides.

An FBI project will complement the Police Foundation study. In partnership with NIJ, the FBI will conduct an indepth study of the circumstances surrounding the serious assaults of police officers. Both victims and offenders will be interviewed as part of this effort.

New Solicitations for 1992

Solicitations for performance measures and rural law enforcement appear below. In addition, a concluding solicitation identifies other areas of interest and encourages proposals on other useful projects within the general area of community policing and police effectiveness.

References

1. Jerome Skolnick and David H. Bayley, "Theme and variation in community policing," *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, ed. Michael Tonry and Norval Morris, Chicago, University of Chicago, 1988.

2. George Kelling, Robert Wasserman, and Hubert Williams, "Police accountability and community policing," *Perspectives on Policing* No.7, Harvard University and National Institute of Justice, 1988.
3. Skolnick and Bayley, note 1 above, pp. 13-15.
4. George Kelling, Antony M. Pate, Amy Ferrara, Mary Utne, and Charles E. Brown, *The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment*, Washington, D.C., Police Foundation, 1981; Antony M. Pate, Mary Ann Wycoff, Wesley G. Skogan, and Lawrence W. Sherman, *Reducing Fear of Crime in Houston and Newark*, Washington, D.C., Police Foundation, 1986.
5. Antony M. Pate and Sampson Annan, *The Baltimore Community Policing Experiment*, Washington, D.C., Police Foundation, 1989.
6. William Spelman and John E. Eck, "Problem-oriented policing," *Research in Brief*, National Institute of Justice, January 1987.
7. D.H. Bayley and E. Bittner, "Learning the skills of policing," in *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings*, ed. R.G. Dunham and G.P. Alpert, Prospect Heights, Illinois, Waveland Press, 1989.
8. C.D. Uchida and L.W. Brooks, "Violence against the police in Baltimore County, 1984-1986," unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland, 1988.

Community Policing and Police Effectiveness: Solicitations for 1992

Performance Measurement for Community Policing

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for original research that develops and implements a system of performance measurement suitable for use by police departments engaged in community policing.

Background

Many police departments introduced community policing in the 1980's. Community policing calls for changes in the structure and practice of American police forces, not the least of which is change in the measurement of the department's performance. For many years, police departments relied upon data generated for the Uniform Crime Reports to assess departmental performance: counts of crime, arrest reports, and clearance rates. Most also paid close attention to response times to calls for service. The limitations of these measures are widely known among police and researchers, and it is recognized that alternative measures of department performance should be developed, particularly alternatives that are compatible with the demands of departments engaged in community policing.

Precisely what such a performance measurement system should entail is not clear, due in part to the lack of consensus about what constitutes community policing and to the variety of forms it now takes. Within this diversity, two basic elements have emerged from the proposals and implementation of community policing

programs: (1) establish strong links between police and communities, and coordinate police with other services affecting neighborhood quality of life; and (2) develop the capacity of departments and operating units to identify, analyze, and respond to community problems in systematic ways.

These two elements have several implications for performance measurement:¹ (1) police performance is defined to include positive changes in the quality of life in the community as well as crime control and law enforcement; (2) direct community participation in identifying measures of police performance; (3) greater police accountability to citizens, their government representatives, and stakeholder groups through dissemination of the results of performance evaluations; (4) greater police capacity to conduct research and planning, to identify and deal with community problems, and to evaluate the agency's response; (5) greater flexibility in generating information essential to evaluating performance; (6) development of a system that serves users at all levels within the department, an essential element of a decentralized community problem-solving process; and (7) greater organizational commitment to use performance evaluations to develop and change police department policies and practices.

Choosing Measures of Police Performance. Community policing is results-oriented, which means that measures of performance must include *outcomes*, not just inputs and activities.² Additionally, a major challenge in performance measurement is to select measures that cover the full range of performance dimensions: effectiveness, efficiency, equity, and accountability.³ Finally, performance measures need to address both strategic and tactical police objectives.⁴

Assessing Validity and Reliability of Performance Measures. A top priority is the validation of performance measures. For example, does a decline in calls for service reflect an actual reduction in the occurrence of "crimes" or other problems, or does it only reflect changes in the expectations of citizens toward police performance? Fear of crime measures are another

example.⁵ Reductions in citizens' fear of crime have not been validated as a measure of the achievement of department goals.

Data Deficiencies. Police collect considerable information that can be useful in performance evaluation. However, key pieces of data are often not in machine-readable form, or they cannot be easily linked to other pieces of data. Perhaps most importantly, data must be collected and processed on a timely basis, a particularly telling challenge for most police departments who wish to engage in problem-oriented policing. That style of policing generates considerable demand for information at all levels in the department—especially at the street level.

Research Design. Reviews of the research on community policing performance provide contradictory information.⁶ The early evaluation of Newark's foot patrol experiment concentrated on impacts (victimization and fear of crime), but did not monitor the activities of the foot patrol officers. Consequently, it was difficult to explain why foot patrol showed no effect on victimization, but appeared to reduce fear of crime. This suggests that police performance measurement systems need to *monitor program implementation* as well as program effects. Research designs for assessing impacts must often strike a balance among technical rigor, costs, deadlines, and legal limitations.

Policy Challenges. Two policy problems confront police agencies committed to performance measurement of community policing: (1) how to involve the community in setting up the system, and (2) how to use the results. These policy problems are often overlooked by police agencies and researchers. They are, however, important because they assist in increasing department accountability to the community.

Goals

- To develop and implement a prototype performance measurement system for a police department engaged in community policing.

- To document the prototype performance measurement system and disseminate lessons learned from its development and implementation.

Objectives

- Work closely with a qualified research team to develop a prototype performance measurement system.

- Implement the prototype performance measurement system with the assistance of the research team.

- Document the planning and implementation of the performance measurement system with the assistance of the research team.

- Formulate lessons learned from the prototype experience, recommend future refinements of the system, draw implications for its applicability to other departments with the assistance of the research team, and summarize these in a report for publication by NIJ.

Program Strategy

Work closely with a qualified research team to develop a prototype performance measurement system.

The grantee will be a local police agency that is currently engaged in community policing. The goals and objectives of the grantee's community policing program and the organizational structures, policies, and practices that constitute its approach to community policing should be clearly described in the proposal. Although the grantee may be in the process of developing additional features of the program, the proposal should provide evidence that the department has already made substantial progress in implementing key elements of its community policing plan.

The grantee must work closely with one or more researchers with special expertise in performance measurement, performance evaluation, and community policing (hereafter called the research team). The research team should be a subcontractor to the grantee;

the grantee will have overall responsibility for the project. The applicant's proposal should identify the key members of the research team, document their qualifications, and detail the team's responsibilities. In addition, the proposal should clearly describe what resources and which personnel of the department will work with the research team.

The proposal should describe the major features of a performance measurement system that fulfill community policing needs. It should identify the tasks and challenges in developing the performance measurement system and indicate the methods planned to address them. The proposal should address the five issues raised in the background section of this solicitation: choosing measures of police performance, assessing the validity and reliability of performance measure, data problems, research design problems, and policy challenges. Other issues may be addressed as appropriate.

The product resulting from this objective will be an interim report that describes the performance measurement system, the methods used to develop and validate it, and preliminary forms, software, and instructions. This report will be submitted to NIJ before the department proceeds with the implementation of the system.

Implement the prototype performance measurement system with the assistance of the research team.

By the project's 18th month the grantee should have implemented the performance measurement system. This will allow a few months to document the system's operation (see below). The scope of implementation should be configured to the organizational units, programs, and activities that constitute the department's community policing program. The research team's role in the implementation process should be clearly defined in the proposal.

Document the planning and implementation of the performance measurement system with the assistance of the research team.

The grantee must ensure that the process by which the performance measurement system is developed, the system itself, and its implementation are documented in detail. This documentation will become part of the final report to NIJ. The grantee will also submit to NIJ any software, forms, instructions, or other materials that are part of the performance measurement system. Samples of data analyses that illustrate the potential applications of the performance measurement system for supporting and evaluating community policing efforts should be included in the report.

Formulate lessons learned from the prototype experience, recommend future refinements of the system, draw implications for its applicability to other departments with the assistance of the research team, and summarize these in a report for publication by NIJ.

The final report, which may be published by NIJ, should include a discussion of lessons learned by the grantee concerning the development and implementation of their performance measurement system. Any anticipated refinements to the system should be described. How and in what ways the system can be adapted for use by other departments should be discussed, indicating the types of departments or programs for which this system is best suited. The final report should also indicate the implications of this system for the development of a compatible employee performance appraisal system.

The proposal should include a statement of the applicant's willingness to cooperate with a followup assessment of the department's use of the performance measurement system should NIJ decide to undertake it. This assessment would be performed under a separate agreement with an independent researcher not involved in this project.

It is expected that appropriate summary reports and briefs will be prepared for research and policy audiences. Applicants should describe and provide a rationale for each proposed product to be prepared. Actual summary products will be determined prior to the award of a grant or cooperative agreement.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of this project. Funding for this project has been tentatively set for up to \$350,000 per site; multiple awards may be considered. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Performance Measurement for Community Policing
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data

availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Craig D. Uchida, Director, Evaluation Division, at the above address, or contact him at 202-307-2959.

References

1. Herman Goldstein, *Problem-Oriented Policing*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1990.
2. H. Goldstein, note 1 above, p. 35.
3. S. Mastrofski and R. Wadman, "Personnel and agency performance appraisal," *Local Government Police Management*, ed. W.A. Geller, Washington, D.C., International City Management Association, 1991.
4. D. H. Bayley and E. Bittner, "Learning the skills of policing," in *Critical Issues in Policing: Contemporary Readings*, ed. R.G. Dunham and G. P. Alpert, Prospect Heights, Illinois, Waveland Press, 1989; Mastrofski and Wadman, note 3 above.
5. M.H. Moore and D.W. Stephens, 1991. "Organization and management," in *Local Government Police Management*, W.A. Geller, ed., Washington, D.C., International City Management Association, 1991.
6. D.P. Rosenbaum, *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?*, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1986; J.R. Greene and R.B. Taylor, "Community-based policing and foot patrol: Issues of theory and evaluation," in *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*, ed. J.R. Greene and S.D. Mastrofski, New York: Praeger, 1988; W.G. Skogan, *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*, New York: The Free Press, 1990.

Policing In Rural Areas

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a national assessment to provide information about the current organization and management of rural police agencies and their crime and public safety problems.

Background

Research on rural police is scant compared to that conducted on their urban counterparts.¹ Three important questions need attention: (1) what is the nature of the public safety problems confronting rural police; (2) how are police forces organized to handle rural arrests, and what are their resources and management capabilities; and (3) what is the nature of community resources available to assist police in rural communities, and what challenges confront effective mobilization of those resources?

Rural Crime and Disorder. Rural crime rates, as measured by the Uniform Crime Reports, are generally lower than in urban and metropolitan areas, but they appear to be growing at a rapid rate.² Policy makers need to know in what way, if any, patterns of crime in rural areas differ from those of urban areas. There is considerable variability in rural crime patterns, depending upon their geographical location, economic position, and demographic features. Crime and victimization rates from the Uniform Crime Reports and the National Crime Victimization Survey may be useful in identifying some of the patterns that distinguish rural from urban areas and rural areas from each other.

There is also a need to learn a great deal more about the particulars of rural crime. Do domestic violence and other nonstranger crimes committed in rural areas differ significantly in how they are done and to whom when compared to those in urban areas? What role do alcohol and other drugs play in a variety of offenses? What are the special features of property crime associated with

various rural industries, businesses, and residences? Answers to these questions may come from more focused, regional, or localized studies of particular types of crime.

The Police Who Serve Rural America. There are reports of considerable variation in the organization and delivery of police services to rural America. There are small town (and even only part-time) local police forces, sheriffs' offices, consolidated county police forces, State police and highway patrol departments, park and wild-life enforcement offices, and sundry special function police forces. To complicate matters, there is often jurisdictional overlap among police forces. A small town may rely upon its own force for routine patrol services part of the day and on the sheriff, State police, or nearby town for the remainder of the day. The size and structure of police forces serving rural areas varies greatly as well. Some communities may be served by their own small force, while others rely upon a large, centralized force, such as the State police, county sheriff, or metropolitan district police.

All this variation means that it is difficult to generalize about the needs of rural police. The resources available to them—the nature and number of their personnel and the processes of external accountability and internal command and control—all may configure very differently for rural law enforcement agencies located in the same county.

Given this diversity, a number of questions arise about the needs of rural law enforcement. Are rural police agencies better or worse off in the ratio of sworn and civilian personnel to workload compared to police in urban areas? How do rural police compare to urban police in equipment and physical facilities necessary to do their work? How about education and training? Are rural police more knowledgeable than urban police about the people they serve?

Another set of police organization issues concerns police practices in rural areas. The differences between urban and rural areas and the crime and disorder problems characteristic of each should produce distinctly

different styles of police work. How are these different styles reflected in the enforcement, order maintenance, and service-oriented aspects of police work in rural areas compared to urban areas? For example, some data suggest that rural police are more proactive than their urban counterparts, perhaps because the rural calls-for-service workload is lighter relative to police personnel.³ Presumably there should also be much greater variation in styles of policing among rural departments.

A final concern about policing in rural areas is the outcome of their activities. Virtually all of the major evaluations of police tactics and strategies in the last 25 years have been conducted in urban police departments. Unfortunately, we know little of the nature or success of efforts undertaken by rural police forces. There has been no report stating how these findings apply in rural areas. In addition, we do not know whether citizens in rural areas are more or less pleased with the service they receive than their urban counterparts, and why. For instance, if differences are observed, are they due to differences in performance expectations or to differences in police practices?

Rural Communities. The successful conduct of police work is heavily dependent upon the public.⁴ Police rely on the public to learn about crime and disorders, to devise short-term reactions to those situations, and to develop and prosecute criminal cases. Whether rural police depend more on the public for their work than do urban police is not at all clear from the few studies available.⁵

Community policing advocates urge police to work more closely with the *public* to accomplish much more than the police alone can bring to bear.⁶ There is often a presumption that rural areas have stronger informal social control, and there is some evidence in support of this view.⁷ Yet, there are a number of forces at work in rural areas that may be weakening their influence, such as the increasing instability of rural residential populations and the influence of mass culture. In addition, it is not at all clear that the kinds of community-oriented programs that have been designed for urban neighborhoods⁸ are appropriate for rural societies.⁹ Rural partici-

pation in such programs does not appear to be very high.¹⁰

We need more knowledge about how the social organization of rural society presents challenges and opportunities for police. It is undoubtedly a mistake to assume that rural areas are all alike in this regard, so it is important to capture their variation.

Goals

- To provide an overview of the current structure and operations of policing in rural America.
- To identify the needs of rural police.
- To outline an agenda for research and development for the policing of rural America.

Objectives

- Review and synthesize the existing research literature on police agencies in rural areas, their communities, and their public safety problems.
- Use existing data sets to conduct an analysis of the needs, challenges, and opportunities of police agencies in rural communities and of the nature of their communities.
- Present an agenda for policy development, research, and evaluation for policing rural areas.

Program Strategy

Review and synthesize the existing research literature on police agencies in rural areas, their communities, and their public safety problems.

Studies relevant to police agencies in rural areas, their communities, and public safety appear to be dispersed across a number of disciplines: criminal justice and criminology, political science, rural sociology and economics, and sociology. In addition, there is relevant literature from practitioner communities: the police,

agricultural extension, and rural development agencies. The grantee should conduct a review of these and other relevant literatures to establish what is known about the status of rural policing in America and the needs of police in these communities. The review should summarize findings, note and attempt to account for conflicting results, take into account the methodological strengths and limitations of the studies, and identify issues requiring further investigation.

A preliminary (interim) report of this literature review should be submitted to NIJ by the end of the sixth month of the project. By the end of the ninth month, a summary of this report should be submitted. It should be approximately 2,500 words, written to be accessible to policy officials and practitioners, and suitable for possible publication as an NIJ *Research in Brief*.

Use existing data sets to conduct an analysis of the needs, challenges, and opportunities of police agencies for rural communities and of the nature of their communities.

A number of data sets are currently available that can be examined to address rural policing issues. At the national level these include the Uniform Crime Reports, the National Crime Victimization Survey, Employment and Expenditure data, the National Assessment Program Survey, and the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics.¹¹ The proposal should indicate how these and any other relevant nationwide data sets would be used: what topics can be explored with them, how data sets might be merged for analysis, and methods of analysis.

The grantee is expected to identify and use regional, State, and local data sets relevant to rural policing issues as well. These data sets should be used to develop indepth knowledge of a particular issue that cannot be addressed adequately in the nationwide data sets. A task of this strategy is to identify and obtain such data sets, so the proposal should indicate current knowledge and availability of such data sets and the methods to be used to identify and obtain additional data. The proposal

should indicate what topics can be explored and which methods of analysis should be used.

The results of the data analysis will be presented in the final report to the National Institute of Justice. In addition, one or more summaries of the findings should be submitted with the final report. The number of summaries will depend upon the range of topic areas and data sets covered by the analysis and will be determined by mutual agreement between NIJ and the grantee. Data tapes and their documentation should be submitted with the final report.

Present an agenda for policy development, research, and evaluation for policing rural areas.

It is very important that this research provide information relevant to policy development and implementation. To assist in accomplishing this task, the grantee should form an advisory team of practitioners and policymakers with expertise on policing in rural communities and on crime and public safety problems. This advisory team should meet one or more times to respond to the research objectives of the grantee and assist the grantee in identifying policy issues for the agenda. The applicant's budget should include the cost of this advisory team's honoraria and travel.

The final report should include a section that discusses the implications of the literature review and secondary data analysis for policies that would advance policing of rural areas. The report should identify areas requiring additional research and evaluation. The report should offer suggestions on specific topic areas and research/evaluation methodology. A summary of this section should be submitted with the final report.

It is expected that appropriate summary reports and briefs will be prepared for possible NIJ publication and distribution to research and policy audiences. Applicants should describe and provide a rationale for each proposed product to be prepared. Actual summary products will be determined prior to the award of a grant or cooperative agreement.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of this project. Funding for this project has been set at \$250,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Policing in Rural Areas
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data avail-

ability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Ms. Marilyn C. Moses, M.S., Program Manager, at the above address, or contact her at 202-514-6205.

References

1. T.J. Carter, G.H. Phillips, J.F. Donnermeyer, and T.N. Wurschmidt, eds., *Rural Crime—Integrating and Prevention*, second edition, Stoneham, Massachusetts, Butterworth-Heinemann, 1982.
2. G.H. Phillips, J.F. Donnermeyer, and T.N. Wurschmidt, "Crime and its prevention," in *Rural Society in the U.S.: Issues for the 1980's*, ed. D.A. Dillman and D.J. Hobbs, Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press, 1982: 234-243.
3. C.J. Murphy, *The Social and Formal Organization of Small Town Policing: A Comparative Analysis of R.C.M.P and Municipal Policing*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1986.
4. A.J. Reiss, Jr., *The Police and the Public*, New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University Press, 1971.
5. L.J. Beaulieu and A.E. Luloff, "Crime reporting patterns among nonmetropolitan residents: Strategies for action," *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 18, 2 (1987): 81-97; J.H. Laub, "Ecological considerations in victim reporting to the police," *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 9, 6 (1981): 419-430; B.L. Smith, "Criminal victimization in rural areas," in *Criminal Justice Research: New Models and Findings*, ed. B.L. Price and P.J. Baunach, Beverly Hills, California, Sage Research Progress Series in Criminology, 16(1980): 36-54.
6. J.Q. Wilson and G.L. Kelling, "The police and neighborhood safety: Broken windows," *Atlantic Monthly*, March 1982, pp. 29-38; J.H. Skolnick and D.H. Bayley, *The New Blue Line: Police Innovation in Six American Cities*, New York, The Free Press, 1986.

7. K.P. Wilkinson, "Rurality and patterns of social disruption," *Rural Sociology* 49 (Spring 1984): 23-36.

8. D.P. Rosenbaum, *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?* Beverly Hills, California, Sage Publications, 1986; D.P. Rosenbaum, "Community crime prevention: A review and synthesis of the literature," *Justice Quarterly* 5 (1988): 323-395; W.G. Skogan, *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*, New York, The Free Press, 1990.

9. Beaulieu and Luloff, see note 5 above.

10. J.F. Donnermeyer and R.E. Mullen, "Use of neighbors for crime prevention: Evidence from a statewide rural victim study," *Journal of the Community Development Society* 18, 1 (1987): 15-29.

11. See the following for details on these data: Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Police employment and expenditure trends," Special Report, February 1986; "BJS data report, 1988," April 1989; "Profile of State and local law enforcement agencies, 1987," Special Report, March 1989. See also B. Manili and E. Connors, "Police chiefs and sheriffs rank their criminal justice needs," *Research in Action*, National Institute of Justice, 1988; B.A. Reaves, "Sheriff's departments, 1990," Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, 1992; B.A. Reaves, "State and local police departments, 1990," Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, 1992.

Community Policing and Police Effectiveness: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research program, including both basic and applied approaches. NIJ conducts annual evaluations of promising criminal justice programs, conducts demonstration projects, assesses the usefulness and effectiveness of advances in technology, and conducts training programs.

NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies, including case studies, structured observational methods, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative research proposals that would draw upon a variety of disciplines for the study of crime. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest might include, but are not limited to the following:

- Controlling police use of force.
- Use of mediation and dispute resolution in community policing.
- The compatibility of community policing and accreditation.
- The police-prosecutor relationship in community policing.
- Using computer technology for homicide investigations.

Applicants uncertain about whether a given project idea falls within the program's scope should consult the Program Manager.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Community Policing and Police Effectiveness:
Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Craig D. Uchida, Director, Evaluation Division, at the above address, or contact him at 202-307-2959.

Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability

Management of Special Populations:
Female Offenders

Management of Special Populations:
Sex Offenders

Management of Special Populations:
Mentally Disabled Offenders

Prison Inmate Classification Systems

Intermediate Sanctions and User
Accountability: Priority Topics

OJP Policy Statement — *Intermediate sanctions fall between traditional probation and incarceration and are usually less severe than jail or prison. However, they are more restrictive than probation for nondangerous offenders. Intermediate sanctions are designed to hold the drug user accountable and focus on the range of postadjudication sanctions that fill the gap between traditional probation and jail or prison sentences. These sanctions can be used to address the problems of both juvenile and adult crime. Demonstration programs, as well as evaluation efforts, are being initiated to promote and test a continuum of sanctions, such as the expanded use of fines, restitution, community service, home detention, intensive supervision probation, electronic monitoring, and boot camps. Intermediate sanctions recognize gradations in the seriousness of criminal behavior and are designed to respond accordingly with graduated levels of criminal punishment.*

Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability

At midyear 1991, the Nation's prisons held 804,524 inmates, an increase of 6.5 percent over 1990. For every offender serving an incarceration sentence, approximately three others are under some form of community supervision, the vast majority on probation. Overall, there are more than 4.3 million adults currently under correctional supervision.

Much of this growth has been attributed to drug use by offenders. In a few instances, rates of prison commitments are declining, because arrests for drug offenses have also declined. However, it is probable that correctional populations—both in institutions and in the community—will not stabilize or decline for the remainder of this decade. The ongoing increases in prison populations are generally attributed to increased length of sentences for more serious offenders.

Accordingly, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has focused research, evaluation, demonstrations, training, and technical assistance on developing intermediate sanctions, improving policies and practices for managing institutions, and creating innovative methods for expansion of correctional facilities.

Recently completed NIJ research and evaluation in intermediate sanctions has established the feasibility of using day fines as a strengthening of traditional probation, while other studies have examined the experience of three jurisdictions in the use of electronic monitors for both pretrial and postconviction populations. NIJ also has evaluated intensive supervision probation, house arrest, and a model drug user accountability program—approaches of particular interest to States burdened with excessive probation caseloads. NIJ also has reviewed and published information on promising new approaches, such as day reporting centers for offenders.

Current NIJ research and evaluation in intermediate sanctions include a study of how probation agencies are handling caseloads composed largely of drug users and an evaluation of the effectiveness of local drug testing/treatment programs in reducing offender drug use and its concomitant criminal behavior. Also in progress is research examining the effectiveness of boot camps for both young adults and juvenile offenders. Also scheduled are training conferences on implementing intermediate sanctions for State and local officials.

Research on the management of prison populations has included studies of the prevention of riots, prison gangs, duty-related injuries to correctional officers, and the effectiveness of postrelease employment programs.

A third category of NIJ research has examined public policy issues central to corrections. Representative studies include assessments of early release strategies to comply with court-ordered prison population caps, studies of the costs and benefits of adopting various confinement/incapacitation policies, and studies of offender recidivism.

Although only one in four adults under correctional supervision is incarcerated, these are the most serious offenders, and their confinement accounts for the greatest proportion of State correctional expenditures. Recent NIJ research in corrections has addressed prison and jail management, with a particular emphasis on controlling inmate populations while containing costs. An intramural study is developing a prison population forecasting methodology. NIJ established the Corrections Construction Information Exchange, which provides information on innovative cost-effective prison and jail construction projects across the Nation. (See chapter on Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology, for discussion of this program.)

Ongoing Programs for 1992

In 1992, research is focusing on problems not previously addressed, including probation management and inmate work.

Corrections Management Analysis Program: Probation Risk Assessment and Caseload Management

This intramural program will soon test an integrated, computer-based data system for potential use by state-wide corrections departments. This program builds on recidivism research conducted by NIJ staff and others. It seeks to develop practical applications of recidivism models that heretofore have served only research purposes. This program aims to improve probation caseload management by aiding probation departments in assessing the risks posed by probationers, informing probation officers of the risks posed by their caseloads, and assisting management in allocating resources. The program also will provide an opportunity to study the effectiveness of various supervision strategies. Although the focus is on probation supervision, the products will be equally applicable to parole supervision.

Research, Development, and Training in Private Sector Prison and Jail Industries

Since 1984, the National Institute of Justice has supported research and development that promote innovative inmate work programs in prisons and jails, including nationally recognized demonstration projects such as the Nebraska prison system and the Strafford and Belknap County jails in New Hampshire. The results demonstrate that the private sector can play a critical role in providing real-world work experiences that require inmates to develop industrial and service skills. These public-private partnerships have helped reduce inmate idleness, lower correctional costs through inmate wage deductions, and provided participating businesses with a reliable entry-level labor pool. In 1992, the Institute will provide technical assistance and training, conduct evaluations, and develop and distribute reports related to this effort.

New Solicitations for 1992

The National Institute of Justice seeks studies of intermediate sanctions programs for special offender populations—populations that need special services, involve special costs, and pose special supervision requirements. These include female offenders, sex offenders, and mentally disabled offenders.

NIJ's research interests also include prison classification systems, an area in need of reassessment in view of the changing composition of inmate populations. In addition, a concluding solicitation identifies other areas of interest and encourages proposals on other useful research projects on intermediate sanctions and user accountability.

Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability: Solicitations for 1992

Management of Special Populations: Female Offenders

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a national assessment of the ways in which correctional officials are managing the increased numbers of female offenders in the criminal justice system.

Background

The female arrest rate has been steadily increasing since the 1960's. Between 1971 and 1985, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI's) Uniform Crime Report (UCR), the women's arrest rate for Index Crimes increased six times more than the men's arrest rate, which showed only a 6 percent increase. The women's arrest rate for FBI Index Crimes increased by 37 percent, and arrests for violent crime increased by 38 percent during those years.¹

The number of female offenders committed to prison also increased at a rapid pace. At the end of 1989, a record 40,556 women were under the jurisdiction of State and Federal prison officials. From 1980 to 1989, the male inmate population increased 112 percent; the female inmate population, 202 percent. In every year since 1980, except 1990, the rate of growth for female inmates has exceeded that for males.²

It is unclear whether the observed increase in the arrest and incarceration of women reflects an increase in criminal behavior among women, a reduced level of

tolerance toward female offenders, or a change in the composition of female offenders and/or those sent to jails and prisons. Some have noted that greater social, political, and economic opportunities for women in the United States and other countries appear to be correlated with increasing female crime rates.³

There is evidence that the composition of the female offender population has changed in the past decade and that the burgeoning number of female inmates requires a greater emphasis on concerns and programs for this population.

This solicitation is for a national assessment, which will involve: (1) a survey and analysis of the problems and issues related to female offenders and sanctioning; (2) identification and description, where appropriate, of model programs or practices designed for controlling female offending, which can be subsequently evaluated; and (3) recommendations for future research.

Goals

- To determine the nature and extent of programs aimed at alleviating problems for the population of female offenders in jails and prisons.
- To identify model programs for women in terms of their purposes, practices, and effects.
- To disseminate the results of this research to policymakers, prison and jail administrators, and researchers.

Objectives

- Collect information to assess the current ways that women are being processed and managed in correctional facilities.
- Identify current management policies and practices that have potential to improve the effectiveness of programs for women, and describe promising innovations in detail.

- Formulate a research agenda that provides basic questions for future research.

- Formulate recommendations and develop a report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on policies, procedures, and practices for the processing of female offenders.

Program Strategy

Collect information to assess the current ways that women are being processed and managed in correctional facilities.

In the proposal, the applicant should include a plan for a review of the current literature regarding the management of female offenders. The review should identify areas in which current practices and theory and/or research findings are consistent or contradictory. This information will be of particular use in guiding future research and evaluation on programs for female offenders.

Information about the ways that women currently are being processed and managed in correctional facilities should be collected through a national sample survey of State and local correctional facilities. The proposal should describe the sampling frame and strategy, data collection procedures (mail, telephone, inperson interviews, etc.) and discuss the types of information to be collected and how it will be compiled and analyzed.

Of particular importance are descriptions of correctional management policies and practices concerning programs for women inmates. Special attention should be paid to whether their effectiveness has been assessed. Descriptions of contracts for specialized services (drug treatment, health services, family and children services) and transitional programs should be included. Attention should also be given to services within the prison, such as educational and vocational programs, family and marriage counseling, and the like.

The grantee is also expected to address how female offenders are processed and routinely managed within

the jails and prisons—for example, a description of classification strategies, disciplinary procedures in prison, provision for home leave, and the existence and/or function of policies regarding inmate management.

Identify current management policies and practices that have potential to improve the effectiveness of programs for women, and describe promising innovations in detail.

Based on the survey described above, the grantee will identify particularly promising programs for female inmates. The proposal should describe how such programs will be identified.

In consultation with NIJ, the grantee will select a subset of programs/practices for further onsite assessment and evaluation. Provisional assessment of innovative programs that affect women's status upon release, reintegration into their families and communities, and recidivism also should be included.

Formulate a research agenda that provides basic questions for future research.

The research agenda should identify (1) fundamental issues for study and (2) issues and questions that will result in research projects that are of direct practical utility to criminal justice professionals.

Formulate recommendations and develop a report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on policies, procedures, and practices for the processing of female offenders.

This report will include: (1) a discussion of the dimensions of the management and offender supervision problems that correctional officials face; (2) descriptions of the innovative ways in which correctional administrators are allocating staff and money; (3) a description of innovative offender supervision practices for providing alternatives that could serve as effective approaches for handling female offenders; (4) identification of a select number of particularly promising programs for future study and evaluation; and (5) a research agenda that

discusses where research knowledge and practice are consistent or contradictory for the purpose of guiding future research.



The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to fully justify the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding for this topic has been tentatively set at \$150,000 to \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Management of Special Populations:
Female Offenders
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Voncile Gowdy, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-307-2951.

References

1. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice*, second edition, March 1988, p. 46.
2. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Women In Prison*, March 1991.
3. F. Adler and R.J. Simon, "Changing patterns," in F. Adler and R.J. Simon, eds., *Criminology of Deviant Women*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1979.

Management of Special Populations: Sex Offenders

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a national assessment of information, programs, and practices that advances our understanding of ways of controlling, managing, and supervising convicted sex offenders.

Background

Because sex offenders are seen as posing a considerable risk to the public, they require special attention and thus consume greater correctional resources. Over the past 8

years, there has been a 240-percent increase in the number of sex offenders serving sentences in the Nation's prisons, reaching a high of 85,647 incarcerated offenders in 1990.¹

Sex offenders as a proportion of total State prison populations ranged from a low of 1 percent to a high of 35.7 percent in 1990. While the highest percentages were reported by smaller States, sex offenders represented significant proportions in some of the larger States as well. Sex offenders accounted for 14.8 percent of the prison population in California, 14 percent in Illinois, 12 percent in Texas and Michigan, and 11 percent in Florida.

Corrections professionals attribute the recent increase to a number of factors: increased public concern; increased reporting of sexual offenses, particularly child abuse and family sex offenses; statutory changes in the law regarding sex offenses; better enforcement and prosecution; and vigorous victim advocacy. Furthermore, because of more stringent sentencing policies, sex offenders in many States now serve longer terms than previously.

The total number of convicted sex offenders on probation is not precisely known. A 1988 Bureau of Justice Statistics study of felony dispositions in 14 States found that 1 percent of those granted probation had been convicted of a sexual offense. It is not known how much this would increase if offenders convicted of sexual misdemeanors or convicted sex offenders who pleaded guilty to lesser charges were included. Many sexual abuse cases are reportedly handled with pleas to lesser offenses that are not sex related, according to one study.²

A 1986 Bureau of Justice Statistics study of offenders granted probation revealed that, of those who had been convicted of rape, one in five was rearrested for a felony while under supervision; 3 percent were rearrested for rape.

Since most convicted sex offenders eventually return to the community, research is needed to establish the most appropriate combination of sanctions for punishing and treating them.

Further documentation is needed regarding the ways in which State and local jurisdictions identify and define different types of sex offenders and determine which sanction to impose on what type of offender.

The effectiveness of some recent innovations in sanctions for at least some types of sex offenders needs to be tested. Studies indicate that as many as 50 percent of convicted child molesters are required to participate in some form of treatment program, whether residential or community-based. The community-based treatment concept for nonviolent sex offenders, a somewhat recent approach, needs to be assessed.

This solicitation is for a national assessment, which will involve: (1) a survey and analysis of the problems and issues in the sanctioning of sex offenders and/or their treatment; (2) identification and description, where appropriate, of model programs or practices for further evaluation; and (3) recommendations for future research.

Goals

- To obtain a better understanding of how probation and parole agencies manage sex offenders.
- To identify and critically examine innovative strategies that appear to have the greatest potential for supervision and treatment of different types of sex offenders.
- To communicate information to policymakers regarding current programs and the combinations of sanctions most appropriate for different types of sex offenders.

Objectives

- Document how probation and parole officials allocate resources and implement policies for supervising sex offenders.

■ Identify current sex offender probation and parole management practices and policies that have the potential to be more effective in supervising and controlling sex offenders.

■ Formulate a research agenda that provides basic questions for future research.

■ Produce a report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on current management and supervision policies and practices that will assist policymakers and criminal justice professionals.

Program Strategy

Document how probation and parole officials allocate resources and implement policies for supervising sex offenders.

In the proposal, the applicant should include a plan for a review of the current literature regarding supervision of sex offenders. The review should identify areas in which current practices and theory and/or research findings are consistent or contradictory. This information will be of particular use in guiding future research and evaluation on probation and parole supervision of sex offenders.

The grantee will be expected to conduct a thorough survey of State and local probation and parole agencies' programs relevant to sex offenders. The proposal should provide a detailed strategy for sample selection and data collection and should discuss the types of information to be collected and how that information will be compiled and analyzed.

Of particular interest are agency policies for distributing staff workloads; brokering specialized services, such as treatment; and initiating followup procedures for making sure treatment and supervision are carried out.

The product will be a report on current probation and parole agency resource management practices and offender supervision policies.

Identify current sex offender probation and parole management practices and policies that have the potential to be more effective in supervising and controlling sex offenders.

Based on the survey described above, the applicant should identify particularly promising offender supervision strategies. The applicant should describe how such identification will be made. Model programs that could be replicated in other jurisdictions should be identified. In consultation with NIJ, the grantee will select a subset of practices for further onsite assessment and evaluation.

Of particular interest are supervision practices regarding initial assessments and periodic reassessment of risk and supervision levels for offenders, use of special units for supervision of this population, profiles of offenders in these units (when applicable), and whether special credentials are required for officers involved with these offenders.

The product will be a report on current and innovative probation and parole practices for sex offenders that also identifies promising programs for future research and evaluation and probation/parole supervision issues requiring further research.

Formulate a research agenda that provides basic questions for future research.

The applicant should prepare a research agenda that will identify (1) fundamental issues for study and (2) issues and questions that are of direct practical utility to criminal justice professionals.

Produce a report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on current management and supervision policies and practices that will assist policymakers and criminal justice professionals.

This report will include: (1) a discussion of the dimensions of management and supervision problems probation and parole agencies face in dealing with sex offenders; (2) a description of innovative ways in which probation/parole administrators allocate staff and money

in such cases; (3) a description of innovative sex offender supervision practices; (4) the identification of a select number of particularly promising programs for future study and evaluation; and (5) a research agenda with discussion of where research findings and practices are consistent or contradictory for the purpose of guiding future research.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to fully justify the pro-posed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$150,000 to \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Management of Special Populations: Sex Offenders
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact: Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Voncile Gowdy, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact her at 202-307-2951.

References

1. Contact Center, Inc., *Corrections Compendium*, Lincoln, Nebraska, May 1991.
2. Debra Whitcomb, *When the Victim Is a Child*, second edition, National Institute of Justice, 1992.

Management of Special Populations: Mentally Disabled Offenders

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a national assessment of information, programs, and practices on the management and supervision of mentally disabled offenders by the correctional system.

Background

Dealing with the mentally disabled offender is a chronic problem for law enforcement and corrections. It is widely accepted among professionals that the number of

mentally disabled persons entering the criminal justice system has increased during the past two decades, following statutory changes that restricted new commitments to mental facilities while releasing large numbers of patients to fend for themselves in the community. Inevitably, many mentally disabled persons commit offenses resulting in arrest and, because alternatives are not available, they are detained in facilities ill-equipped to deal with their special needs.¹ For this solicitation, the term mentally disabled includes two categories of disability: (1) offenders who are mentally ill and (2) offenders who are mentally deficient.

In 1991, the Interagency Council on the Homeless, a Federal council composed of heads of 17 Federal agencies, including representatives of the Department of Justice, Housing and Urban Development, and Health and Human Services, was formed to address the issue of homelessness in the United States. The Council estimates that 600,000 persons are homeless on a given day, one-third of whom may be seriously mentally ill and in need of special services and housing.² It is probable that a sizable number of these individuals will be detained in jail.

Although experts caution that it is difficult to make accurate estimates of the extent of the problem, a number of studies report generally consistent estimates of the proportion of mentally ill incarcerated in prisons and jails. A California Department of Corrections study of State prison inmates reported that 7.9 percent were currently suffering from mental disorder and that 14 percent had a history of serious mental illness.³ However, the problem is undoubtedly most acute at the local jail level—the point of entry into the criminal justice system.

One recent study of a sample of Cook County (Chicago) jail inmates indicated that 6.4 percent were suffering from some form of psychosis, a percentage three times greater than that in the U.S. population at large.⁴ These results were similar to those reported in an earlier study published in the *American Journal of Public Health*.⁵ A

1989 Bureau of Justice Statistics survey asked a sample of jail inmates if they had ever been sent by the court to a mental hospital or mental treatment program; 8.2 percent said yes. Thirteen percent reported a history of doctor-prescribed medication for mental or emotional disorders.⁶

It should be noted that these figures refer to persons with serious mental disabilities. The number of persons who have less acute problems but still need treatment is undoubtedly larger than the populations observed in these studies. Moreover, the mentally retarded, unless also mentally ill, are not included in these studies.

The American Association on Mental Retardation defines mental retardation as “. . . significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior . . .”⁷ A 1985 study estimated there were 25,000 mentally retarded individuals serving sentences in the Nation’s prisons.⁸ The number detained in jail facilities is unknown, but presumably it is a significant number.

Most of the research on mentally retarded persons in correctional facilities has focused on prisons rather than jails.^{9 10} Information is needed not only on jail programs for mentally retarded inmates, but on alternative approaches for dealing with them.

Goals

- To document how jail administrators currently manage mentally disabled offenders.
- To identify and examine promising current practices and strategies for managing mentally disabled inmates.
- To identify new strategies and alternative approaches for managing mentally disabled inmates.
- To distribute, through publication by the National Institute of Justice, the results of this research to policymakers and professionals nationwide.

Objectives

■ Collect information on current policies and practices for managing mentally disabled inmates in jails and alternative facilities, with special attention to how officials allocate resources and supervise this population.

■ Identify current policies and practices that have potential to improve the supervision and treatment of mentally disabled offenders, both in jail and in alternative facilities, and examine how these policies and practices fit with current theory and research findings.

■ Formulate a research agenda that provides basic questions for future research.

■ Produce a report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on current management and supervision policies and practices that will assist policymakers and professionals in the field.

Program Strategy

Collect information on current policies and practices for managing mentally disabled inmates in jails and alternative facilities, with special attention to how officials allocate resources and supervise this population.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee must complete a stratified random sample survey of jails to obtain information on the allocation of resources and the implementation of policies for supervising this population, the kinds of programs used in dealing with these offenders, and the special management needs of the mentally disabled offender.

The applicant should provide a detailed strategy for sample selection and data collection procedures (mail, telephone, inperson interviews, etc.), as well as a discussion of the types of information to be collected and how that information will be analyzed.

Identify current policies and practices that have potential to improve the supervision and treatment of mentally disabled offenders, both in jail and alternative facilities, and assess how these policies and practices fit with current theory and research findings.

In addition to completing the survey of policies and procedures associated with the handling of mentally disabled offenders, the grantee shall select, describe, and examine those practices and strategies that appear to offer particularly promising approaches to offender placement and supervision.

Of particular interest are policies and practices regarding initial identification and assessment of the mentally disabled, practices directed at segregating the mentally disabled from or integrating them into the general inmate population, use of support systems, use of discharge planning programs, any coordination with social service agencies, and use of alternative facilities.

Formulate a research agenda that provides basic questions for future research.

The research agenda should identify (1) fundamental issues for study and (2) issues and questions that will lead to projects of direct practical utility to criminal justice professionals.

Produce a report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on current management and supervision policies and practices that will assist policymakers and professionals in the field.

The grantee should produce a report for possible publication by the National Institute of Justice that: (1) describes management and offender supervision problems that correctional officials face in managing mentally disabled offenders; (2) describes the innovations of correctional administrators in allocating staff and money, including innovative offender supervision practices and alternatives for handling mentally disabled offenders; (3) identifies a select number of particularly promising programs for future study and evaluation; and (4) presents a research agenda with priorities for future research.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to fully justify the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000. It is anticipated this amount will support one or two awards. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date: Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Management of Special Populations:
Mentally Disabled Offenders
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Voncile Gowdy, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact her at 202-307-2951.

References

1. Daniel Kagan, "Landmark Chicago study" documents rate of mental illness among jail inmates, *Corrections Today*, December 1990.
2. *The 1990 Annual Report of the Interagency Council on the Homeless*, Interagency Council on the Homeless, Washington, D.C., February 1991; U.S. General Accounting Office, *Mentally Ill Inmates: Better Data Would Help Determine Protection and Advocacy Needs*, U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1991.
3. Kagan, n. 1 above.
4. Kagan, n. 1 above.
5. Kagan, n. 1 above.
6. Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Profile of Jail Inmates, 1989*, U.S. Government Printing Office, April 1991.
7. H. Grossman, ed., *Classification in Mental Retardation*, American Association on Mental Retardation, Washington, D.C., 1983.
8. G.C. Denowski and K. Denowski, "The mentally retarded offender in the State prison system", *Criminal Justice and Behavior* [Newberry, California] 12(1): 55-69, 1985.
9. Miles Santamour and B. West, *The Mentally Retarded Offender and Corrections*, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., 1977.
10. Anthony Trivisono, foreword to *The Mentally Retarded Offender*, The American Correctional Association, Laurel, Maryland, 1989.

Prison Inmate Classification Systems

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a national survey to collect information on the types and utility of current State and local adult prison inmate classification systems.

Background

The basic tool for managing prison populations is a classification instrument that is used to identify the security and custody risks posed by an inmate. Classification may identify other core elements or needs of an inmate, such as medical history or educational achievement, that are necessary for determining program assignments and for periodically reassessing inmate status. Finally, aggregated classification data provide basic information for administrators in system planning and management.

Two basic types of classification tools use objective criteria: (1) those that primarily use dichotomous criteria and (2) those that employ weighted factors that produce a score that determines the inmate's classification category. Typically, inmates are classified as requiring some degree of custody—maximum, medium, and minimum are commonly used categories.

A 1987 NIJ study examined the factors used in five model objective classification systems. Some disparity appeared in the individual factors used to determine security ratings (escape history was the only factor used by all five). For three models that were examined in detail, there was disparity in the weights assigned to some of the common factors.¹ Such disparity clearly results in similar inmates being rated differently; whether such differing scores result in classifying inmates inappropriately is not known.

Although little published research compares how differing classification systems rate similar inmates, it is

possible that large numbers of State inmates have been misclassified and may be serving sentences in facilities of higher or lower security than needed to ensure public safety. Misclassification can be attributed to the axiom that the efficiency of classification instruments declines over time, primarily because of changes in the characteristics of inmate populations and changes in the importance of the individual factors used.

In the past decade, State prison populations have indeed changed significantly, resulting in larger proportions of special-need inmates such as sex offenders, gang members, violent offenders, and drug users.² Similarly, some factors used to determine an inmate's security classification status may contribute less now than when the classification instrument was developed. In particular, such factors as history of substance abuse and/or violent behavior may be less useful in classifying populations where the majority of inmates are drug users or serving sentences for violent offenses. Information from practitioners on the usefulness of individual rating factors in determining overall security class, as well as in determining more specific security classifications (such as potential for violence directed at staff), would enable development of more effective classification instruments.

In this national assessment, NIJ seeks information on prison classification systems that State corrections departments can use to meet the problems posed by increasing prison populations composed in large part of special-need adult offenders.

Goals

- To collect information on the types of State and local prison classification instruments currently in use.
- To collect information from practitioners on the usefulness and effectiveness of the instruments in current use.
- To identify deficiencies in the design and use of classification instruments that can be addressed by future research and development.

Objectives

■ Conduct a national survey of State prison systems to identify the types and purposes of classification systems in use.

■ Collect information on how satisfied users are with their current instruments, whether they have used other instruments and why they chose the current instruments, and suggestions for the development of new instruments or improvement of current models.

■ Collect information on modifications of classification instruments and research and evaluation studies conducted by State users, particularly studies that compare different instruments for classifying inmates for security, custody, and special needs.

■ Prepare a report of the findings for publication by the National Institute of Justice for distribution to corrections officials and staff and professional organizations.

■ Prepare a research agenda for future research in prison classification.

Program Strategy

Conduct a national survey of State prison systems to identify the types and purposes of classification systems in use.

The applicant should specify how the national survey will be designed and conducted, the basis on which survey respondents will be selected (such as facility age, current population, staffing ratios, etc.), and how survey participation will be encouraged. The survey should be limited to prisons for adult offenders and should include facilities for both male and female inmates.

Collect information on how satisfied users are with their current instruments, whether they have used other instruments and why they chose the current instruments, and suggestions for the development of new instruments or improvement of current models.

The applicant should enclose a preliminary draft of the data collection instrument for the survey and discuss how the classification information collected through the survey will be analyzed. Especially important is information in three areas: (1) identification of factors used to determine inmate security ratings and subsequent custody or housing assignments, (2) identification of factors used to classify inmates with special needs, and (3) use of classification policies in litigation of lawsuits. The proposal should contain a management plan and timetables for beginning and completing specific tasks.

Collect information on modifications of classification instruments and research and evaluation studies conducted by State users, particularly studies that compare different instruments for classifying inmates for security, custody, and special needs.

The applicant should describe what information on modifications to State classification systems will be collected and how the information will be used. The proposal should present a plan for locating State user research and evaluation studies and establish whether those studies are evaluating their classification system. Emphasis should be placed on locating studies that compare different instrument ratings of inmate security risks and classification of different types of offenders that pose special security risks.

Prepare a report of the findings for publication by the National Institute of Justice for distribution to corrections officials and staff and professional organizations.

The grantee must produce a final report and an executive summary for possible NIJ publication that can be distributed to professionals and researchers. The report shall include all relevant data collection instruments, applicable data tapes, and findings and recommendations. The proposal should contain an outline of the report. The grantee will also be required to submit an article-length summary suitable for publication by NIJ.

Prepare a research agenda for future research in prison classification.

The grantee must, in the final report, recommend subjects for future research, analyze underlying rationales, and propose designs for the research.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to fully justify the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$150,000 to \$200,000. It is anticipated this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Prison Inmate Classification Systems
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to John Spevacek, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact him at 202-307-0466.

References

1. Robert Buchanan and Karen Whitlow, *Guidelines for Developing, Implementing, and Revising an Objective Prison Classification System*, National Institute of Justice, June 1987.
2. Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Profile of State Prison Inmates, 1986*, Washington, D.C., January 1988; Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Violent State Prisoners and Their Victims*, Washington, D.C., July 1990; and Bureau of Justice Statistics, *Prisoners in 1990*, Washington, D.C., May 1991.

Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research, evaluation, and demonstration program that includes both basic and applied work and involves a large majority of the law enforcement and criminal justice research and professional communities. Moreover, NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies that include case studies, structured observation, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data.

NIJ encourages innovative research proposals that will bring thinking and research from a variety of disciplines to bear on the study of crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but address NIJ's goals and objectives. Program goals include research that helps to reduce crowding, costs, and recidivism and improves public safety and professional practice. Research is requested that will result in:

■ **Sentencing.** Better understanding of the degree to which varied sentence lengths deter offender recidivism; identification of alternative sanctions between traditional probation and traditional jail or prison sentences for postadjudicative offenders.

■ **Intermediate Sanctions.** Information to support legislative and administrative strategies that could lead to implementation of intermediate sanctions.

■ **Correctional Planning.** Planning tools for correctional administrators.

■ **Costs.** Knowledge of the impact on incarceration costs of private industry's entry into corrections, both in the construction and operation of facilities and for inmate work programs.

■ **Inmate Education and Work.** Information on the effectiveness of prison programs in changing postrelease behavior, with particular emphasis on inmate education and work programs.

Researchers submitting proposals should fully justify the selection of their topic and fully explain the methodology they intend to employ. Applicants unsure about whether their project idea falls within the program's scope should consult the Program Manager.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability:
Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Voncile Gowdy, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-307-2951.

Drug Prevention

Impact of State and Local Drug Laws on Drug Abuse and Related Crime

Criminal Justice Drug Treatment Programs for Female Offenders

Drug Prevention: Priority Topics

OJP Policy Statement — *The criminal justice system should assume a primary role in developing communitywide efforts to prevent the use and trafficking of illegal drugs. The Office of Justice Programs' (OJP's) drug prevention activities focus on community-based efforts to reduce the problems of drug abuse, gang activities, illiteracy, juvenile delinquency, and school dropouts, especially in our minority communities. This priority area will emphasize programs at the grass-roots level which focus on mobilizing law abiding citizens to get involved with prevention in high crime neighborhoods where there is a prevalence of drug trafficking, serious crime, gang violence, and child sexual exploitation. Through comprehensive and coordinated activities, law enforcement officials, community leaders, including school administrators, church, business, and civic leaders, can work together in partnership to both take back the streets and keep those most at risk safe from criminals. OJP will also focus on offenders who have had previous drug involvement and are returning from correctional programs. These program activities will be implemented through demonstration programs, training and technical assistance, and evaluations.*

Drug Prevention

The prevention and control of drug abuse and drug-related crime is a central component of NIJ's research programs. Recent reports show a downturn in drug use. Between 1985 and 1988, hospital emergency room incidents were rising dramatically; up 315 percent for cocaine, 96 percent for marijuana and hashish, and 40 percent for heroin. But those trends have been reversed. From 1988 to 1990, emergency room incidents for all drugs decreased by 18 percent. Heroin incidents dropped by 18 percent, marijuana and hashish by 23 percent, and cocaine by 26 percent.¹

Although recent indicators suggest that drug abuse in the general population has declined, drug use by offenders and drug-related crime remain high. Drugs tend to accelerate and intensify criminal behavior—both in crimes against property and violent crime. In a recent survey of more than 5,000 jail inmates across the Nation, offenders were found to be twice as likely as persons in the general population to have used drugs and seven times more likely to be current users; over one-third reported they were trying to get money for drugs when they committed the crime for which they were incarcerated.²

The drug problem is not the same in all communities across the Nation; rather it is diverse and changing. Some drugs such as crack cocaine, narcotics, and marijuana are reported in all regions, while others like PCP and "ice" (a smokeable form of methamphetamine) tend to be found only in certain areas.

Drugs pose complex and costly problems for which there are no easy answers. Proposals for drug control strategies range from police crackdowns on the one hand to treatment and rehabilitation on the other, from supply reduction aimed at traffickers to demand reduction aimed at users. The National Institute of Justice

seeks to inform public policy through objective data and analysis to assess how different drug control strategies will affect drug abuse and drug-related crime.

NIJ supports a broad range of basic and applied research, development, evaluation, training, and technical assistance to prevent drug abuse and related crime. NIJ efforts have included research and evaluations of criminal justice programs for drug abuse prevention, detection and treatment in high-risk groups, and advanced methods for measuring the nature and extent of drug problems and related crime.

Prevention, Control, and Treatment of Drug Abuse and Related Crime. In designing effective prevention policies directed toward high-risk groups, research has shown that while drug and alcohol abuse affect both the nature and intensity of crime in youth and adults, risk factors alone do not explain why some individuals develop these patterns while others in high-risk groups do not. Effective prevention requires research, development, and evaluation to clarify the processes of the onset, intensity, and cessation of abuse.

NIJ research on local efforts to prevent and control drug abuse and drug-related crime has included: (1) evaluation of community responses to the crack epidemic to identify successful local anti-crack efforts and the characteristics of neighborhoods likely to develop and sustain effective community anti-drug organizations; (2) assessment of the impact and effectiveness of State and local statutes and ordinances as means of ridding low-income private housing neighborhoods of street-level drug markets and houses used for drug trafficking; and (3) assessment of the deterrent effect of laws aimed at the prevention of drug use and reduction of demand. Evaluations of four types of State and local approaches to user accountability are being conducted—suspension and postponement of driving privileges, imposition of

finer, application of land use controls such as nuisance abatement and zoning laws, and State civil asset forfeiture statutes.

NIJ is also developing a comprehensive analysis of drug treatment programs and methods within the criminal justice system, which will serve as a basis for further research efforts to enhance the effectiveness of drug treatment in controlling drug abuse and related crime. This project will develop case studies of drug treatment programs at each stage of the criminal justice system. It will examine how well such programs are being carried out and coordinated, and it will offer recommendations to guide new research and programs.

Other recent NIJ research has explored the links among drugs, alcohol, and patterns of campus crime based on a national survey of college students. This project found that students who commit crimes tend to be heavier drug and alcohol users than either their victims or other students. Other NIJ research is examining the advantages of drug testing as an adjunct to treatment and monitoring programs for criminal offenders in preventing further drug use.

Analytic Models and Estimates of Drug Use. Accurate and timely measurement is essential for detecting emerging problems, projecting and allocating criminal justice resources, and evaluating the impact of both criminal justice and community-based programs.

To this end, NIJ recently cosponsored with the National Institute on Drug Abuse an interagency technical review workshop on innovative approaches to estimating the sizes of drug abuser populations and projecting the impacts of prevention and control policies on the numbers of drug users and the consequences of drug abuse. NIJ research has also addressed development of statistical modeling and simulation techniques for estimating the prevalence of cocaine use at State and local levels, especially among criminal offender populations. NIJ has also pioneered multi-indicator methods for State and local jurisdictions to monitor and project patterns of drug use and related crime.

Ongoing Programs for 1992

AIDS/HIV Education in Lockups

This interagency collaborative effort between NIJ and the National Institute on Drug Abuse is to design, test, and evaluate the effectiveness of strategies for AIDS/HIV education and referral to drug treatment for arrestees held less than 48 hours in jail booking facilities and lockups. The project, currently in its final phase, is being carried out in Portland, Oregon, and Washington, D.C. It is scheduled for completion in the spring of 1993.

New Solicitations for 1992

The 1992 NIJ program builds upon ongoing and past research. Specific solicitations identify areas of particular interest involving drug laws and treatment programs, and special offender populations. A concluding section encourages proposals on other relevant issues related to drug prevention and the control of drug abuse and drug related crime. (Applicants can also refer to the fiscal year 1992 solicitations in the Drug Testing chapter.)

References

1. *National Drug Control Strategy: A Nation Responds to Drug Use*, p. 23, The White House, 1992.
2. *Drugs and Jail Inmates, 1989*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, August 1991.

Drug Prevention: Solicitations for 1992

Impact of State and Local Drug Laws on Drug Abuse and Related Crime

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for research to analyze State and local drug laws, describe their implementation for prevention and control of drug abuse and its consequences, and assess their impact on drug abuse and drug-related crime.

Background

Federal controlled substances statutes regulate the manufacture, growth, distribution, sale, and possession of specified categories of drugs and drug-related materials and establish penalties for violations of their provisions. Among the States, however, controlled substances acts may differ in many aspects from each other and from the Federal laws. Over the years, as concern about drug abuse has increased, State and local jurisdictions have enacted statutes embodying a variety of approaches to the control of drug abuse and its consequences.

The different approaches may reflect regional differences in the nature and extent of drug problems. Recently developed systems for monitoring local variations in drug use patterns among offender populations, such as NIJ's Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) system, graphically reveal significant variation in the nature and extent of drug problems over time and across jurisdictions.¹

Analyses of the State Controlled Substances Acts (CSA's) by the National Criminal Justice Association² have shown differences in such aspects as definitions or categorizations of the controlled drugs and precursor

chemicals; amounts involved for graduated penalties related to specific acts, such as possession or sale; additional activities or items covered (e.g., drug use, paraphernalia);³ provisions for linking penalties to mitigating or aggravating factors (e.g., number of prior offenses, involvement of minors, or location—as in distance from school zones); types of penalties mandated (such as asset seizure and forfeiture, revocation of drivers' licenses or disqualification from certain types of employment) in addition to imprisonment or fines; and additional legislated controls (such as taxes on drug sales). Some jurisdictions enacted laws, such as New York State's 1973 Rockefeller Drug Laws, containing severe penalties for drug possession and sale and limitations on plea bargaining, which resulted in severe court crowding and were later modified or rescinded.⁴

Although the legislative intent of both Federal and State drug laws is clearly directed not only at drug trafficking, but also at the prevention and control of drug use—such use (or abuse), *per se*, has *not* been made a chargeable offense in either the Federal drug laws or the controlled substances acts of most States. Eleven States, however (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, Wyoming), have expanded the scope of drug offenses to include mandated sanctions on drug use itself.

Beyond these variations in State and local laws, differences in the severity of their prescribed sanctions may lead to variations in the actual enforcement of those provisions, inequities arising from intermittent or selective enforcement, displacement to neighboring jurisdictions, and possible border effects between jurisdictions with significantly different penalties.

The success of policies for reducing and controlling drug supply and demand depends, in part, on the coordination of national and regional efforts with State and local efforts. Provisions within the State and local laws, of course, form the bases for corresponding law enforcement efforts. Existing compilations and analyses of State CSA's permit interjurisdictional comparisons to assess some issues. Further research is needed on the impacts of different features of these laws and their relative

success over time and across jurisdictions with different types of drug problems; this will help coordinated efforts to control drug abuse and its consequences.

Goals

- To identify the relative effectiveness of alternative components of State and local drug laws and enforcement policies for controlling drug abuse and related crime.

- To inform and enhance the abilities of State and local jurisdictions to prevent and control drug abuse and related crime through the use of legislative sanctions.

Objectives

- Identify the components of selected State and local laws to prevent and control drug abuse and related crime, and possible legal, social, and criminal justice factors contributing to their implementation and effectiveness.

- Analyze the impact of State and local laws and their enforcement on patterns of drug abuse and related crime through local or regional case studies.

- Analyze patterns of time sentenced versus time served for drug offenders and other impacts of drug legislation on the courts and corrections systems for selected State and local laws.

- Develop recommendations for a research agenda that addresses major policy questions on the alternative approaches in these laws and evaluates their impact on State and local drug abuse and its consequences.

- Provide a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on these State and local drug law issues to inform policymakers and criminal justice professionals about these approaches to preventing and controlling drug abuse and related crime.

Project Strategy

Identify the components of selected State and local laws to prevent and control drug abuse and related crime, and possible legal, social, and criminal justice factors contributing to their implementation and effectiveness.

The proposal should identify and analyze differences in the approaches of existing legislation and law enforcement policies at State and local levels to prevent and control the abuse of drugs. It should describe the features of those laws and policies that are directed toward deterrence, detection, sentencing, treatment, and other possible outcomes.

The proposal's analyses should address the potential interaction of State and local laws and enforcement practices with those of other community factors for reducing and controlling abuse of these substances and their consequences. These might include variations in: (1) definitions of prohibited or controlled behaviors (such as manufacturing, sale, possession, distribution or usage) of the specific drugs, associated chemicals and paraphernalia, and the quantities involved; (2) the severity of the penalties imposed for specified behaviors (in terms of incarceration, fines, loss of licenses or other eligibility, etc.); and (3) conditional provisions (enhanced penalties for school zones, etc.).

Analyze the impact of State and local laws and their enforcement on patterns of drug abuse and related crime through local or regional case studies.

Projects developing local or regional case studies are desired. The proposal should, therefore, nominate specific current State laws and local law enforcement efforts that will permit assessment of the impact of their alternative approaches for reducing and controlling both the abused substances and related property and violent crime. The rationale for each nomination (e.g., the mechanisms built into the particular law and the impacts to be addressed) should be presented in detail. These nominations shall be based on the proposal's review of theoretical and empirical research, and shall identify

information resources and evaluation methodologies that will be used to assess the impact and effectiveness of alternative strategies reflected in the selected State and local laws.

The proposal should provide plans and sequenced timelines for final identification of selected State and local statutory features and programs incorporating them, and select final sites and programs for intensive analysis in consultation with NIJ. The case studies should, to the extent possible, represent the range of approaches within these laws and include jurisdictions using innovative and graduated sanctions. The proposal should also offer evidence of the feasibility of the proposed special case studies and local or regional program impact evaluations by discussing proposed criteria, measures, methods, and time periods for retrospective and prospective evaluation, and by including evidence of willingness by the States, sites, and programs to cooperate.

In addition, the applicant's proposal should describe plans for potential further analyses of existing data sets, if the applicant believes that such reanalyses will enhance the goals and objectives of this solicitation. The applicant is encouraged to consult the current edition of the *Data Resources of the National Institute of Justice* for a listing of appropriate data sets.

Analyze patterns of time sentenced versus time served for drug offenders and other impacts of drug legislation on the courts and corrections systems for selected State and local laws.

A major area of interest under this solicitation is the issue of potential disparities between time sentenced and time served for convicted drug offenders sentenced to incarceration. The analysis should focus on the impact of selected State and local laws on the criminal justice system through analyses of any changes in disparities between time sentenced and time served. In addition, the rapid influx of increased numbers of drug cases, combined with enhanced penalties mandated by legislation directed at drug offenses, may significantly increase the

caseloads of the courts and corrections systems. These changes may require increased system capacities and increased prison and jail capacity. In cases of crowding, there may be procedures in place to reduce the time served by drug offenders and/or offenders in other categories. Sites should be selected to illustrate these disparities, and analysis should include detailed explanation of systemwide impacts.

The proposal should include how the applicant will address these issues, incorporating all other relevant indicators of criminal justice system responses in implementing these laws.

Develop recommendations for a research agenda that addresses major policy questions on the alternative approaches in these laws and evaluates their impact on State and local drug abuse and its consequences.

The agenda should identify: (1) major research and policy issues on the links between the provisions of these laws, the related drug abuse problems, and policy options potentially available to State and local criminal justice programs and professionals; and (2) potential research and program strategies for addressing these priority policy questions and developing enhanced State and local abilities to control drug abuse and its consequences.

Provide a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice on these State and local drug law issues to inform policymakers and criminal justice professionals about these approaches to preventing and controlling drug abuse and related crime.

This report should discuss in detail the policy and resource factors relevant to the use of legal sanctions to control drug abuse and related crime at State and local levels, review prior historical developments, analyze related legal issues at Federal, State, and local levels, and summarize current and prior research on these topics and the data and analytic methods employed. To the extent feasible, potential approaches for enhancing State

and local capabilities to monitor and evaluate the impacts of the provisions of their drug laws should be described and assessed.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the solicitation.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000 to \$250,000. It is anticipated this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date: Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

State and Local Drug Laws
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact: Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Bernard A. Gropper, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact him at 202-307-0647.

References

1. *Drug Use Forecasting: 1990 Annual Report.* National Institute of Justice, 1991.
2. *A Guide to State Controlled Substances Acts.* National Criminal Justice Association, 1991.
3. *State and Local Experience With Drug Paraphernalia Laws.* NIJ Issues and Practices. National Institute of Justice, 1988.
4. *The Nation's Toughest Drug Law: Evaluating the New York Experience.* Association of the Bar of New York City, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, 1978.

Criminal Justice Drug Treatment Programs for Female Offenders

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a comprehensive analysis of the special drug treatment needs and requirements of female offenders that will assess the capabilities of criminal justice programs to provide such treatment, and develop information for criminal justice policymakers and treatment agencies to support their efforts to reduce female offender drug abuse and drug-related crime.

Background

Drug treatment has been identified by the President's National Drug Control Strategy as an important part of the Nation's efforts against drug abuse and drug-related crime. Priority areas in demand reduction include drug treatment programs aimed at hard-to-reach populations with special needs, such as female offenders, and providing such services within the criminal justice system.¹

Female drug-abusing offenders have special characteristics that should be addressed in planning treatment. Effective programs for these offenders may need to differ from those for adult male drug-abusing offenders because of the different *nature of their drug abuse problems*, such as the types of drugs abused (e.g., inhalants, alcohol), the *different factors affecting drug use or its consequences* (sexual victimization, prostitution, homelessness, unemployment), or *additional service needs*, such as child care, counseling, training.^{2,3,4,5,6}

The crime reduction benefits of treatment programs for female drug-abusing offenders may therefore depend not only upon a particular treatment modality and the needs of individual offenders, but also upon the appropriate matching of other program procedures and

services with the specific needs and characteristics of these groups.

Females represent an increasing proportion of those arrested for drug offenses and of those classified as significantly drug-involved. From 1980 to 1989, the number of women in State and Federal prison systems grew by more than 200 percent, and about one-third reported they were under the influence of a drug at the time of their offense. One-quarter reported daily use of a major illicit drug during the prior month.

Within the framework of the President's National Drug Control Strategy priorities, the National Institute of Justice is supporting comprehensive analyses of drug treatment within the criminal justice system.⁷ The special characteristics and needs of female offenders that are the focus of this solicitation should complement this effort and provide guidance on particular programs aimed at this special offender population.

Development and distribution of information on the drug prevention and crime reduction benefits of specialized drug treatment for female offenders can assist State and local policymakers in planning for criminal justice resource needs and enhance efforts to control drug-related crime through appropriately matched treatment within criminal justice and community-based settings.

Goals

- To understand the special drug treatment needs of female offenders and their implications for criminal justice drug treatment programs.
- To enhance the capability of criminal justice programs to meet the treatment needs of drug-abusing female offenders so as to reduce drug abuse and drug-related crime.

Objectives

- Identify and assess the special drug treatment needs of female offenders and their implications for criminal justice drug treatment programs.

■ Identify and analyze the features of selected drug treatment programs for female offenders in criminal justice or community-based contexts.

■ Develop recommendations for a research agenda to: (1) enhance the abilities of criminal justice programs to provide drug treatment services for female offenders; and (2) assess the effectiveness of these programs in reducing the problems of drug abuse and its consequences in this offender population.

■ Provide a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice identifying what facilitates success in meeting female offender drug treatment needs in criminal justice and community-based treatment settings.

Project Strategy

Identify and assess the special drug treatment needs of female offenders and their implications for criminal justice drug treatment programs.

To accomplish this objective, the proposal should outline in detail an analysis of criminal justice and drug treatment issues for female offenders. The analysis will be expected to address *individual treatment needs*, including: (1) detection and diagnosis of drug-related problems; (2) matching of offender profiles to treatment services and monitoring client progress; and (3) provision of treatment and related services in criminal justice and community-based contexts.

In addition, *program characteristics* are also important, including: (1) types of clients (criminal offense categories, age, race, etc.); (2) types of treatment (outpatient, residential, etc.) and related services; (3) links to other programs (counseling, parent training, and job training); and (4) criminal justice contexts and coordination (court referral, diversion, boot camps, jail or prison-based, parole, probation, intensive supervision, Federal, State, local, etc.).

The proposed study should also give attention to program evaluation, including the results of any process

and outcome evaluations (e.g., within-program and post-release effects on individual client drug abuse, other problems, criminal recidivism) and how specific components or program characteristics relate to outcomes.

Identify and analyze the features of selected drug treatment programs for female offenders in criminal justice or community-based contexts.

NIJ is particularly interested in program case studies. Therefore, the proposal should include plans for developing case studies of drug treatment programs for female offenders. The case studies should permit assessment of the effects of key program elements in reducing and controlling drug abuse and related problems.

The proposal should provide criteria for nominating specific programs, based upon a review of theoretical and empirical research. It should identify sequenced timelines for final identification of candidate programs for these offenders. Final programs and sites for intensive analysis should be selected in consultation with NIJ. The case studies should represent the range of drug treatment approaches within the criminal justice system and include programs offering innovative and coordinated services for each of these populations.

The proposal should also offer evidence of the feasibility of the proposed case studies by describing the information resources and methodologies that will be used to evaluate each type of program and by including evidence of the willingness of these jurisdictions and programs to cooperate.

The proposal should also describe plans for potential further analyses of existing data sets if the applicant believes that such reanalyses will enhance the goals and objectives of this solicitation. The applicant is encouraged to consult the current edition of the *Data Resources of the National Institute of Justice* for a listing of appropriate data sets.

Develop recommendations for a research agenda to: (1) enhance the abilities of criminal justice programs to provide drug treatment services for female offenders;

References

1. *National Drug Control Strategy: A Nation Responds to Drug Use*, "Targeting Hard-To-Reach Populations," pp. 67-70, "Treatment and the Criminal Justice System," pp. 70-73, The White House, 1992.
2. *Intervening With Substance-Abusing Offenders: A Framework for Action, Report of the National Task Force on Correctional Substance Abuse Strategies*. 1991.
3. M. Tonry and J.Q. Wilson, eds., *Treatment of Drug Abuse*, M.D. Anglin and I. Hser, in *Drugs and Crime—Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, Volume 13*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 393-460, 1990.
4. *State Initiatives for Women: A Directory of State Alcohol and Drug Agency Resources*. National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors, 1990.
5. M. Chaiken, *In-Prison Programs for Drug Involved Offenders*, NIJ Issues and Practices, National Institute of Justice, 1989.
6. R. L. Hubbard et al., *Drug Abuse Treatment: A National Study of Effectiveness*, Treatment Outcome Prospective Study (TOPS), University of North Carolina Press, 1989.
7. *Drug Treatment Within the Criminal Justice System: A Comprehensive Analysis*. NIJ Grant No. 91-IJ-CX-K009.

Drug Prevention: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research program, involving both basic and applied approaches, that involves a large majority of the criminal justice research and professional communities. NIJ conducts annual evaluations of promising criminal justice programs, conducts demonstration projects, assesses the usefulness and effectiveness of advances in technology, and conducts training programs.

NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies including case studies, structured observation, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative research proposals that would bring to bear thinking and research from a variety of disciplines to the study of drug-related crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest might include but are not limited to the following:

- Assessments of the situational or policy-related factors contributing to the success of State or local efforts for prevention and control of drug abuse, drug trafficking, and drug-related crime. Programs combining criminal justice components with other community-based prevention efforts are preferred.

- Evaluations of the relative effectiveness of local criminal justice programs for drug education, detection, and treatment. These may be aimed at prevention or reduction of individual or aggregate problems in high-risk groups or areas. Studies of adolescent offenders are particularly encouraged.

- Development of advanced models for estimation of the nature and extent of drug problems and related crime at State and local levels to enhance abilities to

assess prevention needs and monitor outcomes. Preference would be for multi-indicator models integrating measures of drug use and its consequences.

If there is a question about whether a given project idea falls within the program's scope, applicants are encouraged to seek the advice of the Program Manager.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements of award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Drug Prevention: Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact: Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Bernard Gropper, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-307-0647.

Drug Testing

Using DUF Findings in Innovative Programs

Hair Testing in Probation and Parole

Drug Testing: Priority Topics

OJP Policy Statement — *Drug testing should be considered an essential component of intermediate sanctions, as well as all other pre- and postadjudication sanctions of the criminal justice and juvenile justice systems. It should be available at intake and throughout the system for initial and periodic screening and diagnostic assessment purposes. In addition, it should be used to guide decisions pertaining to immediate and longer term control and treatment needs, levels of security, and types of confinement, as well as the development of appropriate dispositions, treatment plans, and referrals for services. Through research, demonstration, technical assistance, training, and information dissemination programs, OJP will provide policymakers at the State and local levels with information to enable and encourage them to incorporate drug testing in all aspects of the criminal and juvenile justice systems.*

Drug Testing

Links between drugs and crime have been well documented. Researchers have consistently found that the proportion of drug users among arrestees and criminal offenders is far higher than in the general population.¹ As a consequence, drug testing—defined as an objective technique to identify, monitor, and deter illegal use—offers an important tool for the justice system. Successive editions of the *National Drug Control Strategy*, published by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, have recommended expanded use of drug testing by criminal justice agencies,² and examples of such State and local programs can now be found at virtually every point of the criminal justice process. Drug testing is now employed to screen for recent use, identify chronic users, monitor for compliance with probation and parole conditions, deter further use, and estimate use trends in criminal populations.³ Arraignment judges are now using results from arrestee drug tests in deciding on and setting conditions for release, and positive drug tests are now accepted as a basis for new sanctions—including parole revocations—for adjudicated offenders.

National Institute of Justice (NIJ) drug testing activities have focused on three topics: the possible uses of drug testing in operating criminal justice agencies, the development and evaluation of testing technologies, and drug testing's value as a basis for a drug use indicator system. In the course of its work, NIJ has pioneered hair analysis as a less obtrusive, more accurate means for detecting illegal drug use. NIJ also has operated the Drug Use Forecasting (DUF) program, initiated in 1987 after two NIJ studies showed dramatically higher levels of drug use among arrestees than had been estimated through self-reporting. DUF is now recognized as one of the leading indicators of illegal drug use.

Drug Testing in Criminal Justice. NIJ is currently sponsoring research on the costs, operations, and outcomes of drug testing programs in a range of criminal justice settings. In a study requested by the Congress, researchers are using econometric modeling to examine the implications of different approaches for increasing drug testing of arrestees and correctional populations. An evaluation of a program that offers first-time offenders the opportunity to participate in drug treatment programs—in lieu of incarceration—is attempting to determine whether these types of programs will reduce casual drug use. Evaluations of three Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA)-sponsored focused-offender disposition projects are assessing the treatment needs of drug-involved offenders and attempting to identify types of offenders for whom regular urinalysis will deter drug use. Two NIJ field experiments of drug testing in community corrections are underway. One is comparing the effects of different levels of routine testing and unscheduled drug testing on criminality and parole adjustment in a sample of young offenders. The second is examining the effectiveness of drug testing and alternative interventions with adult probationers. Another NIJ project is analyzing the costs and effectiveness of intensive supervision of drug offenders. Recent work on drug testing in the context of intensive supervision programs found that technology appeared to have moved faster than some agencies' ability to use the information effectively.⁴

Drug Testing in Corrections. NIJ is also evaluating correctional programs where drug testing is one element of supervision or treatment, but may also contribute to knowledge of how and for whom testing can be effective. Current NIJ studies involve a range of State- and local-level boot camp programs that target adult or juvenile drug-involved offenders. Other studies are evaluating drug treatment in the Georgia prison system and analyzing drug treatment programs throughout the criminal justice system.

Pretrial Drug Testing

In the mid-1980's, NIJ established the operational feasibility of a comprehensive pretrial drug testing program in Washington, D.C. That program became the basis for BJA-sponsored replications. Studies in nine communities have examined the value of drug testing in making release decisions and supervising drug-involved defendants. Research results on pretrial drug testing have been mixed, and there is a need for more focused research.⁵ In an effort to conduct such research and move from debate to more definitive answers, NIJ is also sponsoring a cross-site comparison of pretrial drug testing programs, focusing on whether drug testing information is useful in predicting pretrial misconduct.

Drug Testing Technologies

The accuracy and reliability of testing technologies is another important research area for NIJ. A recent study, which BJA cofunded, evaluated the four methods of urine screening commonly used to detect illegal drugs in criminal justice settings. The evaluation found that, although the urinalysis technologies were likely to result in false negative results about 20 percent of the time, they rarely led to false positive results.

Drug Use Forecasting

NIJ's Drug Use Forecasting program, established in 1987, uses drug tests and interview data to estimate the levels and types of drugs used by booked arrestees in 24 urban sites throughout the Nation. In conducting the DUF program, NIJ works closely with the DUF Program Review Panel, which is composed of representatives of other Federal agencies involved in drug enforcement, treatment, or drug research, such as the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) and the National Institute of Drug Abuse (NIDA); State and local criminal justice agencies; and professional organizations in the field; as well as statisticians and researchers. Members suggest how DUF findings can be used more effectively; what system refinements, such as

sampling technique improvements, will increase DUF utility for practitioners; and how DUF data might be combined with other drug use indicators to improve understanding of the drug problem. DUF-related research efforts currently underway include a major analysis of the DUF sampling strategy, the development and piloting of a computerized DUF interview, and the revision and expansion of the juvenile interview instrument.

Ongoing Programs for 1992

Cross-Site Comparison of Pretrial Drug Testing Programs

NIJ has commissioned this work through an existing contract to determine to what extent, if any, information on a defendant's drug status at the time of arrest improves the ability to assess the risk of pretrial misconduct, over and above the information normally compiled as background for the release decision. The project will also assess mature drug testing programs and how sanctions for noncompliance are applied.

Models for a Drug-Free Criminal Justice System

This project is developing models of the elements of effective drug testing programs at different points within the criminal justice system, based on a review of the literature and the operations of current testing programs. It is paying particular attention to the issues faced in attempting to ensure consistent, uniform, and feasible responses to positive test results and to the complex issues in chemical-dependence treatment referral.

Hair Analysis for Drugs of Abuse

This joint NIJ-NIDA program is a continuation of research and development activities on hair analysis as a technique for identifying illegal drug users. Other efforts are working toward developed information for hair analysis and explored factors that affect its accuracy in criminal justice settings.

Drug Use Forecasting (DUF)

NIJ will continue in fiscal year 1992 to operate this program at 24 sites with cofunding from BJA. The DUF Program Review Panel will consider the findings and recommendations of the independent analysis of the DUF sampling strategy and provide input to NIJ on appropriate implementation. Pilot testing of the computerized DUF interview will begin in the spring of 1992, and the use of the interview will be assessed for its effect on both data quality and timeliness of data entry. The advisors will review the pilot test and make recommendations on wider application. NIJ is also continuing to coordinate with NIDA and other Federal agencies on incorporating DUF findings with other indicator systems.

New Solicitations for 1992

In fiscal year 1992, NIJ's drug testing research will focus on the use of DUF findings in operating programs, attempting to demonstrate how State and local agencies can analyze and use DUF findings—alone or in conjunction with other drug-related information—to identify program, information, or service needs within the jurisdiction and to design appropriate policy and program responses. Use of hair analysis as a potential drug testing procedure in probation or parole programs will also be explored.

In addition, a concluding solicitation identifies other areas of interest and encourages proposals on other useful research on this priority topic.

References

1. Alfred Blumstein, Jacqueline Cohen, Jeffrey A. Roth, and Christy A. Visher, eds., *Criminal Careers and "Career Criminals."* National Academy Press, Washington, D.C., 1986; Christopher A. Innes, *Drug Use and Crime*, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1988; J.A. O'Neil and V. Baldau, *Drug Use Forecasting—Drugs and Crime—1990 Annual Report*, National Institute of Justice, 1991; *Drug Use Forecasting—First Quarter 1991*, National Institute of Justice, 1991.
2. Office of National Drug Control Policy, *National Drug Control Strategy: September 1989*: 16, 26; *National Drug Control Strategy: January 1990*: 12, 26; *National Drug Control Strategy: January 1992*: 126–127, 154–155, and 166.
3. Eric D. Wish and Bernard A. Gropper, "Drug testing by the criminal justice system," *Drugs and Crime*, ed. M. Tonry and J.Q. Wilson, (*Crime and Justice* 13, 1990), University of Chicago Press.
4. Susan Turner, Joan Petersilia, and Elizabeth Deschenes, "The implementation and effectiveness of drug testing in community supervision: Results of an experimental evaluation," from the final report to NIJ, grant number 89-IJ-CX-0044, 1991.
5. Christy A. Visher, "Pretrial drug testing: panacea or Pandora's box?," *The Annals*, ed. Eric Wish, to be published May 1992. For research on individual jurisdictions, see: M. Toborg et al., *Assessment of Pretrial Urine Testing in the District of Columbia*, National Institute of Justice, 1989; Christy A. Visher and Richard L. Linster, "A survival model of pretrial failure;" Christy Visher, "Using drug testing to identify high-risk defendants on release;" Michael Gottfredson, Chester L. Britt, and John Goldkamp, *Evaluation of Arizona Pretrial Services Drug Testing Programs*, final report to the National Institute of Justice, 1991; John S. Goldkamp, Peter Jones, and Michael Gottfredson, *Measuring the Impact of Drug Testing at the Pretrial Release Stage: Experimental Findings from Prince George's County and Milwaukee County, Final Report*, final report to the Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1990.

Drug Testing: Solicitations for 1992

Using DUF Findings in Innovative Programs

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a Drug Use Forecasting demonstration project that will use DUF findings to identify the needs for particular policies, programs, or services at State or local levels and to develop and implement the appropriate response(s). With this solicitation, NIJ is, for the first time, providing support not only for the analysis of DUF data, but also for State or local officials who wish to take actions based on the results of their analyses.

Background

The Drug Use Forecasting program is designed to provide estimates of recent drug use among booked arrestees. To obtain DUF data, voluntary and anonymous interviews and urine specimens are obtained on a quarterly basis from a sample of 225 male arrestees processed through the booking facilities of each of DUF's 24 sites. Twenty-one DUF sites also interview and test all female arrestees booked during the collection period (approximately 100 per quarter), and 11 sites interview and test all juvenile arrestees/detainees (50 to 100 per quarter) brought in during the collection period. Urine specimens are analyzed at a central laboratory for the presence of 10 drugs. Urinalysis results are then merged with official record information on charge and self-report data from the interviews. NIJ conducts analyses for national reporting purposes, but it strongly encourages analysis and use of DUF findings in State and local policy development and program decisions.

DUF results have been used in a number of ways. For example, in Chicago and Portland, Oregon, DUF findings led to use of State funds to support DUF replications in selected suburban and rural counties. In New Orleans, the DUF program is credited with stimulating State legislation on the drug testing of arrestees and the creation of a new drug testing program in New Orleans Parish. In San Diego, officials used findings from their DUF project to support the development of a special drug court. In addition, Birmingham, Alabama, is now using DUF data to plan a new project that will provide perinatal and infant care for high-risk women.

In an effort to expand use of DUF data at the local level, NIJ provided support for two projects in 1991. One, an examination and documentation of how States and communities currently analyze and use DUF findings, will provide techniques to assist other jurisdictions in using DUF. The other is identifying drug use information needs, conducting special analyses, and determining the most useful formats of DUF data files and information for local use of findings.

This solicitation will support a project to use DUF findings to identify the need for particular policies, programs, or services and to develop and implement appropriate response(s) to the needs. Because NIJ is interested in not only encouraging State and local use of DUF findings, but also in stimulating their regular and continuing use, eligibility is restricted to State or local agencies associated with one of the 24 DUF sites.

Goals

- To demonstrate how State or local agencies can analyze and use DUF findings—alone or in conjunction with other drug-related information—to identify program, information, or service needs within the jurisdiction and to design appropriate policy and program responses.
- To implement the resulting policies, programs, and/or practices and any information systems needed to document and assess their operation.

■ To disseminate the demonstration findings so they can be employed and applied within other jurisdictions.

Objectives

■ Analyze DUF data, together with other relevant drug-related information and in conjunction with other appropriate agencies or organizations; identify and prioritize the program, information, or service needs suggested by the findings; and select the area(s) to be addressed.

■ Design the selected policy and program response(s), and prepare a detailed implementation plan that includes the development of any information systems needed to monitor and assess implementation.

■ Establish and implement the resulting policies, programs, and/or practices, and document their operation.

■ Prepare a report on the demonstration, for publication by the National Institute of Justice, to inform policymakers and law enforcement and criminal justice professionals and to serve as a guide for other jurisdictions.

Program Strategy

Analyze DUF data, together with other relevant drug-related information and in conjunction with other appropriate agencies or organizations; identify and prioritize the program, information, or service needs suggested by the findings; and select the area(s) to be addressed.

The grantee will: (1) review and analyze DUF data for the jurisdiction; (2) identify, collect, and analyze or compile other drug-related information available within the jurisdiction that is relevant to the topic of inquiry; and (3) work with key agencies, organizations, and officials to review the results and identify policies, programs, or practices that the findings of the analyses suggest would help the jurisdiction achieve its goals in

the control and prevention of drug abuse and related crimes such as homicides, burglaries, and robberies. Applicants should explain how they will assign priorities to the potential responses in terms of need, feasibility, cost, potential utility, etc., and how they intend to reach a consensus among the participating agencies on the area(s) to be addressed.

Applicants should review within the proposal how DUF data have been and/or are currently being used within the jurisdiction to: (1) identify agencies or individuals who normally receive DUF findings; (2) summarize past DUF analyses or reports developed by or for the jurisdiction; and (3) explain the questions to be addressed and the analyses to be contemplated under this project. Any other sources of drug testing or drug-related information being considered for review or analysis should be identified; their relevance explained; and the means for accessing, collecting, and using this information detailed. Applicants should discuss in detail the process that they will use to identify, select, and prioritize policy and program responses and identify the agencies and/or individuals to be involved. **In jurisdictions where prior review and analysis of DUF data have already suggested policy or program needs that will be considered or refined under this project, applicants should discuss the needs identified and the potential responses with as much specificity as possible.**

The products of this effort will include a summary of the policy and program needs suggested by the review and analysis of DUF and related data, a prioritized list of potential responses, and a description of the selection and justification of the area(s) to be addressed.

Design the selected policy and program response(s), and prepare a detailed implementation plan that includes the development of any information systems needed to monitor and assess implementation.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee should develop and define the goals, objectives, operational procedures, and anticipated outcomes of the proposed project, including the identification or development of

the data elements or systems that will be used to document and assess operational performance. The grantee should identify staffing and/or training requirements and develop a detailed budget for the project. If the budget for the operational project exceeds resources available from NIJ, the grantee will identify in-kind contributions and/or alternative sources of funds. The grantee should develop a detailed implementation plan, specifying both the steps for implementing each element of the plan and a timeline and milestone for each of those steps. Throughout, the grantee should network and coordinate with other appropriate agencies and organizations.

Within the proposal, applicants should detail strategies for accomplishing this objective and demonstrate both the capability and experience to develop, design, and implement new and innovative responses to law enforcement and criminal justice problems. Supporting documentation is encouraged. Applicants should demonstrate their experience in developing the resources to support new efforts. Applicants are encouraged to address their willingness and capability to make in-kind contributions and/or acquire additional resources necessary to support implementation.

NIJ anticipates that the review and analysis conducted under the first objective will identify some needs that can be met without new program initiatives or major commitments of resources, even though they are included in the overall response strategy and implementation plan. Examples include needs that can be met through more frequent or more systematic information-sharing among agencies, through new legislative proposals, or through improved public information. Applicants must, therefore, demonstrate their experience in collaborating constructively with other agencies and organizations to achieve common or complementary goals.

The products of this objective will be a fully developed program design and a detailed implementation plan for the response strategy.

The grantee shall complete this objective within 3 to 6 months of award.

Establish and implement the resulting policies, programs, and/or practices, and document their operation.

NIJ must review and approve the proposed response strategy, program design, and implementation plan before the grantee undertakes further work. Upon approval, the grantee shall implement the plan, monitor execution, and collect and analyze information necessary to assess performance and document accomplishments. The grantee is expected to use that information to modify and improve the program. The grantee shall submit periodic reports on program status, operations, and accomplishments.

Applicants should detail both the strategies and techniques that will be used to implement the policies, programs, and/or operations developed. Applicants must also: (1) demonstrate knowledge of, and experience with, the type of problems that are common to innovation and that prevent new initiatives from achieving their full potential; (2) discuss potential techniques for avoiding or resolving them; and (3) demonstrate experience with procedures for program adjustment, refinement, and improvement.

The products will include the operational programs and activities of the response strategy. Reports on program operations and accomplishments will serve as inputs for the report specified in the following objective.

Prepare a report on the demonstration, for publication by the National Institute of Justice, to inform policy-makers and law enforcement and criminal justice professionals and to serve as a guide for other jurisdictions.

The grantee will be required to produce a report, for possible NIJ publication, that includes: (1) a discussion of the analysis, design, and development process; (2) a description of the implementation and operation of the program and resulting policies, programs, and activities; and (3) information and supporting data on program achievements and/or problems encountered. The report should be designed for law enforcement and criminal

justice professionals and policymakers, and, presented in sufficient detail to serve as a guide for other jurisdictions.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Eligibility Requirements. Agencies of State or local government associated with one of the 24 DUF projects are eligible under this solicitation.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum of 24 months.

Award Amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at up to \$250,000 per demonstration award; multiple awards may be considered. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Using DUF Findings in Innovative Programs
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Bernard A. Gropper, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-307-0647.

Hair Testing in Probation and Parole

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals to support the research, development, and evaluation of hair analysis as a potential drug testing procedure for use in probation or parole programs.

Background

Detection of drug use is an essential part of the Nation's fight against drug abuse and drug-related crime. But no one drug testing method is optimal for all information and decisionmaking needs. The availability of alternative techniques with complementary capabilities can strengthen detection and control of drug use and its consequences.

Hair analysis may offer unique advantages compared to other currently used drug testing methods based on behavioral indicators or body fluids. Unlike these short-term and reversible processes, hair tends to retain drug components for longer periods. Drug use can be detected in hair for as long as weeks or months compared to the 2 to 3 days that cocaine or heroin can be detected in blood or urine. It may thus provide wider windows of detection and less opportunity for evasion. In addition, hair specimens can be readily obtained without the privacy problems associated with urine or the invasiveness of drawing blood.¹ Because of these features, which increase the capacity to monitor drug use, hair analysis is likely to be particularly useful in probation and parole settings. The Office of National Drug Control Policy has noted the potential of hair analysis as a useful addition to current capabilities.²

Exploratory work on the use of hair analysis to detect drug use in a criminal justice population in Pinellas County, Florida, has provided current data comparing urinalysis techniques and hair analysis for detecting

drug use in arrestees. This study assessed the results obtained from self-reports, urine-based tests, and hair analysis; and it confirmed the potential advantages of hair analysis in terms of its ability to reveal drug use within the last 30 days that may be missed by urine tests.³

NIJ's program on hair testing has three components: (1) development and evaluation of programs that can be used by State and local criminal justice agencies; (2) forensic issues; and (3) technological research.

First, program development and evaluation research focuses on potential applications of drug testing by hair analysis for criminal justice agencies. These include developing optimal field procedures for the acquisition and handling of hair samples in operating agencies and evaluating the relative merits of urine and hair tests for specific detection and monitoring applications in criminal justice.

A second line of research focuses on the forensic uses of hair as a test medium and its acceptability as evidence. Evidentiary issues include time-dosage profiles of how much and how soon different types of drugs can be detected in hair, how drug use or other exposure affects hair, and how any group differences (e.g., age, race, or sex) should be accounted for in either the analytic techniques or specimen acquisition and handling. These issues must be resolved before hair analysis will be accepted as evidence in court proceedings.

Third, technological research focuses on hair testing methods and standards, including techniques for the extraction and analysis of drug-related information from hair, the effects of the environment on hair, ways of altering the drug content of the hair to evade detection, and the development of test criteria and standard materials for different analytic techniques.

Because of common interests in drug testing methods and applications, NIJ and NIDA have entered into an interagency agreement for support of this research and anticipate long-term collaborative efforts on these topics.⁴

The present solicitation is directed toward adding hair analysis to methods currently used in the criminal justice system to test for and monitor drug use and evaluating the merits of the technique in a field study within a State or local criminal justice agency.

Goals

■ To develop and evaluate the scientific, technological, and program capabilities needed for enhanced drug detection and monitoring of drug-abusing offenders through hair analysis.

■ To inform and enhance the abilities of State and local criminal justice agencies to detect and monitor drug-abusing offenders through additional testing capabilities by hair analysis.

Objectives

■ Compare and evaluate the merits of hair analysis for obtaining drug-related information from offenders in probation and parole programs relative to other types of drug testing by designing and conducting a field study.

■ Prepare a report on the results of the field study, focusing on the advantages and disadvantages of hair testing for criminal justice applications, for publication by the National Institute of Justice and distribution to policymakers and criminal justice professionals.

■ Develop recommendations for further research and evaluation on integration of hair testing for individual and group applications in criminal justice populations.

Program Strategy

Compare and evaluate the merits of hair analysis for obtaining drug-related information from offenders in probation and parole programs relative to other types of drug testing by designing and conducting a field study.

Programs for monitoring or intensive supervision of drug-involved offenders and detection of drug usage

among probationers and parolees may have to balance tradeoffs between frequency of testing, likelihood of detection (and related deterrence), costs, and interference with jobs or other considerations in community-based settings. Field study and evaluation, in cooperation with State and local criminal justice agencies, is needed to determine the optimal balances of these issues with any single type of test (e.g., hair, urine, breath, etc.) or the optimal combinations of them for screening or confirmation of continued drug use with criminal justice populations.

Under this solicitation, NIJ is seeking projects providing data on the use of hair analysis as a drug detection technique in operational programs within State and local criminal justice agencies. The proposal should design a field study to test and demonstrate the technique in a probation or parole setting. The proposed study design should reflect the current developmental nature of hair testing and be employed solely for research purposes, with no use of individual hair analysis data for individual case decisions.

Issues to be addressed may include: (1) comparison of alternative single or multimethod programs for drug monitoring of offenders; (2) types of drug use patterns detected through different program schedules, tests, and cutoff criteria; and/or (3) the extent to which hair tests can complement other indicators (e.g., official records, clinical signs, urine/blood tests) in monitoring drug use among criminal justice populations.

Other criminal justice operational concerns may relate to program management, provision of appropriate onsite staff training, monitoring to ensure acquisition of adequate size hair samples for detection and confirmation of multiple drugs by current methods, and chain of custody for sample labelling and shipping to offsite laboratories for analysis.

The applicant's proposal should reflect a thorough review of the relevant program and research literature on current drug testing and monitoring methods in criminal justice program settings. These should include at least those related to hair, urine, and other relevant physi-

ological indicators, plus self-report, clinical profiles, or official data records. The proposal should offer evidence of the feasibility of the proposed studies by showing cooperation by the relevant jurisdictions and criminal justice agencies. The proposal should describe provisions for human subjects protection and document compliance with all relevant Federal, State, and local laws and policies.

Prepare a report on the results of the field study, focusing on the advantages and disadvantages of hair testing for criminal justice applications, for publication by the National Institute of Justice and distribution to policymakers and criminal justice professionals.

The final report, for possible NIJ publication, should include detailed discussions of the operational, technical, and scientific issues of drug testing and detection by hair analysis relative to the other methods considered in the field study. It also should indicate the advantages, limitations, and relationships of the hair analysis findings to other drug detection technologies for criminal justice applications. The report should be designed for State and local law enforcement and criminal justice professionals and policymakers and serve as a guide for interested jurisdictions and drug testing programs.

Develop recommendations for further research and evaluation on integration of hair testing for individual and group applications in criminal justice populations.

An important component of the study should be a blueprint of recommended research and evaluation strategies, based on the data collected and analyzed, for advancing use of hair analysis in criminal justice settings. Unresolved operational, technical, and scientific issues should be clearly presented, drawing upon knowledge of current drug testing and monitoring methods in criminal justice programs and experience gained from the field study.

The applicant should detail appropriate mechanisms for evaluating these strategies, developing and justifying the recommended strategies and outlining evaluation issues

pertaining to, for example, site selection, costs, staffing, and duration. The applicant should also discuss potential problems, including feasibility, funding sources, ethical or legal impediments, and potential negative consequences of the recommended strategies.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on this topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$150,000 to \$200,000. It is anticipated this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date: Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Hair Testing in Probation and Parole
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Bernard A. Gropper, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact him at 202-307-0647.

References

1. M.R. Harkey and G.L. Henderson, *Hair Analysis for Drugs of Abuse*, Advances in Analytical Toxicology, Biomedical Publications, 1989; W.A. Baumgartner, V.A. Hill, and W.H. Bland, "Hair analysis for drugs of abuse," *Journal of the Forensic Sciences*, (November 1989): 1433-1453; B.A. Gropper, "Drug detection through hair analysis," *NIJ Technology Bulletin, Law Enforcement Technology*, (February 1989):18.
2. *National Drug Control Strategy*, Office of National Drug Control Policy, 1989:83.
3. Tom Mieczkowski, Harvey Landress, Richard Newel, and Shirley Coletti, *The Concordance of Drug Use Indicators: Urine, Hair and Self-Report in an Arrestee Population*, final report to the National Institute of Justice.
4. A. Keegan, "Putting hair to the test," *NIDA Notes* 6,4, (Winter 1991): 10-12.

Drug Testing: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research program, including both basic and applied approaches, that involves a large majority of the criminal justice research and professional communities. NIJ conducts annual evaluations of promising criminal justice programs, conducts demonstration projects, assesses the usefulness and effectiveness of advances in technology, and conducts training programs.

NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies, including case studies, structured observation, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative research proposals that would bring thinking and research from a variety of disciplines to the study of crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest might include, but are not limited to, the following:

■ **Analyses of DUF data.** In addition to data on adult arrestees, which have always been available for public use, NIJ will make available in 1992 data on juvenile detainees from 11 DUF sites for analysis for the first time. Analyses of both these data sets for their policy and criminal justice practice implications are needed.

■ **Field kits for drug testing.** Drug test field kits can add new levels of flexibility and accuracy to the identification and monitoring of drug-using probationers and parolees. Research is needed on the validity, cost-effectiveness, impact on offenders, and officers' assessments of these kits.

■ **Uses for drug testing information.** Research is needed on the extent to which State and local agencies are, or have the potential for, managing and using information from drug testing programs—not only for individual offender-based decisions—but also for probationers and parolees and for other purposes as well.

Applicants uncertain about whether a project idea falls within the program's scope should consult the Program Manager.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Drug Testing: Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Bernard A. Gropper, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-307-0647.

Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication

The Nature and Extent of Environmental Crime

Eyewitness Recall and Testimony in the
Criminal Justice System

Justice System Processing of Child Abuse Cases

Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication:
Priority Topics

OJP Policy Statement — *Prosecution and adjudication should be a primary focus of criminal and juvenile justice system activity in order to attack aggressively the problems of illegal drug trafficking, gang violence, and community exploitation. Office of Justice Programs (OJP) activities will focus on promoting legislation as well as policies, procedures, and practices that expedite the identification, processing, adjudication, and case disposition of adult and juvenile serious, violent offenders. The activities will emphasize tactics, technologies, and strategies that include systemwide coordinated responses, vertical prosecution, offender specialization, case management, expeditious court decisionmaking, and appropriate dispositional alternatives. Demonstration, training, technical assistance, and information dissemination are the primary program mechanisms that will be used in preparing more effective prosecutorial and judicial responses to serious and violent crime.*

Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication

Efforts to strengthen prosecution, adjudication, and sentencing of serious and, especially, violent offenders take on added significance in light of increasing caseloads stemming from drug abuse and trafficking crimes. Recent national surveys of prosecutors, public defenders, judges, and court administrators document the impact of the drug crisis on their caseloads. They also cite prison and jail crowding as the most significant local problem.¹ Surveys reveal a lack of sufficient resources for practitioners to do their jobs well and still provide the quality of justice the public expects.² They also point to the need for improved pretrial practices and a range of sanctions to reduce caseloads and dispose of cases more effectively.

These issues have been a central concern in National Institute of Justice (NIJ) research in recent years. Past research related to prosecution and adjudication has focused on intensive prosecution of career criminals, sentencing, evidentiary issues, factors related to felony case attrition, plea bargaining, court delay, and jury decisionmaking and management.

Recent and current NIJ projects focus on issues relating to the efficient adjudication of drug cases and the special problems of prosecuting and adjudicating child abuse and environmental crimes.

Drug Case Management. A recently concluded NIJ project examined expedited drug case management efforts in court systems at three sites around the country. Current court-related NIJ projects are assessing the Dade County, Florida, drug court (an assessment jointly sponsored with the State Justice Institute), court responses to the influx of drug cases, and the use of a more structured and efficient approach to fine imposition and enforcement.

Child Abuse. Family crime, particularly child abuse, has become an increasing concern to the criminal justice system and of increasing importance in the NIJ research program. Over the past decade, caseloads involving child victims have increased dramatically. Parental substance abuse has been linked to many child maltreatment cases. One study reports that in 43 percent of serious child abuse or neglect cases, at least one parent is a documented substance abuser, with alcohol, cocaine, and heroin the most frequently abused drugs.³

Recent NIJ projects to reduce child abuse have examined policies, innovative practices, and relevant statutes;⁴ assessed the expanded responsibilities of police in regard to child abuse;⁵ and devised improved approaches to effective interviews with children.⁶

Environmental Crime. Public concern has grown as both the public health and ecological balance continue to be affected by increased violations of environmental regulations. A poll conducted for the Department of Justice in 1984 found that Americans believed environmental crime to be more serious than heroin smuggling, bank robbery, and attempted murder.⁷ In a 1991 survey, 84 percent of Americans believed that damaging the environment is a serious crime, and 75 percent believed that corporate officials should be held personally responsible for environmental offenses committed by their firms.⁸

NIJ research is supporting a national survey of prosecutors to assess approaches to prosecuting environmental crimes and the level of resources directed at such efforts. This research will also produce case studies of five promising approaches to prosecuting these serious crimes.

New Solicitations for 1992

In 1992, the NIJ research program will study issues and problems concerning the prosecution and adjudication of criminal cases and related civil matters. The program builds on past research and upon recently identified problems and issues important to prosecution and the judicial process. Areas of particular interest in the current year include environmental crime, ways to improve eyewitness recall and testimony in cases of serious crime, and justice system processing of child abuse cases. The solicitations in each of these areas are detailed below. In addition, a concluding solicitation identifies other areas of interest and encourages proposals on other useful research projects within the area of prosecution and adjudication.

References

1. *National Assessment Program* (NAP), surveys conducted by the Institute for Law and Justice, Inc., for the National Institute of Justice, 1990.
2. NAP (note above) and *Criminal Justice in Crisis*, American Bar Association, Criminal Justice Section, 1988.
3. J.M. Murphy, M. Jellinek, D. Quinn, G. Smith, F.G. Poitras, and M. Goshko, "Substance Abuse and Serious Child Mistreatment: Prevalence, Risk, and Outcome in a Court Sample," *Child Abuse and Neglect* 15, 3(1991): 197-211.
4. D. Whitcomb, *When the Victim Is a Child*, 2d ed., National Institute of Justice, 1992.
5. S.E. Martin and D.J. Besharov, *Police and Child Abuse: New Policies for Expanded Responsibilities*, National Institute of Justice, June 1991.
6. "New Approach to Interviewing Children: A Test of Its Effectiveness," National Institute of Justice, *Research in Brief*, 1992, based on research by R.E. Geiselman, G. Bornstein, and K.J. Saywitz.
7. A.J. Celebrezze et al., "Criminal Enforcement of State Environmental Laws: The Ohio Solution," *Harvard Environmental Law Review* 14(1990): 217, 218.
8. Arthur D. Little, Inc., "Environmental Damage Rated as Most Serious Among Business Crimes: Corporate Executives Should Be Held Liable, Survey Shows," Press release, July 1991.

Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication: Solicitations for 1992

The Nature and Extent of Environmental Crime

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals to develop a data collection system to assist local prosecutors' offices to allocate environmental enforcement and prosecution resources where they will have the greatest impact.

Background

Environmental crime is a critical problem for the United States. The American public has become increasingly concerned as both the public health and ecological balance of the Nation continue to be endangered by growing numbers of persons and firms not in compliance with environmental regulations. A poll conducted for the U.S. Department of Justice in 1984 found that Americans believed environmental crime to be more serious than heroin smuggling, bank robbery, and attempted murder.¹

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has emphasized that greater involvement by district attorneys in criminal prosecutions would provide a faster response to environmental crimes, thereby reducing environmental risk and damage.² However, due to the many obstacles local prosecutors face in prosecuting environmental crimes, relatively little attention has been paid to the criminal prosecution of environmental crimes at the local level.

The National Institute of Justice is committed to assisting local prosecutors in the important task of prosecut-

ing environmental crimes. In 1991, NIJ awarded funds to the American Prosecutors Research Institute (APRI) to conduct a national survey of prosecutors to examine current approaches to the prosecution of environmental crime. Additionally, case studies of five promising approaches to local environmental crime prosecution will be conducted under this NIJ project. The results of the survey and case studies will provide NIJ with important information on needs in the prosecution field as they relate to environmental crime.

NIJ seeks proposals to develop data on environmental crime similar to that available and collected for other types of crimes. Experts in the field believe such a collection system would be helpful in developing effective prosecution strategies and assist in identifying the "typical" environmental offender in a particular jurisdiction so that with limited resources prosecutors can decide where to most effectively target resources. The pilot data collection system also is expected to be adaptable for use in other jurisdictions.

Goals

- To understand the nature of environmental crimes, the characteristics of offenders engaged in such crimes, the number of parallel civil/criminal proceedings and their outcomes, and the sentences received and served under applicable criminal environmental crimes statutes.

- To produce a comprehensive report detailing the following: (1) an analysis of the data collected, including a description of the data system that was designed during the study; (2) how the information can be used to assist local enforcement and prosecution authorities to allocate resources where they will have greatest impact; and (3) the data collection system's potential for replicability in local prosecutors' offices across the United States.

Objectives

- Design a pilot data collection system in a local prosecutor's office to collect comprehensive data from

the environmental crime cases processed by that office, incorporating information from past cases including the frequency, characteristics, and outcomes of such cases, to identify data elements needed.

- Identify possible site(s) in which this pilot data collection effort could be implemented.
- Collect and analyze the data to determine how the findings can be used to assist the jurisdiction in improving its environmental prosecution practices and better allocating its resources.
- Formulate recommendations, based on the operational aspects of the data collection system; develop a comprehensive report, for publication by the National Institute of Justice, on how the types of data collected can be used by local prosecutors to improve their environmental prosecution practices and better allocate resources; and provide an assessment of how this model can be replicated in other jurisdictions.

Program Strategy

Design a pilot data collection system in a local prosecutor's office to collect comprehensive data from the environmental crime cases processed by that office, incorporating information from past cases including the frequency, characteristics, and outcomes of such cases to identify data elements needed.

The applicant should outline methods for determining the nature of environmental offenses and offenders referred to a local prosecutor's office for environmental prosecution. The applicant should examine the types of environmental offenses reported to criminal justice and regulatory agencies, whether or not these offenses are accepted for investigation/prosecution. Special attention should be paid to: (1) the mechanisms through which cases are reported; (2) the types of cases accepted for investigation or prosecution at the local level; (3) the cases, referred to other authorities or otherwise rejected; and (4) the characteristics of offenders involved in various types of environmental crimes.

The proposal should include a strategy for collecting valid and reliable data that cover the following: (1) characteristics of offenders engaged in environmental crimes; (2) the nature of the environmental crimes committed; (3) whether an offense is related to the storage, transportation, or disposal of hazardous materials; (4) whether environmental offenders are prosecuted under traditional criminal statutes or under environmental statutes; and (5) types of environmental cases that are settled as opposed to those that go to trial. The proposal should address methods of obtaining the following types of information from archival case data: (1) sentences received and sentences served by convicted environmental offenders; (2) the numbers of parallel civil/criminal proceedings and the outcomes; and (3) the frequency with which site remediation actually occurs as part of an offender's sentence. The applicant should present evidence that the local prosecutor's office selected for this project has a wide range of environmental crimes in its files that will be available for developing the pilot data collection system. Information should be presented on the kinds of data a typical file contains for each decision point from complaint to different final dispositions.

The proposal should specify the types of issues to be addressed, the types of data to be collected, and the methodologies to be employed on site, such as interviews with officials in law enforcement, criminal justice, and regulatory agencies responsible for environmental enforcement, onsite observation of programs, and archival data analysis. The proposal should offer draft data collection instruments and provide assurances of access to proposed archival and other data sources. Finally, the applicant should provide a research management plan and schedule.

Identify possible site(s) in which this pilot data collection effort could be implemented.

It is expected that the data collection system developed under this solicitation will subsequently be pilot tested in a different site. In consultation with NIJ, the grantee will select a site for implementation of the pilot data collection system. Within the grant proposal, the

applicant should identify potential sites and provide site selection rationale. The proposal should include assurances of data access and site cooperation.

The applicant should also address the issue of individual systems' (i.e., police, regulatory agencies, prosecutors, courts) response to environmental crime in the community. Special attention should be paid to coordination networks and the interplay between the various law enforcement, justice system, and regulatory agency responses to environmental crime. If multiagency task forces exist, these should be studied in particular detail. Strengths and weaknesses of various policies and strategies should be identified, as well as the resources required to implement them.

Collect and analyze the data to determine how the findings can be used to assist the jurisdiction in improving its environmental prosecution practices and better allocating its resources.

The proposal should describe a design for data analysis to follow the data collection phase. The applicant should specify how the data will result in a sound description of the nature and patterns of various environmental crime activities, the characteristics and motivations of offenders, and the conditions that facilitate the commission of these crimes or hamper efforts to prevent and control their occurrence. Special attention should be paid to an assessment of sentencing patterns for environmental crime offenders in the local jurisdiction. Special attention should also be paid to organizational offenders and their sanctioning and whether such prosecutions also sanction individual offenders within the organizations.

Formulate recommendations, based on the operational aspects of the data collection system; develop a comprehensive report, for publication by the National Institute of Justice, on how the types of data collected can be used by local prosecutors to improve their environmental prosecution practices and better allocate resources; and provide an assessment of the replicability of this model in other jurisdictions.

This comprehensive report is expected to include a thorough discussion of the data collection system designed, the data collected, and an analysis of the data in terms of how the data collected can assist the jurisdiction in better allocating its resources on environmental crimes and in developing enhanced prosecution strategies.

The recommendations should also include an assessment of the replicability of this data collection system to other local prosecutors' offices. The report should address the potential for this type of data, once collected, to become part of a standardized reporting procedure similar to those for other types of crime, such as homicide and burglary. It is expected that local prosecutors' offices throughout the Nation will be able to benefit from the replication and use of such a data collection system in improving environmental crime prosecution practices and better allocating resources.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000 to \$250,000. It is anticipated this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposal received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Nature and Extent of Environmental Crime
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Ms. Cheryl Crawford, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-514-6210.

References

1. A.J. Celebrezze et al., "Criminal enforcement of state environmental laws: the Ohio solution," *Harvard Environmental Law Review* 14(1990): 217, 218.
2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Enforcement Four-Year Strategic Plan: Enhanced Environmental Enforcement for the 1990's*, Washington, D.C., EPA, September 1990.

Eyewitness Recall and Testimony in the Criminal Justice System

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a comprehensive analysis and synthesis of the issues and practices concerning eyewitness recall and testimony in the criminal justice system. The project should synthesize existing studies and assess both current law enforcement interviewing practices and judicial processes related to eyewitness recall and testimony.

Background

Most serious crimes, such as robbery and assault, involve at least one witness, the victim, who usually can give some eyewitness report of the crime. Evidence from an eyewitness can be significant in cases that are plea bargained as well as in those that go to trial, particularly as such evidence influences a jury. Eyewitness accounts are always a critical element of evidence. In those cases that are tried, eyewitness accounts are most often presented as evidence in court. Yet the eyewitness account poses many problems that raise questions about its significance in criminal prosecution and trial proceedings, not the least of which is the credibility of eyewitnesses and their accounts.

Efforts to improve eyewitness recall and testimony have focused on issues of accuracy, reliability, and the impact in a legal proceeding. NIJ-supported¹ and other research have addressed these issues over the past decade. The research has revealed various sources of unreliability that affect the acquisition, retention, and recall of a witnessed event. Other research has addressed issues in the recognition and recall of crime suspects, and methods of enhancing memory through improved interview procedures that gain more complete information from a witness. Still other research suggests that juries tend to

believe eyewitnesses even though eyewitness testimony is often in error.²

NIJ research has examined methods of aiding recall of events by victims and witnesses. Completed research has addressed the forensic use of hypnosis³—influential in State courts and the U.S. Supreme Court—and the use of an interviewing technique known as the “cognitive interview.”⁴ While the former approach has been thought to enhance recall by inducing a relaxed state, the latter provides a structured method of enabling a witness to recall an event from a variety of perspectives. Research results suggest that hypnosis does not adequately enhance recall and that it is an unreliable memory “refreshing” technique. On the other hand, the “cognitive interview” and other motivational methods to enhance recall may be more useful to improve the results in many criminal cases.⁵

A number of judicial procedures, such as jury instruction on eyewitness reliability and the use of expert psychological testimony on eyewitness reliability have attempted to address problems of the credibility of eyewitness testimony. Various procedures seek to minimize the possibly damaging results of unreliable eyewitness testimony.

This solicitation for a comprehensive analysis will include a critical review and synthesis of the literature on eyewitness recall and testimony; an analysis of conflicting or differing perspectives on the topic; the identification and description of current practices; and the development of a research agenda.

Goals

- To determine the variability in current practice and needs of law enforcement and criminal justice agencies regarding the collection of reliable eyewitness accounts of criminal events and the standards and practices used in the presentation of such evidence.
- To gain an understanding of the current scientific knowledge on eyewitness recall and the dynamics of

presenting such evidence in various public and private settings where such accounts are elicited—homes, workplaces, police stations, courts, etc.

Objectives

- Conduct a critical state-of-the-art review and synthesis of the literature on eyewitness recall and testimony as it relates to law enforcement and criminal justice processes.
- Survey a sample of jurisdictions and visit selected sites in order to determine variability in practices, legal procedures, and training regarding methods of obtaining eyewitness accounts and the introduction and processing of eyewitness evidence.
- Recommend a research agenda on eyewitness recall and testimony that considers both law enforcement and criminal justice needs and research feasibility.
- Prepare reports and briefs on these efforts for publication by the National Institute of Justice.

Program Strategy

Conduct a critical state-of-the-art review and synthesis of the literature on eyewitness recall and testimony as it relates to the law enforcement and criminal justice process.

The applicant should outline a strategy to conduct a critical review and synthesis of the literature on eyewitness recall and testimony. The literature of various disciplines will be examined, but particularly the psychological, legal, and criminal justice literatures. All of the relevant National Institute of Justice supported research will be included in this review, and the review will contain literature that focuses on the adult and the child eyewitness. It is recognized that much of this literature has relevance to many civil proceedings, although the primary focus of this research concerns its relevance to criminal investigations and proceedings. The product of this critical review and synthesis will be a report for

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Eyewitness Recall and Testimony
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Bernard Auchter, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-307-0154.

References

1. National Institute of Justice supported research has included these grants:

90-IJ-CX-0025—Evaluating a New Technique for Improving Eyewitness Identification, Victor Johnston, New Mexico State University.

88-IJ-CX-0033—Cognitive Interview Techniques for Use with Children, R. Edward Geiselman, University of California, Los Angeles.

87-IJ-CX-0052—The Use and Effectiveness of Hypnosis and the Cognitive Interview for Enhancing Eyewitness Recall, Martin Orne, Institute for Experimental Psychiatry.

84-IJ-CX-0010—Evaluating Techniques to Improve Eyewitness Reliability, Steven Penrod, University of Wisconsin.

83-IJ-CX-0025—Memory Enhancement Procedures for Interviewing Victims, R. Edward Geiselman, University of California, Los Angeles.

82-IJ-CX-0012—Factors Affecting Accuracy of Eyewitness Identification, John Brigham, Florida State University.

82-IJ-CX-0007—Reliability of Hypnotically Induced Testimony, Martin Orne, Institute for Experimental Psychiatry.

2. E.F. Loftus, "Eyewitness testimony; Psychological research and legal thought," *Crime and Justice* 3(1981): 105-151, University of Chicago Press.

3. M.T. Orne, D.A. Soskis, D.F. Dinges, E.C. Orne, and M.H. Tonry, *Hypnotically Refreshed Testimony: Enhanced Memory or Tampering With Evidence?* National Institute of Justice, 1985.

4. R.E. Geiselman and R.P. Fisher, "Interviewing Victims and Witnesses of Crime," National Institute of Justice, *Research In Brief*, 1985; "New Approach to Interviewing Children," National Institute of Justice, *Research In Brief*, 1992, based on research by R.E. Geiselman, G. Bornstein, and K.J. Saywitz.

5. M.T. Orne, *The Use and Effectiveness of Hypnosis and the Cognitive Interview for Enhancing Eyewitness Recall*, report to the National Institute of Justice under grant number 87-IJ-CX-0052.

Justice System Processing of Child Abuse Cases

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a multisite study of child abuse case processing and decisionmaking in the justice system. It will address the need for a better understanding of justice system case tracking, case attrition, and followup for child victims of physical and sexual abuse, and criminal neglect. The results are expected to serve as the basis for the National Institute of Justice to design a national-level tracking of reported child abuse cases investigated, prosecuted, or adjudicated by criminal justice agencies. The project will be jointly supported by NIJ and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP).

Background

Approximately 2.5 million cases of suspected child maltreatment were reported in 1990. Of this number an estimated 380,000 were reported cases of child sexual abuse. The most severe cases of abuse and neglect resulted in the deaths of an estimated 1,211 children.¹ These cases tax both child protective services and the justice system. Improved social services and legal responses to the problem of child abuse are essential.

While many child abuse cases are handled by child protective services, the more serious cases come to family and domestic relations courts for the protection of the child. An increasing number result in a suspect being charged with a criminal offense. A 1988 survey of law enforcement agencies in jurisdictions with populations over 100,000 found that 27 percent of physical abuse cases and 45 percent of sexual abuse cases reported to police resulted in an arrest.² Another indication of the increasing number of these cases in the criminal justice system is a recent survey of prosecutors in which 90 percent of respondents report child victim cases as a

factor in the rising number of felony cases filed in recent years.³

Prior NIJ research has examined the effect testifying in court has on sexually abused children,⁴ explored case processing issues in sexual abuse,⁵ examined the police role in child abuse cases,⁶ and discussed current investigation and prosecution methods.⁷ These efforts, and an understanding of related national data systems,⁸ provide background for the development of this project.

This project will track physical and sexual child abuse and serious neglect cases from official point of entry into the justice system to disposition. Prospective case studies would track cases, victims, and perpetrators through law enforcement, prosecution, and courts (including family and dependency proceedings, criminal cases, and abuse cases that may be handled via court-approved alternative dispute resolution) to case disposition. Applicants must ensure an adequate representation of physical abuse cases in their proposed study.

Goals

- To provide an examination and description of the justice system processing of child abuse cases.
- To inform policy and improve practice in dealing with physical and sexual child abuse cases in the child protection and justice system.

Objectives

- Provide a synthesis of the most recent research and literature relevant to child abuse case processing in the justice system.
- Develop a detailed design for conducting a prospective multisite justice system case processing study.
- Conduct a multisite study of child abuse case decisionmaking and processing in the justice system.

■ Develop a feasibility study for followup on child abuse victims to determine their status since their cases were closed by the justice system.

■ Prepare a comprehensive report and policy-oriented summaries on the results and implications of the project, for publication by the National Institute of Justice.

Program Strategy

Provide a synthesis of the most recent research and literature relevant to child abuse case processing in the justice system.

Applicants should include only a brief review of the relevant literature in their application. An initial task under the project will be to synthesize recent research and published literature on child abuse that relates to justice system processing. The synthesis should be developed for a policy-making and professional audience.

Develop a detailed design for conducting a prospective multisite justice system case processing study.

While elements of design should be discussed in the proposal, the detailed design and site selection will be among the first tasks of the project. The project would be conducted in more than one site and the size of the jurisdictions vary. Applicants should discuss in detail the criteria for site selection. Sites may be among those that are selected for the third National Incidence Study (NIS-3) on child abuse and neglect sponsored by the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect. The inclusion of sites that are among the NIS-3 locations and the use of similar identifiers and definitions of terms will enable further analysis and a comparison of cases in the two data sets.

Applicants should provide a discussion of research questions that will be addressed by the project. Issues that might be considered include a comparison of cases in the criminal justice system with cases handled in the civil justice system; the proportion of cases involving

drug or alcohol abuse by caretakers; the proportion of cases involving prior allegations of abuse and neglect; the use of protection orders; multiple court processing of cases; and forms of representation, including legal representation of child victims in criminal cases.

Conduct a multisite study of child abuse case decisionmaking and processing in the justice system.

Physical and sexual child abuse cases would be tracked in prospective studies during a 2-year project to gain an understanding of the processes, decisions, dispositions of cases, and the factors about the case that affect these decisions, including the child, the perpetrator-child relationship, and the family. Interviews will be conducted with justice system professionals.

Information would be gained on the various stages of the process, including initial contact, police screening, referrals for prosecution, diversion, juvenile and family court proceedings, declinations, court dismissals, pleas, trials, acquittals, sentencing, and final disposition. Issues such as the amount of information lost in case processing and the degree of agreement on a case between police and prosecutor should be addressed. The project should emphasize both felony and misdemeanor physical abuse cases along with a sample of sexual abuse cases. The project should provide information useful in improving the justice system response to child abuse cases and in meeting the justice system's data needs on abuse and neglect cases.

Develop a feasibility study for followup on child abuse victims to determine their status since their cases were closed by the justice system.

The project will determine the feasibility of following up closed cases in each of the sites to determine the victim's status since closure. This component would be based primarily on contacts with various agencies in the city/county to identify continuing problems requiring community intervention. It would include new referrals to the justice system and information available from social service, mental health, and school systems.

Prepare a comprehensive report and policy-oriented summaries on the results and implications of the project, for publication by the National Institute of Justice.

The grantee will be expected to produce a final report and an executive summary that can be distributed to professionals and researchers. Final products will include the synthesis of the literature; the data collection plan and instruments; any applicable data tapes; the case studies from each site that include an analysis of case processing and decisionmaking, case flow diagrams, and the feasibility of a victim follow-up study; and conclusions and recommendations for improving justice system processing of child abuse cases.

Individual case narratives will be an important part of the report. These narratives will provide qualitative illustrations of the different paths cases may take, such as attrition or diversion. Another expected product is an article-length summary, suitable for NIJ publication, that informs professionals, policymakers, and researchers of the project's results.

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria. This project is supported jointly by the National Institute of Justice and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$500,000, jointly supported by the National Institute of Justice and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Child Abuse Case Processing
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Bernard Auchter, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-307-0154.

References

1. D. Daro and K. McCurdy, *Current Trends in Child Abuse Reporting and Fatalities: The Results of the 1990 Annual Fifty State Survey*, National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse, April 1991.
2. S.E. Martin and D.J. Besharov, *Police and Child Abuse: New Policies for Expanded Responsibilities*, National Institute of Justice, June 1991.
3. J.T. McEwen and E. Nugent, *National Assessment Program: Survey Results for Prosecutors*, National Institute of Justice, October 1990.
4. G.S. Goodman, E.A. Pyle, D.P.H. Jones, P. England, L.K. Port, L. Rudy, and L. Prado, *Emotional Effects of*

Criminal Court Testimony on Child Sexual Assault Victims, report to the National Institute of Justice on grant 85-IJ-CX-0020; D.K. Runyan, M.D. Everson, and N.M.P. King, *Impact of Court Process on Sexually Abused Children*, report to the National Institute of Justice on grant 85-IJ-CX-0066.

5. Martin and Besharov, n. 2 above.

6. J.R. Chapman and B.E. Smith, *Child Sexual Abuse: An Analysis of Case Processing*, report to the National Institute of Justice on grant 84-IJ-CX-0074; D. Whitcomb, *Child Victim as Witness Research and Development Program*, report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention on grant 87-MC-CX-0026.

7. D. Whitcomb, *When the Victim is a Child*, 2d Edition, National Institute of Justice, 1992; K. Freeman, *Trial Considerations in the Investigation and Prosecution of Child Sexual Abuse Cases*, report to the National Institute of Justice on grant 86-IJ-CX-0082; R.E. Geiselman and G.K. Bornstein, *Effects of Cognitive Interviewing, Practice, and Interview Style on Children's Recall Performance*, report to the National Institute of Justice on grant 88-IJ-CX-0033.

8. The National Incidence Study (NIS-3) and the National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, and the National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children (NISMART) of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research, demonstration, evaluation, training, and technical assistance program, including both basic and applied approaches, that involves a large majority of the criminal justice research and professional communities. Moreover, NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies including case studies, structured observation, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative proposals that would bring to bear ideas and research from a variety of disciplines to the study of crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Applicants should provide a clear and convincing rationale for their particular proposal and the projected policy benefits anticipated. Topics of interest include, but are not limited to, the following:

■ **Pretrial issues.** Methods to improve pretrial efficiency while maintaining community safety are among the needs in this area. Study might be warranted, for example, of innovative supervisory techniques that allow for release pending trial while effectively controlling pretrial crime, or of State statutory requirements for pretrial detention.

■ **Sentencing.** Interest in sentencing extends from criminal misdemeanors to capital cases, and from studies of sentencing practice to assessments of sentencing reforms, for example sentencing guidelines.

■ **Child abuse.** Innovative ideas and methods are needed to address the problem of child abuse and neglect and the justice system's handling of these cases.

Issues of interest include the impact of child abuse on later criminality, drug and alcohol dependency as a factor in child maltreatment cases, and child abuse as analyzed within the broader context of domestic violence.

■ **Environmental crime.** Research on enforcement and prosecution approaches for environmental cases is needed, as is assessment of methods for improved coordination between the justice system and regulatory agencies. Research results should aid the justice system in dealing more effectively with environmental offenders. Researchers might also address other areas of and issues in environmental crime.

Applicants uncertain about whether their project idea falls within the program's scope should consult the Program Manager.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication:
Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 27, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Bernard Auchter, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-307-0154.

Money Laundering and Financial Investigation

Insurance Fraud

Detection and Control of Organized Crime

Money Laundering and Financial
Investigation: Priority Topics

OJP Policy Statement — *The criminal justice system must stop the flow of lucrative, illegal drug profits that constitute the life blood of international drug cartels. Law enforcement officers must be knowledgeable in conducting sophisticated financial investigations to track the movement of drug money through financial institutions and legitimate business enterprises. At the same time, criminal prosecutions must focus on white collar crime in order to disrupt the illegal activities that promote fraud and abuse particularly in the insurance and health care industries. This requires appropriate statutory authorizations, specialized financial investigative techniques, and expertise. Prosecutors and other law enforcement officials have to be knowledgeable in financial crimes and the movement of illegal revenues from drug trafficking and white collar crime. Countering major interstate and international criminal enterprises requires techniques that involve identifying the hidden assets and proceeds of drug and white collar crime, tracing financial structures and money laundering schemes and asset administration. Demonstration, development, and training and technical assistance programs as well as, evaluation efforts are being implemented to promote and test a complete range of skills, techniques, and approaches to effect the necessary legislation, policy, and practices to conduct successful financial investigations.*

Money Laundering and Financial Investigation

In this priority area, NIJ's principal research focus is on **white collar crime**, including crime within and against the insurance industry, and **organized crime**, which includes money laundering.

White Collar Crime. The pervasiveness of white collar crime has a devastating impact on the stable and effective functioning of the Nation's economy. Although these complex, sophisticated crimes may not generate the public fear elicited by such violent crimes as robbery and rape, they have far-reaching consequences that threaten economic security, corrupt legitimate institutions, and undermine public trust in government and the rule of law. Moreover, the intricate and covert nature of these crimes makes them difficult to prevent and control.

Recognizing the threat posed by these offenses, the Department of Justice has targeted white collar crime for priority attention. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has also responded by establishing a special research program that will contribute to the improved detection, prevention, and control of white collar criminal offenses.

The NIJ program recognizes that certain white collar crimes have reached critical proportions, contributing to the Nation's most serious economic and social problems and severely draining criminal justice and public resources. For example, *financial institution fraud* is currently threatening the economic stability and effective functioning of banks and savings and loan institutions. Government investigators estimate that internal fraud and criminal conduct have been involved in a significant percentage of the bank and savings and loan failures in the past several years. They predict that the discovery of such offenses will continue to increase in the years to come, ultimately generating a massive debt of up to \$500 billion and requiring a public bailout far exceeding

anything in the Nation's history. Recognizing the importance of this problem, NIJ funded a major study of savings and loan fraud in 1990 that will examine conditions facilitating crime commission and will identify regulatory and law enforcement strategies for effective prevention, detection, and control of these offenses.

Another major white collar crime threat to the economy is *securities fraud* and *insider trading*. Electronic stock market trading, which generates instantaneous worldwide transactions, has created opportunities for securities fraud on a much broader scale than ever before. Because the complexities of these offenses pose special problems for regulatory and criminal justice agencies, NIJ in 1991 funded a national assessment of securities fraud that will examine the nature and patterns of these offenses and recommend strategies for improved regulation and control.

Currently, another area of the financial sector—the *insurance industry*—is being threatened by *corruption* and *fraud* both from within and without. Insurance company insolvencies have been escalating, and experts have cited insider fraud and deceptive financial reporting as a leading cause for many of these failures. In addition, crimes against the industry, such as fraudulent property and casualty claims, are further weakening its economic stability and are adding to the cost of insurance of all types.

One area particularly hard hit is health and medical care insurance, where fraudulent claims are adding to the overall cost of insurance to the public. Medicare reimbursement claims by doctors, clinic operators, medical suppliers, and others are becoming an important cause of rising health care costs, according to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The *computer and telecommunications industries* are also becoming sources of major criminal activity. Theft

of sensitive information and destruction of valuable data through infection by virus are among criminal offenses in this area. These crimes are inherently difficult to detect, investigate, and prosecute. Although NIJ has conducted research on these crimes in the past, these growing problems demand further attention.

Organized Crime. The size, pervasiveness, and profitability of the illegal drug-trafficking industry have produced large-scale, often violent criminal organizations whose wealth and power have become so great that they defy conventional methods of interdiction and control. These organized crime syndicates and networks engage in a vast number of legal and illegal enterprises, thereby increasing their income and concealing it through money-laundering and other deceptive techniques.

NIJ research has been directed toward improving law enforcement detection, prevention, and control of organized crime. Early research targeted traditional (Cosa Nostra) organized crime syndicates and their *racketeering* activities, such as gambling. Subsequent studies dealt with organized crime *corruption of legitimate industries* and institutions. For example, one current NIJ study is examining the implementation and impact of a court-imposed RICO trusteeship on organized crime corruption in a local Teamsters union, while two others are developing strategies for controlling corruption in the hazardous waste disposal and school construction industries.

To assist law enforcement agencies in depriving organized crime of its huge profits, NIJ is also continuing its research in *money laundering*, aimed at better understanding these sophisticated schemes and developing improved regulatory and law enforcement strategies of detection, prevention, and control.

Recent NIJ research has targeted other, emerging organized crime groups that are now posing special problems for law enforcement. Of particular concern is the growth of *Asian organized crime* in the United States and the multiple enterprises of its adult syndicates and violent street gangs. One NIJ study is examining law enforcement responses to Asian organized crime and

has identified criminal justice problems, such as language and cultural barriers, that pose particular difficulties for detection, investigation, and prosecution. A second study addresses the victimization of Asian businesses by Asian organized crime and the acceptance of extortion; researchers are currently interviewing Asian gang members about their gang membership, organization, and activities. Because of the growing sophistication and threat of Asian organized crime, both in this country and abroad, NIJ and DOJ jointly sponsored an international conference at which investigators, prosecutors, and researchers from 11 nations discussed common problems and the potential for coordinated international response.

Ongoing Programs for 1992

Building on its previous and ongoing research and conferences, NIJ is supporting further studies that address large-scale organized criminal networks and their enterprises. International crimes, such as drug trafficking and money laundering, are receiving priority attention, as is the corruption of legitimate industries and institutions.

International Money Laundering

NIJ is currently supporting a national assessment of money laundering offenses, offenders, and law enforcement responses in the United States. To complement this effort, an NIJ visiting fellowship in 1992 will focus on the international aspects of these offenses. The NIJ Visiting Fellow will pay special attention to multinational cooperative efforts to detect, investigate, and prosecute these offenses.

New Solicitations for 1992

In fiscal year 1992, NIJ is planning a national assessment of insurance fraud to increase understanding of the types of fraud, of how government at all levels now fight such fraud, and how methods of prevention and control might be enhanced. NIJ will also support original research on multienterprise organized criminal

networks with the aim of identifying effective strategies to detect, intervene in, and control such networks. In addition, a concluding solicitation identifies other areas of interest and encourages proposals on other useful research projects on money laundering, financial investigation, and white collar and organized crime.

Money Laundering and Financial Investigation: Solicitations for 1992

Insurance Fraud

Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals for a national assessment to examine the nature and extent of insurance fraud and to review State regulatory policies and current strategies of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to investigate and prosecute these offenses. The project is intended to increase understanding of types of insurance fraud and existing regulatory and law enforcement strategies and to enhance methods of prevention and control.

Background

Insurance company insolvencies are a growing threat to the health of the U.S. insurance industry. A Justice Department background paper, drawing on data from the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (NAIC), notes that annual insurance company insolvencies jumped to a record 43 in both 1989 and 1990, up from fewer than 5 per year in the early 1980's. Problems are evident in both the property/casualty and life/health sectors. A growing number of large companies have begun to fail, affecting many more policyholders than in the past.

It is difficult to determine precisely the amount of fraud in the industry or the role fraud plays in the industry's economic health. One industry group, the American Council of Life Insurance Task Force on Solvency Concerns, reported in 1990 that two-thirds of the recent failures of life insurance companies were attributable to fraud and "questionable practices."

In addition to fraud *within* the insurance industry, fraud *against* insurance companies and programs has also reached crisis proportions. Fraudulent health care insurance claims are becoming a serious problem. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has cited fraudulent Medicare reimbursement claims by doctors, clinic operators, medical suppliers, and others as an important cause of spiraling health care costs, which reached more than \$700 billion last year and are expected to top a trillion dollars by 1995.

The Department of Justice is responding to these threats. For example, the FBI recently added 50 agents to the 100 already assigned to investigate Medicare and Medicaid cheating and other health care fraud. The DOJ Criminal Division has established a special Insurance Fraud Working Group to coordinate the efforts of Federal law enforcement agencies, such as the FBI, Securities and Exchange Commission, Postal Inspectors, and U.S. Attorneys. Finally, the FBI Economic Crimes Unit, in a joint conference with NIJ in November 1991, identified insurance fraud as the area demanding highest priority attention among the group of major emerging economic crimes.

Industry is also responding: the NAIC is implementing a Solvency Policing Agenda, which includes an evaluation of State compliance with financial regulatory standards and a review of the adequacy of current annual statement disclosures and capitalization and reserve requirements.

Investigation and prosecution of insurance fraud require the coordinated efforts of technical specialists and criminal justice and regulatory agencies. NIJ is interested in supporting research on fraud both within the insurance industry and fraud against the industry, such as false claims in the property/casualty area. In the health and medical care area, there is a need to find effective ways to combat Medicare and Medicaid fraud.

Goals

- To understand the nature and patterns of one or more major types of insurance fraud cases handled at the Federal, State, and/or local levels.
- To examine current strategies of detection, investigation, prosecution, and sanctioning in response to the selected type(s) of insurance fraud offenses.
- To distribute the findings and recommendations of this assessment nationwide to law enforcement and regulatory agencies to enhance their overall effectiveness.

Objectives

- Describe the nature and patterns of one or more major types of insurance fraud offenses handled at the Federal, State, and/or local levels, including the frequency and characteristics of various types of cases and the organizational and individual offenders involved.
- Examine and assess current law enforcement and regulatory agency techniques for detecting, investigating, prosecuting, and punishing the selected type(s) of insurance fraud offenses, and determine the resources required to implement those techniques.
- Examine special needs and problems of criminal justice and regulatory agencies in responding to the selected type(s) of insurance fraud and identify issues requiring research.
- Develop a comprehensive report and executive summary, describing the research and recommendations of the national assessment, for publication by the National Institute of Justice.

Program Strategy

Describe the nature and patterns of one or more major types of insurance fraud offenses handled at the Federal, State, and/or local levels, including the frequency

and characteristics of various types of cases and the organizational and individual offenders involved.

Applicants should select one or more types of insurance fraud for study and justify their selection. Applicants should outline methods for determining the nature and patterns of the selected offenses and the organizational and individual offenders reported to law enforcement and regulatory agencies. After reviewing the research and policy literature, applicants should define key terms, propose strategies for collecting valid and reliable data, and provide assurances of access to proposed archival and other data sources.

Data-collection strategies might include a survey of law enforcement agencies and/or State insurance commissioners (proposals should describe the characteristics of populations to be sampled, sampling strategy, preliminary survey instruments, and a data analysis plan) and/or site visits to selected jurisdictions (proposals should present the rationale for selecting the sites, describe data collection methods and instruments, and identify issues to be addressed). In all cases, applicants should specify how the data will result in a sound description of the nature and patterns of the selected insurance fraud offenses and organizational and individual offenders. Finally, applicants should provide a sound organizational and management plan and schedule of activities to accomplish the data collection and analysis tasks.

Applicants may examine either the types of fraud or questionable practices engaged in by insurance industry officials themselves or schemes perpetrated against insurance companies and programs (such as Medicare). Special attention should be paid to: (1) the mechanisms through which cases are detected or reported; (2) the types of cases accepted for investigation and/or prosecution by Federal, State, and/or local criminal justice agencies and those referred to other authorities or otherwise rejected; (3) the characteristics of organizational and individual offenders involved in the selected type(s) of insurance fraud; (4) the practices used by these offenders to commit their offenses; and (5) the conditions that facilitate these crimes.

For individual offenders, applicants should show how they would obtain information on the individuals' fiduciary or other position within their organization and how their position may have provided the opportunity to commit the fraud. For organizational offenders, applicants should show how they would describe the legal and bureaucratic structure of the organization, the characteristics of the industry that contributed to or motivated the fraudulent behavior, and how organizational means were used to commit the crimes.

The products of this objective include copies of all data collection instruments, data tapes and documentation, and reports and articles presenting preliminary findings on the nature and patterns of the selected type(s) of insurance fraud offenses, the characteristics and methods of their organizational and individual offenders, and the conditions facilitating crime commission.

Examine and assess current law enforcement and regulatory agency techniques for detecting, investigating, prosecuting, and punishing the selected type(s) of insurance fraud offenses and determine the resources required to implement those techniques.

Applicants should explain how they intend to examine and assess current legislation, regulatory mechanisms, and strategies of detection, investigation, prosecution, and sanctioning for the selected type(s) of insurance fraud cases. Applicants should pay special attention to cooperative efforts or task forces and other innovative programs by criminal justice and regulatory agencies. Attention should also be paid to how decisions are made to forward cases for criminal prosecution and/or civil action; with comparison of criminal and civil outcomes and sanctions. The grantee will be required to identify strengths and weaknesses of various policies and strategies, as well as the resources required to implement them. If model programs are found, these should be thoroughly described as well.

Applicants should specify the issues to be addressed, and they should propose strategies for collecting valid and reliable data, providing assurances of access to

proposed data sources. Data collection methods, such as a survey of or onsite data collection in selected States, should be described in detail, and a sound organizational and management plan and schedule of activities should be provided.

The products of this objective include copies of all data collection instruments, data tapes and documentation, and reports and articles presenting preliminary findings on the current policies and strategies for the regulation, detection, investigation, prosecution, and sanctioning of the selected type(s) of insurance fraud offenses.

Examine special needs and problems of criminal justice and regulatory agencies in responding to the selected type(s) of insurance fraud and identify issues requiring research.

Applicants should specify how, based on a thorough review of the available literature and other data sources, they will identify and examine the special needs and problems confronting criminal justice and regulatory agencies that deal with the selected type(s) of insurance fraud. As in the previous objectives, data collection methods should be described clearly and assurances should be given of access to all proposed data resources, including archival, survey, and/or onsite data sources. Finally, a sound and feasible management plan and schedule of activities should be proposed.

Issues to be examined might include adequacy of legislation; sufficiency of resources, manpower, and/or special skills; difficulties of collecting evidence (including privacy restrictions); and the degree of interagency, interjurisdictional coordination. Applicants should analyze these issues with the aim of proposing remedies that could be feasibly and effectively implemented.

The products of this objective include copies of all data collection instruments, data tapes and documentation, and reports and articles discussing project findings on the special needs of and problems faced by law enforcement and regulatory agencies in dealing with the selected type(s) of insurance fraud.

Develop a comprehensive report and executive summary, describing the research and recommendations of the national assessment, for publication by the National Institute of Justice.

The comprehensive report and executive summary should discuss thoroughly the selected insurance fraud problem(s); review existing research and operational literature; describe the data collection methodologies and findings of the research tasks specified in the previous objectives; and present recommendations for the development and implementation of model legislation and regulatory and law enforcement policies and strategies for prevention and control, with special emphasis on issues suggested for future research attention.

~~~~~  
The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

## **Application Information**

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

**Award Period.** NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

**Award Amount.** NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000 to \$250,000. It is anticipated this amount will support one award. Actual funding

allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Insurance Fraud  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, D.C. 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Lois Mock, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact her at 202-307-0693.

---

## **Detection and Control of Organized Crime**

### **Purpose**

This solicitation requests proposals for original research on a multi-enterprise organized criminal network to develop better understanding of its structure and operations and to identify effective programs and strategies for its detection, intervention, and control.

### **Background**

Highly organized, complex criminal syndicates engaged in a wide variety of legal and illegal enterprises through-

out this Nation seriously threaten the stable and orderly functioning of society. The size, pervasiveness, and profitability of the drug trafficking industry have motivated large-scale criminal organizations to import, distribute, and sell illegal drugs. The immense profitability of these offenses provide these high-level drug-trafficking operations with virtually unlimited resources to use in evading or corrupting law enforcement efforts to detect, investigate, prosecute, and sanction their activities. These criminal organizations also engage in gambling, prostitution, extortion, and money laundering as well as in violent crimes, including assassination and murder.

Equally damaging to the safety and security of society is the entry of many of these syndicates into the legitimate economy, where they have used their financial and coercive power to corrupt public institutions and government and infiltrate certain industries and labor unions. The complex and covert nature of these activities pose special problems for regulatory and law enforcement agencies responsible for safeguarding the efficient and effective functioning of the Nation's economic and social institutions.

NIJ seeks proposals for research on one such criminal network to gain better understanding of how these illegal organizations and networks operate.

## Goals

- To understand the structure and operations of a closed network of relationships and enterprises that are organized for criminal activity.
- To examine current legislative, regulatory, and criminal justice strategies for the detection, investigation, prosecution, and sanctioning of the selected organized crime network, and to identify effective policies and practices.
- To distribute the findings of this research to criminal justice and other government agencies responsible for organized crime control.

## Objectives

- Describe the structure and operations of an organizational network established for criminal activity; the characteristics of its members; its relationships with other syndicates, organizations, and groups; and the conditions that facilitate or constrain the establishment and growth of its enterprises.
- Examine and assess current Federal, State, and local strategies for detecting, investigating, and prosecuting the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises, and identify effective or model programs and practices for organized crime control.
- Examine and assess current legislation and sanctioning practices that Federal, State, and local agencies use to control the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises and to deprive it of its illicit profits.
- Produce a comprehensive report and executive summary, describing the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises and assessing legislative and criminal justice strategies of detection and response, for publication by the National Institute of Justice.

## Program Strategy

*Describe the structure and operations of an organizational network that is established for criminal activity; the characteristics of its members; its relationships with other syndicates, organizations, and groups; and the conditions that facilitate or constrain the establishment and growth of its enterprises.*

Applicants should select (and justify the selection of) an organized criminal network and specify sound and feasible methods for determining its structure, operations, membership, enterprises, and conditions promoting its activities. Following a thorough review and synthesis of relevant literature and data, applicants should define key issues to be researched, propose methodologies to collect valid and reliable data, and provide assurances of

access to necessary data resources. Applicants should also specify how the data will result in a description of the structure and activities of the selected criminal network; the size and characteristics of its membership; its relationships with other criminal syndicates and groups and with legitimate organizations, such as banks, law firms, trade unions, and investment firms; and factors that facilitate or constrain its operations.

Proposals should describe the research methodology in detail, specify the study populations and/or archival data sources to be examined, describe sampling strategy and/or site selection/case study plans and rationale, outline the data collection instruments, and present a data analysis plan. Proposals should include a sound and feasible organization and management plan and schedule of activities to accomplish the data collection and analysis tasks.

Products may include data collection instruments, a data tape and documentation, and interim report on findings under this objective.

*Examine and assess current Federal, State, and local strategies for detecting, investigating, and prosecuting the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises, and identify effective or model programs and practices for organized crime control.*

Applicants should state how they will examine and assess current law enforcement programs, policies, and strategies to detect, investigate, and prosecute the selected organized criminal network. Based on a discussion of relevant literature and information from knowledgeable officials, applicants should describe the issues to be addressed and the types of data to be collected, and provide assurances of access to these data sources.

Proposals should also describe the specific methodologies to be employed, such as archival data analysis, case studies, surveys of practitioners, and onsite data collection strategies. Study populations should be identified and sampling strategies should be specified, where relevant. For case studies of model programs to be conducted onsite, proposals should identify potential

program sites, with assurances of program cooperation, and should provide the rationale for their selection. Proposals should describe data collection instruments, including interview schedules and survey questionnaires. Applicants should present a plan for data analysis and explain how the analysis will answer the issues to be addressed. Proposals should include an organization and management plan and a schedule.

The grantee will be expected to study both investigative (police) and prosecutorial agencies at all levels of government, paying special attention to model programs, including multiagency task forces and other cooperative interagency efforts directed against the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises. The grantee should address constraints on effective enforcement and resources required to implement various programs and strategies.

Products may include tested data collection instruments, data tapes and documentation, and a report that details results, assesses current practices, and offers guidelines for implementing effective programs.

*Examine and assess current legislation and sanctioning practices that Federal, State, and local agencies use to control the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises and to deprive it of illicit profits.*

Applicants should state how they intend to examine and assess current legislation and sanctioning strategies to control the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises. Proposals should thoroughly discuss the issues to be addressed in this research task, grounding the discussion in existing theoretical and operational literature and input from relevant officials. Proposals should specify data sources, research methods, instruments, and assurances of access. Proposals should also specify a plan for data analysis and a schedule.

The grantee will be expected to pay special attention to innovative legislative and sanctioning strategies for controlling the organized criminal network and its enterprises and depriving it of illegal profits. These strategies

might include legislative remedies similar to those in the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO), asset seizure and forfeiture, and enhanced "drug kingpin" statutes and sanctions. The grantee should plan to examine the use of various remedies against different types of enterprises and to describe the financial and manpower resources and skills required to implement each. Attention should also be paid to gaps in legislation and constraints on and weaknesses in current sanctioning practices.

Products may include data collection instruments, data tapes and documentation, and a report assessing current legislative and sanctioning strategies and, where appropriate, effective programs and practices.

*Produce a comprehensive report and executive summary, describing the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises and assessing legislative and criminal justice strategies of detection and response, for publication by the National Institute of Justice.*

The grantee shall produce a comprehensive report and executive summary that describe the selected organized criminal network and its enterprises and assess criminal justice and legislative strategies against them. The comprehensive report should thoroughly discuss the problem; review existing research and operational literature; present findings of the three research tasks specified in the previous objectives; and recommend ways to develop and implement effective legislative and law enforcement programs, policies, and procedures.

\*\*\*\*\*  
 The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet the goals of both the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. The applicant will be required to justify fully the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

## Application Information

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

**Award Period.** NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

**Award Amount.** NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000 to \$250,000. It is anticipated this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Detection and Control of Organized Crime  
 National Institute of Justice  
 633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
 Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Lois Mock, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact her at 202-307-0693.

## Money Laundering and Financial Investigation: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research, demonstration, evaluation, training, and technical assistance program, including both basic and applied approaches, that involves a large majority of the criminal justice research and professional communities. Moreover, NIJ supports a wide range of research methodologies including case studies, structured observation, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative proposals that would bring ideas and research from a variety of disciplines to the study of crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that researchers might want to pose their own research questions and structure their own study design and analysis plan.

Applicants may propose research projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest might include, but are not limited to:

■ **Health care fraud.** Fraud and abuse in health care have emerged as a serious national problem, contributing to the rise in the cost of health care and victimizing such vulnerable groups as the poor and the elderly. The Department of Justice has declared these crimes to be of high priority. Research is needed to examine the nature and patterns of offenses and to assess legislative, regulatory, and criminal justice responses.

■ **Computer and telecommunications crimes.** The rapid expansion of information technology has created new opportunities for criminal activity that could have devastating effects on all aspects and functions of society. From massive telephone outages to computer viruses, the potential for damage from these abuses is immeasurable. Research is needed to examine the nature of both offenses and offenders and to assess legislative, regulatory, and criminal justice responses.

■ **Organized crime drug trafficking.** The size, pervasiveness, and profitability of drug trafficking have led to the emergence of violent street gangs and organized criminal networks that import, distribute, and sell illegal drugs. Research is needed to increase knowledge of the structure and operations of such criminal organizations and identify effective strategies of prevention and control.

■ **Organized crime corruption of legitimate industries and institutions.** As organized criminal syndicates become more sophisticated, they expand beyond drugs and racketeering and use their wealth and power to infiltrate and corrupt legitimate institutions and industries such as certain labor unions and the construction and waste disposal industries. Studies are needed to assess innovative programs to prevent and respond to such corruption.

Applicants uncertain about whether a project idea falls within the program's scope should consult the Program Manager.

### Application Information

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

**Award Period.** NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Money Laundering and Financial  
Investigation: Priority Topics  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Lois Mock, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone her at 202-307-0693.

---

# Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology

DNA Technology Development

Forensic Sciences and Criminal Justice Technology:  
Priority Topics

Annual Review of Justice Research

Fellowship Programs

Data Resources Program

---

***OJP Policy Statement*** — *Criminal justice agencies need accurate, comprehensive, and timely information in developing policies and allocating resources to prevent and control illegal drugs. The Office of Justice Program's (OJP's) information systems, statistics, and technology activities focus on the collection and analysis of criminal and juvenile justice information related to serious crime, gang activity, illegal drug use, pre- and postadjudicatory incarceration, criminal history and systemwide service response effectiveness. To enhance reporting of and access to accurate and complete criminal history data, the improvement of criminal history information systems within the States is also a major focus of this activity. Statistical research, analysis, development, and dissemination activities are used to implement this priority. Particular emphasis will be placed on technological programs that focus on less-than-lethal weapons and protective clothing.*

---

---

---

---

---

# Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology

**T**he Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology programs of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) respond to NIJ's statutory mandate to "improve the functioning of the justice system and to disseminate criminal justice information to State and local criminal justice professionals nationwide" and to "serve as a national and international clearinghouse for the exchange of information." New technologies and information systems capabilities are making dramatic changes in the way the Nation's criminal justice system operates, from computer-assisted investigations and the development of new types of equipment, to the formulation of new media and formats for communicating criminal justice information. The Institute's programs under this priority area fall into three broad categories: Technology Research and Development; Research Applications and Support; and Information Retrieval and Dissemination.

**Technology Research and Development Program.** This program includes research to develop less-than-lethal weaponry for use by law enforcement, forensics research to improve the quality of evidence through the development of state-of-the-art identification techniques, development of standards for equipment used by law enforcement and other criminal justice officials, and the use of advanced computer techniques in operational criminal justice settings.

Recent projects have focused on the new DNA typing techniques, advanced computer technology to enhance and restore blurred surveillance photographs, and new fingerprint techniques that include computer automation and laser systems. Less-than-lethal weapons development has concentrated on the identification and development of prototype delivery systems for alternatives that include chemical agents and laser light.

**Research Applications and Support Program.** In this area, NIJ funds a wide range of studies on the opera-

tional needs of State and local criminal justice agencies and state-of-the-art criminal justice practice. Research findings from these studies are published in NIJ's publications series: *Issues and Practices in Criminal Justice*, *Research in Brief*, and *Program Focus*. NIJ also supports the development of curricula and other materials and conducts regional training workshops and national conferences and seminars for criminal justice executives. Peer review for all proposals submitted to the Institute for funding, as well as review of all products resulting from NIJ-sponsored research, is also funded under this activity. NIJ also supports a variety of fellowships: Visiting Fellowships for special research projects conducted at NIJ, Graduate Fellowships for projects conducted at NIJ or within a university graduate program, and research training programs at both the masters and doctoral levels at universities or onsite at the Institute.

**Information Retrieval and Dissemination Program.** Projects in this area have become increasingly more sophisticated during the past decade. The cornerstone of this endeavor is the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS), NIJ's national and international clearinghouse for the dissemination of criminal justice information. In addition, NIJ now operates a Data Resources Program, which provides public access to all data sets produced by NIJ-sponsored research projects. NIJ will continue to improve these programs, creating new formats for criminal justice publications and presenting and marketing information using new technologies, including special software packages, CD-ROM, and electronic bulletin boards.

In fiscal year 1992, the Institute will continue its programs in the areas of technology research and development, program development, and information dissemination. Three new programs are also planned. NIJ will support development and production of an annual volume reviewing the most significant and

policy-relevant developments in research on crime and the criminal justice system. The Institute will also support a new initiative to investigate topical policy questions through the analysis of data deposited by NIJ's Data Resources Program in the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, University of Michigan. Finally, a new program will be launched under the Institute's Fellowships Program to encourage young research professionals, particularly members of minority groups and graduates or graduate students at historically black colleges and universities, to enter the field of criminal justice.

## Ongoing Programs for 1992

### Less-Than-Lethal Weapons

NIJ's Less-Than-Lethal Weapons development program was initiated in response to *Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1 (1985), which held that use of deadly force to apprehend an apparently unarmed, nonviolent fleeing felon is unreasonable seizure under the fourth amendment. This highlighted law enforcement officers' need for nonlethal weapons to avoid killing or inflicting serious injury to fleeing suspects. Law enforcement officials have also cited a need for nonlethal or less-than-lethal weapons for use in hostage situations, domestic disturbances, barricade/ tactical assault, search warrant/raid, and prison/jail disturbances.

It has been recognized that no one technology can meet the needs of all law enforcement situations. Less-than-lethal technologies can take many forms. In 1992, NIJ will investigate recent developments in such technologies as visible light, laser beams, microwaves, sound waves (acoustics), entanglement, impact weapons, electromagnetic fields, and electric fields. Issues to be investigated in these technical assessments will include delivery systems for a range of existing and future less-than-lethal weapons, safety margins for the operational use of proposed methods such as chemicals and laser systems, and quantifying other issues such as cleaning

up hazardous materials employed in less-than-lethal technologies.

To clearly define user needs and requirements, NIJ will sponsor a survey to be conducted through working groups of law enforcement and criminal justice officials and representatives from other government agencies. The working groups will explore the kinds of weapons currently being used, the policies and procedures that agencies have developed for the use of nonlethal force, and the relative effectiveness of the types of less-than-lethal weapons currently employed by State and local law enforcement agencies. The survey is designed to provide information on the extent of current less-than-lethal weapon use and to serve as a foundation for the development of a long-term research agenda featuring development of multiple technologies for NIJ.

For further information, write to Dr. Alan Preszler, Visiting Scientist, at NIJ, or contact him at 202-616-3509.

### DNA Uses in Forensics

DNA testing is an important tool in identifying suspects in major criminal justice investigations and is growing in importance as vital evidence in criminal court cases. Almost every cell in the human body contains DNA. Thus, it may be present in innumerable forms at crime scenes: bloodstains; semen stains; hair follicles; bone; and even in materials such as rugs, clothing, and furniture where skin cells are routinely found. Because DNA is unique in virtually every person (except identical twins), it can be used to determine with compelling accuracy the involvement of an offender or the noninvolvement of an innocent suspect.

The technology that forms the basis for DNA testing has developed rapidly in the last decade. The current procedure, known as Restriction Fragment Length Polymorphism (RFLP), is still widely used, but may be replaced by a more effective and simpler technology such as Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR), a procedure that is undergoing development.

DNA testing requires further research and development. NIJ will consider supporting the following issues and may proceed in any of these areas in fiscal year 1992: (1) the development of acceptable and appropriate performance standards to help crime laboratories generate reliable and valid DNA profiles; (2) the development of appropriate and reliable statistical procedures to determine whether the DNA profile from a suspect is the same as a DNA profile from evidence at a crime scene; (3) the generation of suitable and reliable population data for making DNA profile match calculations; (4) the development of implementation strategies to advance the use of the new technologies in crime laboratories; (5) the development of standards, safeguards, and guidelines for accessing and using local and national DNA profile data bases by law enforcement agencies for rapid suspect identification; and (6) the support of demonstration projects to expand the use of DNA testing by law enforcement agencies.

This broad overview of DNA technology delineates a number of areas for priority research. NIJ expects to continue its research on DNA in fiscal year 1992 through a solicitation for new research.

For further information, write to Dr. Richard Laymon, Program Manager, at NIJ, or contact him at 202-307-0652.

### **Computer Sourcebooks Using Hypertext Software**

This project will continue NIJ's program in the development of hypertext sourcebooks, which provide a reader with a comprehensive explanation of an issue and quick access to related bits of information.

In 1991, NIJ supported the development of a hypertext sourcebook on firearms. In 1992, sourcebooks will be developed in forensic serology, fingerprint identification, and trace evidence analysis. The universal access to the literature in these areas provided by the hypertext format will conserve time for laboratory personnel, attorneys, and police investigators in need of information on these topics. Hypertext sourcebooks also permit a relatively inexperienced investigator to base his or her

actions on a full range of information rather than a possibly incomplete fragment.

In addition to rapid searches, the sourcebooks will allow the establishment of embedded links to associated materials in both text and graphic format for virtually instantaneous information retrieval.

For further information, write to Dr. Richard Rau, Program Manager, at NIJ, or contact him at 202-307-0648.

### **Technology Assessment Program**

NIJ developed the Technology Assessment Program (TAP) to help criminal justice agencies make informed decisions in selecting and purchasing equipment. Through an interagency agreement with the National Institute for Standards and Technology (NIST), U.S. Department of Commerce, minimum performance standards are developed for a wide range of products used in criminal justice—batteries, body armor, weapons, handcuffs, and state-of-the-art communications equipment. This program also coordinates the testing of commercially available products against these voluntary standards. Fiscal constraints and increasingly sophisticated technology underscore the need for objective, reliable information to guide purchasing decisions.

NIJ's TAP Information Center (TAPIC) coordinates TAP activities and distributes technology information in a variety of ways. Results of product testing conducted by independent laboratories are published and distributed throughout the criminal justice community in *Equipment Performance Reports*. *Consumer Product Lists*, published periodically, provide a quick reference to current and previously tested products that have complied with NIJ standards. *User Guides* provide a nontechnical discussion of performance characteristics and components of the subject equipment.

To obtain these and other publications and information about law enforcement equipment, call toll free at 800-24-TAPIC; in Maryland and the metropolitan Washington, D.C., area, call 301-251-5060.

## Research Applications Program

NIJ's Research Applications Program supports applied research projects to help policymakers and criminal justice professionals assess whether particular policies, programs, or approaches would be useful and appropriate for their own jurisdictions and examine emerging research issues and practices where little or no research or experience exist.

Topics cover all aspects of the criminal justice system, and researchers and professionals from a wide variety of disciplines are involved in project development as advisors, reviewers, and investigators. During fiscal year 1992, the program will continue development of a series of case studies on innovative Federal, State, and local crime control efforts. In addition, NIJ will develop reports for its publications series. For example, *Issues and Practices in Criminal Justice* will include the following:

- *Gang Prevention Programs* will review the literature, operational experience, and expert opinion to develop a report highlighting notable programs and discussing key issues in planning and implementing gang prevention efforts, with particular attention to approaches relevant for the U.S. Department of Justice's Weed and Seed Program efforts.

- *Drug Treatment Programs for Pregnant Drug-Involved Offenders and Those With Young Children* will survey the corrections and drug treatment fields to develop a report on innovative approaches that target this population. Programs to be examined will include those operating within the criminal justice system and those operated by treatment agencies that accept criminal justice clients. Particular attention will be given to summarizing expert opinion on specific drug treatment issues for female offenders and to providing examples of effective coordination between corrections and treatment officials.

- *Community Corrections Act Programs* will assess programs operating under community corrections legislation. Eighteen States currently operate under community corrections laws. This represents a signifi-

cant growth since 1973 when Minnesota passed the first Community Corrections Act. Evidence from Minnesota and Oregon shows that changes in the purpose and structure of community corrections legislation have occurred over the years. This project will include a thorough review of Community Corrections Act experiences, including an analysis of costs, a description of program changes and trends, a review of extant evaluations to synthesize lessons learned, and suggestions for further research and evaluation of programs operating under community corrections legislation.

NIJ's *Research in Brief* will include such topics as:

- *Criminal Justice Processing and Child Victims of Sexual Abuse* which will integrate and summarize the findings of two NIJ-sponsored studies that examined the impact of criminal justice processing on child victims of sexual abuse. Results of additional analyses of the data conducted for this review will also be presented.

The Research Applications Program is in the third year of a 3-year contract.

For further information, write to Virginia Baldau, Director, Research Applications and Training Division at NIJ, or contact her at 202-514-6204.

## National Assessment Program

The National Assessment Program (NAP) supports a periodic national survey of criminal justice policymakers and professionals to ensure that their needs and priorities are included in the Institute's research agenda. The NAP survey was conducted in 1990, and analysis of the results as well as a detailed review of issues was completed in 1991.

The NAP survey is the primary means of identifying key needs and problems in State and local criminal justice systems. The program helps ensure that present NIJ programs respond to the needs of the criminal justice field, provide a means to identify emerging issues of importance so that new programs can be developed quickly, and help inform those in criminal justice about

issues of concern and importance to their colleagues nationwide. For the 1990 survey, more than 3,000 questionnaires were mailed to criminal justice professionals and policy officials to determine concerns and trends among such issues as problems with the criminal justice system, workload, operations and procedures, staffing, and department budgets. The next NAP survey is scheduled to be conducted in 1992. There will be a competition for a new contract during fiscal year 1992.

For more information about this program, write to Jonathan Budd, Program Manager, or contact him at 202-514-6235.

### **Professional Conference Series**

The Professional Conference Series brings criminal justice policymakers, officials, and researchers together to share new ideas and information in NIJ-supported conferences, workshops, and seminars. Topics are based on the needs of the field and the findings of NIJ's National Assessment Program; the findings of NIJ research; consultation with major professional organizations; and key priorities of the administration, the Department of Justice, and the Office of Justice Programs.

Examples of planned activities include an international law enforcement conference, with the Office of National Drug Control Policy, on container detection and drug interdiction; a national conference on evaluating drug program initiatives; and regional workshops on intermediate punishments and on development of criminal justice evaluation capability.

The Professional Conference Series is operating in the second year of a 3-year contract.

For more information about the Professional Conference Series, write to John Thomas, Program Manager, or contact him at 202-514-6206.

### **State and Local Technical Assistance**

This program will provide assistance to State and local governments for implementing new and innovative approaches to crime control and criminal justice. The technical support will transfer and apply NIJ research findings and programs to the field. Initial priorities will include drug enforcement, drug testing, financing and construction of prisons and jails, and intermediate sanctions. Methods of procurement in fiscal year 1992 will be determined.

### **1992 Administration of Justice Seminar**

The Institute will support a seminar on the Administration of Justice to be conducted by the Brookings Institution's Center for Public Policy Education. Conducted annually since 1978, the 1-day seminar provides a forum for leading staff members of the judicial, legislative, and executive branches of the Federal Government to examine justice issues of common interest. This year's topics included civil justice reform, long-range judicial planning, crime legislation, bankruptcy court, and the impeachment process. The seminar was held on March 20, 1992, in Annapolis, Maryland.

### **Research Applications for Sheriffs**

The National Sheriffs' Association (NSA) will develop training, technical assistance, and communication strategies in order to extend the application of NIJ research and evaluation findings to operational problems of the Nation's sheriffs. Project activities include the development of: (1) training modules based on NIJ programs for the National Sheriffs' Institute; (2) panel presentations and an information booth at annual meetings of State sheriffs' associations and at the national convention; (3) NSA publications (*The Sheriff, Roll Call*); and (4) response to requests for assistance from the field. Research information will be communicated on a number of topics, including jail industries, jail construction, and crime prevention for and victim assistance to the elderly.

The project is supported under a cooperative agreement for a period of 1 year. For further information, write to John Thomas, Program Manager, NIJ, or contact him at 202-514-6206.

### Research Support Program

The Technical Assistance and Support (TAS) program of the National Institute of Justice provides NIJ with required technical assistance and access to peer review services essential to social science research. Operated under contract, the TAS program manages a consultant pool of experts recruited from universities and colleges, criminal justice agencies, and professional organizations; assists in conducting peer review panels and organizing the written review of all proposals received by NIJ annually; provides logistical arrangements for NIJ meetings and peer review panels; and coordinates peer reviews of NIJ reports.

The Technical Assistance and Support program is operating in the first year of a 3-year option contract.

For information about how to become a consultant for this NIJ program, or for more information about the program, write Shellie Solomon, NIJ Budget Officer, or call 202-307-2955.

### National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)

The National Institute of Justice established the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) in 1972, responding to a congressional mandate to operate a national and international clearinghouse of criminal justice information. NCJRS is designed to provide information to professionals and researchers in all aspects of Federal, State, and local criminal justice operations.

NIJ's Clearinghouse has grown to become the largest automated data base and library on criminal justice in the Nation, with abstracts of more than 112,000 books, articles, and documents. Users can access the data base in three ways: (1) through contact with information specialists at the Clearinghouse; (2) through File 21 on

DIALOG; and (3) through a subscription to computer-based CD-ROM products.

**Information Specialists.** A team of information specialists with expertise in law enforcement, courts, and corrections serve as a link between users and information. The Clearinghouse also operates specialized information services for professionals concerned about corrections construction and drugs and crime through the Construction Information Exchange and the Drugs and Crime Research and Evaluation Center. Other Office of Justice Programs agencies operating information centers at NCJRS include the Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse for the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the National Victims Resource Center for the Office for Victims of Crime, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance Clearinghouse for the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

**Publications.** The *National Institute of Justice Catalog* and the *National Institute of Justice Journal* are the primary vehicles used to announce information about the programs and services of NIJ and its Clearinghouse. More than 90,000 subscribers receive these free periodicals. Other publications include NIJ's *Research in Brief* series, which presents results of NIJ-supported projects; *Evaluation Bulletins*; *Construction Bulletins*; and more detailed research and evaluation reports.

**NIJ Technology.** State-of-the-art technology and products make NCJRS information immediately available to those who need up-to-date information on a wide range of criminal justice topics. The development of computer-based products on diskette and CD-ROM, refinements to the NCJRS Electronic Bulletin Board, and enhancements to services for the international community have helped speed the delivery of information to those who need it.

For answers to criminal justice questions, search services, or information on how to become a subscriber, call the Clearinghouse at 800-851-3420; write to NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850; or dial the NCJRS Electronic Bulletin Board at 301-738-8895.

### **The Construction Information Exchange**

Since 1980, the number of inmates confined in Federal, State, and local correctional facilities has more than doubled. By midyear 1991, inmates in Federal and State facilities numbered 804,524, and those in jails were estimated at 405,320. This population growth rate has resulted in a serious shortfall in prison and jail capacity. Since 1986, the National Institute of Justice Construction Information Exchange has provided valuable assistance to State and local authorities seeking to expand their correctional capacity in cost-effective ways. The Exchange provides access to the latest concepts and techniques in financing, designing, renovating, and constructing new facilities. The Exchange also facilitates communication between correctional officials who have successfully completed construction and those who are just beginning the process. By developing and sharing this information, the Exchange has helped corrections officials save both time and cost while providing safe and secure facilities. The program includes the following:

**The Construction Information Exchange Data Base.** The data base collects information on facilities that are currently being designed and constructed throughout the country. More than 160 data elements are included for each of 252 facilities. In 1992, as many as 800 new projects completed since 1985 will be added to the data base. This data base will allow corrections officials to identify jurisdictions that have recently completed facilities whose requirements are similar to those of their own proposed projects. Officials can review floor plans, evaluate staffing needs, and determine cost and schedule requirements for their own facilities. The data will be available on disk.

**The National Directory of Corrections Construction.** The Directory is a hardbound form of selected information from the data base. Jurisdictions that do not have the computer capability required to access the data base can still review recent projects, select those that most closely resemble their own, and directly contact officials who have completed those projects. The second and

most recent edition of this valuable desk reference was issued in 1988. As the new data are developed, a third edition of this document will be published.

**Construction Bulletins.** These present case studies of critical issues in corrections construction. Thirteen bulletins are currently available providing important information on projects in a number of jurisdictions including Florida, South Carolina, Maine, Ohio, California, and Oklahoma.

Current topics for bulletins being developed include "Construction Options," which reviews a California project that used fast, economical construction methods offering the quality and durability of traditional construction methods. The approach permitted rapid construction of inmate housing units and allowed the jurisdiction to avoid the use of temporary housing.

Another bulletin, "Renovation of Existing Facilities," identifies three jurisdictions where renovation was chosen over new construction and reviews the pros and cons of the renovation option. The third bulletin, "Project Delivery Options," describes innovative management and contracting options.

The Construction Information Exchange has coordinated resources and assistance available through other Federal agencies, including the Bureau of Prisons, the National Institute of Corrections, and the Bureau of Justice Assistance.

The Exchange is operating in the third year of a 4-year contract.

For further information about the Construction Information Exchange, write to Virginia Baldau, Director, Research Applications and Training Division, NIJ, or call her at 202-514-6204.

### **Data Resources Program**

NIJ's Data Resources Program promotes access and use of data collected in NIJ-supported studies. The Data Resources Program facilitates production of fully documented, machine-readable criminal justice research data

sets. The data sets are made available for subsequent analysis through a public data archive. Data sets produced since 1988 are also available directly from NIJ's Data Resources Program contractor.

The program obtains machine-readable data, codebooks, and other documentation provided to NIJ by grantees and contractors. The items are reviewed for accuracy, completeness, and clarity and modified or augmented in consultation with the original investigator as needed. A *User's Guide* briefly describes the study for which the data were collected and details the data produced.

Since 1984, the program has reviewed and made available more than 200 data sets on priority issues such as gangs, drugs and crime, policing, intermediate sanctions, and violence. Under review are an additional 50 data sets, most of which will be released during the next year. The current edition of the *Data Resources of the National Institute of Justice* describes data sets available as of February 1992. These data are available through the National Archive for Criminal Justice Data, Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, at the University of Michigan.

The Data Resources Program was competed as a contract in fiscal year 1989, and a competition for a new contract will take place during this fiscal year.

For further information about this program, write Dr. Pamela K. Lattimore, Manager, Data Resources Program, or contact her at 202-307-2961.

# Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology: Solicitations for 1992

---

## DNA Technology Development

### Purpose

The purpose of this solicitation is to support the development and implementation of those technologies that will result in the reliable, effective, and acceptable utilization of DNA evidence for the identification of suspects for criminal investigations and criminal court cases.

### Background

DNA (Deoxyribonucleic Acid) testing has become an important tool in identifying suspects in major criminal justice investigations and is also becoming more important as vital evidence in criminal court cases. As almost every cell in the human contains DNA, it may be present in innumerable forms at the crime scene in criminal cases—in bloodstains; semen stains; hair follicles; bone; and even materials such as rugs, clothing, furniture, and other areas where skin cells are shed routinely. Because DNA is unique in every person (except for identical twins), it can be used to determine the identity of a suspect with virtual certainty.

The technology that forms the basis for DNA testing has advanced rapidly over the last decade. The current procedure, called RFLP (restriction fragment length polymorphism) is still widely used but will likely be replaced by the more effective and faster PCR (polymerase chain reaction) procedure that is undergoing development. NIJ's research will focus on new procedures such as PCR.

As with any new technology, DNA testing requires further research and development to realize its full potential. These must include the development of acceptable and appropriate performance standards if crime laboratories are to generate reliable and valid DNA profiles. Appropriate and reliable statistical procedures to calculate the likelihood that the DNA profile from a suspect is the same as a DNA profile from evidence found at a crime scene must be developed. Suitable and reliable population data bases for making DNA profile frequency estimates and implementation strategies to advance the deployment of the new testing technologies, such as the PCR-based method, are required. Finally, standards, safeguards, and guidelines must be developed and implemented for accessing and using local and national DNA profile data bases by law enforcement agencies for rapid suspect identification.<sup>1</sup>

### Goals

- To develop DNA profiling performance standards for crime laboratories using the RFLP and PCR methods.
- To produce scientifically-acceptable and court-acceptable methods for estimating rapidly and accurately the probability that two or more DNA profiles from different evidence sources match.
- To operationalize and replace the current RFLP DNA profiling procedure with the PCR-based DNA profiling procedure.

### Objectives

- Develop performance standards using standard reference materials for RFLP and PCR-based DNA profiling for State and local crime laboratories.
- Identify and analyze statistical methodologies for calculating DNA profile match probabilities.
- Validate and implement a PCR-based DNA profiling methodology in State and local crime laboratories.

■ Document and distribute DNA profiling performance standards, guidelines for making estimates of DNA matches, and information on the implementation and initial operation of a rapid DNA profiling technology in State and local crime laboratories.

## Program Strategy

*Develop performance standards using standard reference materials for RFLP and PCR-based DNA profiling for State and local crime laboratories.*

More and more State and local crime laboratories and as many as four private laboratories provide DNA testing services to criminal justice agencies. Even with the training by and support of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, uniform performance standards using acceptable reference materials and procedures for the new method of DNA testing do not yet exist. The need for uniform performance standards is one of the major recommendations from the recent Office of Technology Assessment report. Uniform performance standards acceptable to the profession would increase confidence in DNA evidence in the courts and among the researchers. The acceptance of such performance standards would contribute to a uniform nomenclature in the DNA testing procedures.

The grantee will identify, test, and validate specific performance standards as a consequence of recommendations through NIJ via The Working Group for DNA Analysis Methods. The precise number and types of standards would be identified during the first 30 days of the grant period. Possible topics include identifying gel solutions for RFLP, DNA extraction protocols, quantification of extracted DNA, and electrophoretic separation levels.

The final products from this research will include DNA profiling performance standards bulletin(s) which would be distributed to the forensic science community. A final technical report that describes all of the technical work, summarizes the major findings, and makes recommendations for future research is also required.

*Identify and analyze statistical methodologies for calculating DNA profile match possibilities.*

Questions have been raised within the scientific community and the courts as to the validity of the probability that a DNA profile from a suspect is not the same as a DNA profile obtained from a blood stain, semen sample, etc., found at a crime scene; that is, that the match could have occurred by chance. These estimates can run as high or higher than 1 in 10 million.

Issues to be addressed by this research include the following: (1) How representative are the population data bases currently being used? (2) Can a probability for a single DNA location be determined? (3) Are the DNA segments truly independent? And (4) if DNA segments are not truly independent, how does this affect the probability calculations? The products from this project will include recommendations and protocols for making such calculations to be used in crime laboratories for courtroom presentation. The final technical report will summarize the project and suggest what future research is required.

*Validate and implement a PCR-based DNA profiling methodology in State and local crime laboratories.*

The present RFLP DNA testing procedure has several methodological limitations that have encouraged the development of alternative methods like PCR. RFLP is time consuming, utilizes a radioactive identification procedure, and relies on the visual presentation of the profiling result which can be misinterpreted. The new procedures overcome these limitations and dramatically reduce the testing time while increasing the testing sensitivity. One of these new procedures is the PCR-based approach. Its major contribution is the ability to mass produce from very small case samples a large amount of DNA that could be used in testing for suspect identification. The efficiency and effectiveness of the PCR-based method is so significant that it is being researched extensively and could be the successor to RFLP.

A number of PCR-based procedures and approaches have been evolving rapidly during the last few years,

such as the Variable Number Tandem Repeat (VNTR) and Short Tandem Repeat (STR) methods. Some of these new procedures and methods have had limited experience with case work; hence, there is a need to test the performance of PCR-based procedures and methods in crime laboratories with actual crime cases.

The final results from this objective will describe the PCR profiling process and its implementation and assess the contribution of this process for enhancing the DNA testing technology nationally. In addition, the grantee will be required to prepare a final technical report summarizing the study and making recommendations for putting this new procedure to use in several crime laboratories.

*Document and distribute DNA profiling performance standards, guidelines for making estimates of DNA matches, and information on the implementation and initial operation of a rapid DNA profiling technology in State and local crime laboratories.*

The reports produced under these objectives are expected to include a thorough discussion of the problem the research addresses, a review of the existing literature, a discussion of the methodology utilized, and an analysis of the research findings. Each of the above objectives will also result in an NIJ *Research in Brief* which describes the objective and discusses the implications of the research for criminal justice professionals.

## Application Information

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including products, standards of performance, and monitoring.

**Award Period.** NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

**Award Amount.** NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the cost of this project. Funding for this program area has been set at \$350,000. It is expected that multiple grants will be awarded during 1992. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

DNA Technology Development  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Richard Laymon, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-307-0652.

## References

1. "Forensic DNA tests and Hardy-Weinberg," *Science*, (August 30, 1991): 1037-1041. See also "Imprints on DNA fingerprints," *Nature*, (September 12, 1991): 121-122; Neil J. Risch and B. Devlin, "On the probability of matching DNA fingerprints," (February 7, 1992): 717-720; and *Genetic Witness: Forensic Uses of DNA Tests*, Congress of the U.S. Office of Technology Assessment, 1990.



If there is a question of whether a given project idea falls within the program's scope, applicants are encouraged to seek the advice of the Program Manager.

## Application Information

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements of award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

**Award Period.** NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Forensic Sciences and Criminal Justice Technology:  
Priority Topics  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** Applicants are encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to: (DNA) Dr. Richard Laymon, Program Manager, at the above address, or call him at 202-307-0652; or (Forensics) Dr. Richard Rau, Program Manager, at the above address, or telephone him at 202-307-0648.

---

## Annual Review of Justice Research

### Purpose

This solicitation will support development and production of an annual volume reviewing the most significant and policy-relevant developments in research on crime and the criminal justice system.

### Background

Over the past two decades, research on criminal justice has generated significant knowledge on crime and its control. The extensive body of research, the number of disciplines involved, and the complexities of the issues make it difficult for justice policymakers, professionals, and researchers to stay abreast of the latest developments and to distill the policy implications of the results of a number of studies.

In response to its congressional mandate to communicate and promote understanding of new knowledge that can contribute to more effective criminal justice policymaking, NIJ supports an annual review publication series to synthesize developments and trends in areas of concern and interest to criminal justice policymakers, professionals, and researchers throughout the Nation.

### Goals

- To synthesize the state of the art in knowledge developed through research on topics related to Office of Justice Programs priorities and significant for national and local policies for crime control and criminal justice.
- To increase national awareness of the results of justice research and their implications for more effective public safety policies and practices.
- To review and report on results of studies dealing with crime or the functioning of the criminal justice

system to identify implications for operations, policies, and future research directions.

- To provide an authoritative source in one volume for the most significant information from research and evaluation useful to criminal justice policymakers, professionals, and the research community.

## Objectives

- Identify topics related to Office of Justice Programs priorities of critical concern in controlling crime and improving the criminal justice system.

- Commission leading experts in criminal justice policymaking, operations, and research to write substantive and high-quality essays on topics of national concern.

- Provide for independent peer review and critique of the essays by outstanding criminal justice professionals and researchers.

- Develop an annual volume that will serve as an authoritative reference source accessible to criminal justice policymakers, professionals, and researchers.

- Provide for high-quality publication of the volume in both hardcover and paperback formats.

- Develop marketing and fulfillment/distribution strategies for the volume to ensure the widest possible readership among the criminal justice policy, operations, research, and academic communities.

## Program Strategy

*Identify topics related to Office of Justice Programs priorities of critical concern in controlling crime and improving the criminal justice system.*

To accomplish this objective, the applicant should propose an Editorial Review Board, composed of leading criminal justice professionals and researchers, to identify topics that relate to OJP priorities and represent the most

critical issues facing the criminal justice system. The Board should be representative of the major criminal justice disciplines and reflect both practical and scholarly experience.

The Board would, in consultation and cooperation with the National Institute of Justice, select topics for inclusion in the annual review, recommend writers and reviewers, and review the proposed essays for comprehensiveness and relevance to public policy. The Board also would identify priority topics that might be suitable for future volumes devoted to a single theme or issue.

The Board would review draft essays for depth of substance, quality and clarity of writing, timeliness, and relevance to critical criminal justice policy issues. The Board would take into consideration the research findings and recommendations of the National Institute of Justice and the Office of Justice Programs' priorities in selecting topics, determining scope, exploring policy implications, and recommending future research agendas.

*Commission leading experts in criminal justice policymaking, operations, and research to write substantive, high-quality essays on topics of national concern.*

To accomplish this objective, the applicant should demonstrate the ability to work with leading criminal justice experts to obtain high quality essays. The grantee would also be expected to produce summaries of the in-depth essays suitable for possible publication by the National Institute of Justice in a variety of formats. The proposal should outline the process for assembling editorial staff with broad substantive knowledge of criminal justice operations and research and experience in editing high-quality publications, and knowledge of the development, preparation, production, and marketing of publications. The proposal should include curricula vitae of the editor and all proposed staff and discuss how the background of the editor and staff will ensure the highest quality publications.

*Provide for independent peer review and critique of the essays by outstanding criminal justice professionals and researchers.*

To accomplish this objective, the applicant should demonstrate the capability of securing the services of a wide range of professionals, scholars, and policymakers to ensure rigorous review of the scope, content, and editorial quality of the essays.

*Develop an annual volume that will serve as an authoritative reference source accessible to criminal justice policymakers, professionals, and researchers.*

To accomplish this objective, the editor and staff should be highly experienced in planning, developing, and producing a comprehensive research review volume on a timely basis. The editor and staff should have superior knowledge and experience in all phases of substantive and editorial planning, writing, editing, copyediting, verifying, production, and marketing of high-quality publications. The applicant also should demonstrate the capability of developing and implementing strategies for encouraging use of the volume in universities and other educational institutions.

*Provide for high-quality publication of the volume in both hardcover and paperback formats.*

To accomplish this objective, the applicant should discuss options for producing, marketing and distributing a well-designed volume on a timely basis. The applicant should provide a management plan and a schedule of tasks to accomplish production of the volume.

*Develop marketing and fulfillment/distribution strategies for the volume to ensure the widest possible readership among the criminal justice policy, operations, research, and academic communities.*

To accomplish this objective, the project should have access to marketing and fulfillment/distribution specialists experienced in reaching the target audiences for the volume. The proposal should outline a marketing plan

for effective and timely promotion of the volume through direct mail, advertising in journals and professional publications of the criminal justice community, and other appropriate outreach activities.

## **Application Information**

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

**Award Period.** NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum of 24 months.

**Award Amount.** Funding for this project has been tentatively set at \$150,000 to \$175,000.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Annual Review of Research  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Mary Graham, Project Manager, at the above address or telephone her at 202-514-6207.

## Fellowship Programs

### Purpose

The purpose of these programs is to support research on topics of high priority to the Attorney General and the Office of Justice Programs that enhance the capabilities of law enforcement and criminal justice to combat crime and drug abuse.

### Background

The Fellowship Programs offer criminal justice professionals and researchers an opportunity to undertake independent research on policy-relevant criminal justice issues. The programs provide a path for investigating new approaches for resolving operational problems, developing careers in criminal justice research and administration, and becoming involved in a national program of criminal justice research directed at meeting the needs of Federal, State, and local agencies.

### Goals

- To promote innovative, policy-relevant criminal justice research.
- To encourage the use of National Institute of Justice resources.
- To encourage the development of careers in criminal justice research and administration.

### Objectives

- Conduct research in the National Institute of Justice priority areas.
- Assist in the development of enhanced criminal justice system capabilities.
- Provide technical assistance to State and local law enforcement and criminal justice professionals.

- Encourage scholars to conduct research in the field of criminal justice.

### Program Strategy

The National Institute of Justice supports two fellowship programs: the **Visiting Fellowship Program**, and the **Graduate Fellowship Program**.

NIJ is currently interested in fellowship applications that focus on the following criminal justice priorities: Intermediate Sanctions and Corrections, Victims, Gangs and Violent Offenders, Drug Testing, Community Policing and Police Effectiveness, Drug Prevention, and Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication of Offenders.

**Visiting Fellowship Program.** Visiting Fellows will work at the National Institute of Justice for a period ranging from 6 to 18 months. While at the Institute, the fellows have the opportunity to participate in the development of plans for criminal justice research programs of national scope, interact with Institute staff and other fellows, and present seminars on their work. NIJ provides full financial and logistical support and access to the abundant criminal justice resources of the Nation's Capital.

The Visiting Fellowship Program solicits proposals from three groups of criminal justice specialists, emphasizing the connection between research and practice. Based on their backgrounds and credentials (each candidate must have at least a bachelor's degree), candidates are classified as:

- **Criminal Justice Professionals.** Middle- and upper-level criminal justice personnel, usually employees of State or local government. The candidates should have an active knowledge of how the local communities function, of policy development and command structures of the justice system, and of innovations occurring at the local level. They include representatives from police departments, courts, corrections, probation agencies, and victim services who show a potential for future leadership. Candidates from this category usually propose policy-relevant studies that may require some

technical assistance from NIJ on study design and analysis.

■ **Senior Researchers.** Personnel with broad and extensive criminal justice research experience. Drawn from colleges and universities, these candidates usually propose research that is expected to yield new or improved assumptions on which criminal justice operations can be based or to improve actual field operations in criminal justice.

■ **Postdoctoral Researchers.** Recent doctoral graduates with interest in criminal justice research. Candidates are drawn from universities and should propose research closely following that suggested for the senior researchers.

All fellows may be asked by NIJ as part of their fellowship to provide technical assistance to other government-funded projects and to assist in the development of training materials for new or current projects.

NIJ support will cover salary, fringe benefits, reasonable relocation costs, travel essential to the project, and office costs (telephone, computers, supplies, furniture, etc.). NIJ recognizes that a move to the Washington, D.C., area may cause hardship where there is a significant difference in cost of living from the applicant's home. Hence, salary may be adjusted based on a cost of living difference in excess of 20 percent.

**Graduate Fellowship Program.** The Graduate Fellowship Program supports career development in criminal justice research and administration. Funds support: (1) young scholars seeking Ph.D.'s in criminology or criminal justice and (2) graduate students at colleges and universities who wish to pursue academic or professional careers in criminal justice research or administration. In the future, the Institute may wish to examine ways to encourage the development of academic partnerships with universities with doctoral programs in criminal justice in order to increase access to resources for conducting research and to provide opportunities to minority scholars in criminal justice research. Individual solicitations for these Graduate Fellowship Programs will be issued later this year.

## Application Information

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

**Products.** To deal more effectively with the issues of crime in our society, criminal justice professionals, citizen groups, and policymakers must be well informed. The specific research goals and priorities of the National Institute of Justice and the Office of Justice Programs address this need and provide guidance for focused research and program evaluations. Therefore, fellowship proposals submitted for funding should highlight the policy issues that the research will serve to inform as well as the products that will be developed to provide useful information and assistance.

Applicants must concisely describe the products to be developed through the proposed research and address the purpose, audience, and usefulness of each product to the field. This discussion should include identifying the principal criminal justice constituency or agency type for each product and describing how the constituent group or agency officials would be expected to use the product or report. Under the **Graduate Fellowship Program**, products in addition to the dissertation or master's thesis must include a summary of approximately 2,500 words highlighting the findings of the research and the policy issues those findings will inform. The summary should be written to be accessible to policy officials and professionals and suitable for possible publication as a National Institute of Justice *Research in Brief*.

**Eligibility Requirements.** NIJ awards grants to, or enters into cooperative agreements with, educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, individuals, and profit-making organizations that are willing to waive their fees. Please call or write the respective Program Manager for full detailed information

on eligibility requirements for the Visiting Fellowship Program and the Graduate Fellowship Program.

**Selection Criteria.** Selection for the Visiting Fellowship Program is competitive. The review criteria are based on the background and experience of the individual candidate as well as the quality and viability of the proposed project. Submissions to the Visiting Fellowship Program will be reviewed by panels of NIJ professional staff in most instances, and each review will be based on the applicant's status as either a criminal justice professional, postdoctorate researcher, or a senior researcher.

Selection criteria procedure for Graduate Fellowships are largely the same as those for other grant programs. All applications will be reviewed by a peer review panel of three to five persons from the researcher and practitioner communities, selected for their research experience and operational expertise as well as their knowledge in the substantive areas covered by this solicitation. The essential question asked of each application is, "If this line of research/studies were successful, how would criminal justice policies or operations be improved?" Five criteria are applied in the review of applications: technical merit, understanding of the problem, importance of the research, qualifications of the applicant, and project costs.

**Award Period.** Visiting Fellowships last from 6 to 18 months. Graduate Fellowships are awarded for one year or less.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Fellowship Programs  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, DC 20531

Deadlines for receipt of visiting Fellowship proposals at the National Institute of Justice are June 15, 1992, September 15, 1992, December 15, 1992, and March 15, 1993.

**Contact.** Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability and proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information regarding the Fellowship Program, potential applicants may contact Carol Petrie at 202-307-2942 or Dr. Christy Visher at 202-307-0694.

## Data Resources Program

### Purpose

This solicitation requests proposals to explore topical policy questions through the analysis of existing data from NIJ-supported studies. The data has been deposited by NIJ's Data Resources Program in the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data, Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, University of Michigan. Topics addressing gangs, violence, and the interactions of drugs and crime are of particular interest to the Institute. However, exceptional proposals addressing any topic of concern to criminal justice professionals and policymakers will be considered. Particular consideration will be given to proposals that focus on OJP priorities, which are:

- Gangs and Violent Offenders.
- Victims.
- Community Policing and Police Effectiveness.
- Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability.
- Drug Prevention.
- Drug Testing.
- Money Laundering and Financial Investigation.

- Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication.
- Information Systems, Statistics, and Technology.
- Evaluation.

## Background

Since 1976, it has been NIJ's policy to ensure that all data collected by its grantees and contractors are publicly available. NIJ established the Data Resources Program in 1984 to ensure that all data were fully documented and deposited in the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data. More than 200 data sets, covering a wide range of criminal justice issues, are currently available through the Archive. These data sets are described in the *Data Resources of the National Institute of Justice*, which is available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service.

Data collection is a timely and expensive process. NIJ's policy of archiving data recognizes that data collected for one purpose can often provide the answers to new research and policy questions. Studies using data sets containing similar information collected at different times or from different sites can be of particular value. These "quasi" time series or cross-sectional studies may bring fresh insights not gained from earlier independent studies. New statistical techniques and methodologies, such as expert systems and neural networks, can also be applied in a cost-effective manner to existing data to test the validity of these new methods. Finally, existing data provide a resource for exploring the development of applications of direct benefit to practitioners.

This solicitation is for original research using existing data. The applicant's proposal should develop the research question(s) and issue(s) to be examined, based on a critical review of the literature and the existing data resources that will be used. The purpose of the research should be concisely stated with particular emphasis on implications of the research for policy and criminal justice practice. The project should be designed to produce a final product within 9 months of the award.

## Goals

- To address and answer research and policy questions pertaining to current Office of Justice Programs priorities using existing data resources.
- To communicate the results of these original research projects to criminal justice professionals and policymakers.

## Objectives

- Define the areas where current OJP priorities, specific research, and policy questions intersect with existing data resources. Develop and execute a research design that uses existing data to answer specific research and policy questions pertinent to current OJP priorities.
- Prepare a report describing the research and results, to be published by the National Institute of Justice and distributed to criminal justice professionals and policymakers.

## Program Strategy

*Define the areas where current OJP priorities, specific research, and policy questions intersect with existing data resources. Develop and execute a research design that uses existing data to answer specific research and policy questions pertinent to current OJP priorities.*

To accomplish this objective, the applicant should identify: (1) one or more research or policy questions related to a current OJP priority and (2) one or more archived data sets that will be used to address the research/policy question(s). The specific objectives of the proposed research and the potential implications of findings for criminal justice professionals and policymakers should be clearly described in the proposal.

The applicant should: (1) summarize previous research in the respective research/policy area; (2) describe previous analyses that have been conducted with the proposed data set(s); and (3) clearly delineate how the proposed research builds on previous uses of the data.

The proposal should include a complete research design that specifies the analytic method(s) proposed for the research and the variables to be addressed in the analyses.

*Prepare a report describing the research and results, to be published by the National Institute of Justice and distributed to criminal justice professionals and policymakers.*

A report describing the research and results will be prepared and submitted at the end of the award period. The report should be suitable for distribution to criminal justice professionals and policymakers and will be considered for publication as an *NIJ Research in Brief*. A more detailed report describing complex analyses may also be required.

## Application Information

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria. In addition, the applicant is requested to confine the technical proposal (excluding references and appendices) to no more than 15 pages.

**Special Eligibility Requirements.** In addition to the requirements specified on page 13, institutional affiliations of investigators are encouraged to waive (or reduce) indirect and overhead fees. Awards will not be made to individuals to conduct additional analyses on data they collected under a previous NIJ grant or contract.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements of award recipients, including products, standards of performance, monitoring, etc.

**Award Period.** Awards under this solicitation will be limited to 9 months, and grantees will be expected to produce a final product within that time.

**Award Amount.** NIJ encourages applicants to develop a reasonable budget that will adequately cover the costs of the proposed project. Awards of up to \$25,000 to

support investigators conducting original research using existing data will be made under this solicitation. Funding of this topic has been tentatively set at \$150,000. It is anticipated that this will support six or more awards. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Data Resources Program  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write Dr. Pamela K. Lattimore, Program Manager, at NIJ, or telephone her at 202-307-2961.

---

# Evaluation

Gangs and Targets of Intervention

Evaluating the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act

Drug Market Analysis: An Enforcement Model

Evaluation of Correctional Options Demonstration Program

Denial of Federal Benefits Program

Operation Weed and Seed

Boys and Girls Clubs in Public Housing

Evaluation: Priority Topics

---

**OJP Policy Statement** — *Evaluations are a primary component of OJP discretionary grant programs. OJP promotes program evaluation so that programs that are effective can be identified, publicized and replicated in other jurisdictions, while programs that have not proven effective can be discontinued. OJP will dedicate significant financial resources to encourage, enhance and enforce quality design and program development and will disseminate the results to communicate what works and what does not. These evaluation activities consist of formal assessments of OJP programs through objective measurement and systematic analysis of the manner and extent to which the programs achieve their objectives and produce significant results. The results are used to assist in the formulation of relevant criminal justice and juvenile justice policies. Related program design and the subsequent development and dissemination of program policies, procedures and practices provide information and guidance at the Federal, State and local levels.*

---

# Evaluation

In 1991 the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) began a process to develop a new structure for research and evaluation to meet the critical needs of criminal justice agencies nationwide. With the publication of this combined *Research and Evaluation Plan*, the first of its kind issued by NIJ, the Institute has taken the next step in designing a multiyear strategy to combat crime and improve the criminal justice system.

## Background

NIJ's evaluation program enhances knowledge of what works to prevent and control crime and disorder, particularly in the area of drug control and the criminal justice system. Research that assists criminal justice professionals and policymakers can come from program assessments, process evaluations, impact evaluations, and evaluation reviews of programs, literature and data.

During the next 5 years, this evaluation program will provide information to guide the development and implementation of innovative drug programs and strategies. NIJ will focus its evaluation efforts in such areas as drug enforcement, community policing, intensive prosecution and adjudication, intermediate punishments, corrections, and treatment.

In selecting topics for evaluation, NIJ is guided by previous evaluation research and the priorities outlined in the Office of Justice Programs (OJP) fiscal year 1992 Program Plan and listed in the Introduction.

## Previous Research

Since 1989, NIJ has awarded over \$12.5 million for 45 grants. These have included evaluations of police crackdowns, community policing, new court practices, sanctions targeted at both casual and persistent drug users, promising approaches to monitoring and controlling the

behavior of convicted offenders, and other programs of importance to the criminal justice community. In all instances, the Institute has sought objective information on the value of these approaches and their alternatives so that State and local policy can move in productive directions.

**Drug Enforcement.** As a result of the drug trafficking problems that emerged in the mid-1980's changes in narcotics enforcement have occurred at almost every level of law enforcement. To assist the police in determining appropriate strategies and tactics, the Institute began the process of evaluating new approaches to drug enforcement in 1989. In particular, two studies of police crackdowns were undertaken, one in Detroit, Michigan, and the second in New York City, where police were involved in Tactical Narcotics Teams (TNT).

Both evaluations found that concentrating police resources within a limited geographic area had positive outcomes. In Detroit, for example, the crackdowns altered narcotics distribution patterns and the behavior of drug dealers. By changing the patterns of dealers and sellers, the availability of drugs was diminished. In New York City, street drug trafficking became less visible and blatant as a result of the enforcement activities of the tactical narcotics teams. In both cities, however, the impact on the quality of life of residents did not change significantly. Nonetheless, the findings from each of these studies have important ramifications for determining precinct staffing levels, the duration of a crackdown, and for addressing community demands for narcotics intervention.

**Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication.** Institute evaluations will be used to assist prosecutors faced with the tasks of prosecuting highly complex drug cases. The Institute is also working with court administrators to determine the relative merits of various approaches to assist the courts in coping with increased drug case-

loads. The evaluation of expedited drug case management programs, for example, has produced promising results. This case management system differentiates cases according to the expected disposition and the demand on the docket. Its use in Philadelphia has reduced the time from arraignment to disposition from 158 to 113 days while increasing guilty pleas by 18 percent and reducing jury trials by 42 percent. The net result on the criminal justice system has been to reduce court backlogs and to increase the availability of jail space by up to 400 beds per day.

**Evaluating Community Initiatives.** Citizens, community groups, and local law enforcement agencies have become more actively involved in community-based, anti-drug programs and initiatives. To assist in these efforts, the Institute is supporting five evaluation studies designed to test the feasibility of community-based initiatives; gather practical information on planning and implementation of community-based programs; determine the types of partnerships that have been formed; and learn the types of technical assistance that are helpful to reduce drug-related crime in specific neighborhoods.

One study has found that a comprehensive crime and drug reduction project in Wilmington, Delaware, has helped reduce drug trafficking in targeted neighborhoods. Citizens are more willing to ask for police support since the program began; the number of drug-related calls to 911 has almost doubled. Drug-related arrests have increased and the level of drug activity stabilized, while drug activity in other parts of Wilmington continues to climb.

Information from these evaluations will be disseminated to enable other communities to design effective approaches to combat illicit drugs and reduce drug-related crime.

**Intermediate Punishments and Corrections.** For nearly a decade Federal, State, and local criminal justice agencies have employed a number of approaches for dealing with adjudicated offenders, including: sentencing alternatives; programs designed to reduce recidi-

vism—such as drug treatment programs in prisons, jails, residential treatment settings, and work release programs; and a variety of specialized approaches to probation. The Institute has initiated a number of evaluations of intermediate punishments and corrections to determine what works best and why.

Currently, evaluations are underway of intensive supervision of probationers in Minnesota, a work release program in Michigan, therapeutic communities in Georgia prisons, drug treatment in local jails, and boot camp prisons. Findings from these studies are designed to put accurate information into the hands of those responsible for the design and operation of similar types of programs.

### **Ongoing Programs for 1992**

The fiscal year 1992 evaluation program addresses research issues relevant to the OJP policy statement (presented at the beginning of the chapter). The program builds on past research and upon recently identified problems and issues important to anti-drug abuse priorities. Areas of particular interest in the current year include evaluations of the Correctional Options Program, Operation Weed and Seed, Drug Market Analysis, Gangs, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and the Denial of Federal Benefits Program. Relevant solicitations appear later in this chapter. In addition, a concluding solicitation identifies other areas of interest and encourages proposals on other useful projects within the general area of evaluation.

### **National Evaluation Conference**

The National Institute of Justice and the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) will cosponsor their third annual evaluation conference in Washington, DC, on July 27–29, 1992. The conference attracted over 400 Federal, State, and local participants last year. It presents findings from evaluations sponsored at all levels of government, including work in progress on current programs. It also presents special workshops on evaluation topics and new program concepts. Panel sessions span the interests

of the criminal justice system, ranging from community-based anti-drug initiatives, law enforcement tactics, and new court programs to intermediate sanctions and drug treatment in corrections. The conference is of interest to researchers, administrators of Federal and State grant programs, and professionals in State and local operations. Conference organization and logistics will be provided by an existing contractor.

#### **Michigan's Nokomis Challenge Program for Juvenile Offenders**

Michigan's Nokomis Challenge Program is an integrated program of 3 months in residential custody and 9 months of intensive supervision in the community. It was designed as an alternative program for juvenile offenders serving terms of approximately 12 months in Michigan's training schools. The goal of the program is to prevent relapse into drug use or crime. The evaluation of this program will measure its impact on substance use, continued delinquency, public safety, and correctional costs.

#### **Minnesota's Intensive Community Supervision Program**

Minnesota's Intensive Community Supervision program involves prison diversion and intensive supervised release. Corrections officials provide maximum supervision in a four-phase process that includes a lengthy period of home detention and close contact by specially trained agents with small caseloads. At the core of the program is mandatory work and/or training program participation. The NIJ evaluation is designed to examine three key dimensions: the effects on public safety, offender reintegration, and justice system costs. A random field experiment is being used to evaluate the program.

#### **SMART Assessment**

Evaluation will be central to the Institute's cooperative initiative with the Department of Education to promote nationwide diffusion of the School Management and Resource Teams (SMART) program. Evaluation activi-

ties will include indepth case studies of two exemplary school systems that serve as SMART resource centers—Anaheim, California and Norfolk, Virginia—as well as an overall assessment of the replication initiative describing how various factors influence school systems to adopt the SMART program.

### **New Evaluation Programs for Fiscal Year 1992**

#### **Enhancing the Evaluation Capacity of the States**

In 1992 the National Institute of Justice will continue efforts to build the capacity of State and local jurisdictions to conduct their own evaluations. Three projects will be initiated:

**National Assessment of State Evaluations.** A national survey of evaluations of justice programs in the States will provide information about the scope and focus of evaluations, the use of evaluation findings, and the level of resources available to States.

**Assessment of State-Level Evaluation Capacity.** This study will provide information about the nature and extent of evaluation capacity at the State level. Site visits, interviews with key personnel, and an assessment of evaluation programs are included in this project.

**Compendium of State Drug Program Evaluation Findings.** Since 1989 a number of State and local-level evaluation projects have been completed. The combined experiences of the States in both evaluation implementation and evaluation findings have not been collected and documented in a fashion that facilitates the sharing of those experiences and findings. This project will result in a compendium of State evaluation findings and training materials for publication and distribution by NIJ.

#### **Collaborative Program for High-Risk Youth**

The National Institute of Justice will jointly develop and support the evaluation of a comprehensive program for high-risk children. The program is being developed by

the Bureau of Justice Assistance and New York University's Strategic Intervention for High-Risk Youth (SIHRY) project, with funds from the Ford Foundation, the Pew Charitable Trust, and the Annie Casey Foundation. It will take place in five to seven cities and consist of a wide range of intervention programs targeted at children aged 11 to 13. Providing a safe environment at home and at school are key enforcement objectives. Children will also benefit from community mentors, special scholastic emphasis, family support, and after-school activities. The evaluation, which will span 4 years, will assess the delivery of services and the overall program's impact on child achievement, drug use, and criminal involvement. The evaluation will be performed by an existing contractor.

### **Standards for Correctional Boot Camps**

Since the inception of the first correctional boot camp program in 1983, more than 34 programs for adults and youthful offenders have been developed in 23 States. NIJ research indicates that although there is a common core of military-type drill and discipline within these programs, there are also wide variations in their operations, activities, time served, number served, release procedures and aftercare. The rigorous physical exercise, military drill and discipline, as well as the housing barracks and other noninstitutional characteristics, serve to distinguish correctional boot camps from traditional prisons and jails. NIJ will conduct a program assessment of correctional boot camps for juveniles and adults. On the basis of the results of this assessment a set of professional standards will be established to assist public officials and corrections professionals in the development, operation, improvement, and evaluation of correctional boot camp programs.

## **Evaluation: Solicitations for 1992**

---

### **Gangs and Targets of Intervention**

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of this impact solicitation is to provide for a comprehensive evaluation of strategies for gang prevention and intervention. This evaluation will emphasize the role of social service agencies, schools, family, peers, and community groups in the lives of those high-risk youths who become involved in gangs and those who do not.

#### **Background**

The problem of youth gangs in America has been well documented. In addition to the specific research on gangs, a considerable body of social science as well as education and health literature on adolescent development, violent behavior, and the impact of child abuse may apply to the gang problem. This literature, together with the work of Spergel and others<sup>1</sup>, points to a complex set of social forces that make gang membership an attractive option for many youths and adults. These forces include family problems and other disruptions related to immigration, profound poverty that permeates communities, and the combination of a widespread lack of preventive health care and the failure of schools to engage and educate a sizable proportion of the youth population.

This solicitation is for an impact evaluation that will assess the effectiveness of strategies for intervening in and preventing criminal behavior associated with gangs. It will focus on efforts to affect the lives of youths who become involved in gangs. The evaluation should in-

clude information on the role of social service agencies, schools, family, peers, and community groups in the lives of those high-risk youth who become involved in gangs and those who do not. The selection of specific programs and approaches to be evaluated is left to the applicant. Up to three sites are recommended for inclusion in this evaluation. Programs could be supported by public, private, or volunteer efforts, or some combination thereof. The programs chosen for evaluation may have law enforcement and criminal justice involvement. This evaluation will be coordinated with a national assessment of the roles of probation and parole in gang prevention and control being implemented by the American Correctional Association.

Many existing programs in the United States attempt to control gangs. These programs often include some combination of intervention, prevention and suppression strategies. They vary according to community needs. However, evaluation of recent program efforts has been extremely limited.

Examples of recent programs should give applicants a sense of the breadth and variety of efforts that are currently underway to intervene in gangs: The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has supported a number of programs in the past 5 years, including the Community Reclamation Project, the Serious Habitual Offender Targeted Action program, the Schools and Jobs are Winners program, the Gang-Involved and Gang-Affected Females and Their Children program, and the Boys and Girls Clubs Gang Prevention and Intervention program. Some of these programs have been the subject of limited evaluations.

Both OJJDP and the Bureau of Justice Assistance will be supporting Gang Prevention and Intervention programs in public housing through the Boys and Girls Clubs of America in fiscal year 1992. NIJ will conduct an evaluation of the Boys and Girls Club programs supported by BJA, while OJJDP will evaluate the Boys and Girls Club programs supported with OJJDP funds.

BJA is in the planning phase of a Comprehensive Gang Initiative, targeting the support of demonstration sites in fiscal year 1993. BJA is now assessing comprehensive gang prevention programs and developing prototypes for the demonstrations, and plans to support the Strategic Intervention for High-Risk Youth program in fiscal year 1992 as well. This program is also being supported by the Ford Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trust. It is being managed by the New York University Substance Abuse Strategy Initiative program. NIJ will be supporting the evaluation of this effort starting in fiscal year 1992. The Administration on Children, Youth and Families is supporting consortium grants to organize neighborhood coalitions and provide counseling to families troubled by gangs. These efforts hope to forge new links between people (e.g., law enforcement and community) working to intervene in gangs. A portion of these consortium grants is currently being evaluated.

## Goals

- To evaluate the effectiveness of gang intervention and prevention program(s) emphasizing the roles of social service agencies, schools, families, peers, and community groups.

- To produce reports and provide for the distribution of the results of the evaluation to appropriate audiences.

## Objectives

- Provide for a comprehensive process and impact evaluation of innovative gang intervention and prevention programs.

- Use both quantitative and qualitative methods in the conduct of the evaluation.

- Produce a comprehensive report and executive summary for publication by the National Institute of Justice on the results of the evaluation in all site(s), and develop mechanisms for the distribution of results to appropriate audiences.

## Program Strategy

*Provide for a comprehensive process and impact evaluation of innovative gang intervention and prevention programs.*

The process evaluation will provide technical information that can assist other jurisdictions in implementing a gang intervention and prevention program. Special attention should be given to identifying lessons learned and the guidance that can be provided to other jurisdictions regarding the organization, development, and operation of a gang intervention and prevention program.

The impact evaluation seeks to determine the effect of the gang intervention and prevention program(s) on the gang-related criminal behavior of those targeted by the program and the working relationships of the public, private, and volunteer groups involved in the program(s). The impact evaluation will also provide a comparative assessment of the actual impact of the program(s) with the expectations of the program manager(s) who conceived and planned it (them).

The proposal should discuss the technical aspects of the evaluation plan, factors that may limit the program assessment(s), how these limitations will be addressed, and the methods by which data from the program(s) will be used. It should show how data from specific program(s) can be translated to a national perspective on how a gang intervention and prevention program(s) performs.

The evaluation should include recommendations and guidelines for the development of a gang intervention and prevention program, a detailed case study of each site(s), and guidance on research needs. Applicants should demonstrate a thorough understanding of gang intervention and prevention programs.

*Use both quantitative and qualitative methods in the conduct of the evaluation.*

The evaluation should provide perspectives on the impacts observed in line with the broad range of

decisionmakers concerned about gang intervention and prevention programs. Using both qualitative and quantitative methods will enhance the accessibility of the evaluation results to a broad audience.

*Produce a comprehensive report and executive summary for publication by the National Institute of Justice on the results of the evaluation in all sites, and develop mechanisms for the distribution of the results to appropriate audiences.*

This report will describe the results of the evaluation. It will thoroughly discuss the problem; review the theoretical and empirical research; examine the research methodology employed; state the findings of each program evaluated; synthesize the entire evaluation effort if more than one site is studied; and present recommendations for the development of model policies, procedures, and practices. The other expected product is an executive summary suitable for publication as an NIJ *Research in Brief* that informs professionals, public policymakers, and researchers of the results. In addition, the grantee will provide a thorough status report on the findings for NIJ's annual evaluation report to the Congress.

### **Application Information**

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

**Award Period.** NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

**Award Amount.** Funding for this project has been tentatively set at up to \$250,000 per award; multiple awards may be considered. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Gangs and Targets of Intervention  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact.** Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Ms. Winifred L. Reed, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact her at 202-307-0649.

### **References**

1. J.M. Hagedorn, *People and Folks: Gangs, Crime, and the Underclass in a Rustbelt City*, Chicago: Lake View Press, 1988; C. Ronald Huff, ed., *Gangs in America*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1990; Malcolm W. Klein and Cheryl L. Maxson, "Street Gang Violence," in Neil Weiner and Marvin Wolfgang (eds.) *Violent Crime, Violent Criminals*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1989; M. Sanchez-Jankowski, *Islands in the Street: Gangs and American Urban Society*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991; I.A. Spergel, *Youth Gangs: Problem and Response*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1990.



Services, the New Jersey Coalition for Battered Women, and the District of Columbia Coalition Against Domestic Violence, through fiscal year 1990. Seven additional projects are planned for fiscal year 1992.

OVC has awarded information and dissemination projects to the Denver Police Department, Colorado; the Rochester Police Department, New York; the City of Monroe Planning and Urban Development Division, Louisiana; the City of Pueblo Police Department, Colorado; the Newport News Police Department, Virginia; the Morehead Police Department, Kentucky; the York City Police Department, Pennsylvania; and the Port Gamble Klallam Tribe, Kingston, Washington. Five additional projects are planned for fiscal year 1992.

## Goals

- To evaluate the impact of the Family Violence Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance Program and the Family Violence Information Dissemination Program.

- To produce reports and provide for the distribution of the results of the evaluation to the appropriate audiences.

## Objectives

- Conduct a comprehensive process evaluation of the implementation of the Family Violence Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance Program and the Family Violence Information Dissemination Program.

- Conduct an impact evaluation of the Family Violence Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance program and the Family Violence Information Dissemination program.

- Produce a comprehensive report and executive summary for publication by the National Institute of Justice on the results of the evaluation, and develop mechanisms for the distribution of results to appropriate audiences.

## Program Strategy

*Conduct a comprehensive process evaluation of the implementation of the Family Violence Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance program and the Family Violence Information Dissemination program.*

The process evaluation will provide technical information that can assist other jurisdictions in implementing family violence training and technical assistance projects for law enforcement and family violence information and dissemination projects. Special attention should be given to identifying lessons learned and guidelines that can be provided to other jurisdictions regarding the organization, development, and operation of these programs. Information on site selection and site selection criteria must be included in the grant application.

*Conduct an impact evaluation of the Family Violence Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance program and the Family Violence Information Dissemination program.*

The impact evaluation will assess the effect of the Family Violence Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance program on improving law enforcement's response to the rights and needs of victims of domestic violence incidents. It will also assess the impact of the Family Violence Information Dissemination program on: (1) informing family violence victims about their rights and about local services available to them; (2) ensuring that domestic violence shelters, hospitals, social service, and local law enforcement agencies provide family violence victims with a written report regarding their abuse; and (3) ensuring that domestic violence shelters and local social service personnel, with the victims' consent, are able to obtain information from local law enforcement agencies relating to the victims' abuse.

The proposal should discuss the technical aspects of the evaluation plan, factors that may limit the program assessments, how these limitations will be addressed, site

selection and site selection criteria, and the methods by which data from the programs (and from other sources) will be used. It should show how data from specific projects can be translated to a national perspective.

The evaluation should include recommendations and guidelines for the development of Family Violence Law Enforcement Training and Technical Assistance projects and Family Violence Information Dissemination projects, a detailed case study for selected sites, and guidance on ways to improve these programs.

*Produce a comprehensive report and executive summary for publication by the National Institute of Justice on the results of the evaluation, and develop mechanisms for the distribution of the results to appropriate audiences.*

This report will describe the results of the evaluation. It will thoroughly discuss the problem; review the theoretical and empirical research; examine the research methodology employed; state the findings of each program evaluated; synthesize the entire evaluation effort; and present recommendations for the development of model policies, procedures, and practices. The other expected product is an executive summary suitable for publication as an NIJ *Research in Brief* that informs professionals, public policymakers, and researchers of the results. In addition, the grantee will provide a thorough status report on the findings for NIJ's annual evaluation report to the Congress.

## Application Information

**Application Requirements.** See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

**Award Requirements.** See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

**Award Period.** NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

**Award Amount.** Funding for this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

**Due Date.** Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Evaluating the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act  
National Institute of Justice  
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842  
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

**Contact:** Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Ms. Winifred L. Reed, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact her at 202-307-0649.

## Drug Market Analysis: An Enforcement Model

### Purpose

The purpose of this solicitation is to develop a program model to permit consistent replication of the Drug Market Analysis (DMA) program by State and local law enforcement.

## Background

In 1989 the National Institute of Justice began the Drug Market Analysis (DMA) program to assist law enforcement agencies in developing and implementing sophisticated computer technology and information systems to deal more effectively with high-volume retail drug markets. The program was designed to help police: (1) define the nature, extent, and behavior of street-level drug trafficking; (2) measure the extent of law enforcement activity to counter street-level drug trafficking; (3) provide real-time information to police about drug trafficking activity; (4) overcome the limits imposed by the different jurisdictional boundaries of law enforcement agencies serving a given geographical area; and (5) use information on drug markets and drug-related activities to evaluate rigorously the impact of enforcement efforts on levels and patterns of illicit drug trafficking.

NIJ has funded five police departments (Hartford, Jersey City, Kansas City, Pittsburgh, and San Diego) to develop DMA systems. These departments all share the same fundamental objectives in implementing a DMA system, but each — with the assistance of outside researcher-subcontractors — has developed different structures and methods thought best suited to the respective police agency's needs and circumstances.

A program advisory team, comprising three research scholars and one former chief of police, has provided technical assistance to each of the five sites and has reviewed data collection instruments, documents, and other written material for NIJ. This team has played an important role in the development of the DMA system and the ongoing research at each site.

The operations and development of DMA are being conducted in two phases. During the first phase, each department developed an operational drug market analysis system. During the second phase, departments will use their systems to conduct research projects to determine the effectiveness of a range of enforcement approaches. The overall objectives of the first phase were to develop a DMA information system (instituting hardware, software, and data collection changes as neces-

sary), pretest the system, develop plans for new police strategies that use the DMA system, and develop plans for evaluating the new strategies (again, using the DMA system). The objectives of the second phase are to use the DMA system in drug enforcement operations and to evaluate the effectiveness of the departments' efforts.

## Ongoing Operations and Research by DMA Grantees

During Phase II The Kansas City Police Department will determine whether particular drug enforcement strategies are effective in suppressing drug trafficking. In addition, the department will examine the difference between immediate prosecution and standard prosecution. The mapping system will be used to determine the effects of the enforcement strategies on surrounding neighborhoods. More importantly, the street narcotics unit will make use of data on a daily basis to target drug markets.

The Hartford Police Department is engaged in "Neighborhood Reclamation" — an attempt at taking back areas from drug traffickers. Police will engage in undercover surveillance activities, buy-busts, and foot patrol activities. A community service officer will establish a substation in a neighborhood. Community organizations and individuals will be encouraged to assist the police in maintaining a "drug-free" neighborhood. One neighborhood will be selected for the project, with citizen surveys, observations, and interviews used to measure changes in the area. In addition, the researchers involved in the project will develop mapping capabilities for use by officers working in this area.

The Jersey City Police Department has identified 110 drug markets across the city using a citywide citizen survey, data from a drug-tip line, and arrest data. Drug enforcement strategies will be designed, implemented, and tested in 1992 to determine which strategies work best to combat street-level drug trafficking.

The Pittsburgh Department of Public Safety has integrated countywide law enforcement data, calls for

service, and demographic information into one system. Applications software have been developed for use by police. In addition, a Carnegie-Mellon University research analyst works with narcotics investigators in support of ongoing investigations.

**The San Diego Police Department** is using a county-wide mapping system in its DMA project. Plans for 1992 include the use of the DMA system for focused narcotics enforcement. The police will engage in problem-solving activities using their mapping capabilities.

The five DMA projects underway will help NIJ learn the feasibility of developing DMA systems and assess their utility in coping with street-level drug markets. However, each project focuses on the uniqueness of each site's challenges and opportunities. All emphasize the creation of a technological and organizational environment for change and an assessment of the extent to which these efforts ultimately reduce street-level drug trafficking.

This research solicitation calls for a cross-site overview of the DMA systems and the development of a generic model for the transfer of DMA to other law enforcement agencies.

## Objectives

- Determine the salient features of the different DMA systems and the software used in connection with them.

- Assess the use of the technology and the information it produces at all relevant levels of each police agency using DMA.

- Determine the level of training that is required to use DMA systems.

- Produce and distribute documents and guidebooks that describe the technology, software, and their use for law enforcement. These reports, to be published by the National Institute of Justice, will be distributed to law enforcement agencies, public policymakers and researchers.

## Program Strategy

*Determine the salient features of the different DMA systems and the software used in connection with them.*

A central feature of DMA is the development, modification, and enhancement of the information systems that provide intelligence for drug enforcement and its evaluation. A core feature of that effort is the addition of a capability of computerized map displays. This technology and its accompanying software, when coupled with enhanced information query programs that are user-friendly, are to be incorporated as tools for making enforcement decisions and as aids in evaluating enforcement activity. Technology, software, decision rules, training, and utilization practices all are essential to the successful integration of these new systems into drug enforcement at each of the sites.

Grantees are directed to determine the features of the different technological systems and their software and to determine the level of enhancement necessary to the police departments' computer systems.

*Assess the use of the technology and the information it produces at all relevant levels of each police agency using DMA.*

At each of the five DMA sites, the police department and the research subcontractors are collecting data on the development and use of the DMA systems. This includes the kinds of information included in data files, how it is integrated, transformed, and analyzed.

The grantee should determine how the departments have used DMA and what their potential uses are. For example, complaint and/or hotline data form an important part of the DMA system at the various sites. What do these data tell the departments about drug market dynamics? What is the extent to which different data system configurations are useful for intelligence analysis, planning, resource allocation, and tactical decisionmaking?

To the extent possible, the grantee should attempt to determine whether and in what way DMA has altered

the approach of police users to their work. Do narcotics officers use it to do the same kinds of information searches they conducted before DMA, or has DMA altered their approach to identifying drug markets and designing and assessing their strategies and tactics? Do supervisors and administrators obtain new, more timely, and more useful information to enhance their performance? Has the information proved useful to others outside the department (e.g., prosecutors, city planners, the media, etc.)?

The police agencies are also monitoring the quantity and quality of data entered and the uses to which they are put by users at various levels within the organization. Grantees are directed to track this process and to assess the comprehensiveness of the data and their usefulness for various staff members. The grantee should identify challenges to the departments in getting officers to enter and use data and should recommend one or more approaches to enhance data quality, comprehensiveness, and utility to users.

*Determine the level of training that is required to use DMA systems.*

Training for narcotics and patrol officers may be required for use of the DMA systems. Grantees are directed to determine the level and types of training currently provided at each site and to recommend additional training and technical assistance that may be required for the transfer of DMA to other State and local law enforcement agencies.

*Produce and distribute documents and guidebooks that describe the technology, software, and their use for law enforcement. These reports to be published by the National Institute of Justice will be distributed to law enforcement agencies, public policymakers, and researchers.*

These reports are expected to include: (1) a thorough discussion of the technological aspects of DMA; (2) a review of the types of software currently in use by police departments and researchers at the DMA sites; (3) a

discussion of how police are using the technology in day-to-day operations; and (4) a distribution plan to transfer the DMA model to State and local officials.

Another expected product is an executive summary suitable for publication as an NIJ *Research in Brief* that informs professionals, public policymakers, and researchers of the results.

~~~~~

The **Program Strategy** outlined in this solicitation is the suggested method for conducting a project on the topic that would meet both the goals of the solicitation and the broader program area. NIJ will, however, consider other strategies that would address the purpose and goals of this solicitation. Applicants will be required to justify the proposed alternative strategy in the proposal.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

Eligible Applicants. Current DMA grantees, subcontractors, and the program advisory team are not eligible to compete for this solicitation.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits this cooperative agreement to a maximum period of 18 months.

Award Amount. Funding for this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Drug Market Analysis: An Enforcement Model
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Craig D. Uchida, Director, Evaluation Division, at the above address, or contact him at 202-307-2958.

Evaluation of Correctional Options Demonstration Program

Purpose

The purpose of this solicitation is to evaluate correctional options demonstration projects, funded by the Corrections Branch of the Bureau of Justice Assistance. Correctional options include community-based incarceration, weekend incarceration, correctional boot camps, electronic monitoring, intensive probation, and any other innovative sanction designed to have the greatest impact on offenders who can be punished more effectively in an environment other than a traditional correctional facility.

Background

Over the past decade, prison and jail populations have more than doubled, resulting in higher correctional

costs, crowded facilities and constrained inmate programming budgets. Congress authorized the Correctional Options Amendments to the Crime Control Act of 1990 in response to the need for cost-effective alternatives to traditional modes of incarceration. This statutory provision also mandated NIJ to evaluate this program.

The Correctional Options Amendments provide financial assistance to State and local units of government for the development of correctional options. The Bureau of Justice Assistance administers the program and will be supporting as many as four grants of up to \$2,600,000 for correctional options demonstration projects. The National Institute of Justice will evaluate the demonstration program.

The correctional options demonstration projects will be designed to:

- Provide more appropriate intervention for youthful offenders who are not career criminals, but who, without such intervention, are likely to become career criminals or more serious offenders.
- Provide a degree of security and discipline appropriate for the offenders involved.
- Provide diagnosis, treatment, and services to assist offenders in pursuing a course of lawful and productive conduct following release, including: counseling, substance abuse treatment, education, job training and placement assistance while under correctional supervision, and linkage to similar outside services.
- Reduce criminal recidivism by offenders who receive punishments through such alternatives.
- Lower the cost of correctional services and facilities by reducing criminal recidivism.
- Provide work that promotes development of industrial and service skills in connection with the correctional option.

This solicitation is to support a process evaluation. The Institute's process evaluations attempt to generalize across experiences at several sites rather than perform an

indepth analysis at an individual site. Descriptions of cross-site differences are typically limited to overview descriptions of how sites delivered their programs and confirmation of the performance of program activities.

The bulk of the grant funds are directed toward an assessment and the generalization of results.

Goals

- To understand the costs and effectiveness of innovative correctional options programs operating in different geographic locations.
- To inform policymakers, correctional administrators, criminal justice authorities, and other public officials about new and promising innovative correctional options programs.

Objectives

- Collect and analyze data regarding the design, development and implementation of innovative correctional options projects and their elements.
- Collect and analyze data regarding the costs and effectiveness of innovative correctional options projects and their elements.
- Prepare a comprehensive user-oriented report of this evaluation and an executive summary for publication by the National Institute of Justice for distribution to correctional administrators, policymakers, criminal justice authorities, and other members of the community concerned with innovative correctional options.

Program Strategy

Collect and analyze data regarding the design, development and implementation of innovative correctional options projects and their elements.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee must collect data that will provide other jurisdictions with technical

information to assist them in implementing correctional options projects. Special attention should be given to identifying the lessons learned at the various sites and the guidance those lessons can provide to other jurisdictions in developing correctional options projects for youthful offenders. The following questions suggest the kind of information that will be useful:

- How is the existing correctional system organized? What is the range of correctional services that are currently being provided? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the existing correctional system?
- What are the characteristics of the targeted population that is eligible to participate in the correctional options project? What are the supervised conditions of participation in the correctional options project and what are the consequences of noncompliance and the rewards for compliance?
- How were key criminal justice officials outside the correctional system involved in the development and implementation of the correctional options project? What were the project goals, objectives, and strategy and what were the expectations of project management? What was the plan of implementation and what problems were experienced in implementation?
- Was there an evaluation plan prior to implementation? How was success or failure to be measured and how were measurements made?

Collect and analyze data regarding the costs and effectiveness of correctional options projects.

To accomplish this objective the grantee must collect data that provide management information for correctional administrators, key criminal justice officials outside the corrections system, policymakers and community leaders concerned with developing correctional options for youthful offenders as cost-effective alternatives to traditional modes of incarceration.

The evaluation shall distill the impacts observed in all projects to assess the effect of correctional options on

participants and the existing correctional system. Attention shall be given to the effects of interventions provided through correctional options projects on the education, skill level, employability and other appropriate measures regarding project participants, the behavior of participants following release, linkages between correctional options and community services, correctional costs, other branches of the local criminal justice system and recidivism. There is also a need to determine whether there are general aspects or approaches to correctional options that analyzes the particularities of all projects in a meaningful way.

The evaluation shall provide a comparative assessment of correctional options with traditional modes of incarceration.

The evaluation shall also compare the actual impacts of each project with the expectations of the project managers and those initial criminal justice authorities and other members of the community involved in the design of the correctional options projects.

Prepare a comprehensive user-oriented report of this evaluation and an executive summary for publication by the National Institute of Justice for distribution to correctional administrators, policymakers, criminal justice authorities, and other members of the community concerned with innovative correctional options.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee is expected to prepare a report that includes: (1) a review and synthesis of the existing literature, (2) a description of each project evaluated, (3) a description of the evaluation design, (4) information regarding the costs and value of each project evaluated, (5) recommendations for program development, and (6) additional research needs. The executive summary should inform professionals, policymakers, and researchers of the results of the project.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits this cooperative agreement to a maximum period of 18 months.

Award Amount. Funding for this topic has been tentatively set at \$400,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Evaluation of Correctional Options Demonstration
Program
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact: Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Mr. Thomas Albrecht, Program Manager, Evaluation Division, at the above address, or contact him at 202-514-6236.

Denial of Federal Benefits Program

Purpose

The purpose of this solicitation is to provide a process evaluation of a new user accountability sanction: denial of Federal benefits for persons convicted of drug possession and trafficking.

Background

Recent developments in sentencing policy include holding drug users accountable by providing post-adjudicative sanctions that fill the gap between traditional probation and incarceration. The Denial of Federal Benefits (DFB) program was established in 1990 for that purpose. Section 5301 of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 empowers State and Federal courts to curtail a wide range of benefits normally available to residents including student loans, Federal contracts, and federally issued licenses. Two pilot sites are participating in the program: the State of Rhode Island and Imperial County, California. In addition, a clearinghouse has been created at the Office of Justice Programs. All sentences are recorded under the Act in a data base. To date, over 600 sentences are included from the pilot sites, selected Federal courts, and from other State courts not involved in the demonstration projects.

Three organizations are currently active in implementing the DFB program. The National Center for State Courts provides overall technical assistance and training to inform States of the program and to assist them in implementing it. The American Prosecutors Research Institute has developed model State legislation and will provide technical assistance to demonstration sites. The National Crime Prevention Council has developed a media campaign to bring the program to the attention of the public. These organizations are not eligible for this award.

This solicitation calls for a process evaluation of the implementation of the Act to date, focusing on the two demonstration sites. The evaluation should inform program managers about the administration of the program and the Congress about its contribution as an intermediate sanction. Applicants may obtain information on the program from the OJP Office of the Comptroller.¹

Goals

- To identify the characteristics of offenses and offenders sentenced under the program.
- To assess the effectiveness of denial of Federal benefits as a sanction.
- To identify administrative and legislative improvements for the program.

Objectives

- Compile a description of the offenders and offenses sanctioned under the program.
- Document the perceptions of critical officials and participants regarding the program's effectiveness.
- Prepare a report on the program's implementation with recommendations for its improvement.

Program Strategy

Compile a description of the offenders and offenses sentenced under this program.

Two important questions under the Denial of Federal Benefits program are what kinds of offenders are sentenced under the Act and what are their offenses. Grantees are directed to compile offender characteristics from prosecution and court records in each demonstration site. Grantees should compare and contrast these offenders with other offenders prosecuted for similar charges in those jurisdictions. The clearinghouse data base developed by the Office of Justice Programs will be made

available to the grantee for the purpose of identifying case records.

Applicants should specify the offender and offense characteristics they intend to collect and the sources of information they intend to use. They should also discuss how they plan to contrast offenders under the DFB program with others with similar offenses.

The products from this objective include data collection instruments, site visit plans, and a description of offender characteristics.

Document the perceptions of critical officials and participants regarding the program's effectiveness.

Judges have considerable discretion over imposing the denial sanction. They may impose the sanction in conjunction with other penalties or as the sole penalty. They may also mandate drug treatment in conjunction with denial of benefits. Prosecutors may also divert cases prior to adjudication; then the sanction will not be imposed.

Grantees should interview prosecutors and judges in the demonstration sites. They should determine which offenders and offenses these professionals feel are most appropriate for the denial sanction. Grantees should also interview those organizations currently involved with DFB implementation to learn their perceptions of the program's merits and shortcomings. The information derived from these interviews should be compared with descriptions of offender and offense characteristics obtained under the previous objective.

Grantees must also interview a sample of offenders sentenced under the program at each site. They should determine whether offenders perceived the sentence to be relevant and punitive, whether offenders received and successfully completed a drug treatment program, and whether they have had subsequent involvement with drugs. Applicants are alerted to the possibility that substantial numbers of these offenders may be Spanish-speaking, and should plan accordingly for Spanish language interviews.

Applicants should discuss their interview plans, including details of the kinds of data they will seek, what they expect to learn, and what problems they anticipate. They should also consider how the results of interviews can be integrated with, and validated by, court and offender records.

The products under this objective include a sampling plan, interview protocols, and a descriptive summary of the judge and offender interviews.

Prepare a report on the program's implementation with recommendations for its improvement.

The results of this study are of interest to managers of the Denial of Benefits program and Federal policy-makers who are active in legislation on intermediate sanctions and user accountability. Among the questions that should be addressed are: (1) who is being sentenced; (2) whether the sentences are punitive; (3) what alternative sentences could have been imposed; and (4) how denial of benefits could be applied more effectively.

Applicants should propose outlines for their final reports, including the issues to be addressed and the report delivery schedule. Applicants should also discuss how the information gathered could be used by intended audiences.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months.

Award Amount. Funding for this topic has been tentatively set at \$100,000 per award. Multiple awards may

be made under this solicitation. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Denial of Federal Benefits Program
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact: Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Mr. Thomas Albrecht, Program Manager, at the above address, or contact him at 202-514-6236.

References

1. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of the Comptroller, *Denial of Federal Benefits Information Packet*.

Operation Weed and Seed

Purpose

The purpose of this research is to perform a process evaluation of **Operation Weed and Seed**, a major initiative of the U.S. Department of Justice, administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. This comprehen-

sive program is based on the realization that law enforcement suppression of crime is an essential precondition to the success of social programs.

Background

Operation Weed and Seed is a comprehensive, community-based approach to combating violent crime, drug use, and gang activity in high-crime neighborhoods. The program is creating partnerships in high-crime neighborhoods involving the community; law enforcement; social service agencies; Federal, State, and local government; and the private sector. The goal is to "weed out" crime from targeted neighborhoods and then "seed" these sites with a wide range of crime and drug prevention programs and human service agency resources to prevent crime from recurring.

The rise of crime and drug abuse combined with the limited resources and authorization of police departments have led communities to search for alternative ways of responding to these national problems. Community organizations have sprung up throughout the Nation to formulate programs that might combat and curtail drug sales and use and crime associated with such illicit activity. Police have also been seeking alternatives to traditional police methods that merely react to calls for service. Thus, both citizens and police departments recognize that new kinds of actions are needed, and they have been working independently to form these new actions.

Neighborhood organizations and law enforcement agencies have discovered that their efforts will only have lasting impact when they work together effectively. Cooperative efforts are being formed that involve police, community groups, and other public and private agencies.

Through a comprehensive effort, Weed and Seed seeks:

- To involve law enforcement in "weeding out" violent offenders by coordinating and integrating the efforts of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in targeted high-crime neighborhoods.

■ To implement community policing in each of the targeted sites. Under community policing, law enforcement will work closely with residents of the community to develop solutions to the problems of violent and drug related crime. Community policing will serve as a "bridge" between the "weeding" (law enforcement) and "seeding" (neighborhood revitalization) components.

■ To unite law enforcement, social service agencies, the private sector, and the community in working to prevent crime and violence from occurring. A concentration of a broad array of human services — drug and crime prevention programs, drug treatment, educational opportunities, family services, and recreational activities — in the targeted sites will create an environment where crime cannot thrive.

■ To focus Federal, State, local, and private sector resources on revitalizing distressed neighborhoods through economic development and to provide economic opportunities for residents.

These community partnerships focus on preventive or proactive efforts to control crime and drug abuse and thus augment the traditional reactive responses of their police.

Program Description

Operation Weed and Seed consists of four major components: (1) weeding/suppression efforts, (2) community policing, (3) seeding efforts, and (4) neighborhood revitalization. The weed component of this national initiative recognizes that narcotics traffickers and violent criminals, once arrested, often are returned to the streets where they continue their business, and continue to spread fear in communities. The Weed and Seed initiative is designed to address this condition by giving the local United States Attorney a central role in coordinating Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies to target, apprehend, and prosecute certain drug and/or violent offenders in Federal courts.

Community policing is the key link for Weed and Seed. This style of policing focuses on increased police vis-

ibility and the development of cooperative relationships between the police and the citizens in targeted areas. This approach seeks to maintain or stabilize areas after "weed" activities have taken place. This effort may also enhance public safety and lead to a reduction of fear in the community so that socioeconomic development and related services can be implemented.

To complete this initiative, the "seed" component will focus on addressing the social and economic problems in communities where narcotics trafficking and other drug and violent crimes exist. It is anticipated that a comprehensive and focused framework will be developed where public agencies, community organizations and citizens can form partnerships to enhance public safety and the overall quality of life. Consequently, programs involving recreational activities, jobs and life skills development, mentoring, service projects, and education may be deployed.

The Evaluation

This solicitation calls for a multisite process evaluation which should attempt to provide an understanding of the processes that are critical to the effectiveness of the program.

This evaluation is Phase I of a multiphase effort. In fiscal year 1993 it is anticipated that an impact evaluation will be undertaken in three to five sites.

For the process evaluation, research activities should include the following:

- Designing rigorous evaluation methods.
- Determining levels of program implementation.
- Collecting data to draw inferences between program activities and stated objectives.
- Developing scientific information on evaluation strategies that are part of the program and that are designed to measure effectiveness in terms of multiple indices of performance.

- Relating differences in site environments and implementation to differences in outcomes.
- Summarizing findings across sites.
- Extrapolating program costs and benefits to the national scene.
- Identifying program development potentials.

Goals

- To understand the costs and value of **Operation Weed and Seed** in urban settings.
- To inform policymakers, program developers, and law enforcement agencies about new and promising innovative strategies and make recommendations for program development.

Objectives

- Collect and analyze data regarding the implementation of Weed and Seed projects and their elements.
- Collect and analyze data regarding the costs and value of Weed and Seed projects and their elements.
- Prepare a comprehensive report of this process evaluation for distribution to police departments, community groups, and policymakers who are concerned with urban crime and their drug problems.

Program Strategy

Collect and analyze data regarding the implementation of Weed and Seed projects and their elements.

To accomplish this objective, data must be collected that will provide other jurisdictions with technical information that can assist them in implementing a similar Weed and Seed project. Special attention should be given to identifying the lessons learned at the various sites and the guidance that they can provide. Of particular interest are the issues of the organization and development of

Weed and Seed and the implementation of various project elements that are appropriate and useful in addressing problems relating to drug abuse and crime control. The following questions and issues, while not exhaustive, suggest the kind of information that will be useful:

- What is the target population to be served by the Weed and Seed project? How many people will be served?
- What were the original project goals and objectives and the expectations of project management? What was the plan of implementation? Was the plan implemented as intended? What problems were experienced upon implementation? What factors facilitated or constrained the implementation process in general and the implementation of specific project components in particular? What were the lessons learned? What were the unintended impacts?
- What is the context of the Weed and Seed project? For example, what is the project environment in terms of geography, drug abuse and crime rate, police resources, community organizations, economic and social conditions, etc.?
- What kinds of police, community, and joint police/community project components constitute Weed and Seed? What is the variation in the strength or levels of implementation of these project components?
- What are the project expenditures for police, community and other public agency resources? Are there other sources of funds besides those provided by BJA, and how are funds used for the Weed and Seed project? Are any funds from businesses or other private sources involved?
- How are the project resources organized in the community? In the police department? In other support agencies? What community organizations are involved?
- How are decisions made and who makes them? What are the organizational and personnel conflicts and how are they resolved? Is there documentation of such

organizations and personnel conflicts and how they were resolved?

■ What is the level of community awareness of Weed and Seed? What are the attitudes of the police and the public and private sectors of the community toward the project?

■ What other anti-drug or crime control efforts have been carried out in the identified neighborhood in the past and what has been the nature and outcome of those experiences?

Collect and analyze data regarding the costs and value of Weed and Seed projects and their elements.

To accomplish this objective, data must be collected that provide management information for government officials and community leaders who are involved in policy funding decisions regarding joint efforts that relate to drug sales, drug abuse, drug-related crime and all other crime.

The process evaluation shall distill the processes observed in all projects in order to provide a general assessment of Weed and Seed with regard to problems related to drugs and crime. For this assessment attention shall be given to the potential effects of Weed and Seed on community security as well as other quality of life issues in the neighborhoods being addressed. These issues include: (1) citizen mobilization and responsiveness to broader community problems, (2) economic viability of the area, (3) housing stability, (4) sense of order in the neighborhood, and (5) the project's effects in relation to such other social problems as alcohol abuse and truancy.

The process evaluation shall also provide a comparative assessment of Weed and Seed with other anti-drug and crime control strategies in urban areas. Widely accepted assessments of other competing strategies should be employed for this comparison. This assessment should focus on two separate comparisons involving: (1) those factors relating to community safety and security and (2) those broader set of factors that relate to the quality of life of neighborhood residents.

The process evaluation shall also provide a comparative assessment of the potential impacts of each project with the expectations of the project managers and those initial community leaders and police personnel who conceived and planned the project.

Prepare a comprehensive report of this process evaluation for distribution to police departments, community groups, and policymakers who are concerned with urban crime and drug problems.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee is expected to prepare a report which includes: (1) a review and synthesis of the existing literature, (2) a description of each project evaluated, (3) a description of the evaluation design, (4) information regarding the costs and value of each project evaluated, (5) recommendations for program development, and (6) additional research needs.

Products shall include: (1) a preliminary table of contents, (2) draft final report, and (3) final report. The preliminary table of contents shall be delivered for approval by NIJ prior to the initiation of the draft final report. The draft final report shall be delivered 90 days prior to the end of the grant for review and comment by NIJ and its peer review personnel. The grantee shall incorporate review comments to form the final report prior to its delivery to NIJ.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

Eligibility Criteria. NIJ awards grants to, or enters into cooperative agreements with, educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, individuals, and profitmaking organizations that are willing to waive their fees.

For this particular solicitation, organizations involved in technical assistance to Weed and Seed sites will not be eligible to compete for awards.

Because of the complexity of **Operation Weed and Seed**, NIJ encourages the participation of a consortium of organizations with strengths appropriate to research in drug enforcement, community policing, Boys and Girls Clubs, and the delivery of community-based services.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits this cooperative agreement to a maximum period of 18 months.

Award Amount. Funding for this topic has been tentatively set at \$550,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Weed and Seed
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact. Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Dr. Craig Uchida, Director, Evaluation Division, at the above address, or contact him at 202-307-2959.

Boys and Girls Clubs in Public Housing

Purpose

The purpose of this solicitation is to provide for a process evaluation of the Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing as part of **Operation Weed and Seed**, a high priority Department of Justice initiative.

Background

The Boys and Girls Clubs of America has received funds from the Bureau of Justice Assistance to establish and provide technical assistance to 15 new Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing. Approximately 10 clubs will function in Weed and Seed sites.

Boys and Girls Clubs of America is a private national youth organization that serves boys and girls from disadvantaged economic, social, and family circumstances. Founded in 1906, Boys and Girls Clubs of America operates more than 1200 clubs where 16,000 professionals and volunteers work with 1.5 million mostly disadvantaged girls and boys. Boys and Girls Clubs of America exists to ensure that disadvantaged youths have greater access to quality programs and services that meet their needs and interests.

A demonstration study was conducted by the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention (OSAP), Department of Health and Human Services, on "The Effects of Boys and Girls Clubs on Drug Abuse and Related Problems in Public Housing." This study, conducted by Columbia University¹, evaluated the effects of Boys and Girls Clubs on children and adolescents who live in public housing developments. Focused on drug and alcohol use, delinquency, vandalism, and school failure, the study involved 15 public housing developments in a representative sample of American cities. A major finding of this study was that youths who live in public housing and have access to a Boys and Girls Club are

more involved in healthy and constructive educational, social, and recreational activities than youths who do not have such access.

With funds from BJA, Boys and Girls Clubs of America will work with local clubs to:

- Establish and provide technical assistance to 15 new Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing. Approximately 10 clubs will be in Weed and Seed sites.
- Develop and implement a program model for accessing, coordinating, and monitoring comprehensive children's services including health, education, and social services.
- Develop and implement a comprehensive program of educational support, career, and lifestyle awareness and goal setting for children aged 6–12 years.

This solicitation will support a process evaluation that will include a thorough assessment of the role of Boys and Girls Clubs in Weed and Seed, examining and describing the programs established for youth in targeted neighborhoods.

Goals

- To understand the costs and value of the role of the Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing as part of the Weed and Seed effort.
- To assess the activities of Boys and Girls Clubs in the targeted areas.

Objectives

- Collect and analyze data regarding the implementation of all elements of Boys and Girls Clubs established in public housing as part of the Weed and Seed initiative.
- Assess the activities of the Boys and Girls Clubs in each of the sites.

- Prepare a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice of this process evaluation for distribution to police departments, community groups, and policymakers who are concerned with urban crime and drug abuse.

Program Strategy

Collect and analyze data regarding the implementation of all elements of Boys and Girls Clubs established in public housing as part of the Weed and Seed initiative.

To accomplish this objective, data must be collected that will provide other Boys and Girls Clubs with technical information that can assist them in implementing a similar Weed and Seed project in their Boys and Girls Clubs. Special attention should be given to identifying the lessons learned at the various sites and the guidance that can be provided to other Boys and Girls Clubs. In particular, grantees should address the following questions:

- What were the original project goals and objectives and the expectations of project management?
- What is the nature and scope of the activities of the Boys and Girls Club program?
- How was the program developed and implemented for accessing, coordinating, and monitoring comprehensive children's services including health, education and social services?
- How was the program developed and implemented to provide comprehensive educational support and to establish career and lifestyle awareness and goal setting capabilities for children aged 6–12 years?

Assess the activities of Boys and Girls Clubs in each of the sites.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee must identify and describe the activities of all the Boys and Girls Clubs in the sites. Also, the grantee should identify specific programs that were developed and implemented as part of the Weed and Seed initiative.

Prepare a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice of this process evaluation for distribution to police departments, community groups, and policymakers who are concerned with urban crime and drug abuse.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee is expected to prepare a report which includes: (1) a review and synthesis of the existing literature, (2) a description of each project evaluated, (3) a description of the evaluation design, (4) information regarding the costs and value of each project evaluated, (5) recommendations for program development, and (6) additional research needs.

Products shall include a preliminary report of what was accomplished. The draft final report shall be delivered 90 days prior to the end of the grant for review and comment by NIJ and its peer review personnel. The grantee shall incorporate review comments prior to the delivery of the final report.

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, products, eligibility requirements, monitoring, and selection criteria.

Eligibility Criteria. NIJ awards grants to, or enters into cooperative agreements with educational institutions, nonprofit organizations, public agencies, individuals, and profitmaking organizations that are willing to waive their fees.

For this particular solicitation, organizations involved in technical assistance to Weed and Seed sites will not be eligible to compete for awards.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits this cooperative agreement to a maximum period of 18 months.

Award Amount. Funding for this topic has been tentatively set at \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount

will support one award. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Boys and Girls Clubs Evaluation in Public Housing
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 10, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact: Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Institute to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Ms. Rosemary N. Murphy, Evaluation Division, at the above address, or contact her at 202-307-0646.

References

1. *The Effects of Boys and Girls Clubs on Drug Abuse and Related Problems in Public Housing Projects*, final report to the Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, 1991 (available through NCJRS).

Evaluation: Priority Topics

The National Institute of Justice is committed to a broad research and evaluation program, involving both basic and applied approaches. Moreover, NIJ supports a wide range of methodologies including case studies, structured observational methods, longitudinal studies, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, surveys, and secondary analyses of existing data. NIJ encourages innovative proposals from a variety of disciplines relevant to the study of crime and criminal behavior. NIJ recognizes that applicants may want to offer their own research question, study design, and analysis plan. Under the evaluation priority, applicants may propose: (1) evaluation research; (2) program development assessments; and (3) evaluation reviews. Further information regarding these three specific project types follows.

Applicants may propose projects that are not included in the specific solicitations but that do address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest include the OJP priority areas:

- Gangs and Violent Offenders.
- Victims.
- Community Policing and Police Effectiveness.
- Intermediate Sanctions and User Accountability
- Drug Prevention
- Drug Testing.
- Intensive Prosecution and Adjudication.
- Money Laundering and Financial Investigation.
- Information Systems, Statistics and Technology.
- Evaluation.

Evaluation Research

The purpose of this part of the solicitation is to encourage proposals to evaluate the impact of State and local programs, particularly in the OJP priority areas.

Goals

- To evaluate new and innovative anti-drug programs.
- To inform policymakers, program developers and criminal justice agencies about new and promising strategies and tactics and make recommendations for program development.

Objectives

- Evaluate the impact of State and local programs.
- Formulate a research agenda that will provide basic questions for future research projects.
- Prepare a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice of the evaluation for distribution to policymakers, program developers, law enforcement agencies, and community groups, who are concerned with the prevention and suppression of crime and drug abuse.

Program Strategy

Evaluate the impact of State and local programs.

This solicitation seeks proposals that will evaluate emerging concepts and innovative existing programs. Of primary importance are those programs that fall within the scope of current OJP priorities. Applicants are directed to the list of priorities presented earlier in this section.

In addition, the following areas are of interest to NIJ, but these lists are not exhaustive.

In the area of community policing and police effectiveness:

- The impact of the Americans with Disabilities Act on police employment and personnel practices.
- An assessment of new approaches to calls management (differential police response).

In the area of corrections:

- Evaluations of intervention programs for youthful offenders to (1) reduce recidivism and (2) improve employability.
- Evaluations of education programs in correctional facilities.
- Assessment and development of new techniques for measuring correctional program outcomes.

Formulate a research agenda that will provide basic questions for future research projects.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee is expected to develop a research agenda that will identify: (1) fundamental issues for study and (2) issues and questions that will result in research projects that are of direct practical utility to criminal justice professionals.

Prepare a comprehensive report for publication by the National Institute of Justice of the evaluation for distribution to policymakers, program developers, law enforcement agencies, and community groups, who are concerned with the prevention and suppression of crime and drug abuse.

To accomplish this objective, the grantee is expected to prepare a report that includes a critical review of the literature, a general discussion of the program that was examined, and a detailed report of the evaluation itself, including the research design, methodology, analysis, tables, findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Program Development Assessments

Purpose

The purpose of this facet of the solicitation is to find new and innovative programs in the criminal justice field. This program will enable researchers and practitioners to explore possibilities in evaluation. Proposed Program Development Assessments must address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest include the OJP priority areas listed earlier.

Background

Program development assessments are formative studies that extract knowledge from many sources in order to develop promising anti-drug approaches. Program development assessments seek insights into: (1) the strengths and weaknesses in existing solutions and (2) new ways to use existing resources to achieve reductions in drug consumption and drug-related crime.

Program development assessments are short term (6 to 9 months), examine issues from a variety of programs, and extrapolate from past experience to inform program formulation. The final report should recommend how the objectives under study might better be achieved through new approaches or modifications of existing practices. It should clearly articulate the need under study, the potential value of new approaches, and the likely steps needed to make these approaches operational.

Program development assessments will normally require evidence derived from currently available data. Grantees are encouraged to explore a variety of practices within their scope of study, acquire extant data on effectiveness, efficiency, equity, and accountability. This information should be used to propose new concepts and program initiatives.

Goals

- To find innovative programs for evaluation purposes.
- To develop innovative programs from existing knowledge.

Objectives

- Critically assess the merits of a specific program within the scope of Office of Justice Programs priorities.
- Assess the prospects for program success if these programs were to be evaluated rigorously.
- Make recommendations for future research and program needs.

Program Strategy

Critically assess the merits of a specific program within the scope of Office of Justice Programs priorities.

Topic areas of interest are suggested below. Because the questions raised are often far-ranging and do not exhaust the list of important issues in each area, applicants should propose a research plan that addresses a limited and feasible subset of the questions posed. The Institute will consider multiple assessments within each topic area.

Conventional Drug Enforcement. What kinds of offenders are conventional police practices most (and least) effective against in terms of both community safety and subsequent prosecution? What are the comparative benefits of police strategies that target *individual* offenders, *special groups* of offenders such as juveniles or casual users, or drug trafficking *locations*? How can police best mobilize community resources? What nonarrest activities, including cooperative efforts with other community offices such as schools, housing, zoning, and health agencies, will produce the greatest benefits?

Sanctions. Given the expanding range of sanctions available today, how should States and local jurisdictions choose among them? What do we know about the deterrent value of these sanctions? What are the most appropriate types of offenders for each sanction? How should States and local jurisdictions jointly administer their sanctioning capability? What kinds of sanctions are likely to satisfy needs for low-cost, high-volume punishment?

Monitoring Drug Offenders. What policies should officials pursue to minimize the risks of offenders in the community and maximize the compliance with conditions of release? How should pretrial and correctional officials interact with the courts to ensure that credible deterrents to violations exist? What kinds of offender supervision — including all ranges of surveillance and services — mitigate against future criminal activity? Do technical violations indicate criminal activity and, if so, how should they be used by criminal justice officials?

Treatment. What treatment programs within the criminal justice system show promise in reducing alcohol and other drug dependencies? Previous research has shown that the success of treatment programs requires the targeting of appropriate clientele groups for a given treatment. Are there new diagnostic programs that are effective in guiding treatment assignments?

Program development assessments are exploratory research projects. Consequently, the methods employed depend on the particular topic chosen and opportunities for obtaining data about the relevant programs. Data collection efforts should be limited to field research during site visits and extant program data.

Assess the prospects for program success if these programs were to be evaluated rigorously.

All program development assessments must include a clear description of the underlying theoretical model of how a particular program should work. This should be accompanied by a review of the relevant supporting research and program literature.

Make recommendations for future research and program needs.

All program development assessments should answer these questions: What are the implications of the current state of knowledge for future research and program development? What kinds of issues should have priority? What types of evaluations are needed? What methods seem most promising? What populations need to be studied?

Evaluation Reviews

Purpose

The purpose of this part of the solicitation is to provide information about evaluations for the criminal justice field. Proposed evaluation reviews must address the general goals and objectives of this program area. Topics of interest include the OJP priority areas listed earlier.

Background

Evaluation reviews examine topics where a number of evaluations have already been completed but have not been synthesized by the criminal justice system. Evaluation reviews examine findings as objectively as possible, explain inconsistencies, and suggest conclusions based on the evidence reviewed. Reviews generate original knowledge about program effectiveness or operations. They also distill and synthesize what has already been found in individual studies in an effort to form consensus.

Goals

- To provide a synthesis of evaluation research within a particular program area.
- To distribute information about evaluations and to outline an agenda for research and development within a particular program area.

Objectives

- Document the scope and extent of existing program activity and earlier programs.
- Assess the quality and scope of previous research and identify limitations in existing evaluations.
- Summarize knowledge of program practice and effectiveness.
- Make recommendations for future research and program needs.

Program Strategy

Document the scope and extent of existing program activity and earlier programs.

Evaluation review topics should be drawn from the OJP priority areas identified previously. Appropriate methods should be discussed within the body of the proposal for documenting the scope and extent of existing program activity and earlier programs. This would include, at minimum, definitions of the population to be sampled, site selection and sampling frame, and an explanation of the organization and planning activities necessary to identify programs. A schedule of tasks and an implementation plan should be a part of this proposal.

Assess the quality and scope of previous research and identify limitations in existing evaluations.

Evaluations vary in their quality and scope, which affects the internal and external validity of their conclusions. Evaluation reviews should take important theoretical and methodological considerations into account when synthesizing findings.

An evaluation review should consider the range of underlying models that have framed the studies under consideration. What are their similarities, differences, strengths, and weaknesses?

What can be reasonably inferred from a given study based upon its design, sampling, data collection, and

analysis techniques? Did the evaluation have sufficient power to detect effects at a level appropriate to the study's purpose? Can the results be generalized? What aspects of program performance are not addressed?

In comparing studies, are conflicting results likely due to variations in methodology or population of interest, or do the results suggest the need for a refinement of the underlying model?

Summarize knowledge of program practice and effectiveness.

Based upon careful consideration of the results of pursuing the previous objective, what are the major findings about evaluation research on the selected topic? This summary should make as clear as possible the degree of support or certainty for a given conclusion.

Make recommendations for future research and program needs.

What are the implications of the current state of knowledge for future research and program development? What kinds of issues should have priority? What types of evaluations are needed? What methods seem most promising? What populations need to be studied?

Application Information

Application Requirements. See page 13 for application requirements, eligibility requirements, and selection criteria.

Special Eligibility Requirements. For *program development assessments and evaluation reviews*, NIJ particularly encourages applications from scholars and researchers who have received their doctorates in the past 6 years.

Award Requirements. See page 187 for requirements for award recipients, including monitoring, products, standards of performance, etc.

Award Period. NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 24 months for the *evaluation research* projects. However, for *program development assessments* and *evaluation reviews*, the maximum period is 12 months.

Award Amount: Funding for *evaluation research* projects has been tentatively set at \$400,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support multiple awards. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Funding for *program development assessments* has been tentatively set at \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support four to six awards. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Funding for *evaluation reviews* has been tentatively set at \$200,000. It is anticipated that this amount will support four to six awards. Actual funding allocations are based on the quality of proposals received.

Due Date. Ten (10) copies of fully executed proposals should be sent to:

Evaluation: Priority Topics
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue NW., Room 842
Washington, DC 20531

Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on June 3, 1992. This deadline will not be extended.

Contact: Applicants are strongly encouraged to contact the Program Manager to discuss topic viability, data availability, or proposal content before submitting proposals. To obtain further information, potential applicants may write to Mr. Thomas Albrecht, Program Manager, Evaluation Division, at the above address, or contact him at 202-514-6236.

Requirements for Award Recipients

Expected Products

Each project is expected to generate tangible products of benefit to criminal justice professionals, researchers, and policymakers. As appropriate, additional interim and final products (e.g., articles, manuals, or training materials) may be specified in the proposal or negotiated at the time of the award. See the discussion in the Application Requirements chapter.

Public Release of Automated Data Sets

NIJ is committed to assuring the public availability of research data. Each NIJ award recipient who collects data is required to submit a machine-readable copy of the data and appropriate documentation to NIJ prior to the conclusion of the project. The data and materials are reviewed for completeness and are deposited by NIJ in a public data archive. A variety of formats are acceptable. However, the data and materials must conform with requirements detailed in "Depositing Data with the Data Resources Program of the National Institute of Justice: A Handbook." A copy of this handbook is sent to each project director at the time of the award.

Standards of Performance by Recipients

NIJ expects individuals and institutions receiving its support to work diligently and professionally toward completing a high-quality research or study product. Besides this general expectation, the Institute must impose some specific requirements to ensure that proper financial and administrative controls are applied to the project. Financial and general reporting requirements are detailed in an Office of Justice Programs document, *Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants*. This guideline manual is sent to recipient institutions with the award documents. Project directors and recipient finan-

cial administrators should pay particular attention to the regulations in this document.

Program Monitoring

Award recipients and program managers assume a number of responsibilities as part of their participation in Government-sponsored research.

Each program manager and grantee is responsible for developing a monitoring plan for each project. Elements of this plan include:

- A statement of goals, objectives, tasks, program activities, and products.
- A program implementation plan and budget that schedules program expenditures.
- A schedule of monitoring activities.
- A list of products.
- A summary of subsequent program activities in response to implementing the monitoring recommendations (e.g., the grantee provided the draft report, and the hold was removed from grant funds).

Communications

Project monitors should be kept informed of research progress. Written progress reports are required on a quarterly basis. All awards use standard quarterly reporting periods—January 1 through March 31, April 1 through June 30, etc.—regardless of the project's start date. Reports are due 30 days after the end of the quarter. Progress reports should be thorough, and they should tell the monitor which tasks have been completed and whether significant delays or departures from the original workplan are expected.

Timeliness

Grantees are expected to complete award products within the timeframes that have been agreed upon by NIJ and the grantee. The Institute recognizes that there are legitimate reasons for project extensions. However, NIJ does not consider the assumption of additional research projects that impinge upon previous time commitments as legitimate reasons for delay. Projects with unreasonable delays can be terminated administratively. In this situation, any funds remaining are withdrawn. Future applications from either the project director or the recipient institution are subject to strict scrutiny and may be denied support based on past failure to meet minimum standards.

Publications

The Institute encourages grantees to make their findings available through a variety of media, such as professional journals, books, and conferences. Copies of such publications should be sent to the project monitor as they become available, even if they appear well after a project's expiration. NIJ imposes no restriction on such publication other than the following acknowledgment and disclaimer:

This research was supported by *grant number* _____ from the National Institute of Justice. Points of view are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Research agencies occasionally find it worthwhile to relate important research findings through the media. In such instances, NIJ requires that copies of press releases about NIJ research be sent to the Institute at least 20 days in advance of the actual release. This policy alerts the Department of Justice public information office to possible press inquiries and enables the Institute to coordinate media coverage of Institute-sponsored research findings.

Human Subjects Protection

Research with human subjects plays a vital part in expanding our knowledge about how to combat criminal behavior. It is essential, however, that research be performed without needless risk of distress and with the willing and informed cooperation of research subjects.

Research or statistical information identifiable to a participant in NIJ-sponsored research is protected by statute from being used in legal proceedings.

[S]uch information and copies thereof shall be immune from legal process, and shall not, without the consent of the person furnishing such information, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any action, suit, or other judicial, legislative, or administrative proceedings. (42 United States Code 3789g)

In addition, the Institute has adopted the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Model Policy on Human Research Subjects. This policy requires that each institution engaged in NIJ research provide written assurances that it will comply with these regulations as codified at 45 Code of Federal Regulations 46. Pursuant to that policy, each research project falling within the guidelines established by the Department of Health and Human Services must be approved by the recipient's Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to the initiation of the project. Approval by the IRB need not precede the submission of a proposal to NIJ, but it must be obtained by NIJ prior to the beginning of any research activity.

Application Forms

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SF 424

This is a standard form used by applicants as a required facesheet for preapplications and applications submitted for Federal assistance. It will be used by Federal agencies to obtain applicant certification that States which have established a review and comment procedure in response to Executive Order 12372 and have selected the program to be included in their process, have been given an opportunity to review the applicant's submission.

- | Item: | Entry: | Item: | Entry: |
|-------|--|-------|--|
| 1. | Self-explanatory. | 12. | List only the largest political entities affected (e.g., State, counties, cities). |
| 2. | Date application submitted to Federal agency (or State if applicable) & applicant's control number (if applicable). | 13. | Self-explanatory. |
| 3. | State use only (if applicable). | 14. | List the applicant's Congressional District and any District(s) affected by the program or project. |
| 4. | If this application is to continue or revise an existing award, enter present Federal identifier number. If for a new project, leave blank. | 15. | Amount requested or to be contributed during the first funding/budget period by each contributor. Value of in-kind contributions should be included on appropriate lines as applicable. If the action will result in a dollar change to an existing award, indicate <i>only</i> the amount of the change. For decreases, enclose the amounts in parentheses. If both basic and supplemental amounts are included, show breakdown on an attached sheet. For multiple program funding, use totals and show breakdown using same categories as item 15. |
| 5. | Legal name of applicant, name of primary organizational unit which will undertake the assistance activity, complete address of the applicant, and name and telephone number of the person to contact on matters related to this application. | 16. | Applicants should contact the State Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for Federal Executive Order 12372 to determine whether the application is subject to the State intergovernmental review process. |
| 6. | Enter Employer Identification Number (EIN) as assigned by the Internal Revenue Service. | 17. | This question applies to the applicant organization, not the person who signs as the authorized representative. Categories of debt include delinquent audit disallowances, loans and taxes. |
| 7. | Enter the appropriate letter in the space provided. | 18. | To be signed by the authorized representative of the applicant. A copy of the governing body's authorization for you to sign this application as official representative must be on file in the applicant's office. (Certain Federal agencies may require that this authorization be submitted as part of the application.) |
| 8. | Check appropriate box and enter appropriate letter(s) in the space(s) provided:
— "New" means a new assistance award.
— "Continuation" means an extension for an additional funding/budget period for a project with a projected completion date.
— "Revision" means any change in the Federal Government's financial obligation or contingent liability from an existing obligation. | | |
| 9. | Name of Federal agency from which assistance is being requested with this application. | | |
| 10. | Use the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number and title of the program under which assistance is requested. | | |
| 11. | Enter a brief descriptive title of the project. If more than one program is involved, you should append an explanation on a separate sheet. If appropriate (e.g., construction or real property projects), attach a map showing project location. For preapplications, use a separate sheet to provide a summary description of this project. | | |

BUDGET INFORMATION — Non-Construction Programs

SECTION A — BUDGET SUMMARY						
Grant Program Function or Activity (a)	Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Number (b)	Estimated Unobligated Funds		New or Revised Budget		
		Federal (c)	Non-Federal (d)	Federal (e)	Non-Federal (f)	Total (g)
1.		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
2.						
3.						
4.						
5. TOTALS		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

SECTION B — BUDGET CATEGORIES					
6 Object Class Categories	GRANT PROGRAM, FUNCTION OR ACTIVITY				Total (5)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
a. Personnel	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
b. Fringe Benefits					
c. Travel					
d. Equipment					
e. Supplies					
f. Contractual					
g. Construction					
h. Other					
i. Total Direct Charges (sum of 6a - 6h)					
j. Indirect Charges					
k. TOTALS (sum of 6i and 6j)	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
7. Program Income	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

SECTION C - NON-FEDERAL RESOURCES

(a) Grant Program	(b) Applicant	(c) State	(d) Other Sources	(e) TOTALS
8.	\$	\$	\$	\$
9.				
10.				
11.				
12. TOTALS (sum of lines 8 and 11)	\$	\$	\$	\$

SECTION D - FORECASTED CASH NEEDS

13. Federal	Total for 1st Year	1st Quarter	2nd Quarter	3rd Quarter	4th Quarter
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
14. NonFederal					
15. TOTAL (sum of lines 13 and 14)	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

SECTION E - BUDGET ESTIMATES OF FEDERAL FUNDS NEEDED FOR BALANCE OF THE PROJECT

(a) Grant Program	FUTURE FUNDING PERIODS (Years)			
	(b) First	(c) Second	(d) Third	(e) Fourth
16.	\$	\$	\$	\$
17.				
18.				
19.				
20. TOTALS (sum of lines 16 -19)	\$	\$	\$	\$

SECTION F - OTHER BUDGET INFORMATION

(Attach additional Sheets if Necessary)

21. Direct Charges:

22. Indirect Charges:

23. Remarks

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SF-424A

General Instructions

This form is designed so that application can be made for funds from one or more grant programs. In preparing the budget, adhere to any existing Federal grantor agency guidelines which prescribe how and whether budgeted amounts should be separately shown for different functions or activities within the program. For some programs, grantor agencies may require budgets to be separately shown by function or activity. For other programs, grantor agencies may require a breakdown by function or activity. Sections A, B, C, and D should include budget estimates for the whole project except when applying for assistance which requires Federal authorization in annual or other funding period increments. In the latter case, Sections A, B, C, and D should provide the budget for the first budget period (usually a year) and Section E should present the need for Federal assistance in the subsequent budget periods. All applications should contain a breakdown by the object class categories shown in Lines a-k of Section B.

Section A. Budget Summary Lines 1-4, Columns (a) and (b)

For applications pertaining to a *single* Federal grant program (Federal Domestic Assistance Catalog number) and *not requiring* a functional or activity breakdown, enter on Line 1 under Column (a) the catalog program title and the catalog number in Column (b).

For applications pertaining to a *single* program *requiring* budget amounts by multiple functions or activities, enter the name of each activity or function on each line in Column (a), and enter the catalog number in Column (b). For applications pertaining to multiple programs where none of the programs require a breakdown by function or activity, enter the catalog program title on each line in *Column* (a) and the respective catalog number on each line in Column (b).

For applications pertaining to *multiple* programs where one or more programs *require* a breakdown by function or activity, prepare a separate sheet for each program requiring the breakdown. Additional sheets should be used when one form does not provide adequate space for all breakdown of data required. However, when more than one sheet is used, the first page should provide the summary totals by programs.

Lines 1-4, Columns (c) through (g.)

For new applications, leave Columns (c) and (d) blank. For each line entry in Columns (a) and (b), enter in Columns (e), (f), and (g) the appropriate amounts of funds needed to support the project for the first funding period (usually a year).

Lines 1-4, Columns (c) through (g.) (continued)

For continuing grant program applications, submit these forms before the end of each funding period as required by the grantor agency. Enter in Columns (c) and (d) the estimated amounts of funds which will remain unobligated at the end of the grant funding period only if the Federal grantor agency instructions provide for this. Otherwise, leave these columns blank. Enter in columns (e) and (f) the amounts of funds needed for the upcoming period. The amount(s) in Column (g) should be the sum of amounts in Columns (e) and (f).

For supplemental grants and changes to existing grants, do not use Columns (c) and (d). Enter in Column (e) the amount of the increase or decrease of Federal funds and enter in Column (f) the amount of the increase or decrease of non-Federal funds. In Column (g) enter the new total budgeted amount (Federal and non-Federal) which includes the total previous authorized budgeted amounts plus or minus, as appropriate, the amounts shown in Columns (e) and (f). The amount(s) in Column (g) should not equal the sum of amounts in Columns (e) and (f).

Line 5 — Show the totals for all columns used.

Section B Budget Categories

In the column headings (1) through (4), enter the titles of the same programs, functions, and activities shown on Lines 1-4, Column (a), Section A. When additional sheets are prepared for Section A, provide similar column headings on each sheet. For each program, function or activity, fill in the total requirements for funds (both Federal and non-Federal) by object class categories.

Lines 6a-i — Show the totals of Lines 6a to 6h in each column.

Line 6j — Show the amount of indirect cost.

Line 6k — Enter the total of amounts on Lines 6i and 6j. For all applications for new grants and continuation grants the total amount in column (5), Line 6k, should be the same as the total amount shown in Section A, Column (g), Line 5. For supplemental grants and changes to grants, the total amount of the increase or decrease as shown in Columns (1)-(4), Line 6k should be the same as the sum of the amounts in Section A, Columns (e) and (f) on Line 5.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE SF-424A (continued)

Line 7 - Enter the estimated amount of income, if any, expected to be generated from this project. Do not add or subtract this amount from the total project amount. Show under the program narrative statement the nature and source of income. The estimated amount of program income may be considered by the federal grantor agency in determining the total amount of the grant.

Section C. Non-Federal Resources

Lines 8-11 - Enter amounts of non-Federal resources that will be used on the grant. If in-kind contributions are included, provide a brief explanation on a separate sheet.

Column (a) - Enter the program titles identical to Column (a), Section A. A breakdown by function or activity is not necessary.

Column (b) - Enter the contribution to be made by the applicant.

Column (c) - Enter the amount of the State's cash and in-kind contribution if the applicant is not a State or State agency. Applicants which are a State or State agencies should leave this column blank.

Column (d) - Enter the amount of cash and in-kind contributions to be made from all other sources.

Column (e) - Enter totals of Columns (b), (c), and (d).

Line 12 - Enter the total for each of Columns (b)-(e). The amount in Column (e) should be equal to the amount on Line 5, Column (f), Section A.

Section D. Forecasted Cash Needs

Line 13 - Enter the amount of cash needed by quarter from the grantor agency during the first year.

Line 14 - Enter the amount of cash from all other sources needed by quarter during the first year.

Line 15 - Enter the totals of amounts on Lines 13 and 14.

Section E. Budget Estimates of Federal Funds Needed for Balance of the Project

Lines 16 - 19 - Enter in Column (a) the same grant program titles shown in Column (a), Section A. A breakdown by function or activity is not necessary. For new applications and continuation grant applications, enter in the proper columns amounts of Federal funds which will be needed to complete the program or project over the succeeding funding periods (usually in years). This section need not be completed for revisions (amendments, changes, or supplements) to funds for the current year of existing grants.

If more than four lines are needed to list the program titles, submit additional schedules as necessary.

Line 20 - Enter the total for each of the Columns (b)-(e). When additional schedules are prepared for this Section, annotate accordingly and show the overall totals on this line.

Section F. Other Budget Information

Line 21 - Use this space to explain amounts for individual direct object-class cost categories that may appear to be out of the ordinary or to explain the details as required by the Federal grantor agency.

Line 22 - Enter the type of indirect rate (provisional, predetermined, final or fixed) that will be in effect during the funding period, the estimated amount of the base to which the rate is applied, and the total indirect expense.

Line 23 - Provide any other explanations or comments deemed necessary.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS

Applicants must provide on a separate sheet a budget narrative which will detail by budget category, the Federal and non-Federal (in-kind and cash) share. The grantee cash contribution should be identified as to its source, i.e., funds appropriated by a State or local government or donation from a private source. The narrative should relate the items budgeted to project activities and should provide a justification and explanation for the budgeted items including the criteria and data used to arrive at the estimates for each budget category.

INSTRUCTIONS

PROGRAM NARRATIVE

Prepare the program narrative statement in accordance with the following instructions for all new grant programs. Requests for continuation or refunding and changes on an approved project should respond to item 5b only. Requests for supplemental assistance should respond to question 5c only.

1. OBJECTIVES AND NEED FOR THIS ASSISTANCE.

Pinpoint any relevant physical, economic, social, financial, institutional, or other problems requiring a solution. Demonstrate the need for assistance and state the principal and subordinate objectives of the project. Supporting documentation or other testimonies from concerned interests other than the applicant may be used. Any relevant data based on planning studies should be included or footnoted.

2. RESULTS OR BENEFITS EXPECTED.

Identify results and benefits to be derived. For example, when applying for a grant to establish a neighborhood health center provide a description of who will occupy the facility, how the facility will be used, and how the facility will benefit the general public.

3. APPROACH.

- a. Outline a plan of action pertaining to the scope and detail of how the proposed work will be accomplished for each grant program, function or activity, provided in the budget. Cite factors which might accelerate or decelerate the work and your reason for taking this approach as opposed to others. Describe any unusual features of the project such as design or technological innovations, reductions in cost or time, or extraordinary social and community involvement.
- b. Provide for each grant program, function or activity, quantitative monthly or quarterly projections of the accomplishments to be achieved in such terms as the number of jobs created; the number of people served; and the number of patients treated. When accomplishments cannot be quantified by activity or function, list them in chronological order to show the schedule of accomplishments and their target dates.
- c. Identify the kinds of data to be collected and maintained and discuss the criteria to be used to evaluate the results and successes of the project. Explain the methodology that will be used

to determine if the needs identified and discussed are being met and if the results and benefits identified in item 2 are being achieved.

- d. List organizations, cooperators, consultants, or other key individuals who will work on the project along with a short description of the nature of their effort or contribution.

4. GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION.

Give a precise location of the project or area to be served by the proposed project. Maps or other graphic aids may be attached.

5. IF APPLICABLE, PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION:

- a. For research or demonstration assistance requests, present a biographical sketch of the program director with the following information; name, address, phone number, background, and other qualifying experience for the project. Also, list the name, training and background for other key personnel engaged in the project.
- b. Discuss accomplishments to date and list in chronological order a schedule of accomplishments, progress or milestones anticipated with the new funding request. If there have been significant changes in the project objectives, location approach, or time delays, explain and justify. For other requests for changes or amendments, explain the reason for the change(s). If the scope or objectives have changed or an extension of time is necessary, explain the circumstances and justify. If the total budget items have changed more than the prescribed limits contained in the Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements — 28 CFR, Part 66, Common Rule (or Attachment J to OMB Circular A-110, as applicable), explain and justify the change and its effect on the project.
- c. For supplemental assistance requests, explain the reason for the request and justify the need for additional funding.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 26 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspects of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to the Comptroller, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 633 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20531; and to the Public Use Reports Project, 1121-0140, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, D.C. 20503.

ASSURANCES

The Applicant hereby assures and certifies compliance with all Federal statutes, regulations, policies, guidelines and requirements, including OMB Circulars No. A-21, A-110, A-122, A-128, A-87; E.O. 12372 and Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements — 28 CFR, Part 66, Common Rule, that govern the application, acceptance and use of Federal funds for this federally-assisted project. Also the Applicant assures and certifies that:

1. It possesses legal authority to apply for the grant; that a resolution, motion or similar action has been duly adopted or passed as an official act of the applicant's governing body, authorizing the filing of the application, including all understandings and assurances contained therein, and directing and authorizing the person identified as the official representative of the applicant to act in connection with the application and to provide such additional information as may be required.
2. It will comply with requirements of the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisitions Act of 1970 (P.L. 91-646) which provides for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of Federal and federally assisted programs.
3. It will comply with provisions of Federal law which limit certain political activities of employees of a State or local unit of government whose principal employment is in connection with an activity financed in whole or in part by Federal grants. (5 U.S.C. 1501, et seq.)
4. It will comply with the minimum wage and maximum hours provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act if applicable.
5. It will establish safeguards to prohibit employees from using their positions for a purpose that is or gives the appearance of being motivated by a desire for private gain for themselves or others, particularly those with whom they have family, business, or other ties.
6. It will give the sponsoring agency or the Comptroller General, through any authorized representative, access to and the right to examine all records, books, papers, or documents related to the grant.
7. It will comply with all requirements imposed by the Federal sponsoring agency concerning special requirements of law, program requirements, and other administrative requirements.
8. It will insure that the facilities under its ownership, lease or supervision which shall be utilized in the accomplishment of the project are not listed on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) list of Violating Facilities and that it will notify the Federal grantor agency of the receipt of any communication from the Director of the EPA Office of Federal Activities indicating that a facility to be used in the project is under consideration for listing by the EPA.
9. It will comply with the flood insurance purchase requirements of Section 102(a) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973, Public Law 93-234, 87 Stat. 975, approved December 31, 1976. Section 102(a) requires, on and after March 2, 1975, the purchase of flood insurance in communities where such insurance is available as a condition for the receipt of any Federal financial assistance for construction or acquisition purposes for use in any area that has been identified by the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development as an area having special flood hazards. The phrase "Federal financial assistance" includes any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance payment, rebate, subsidy, disaster assistance loan or grant, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance.
10. It will assist the Federal grantor agency in its compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (16 USC 470), Executive Order 11593, and the Archeological and Historical Preservation Act of 1966 (16 USC 569a-1 et seq.) by (a) consulting with the State Historic Preservation Officer on the conduct of investigations, as necessary, to identify properties listed in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places that are subject to adverse effects (see 36 CFR Part 800.8) by the activity, and notifying the Federal grantor agency of the existence of any such properties, and by (b) complying with all requirements established by the Federal grantor agency to avoid or mitigate adverse effects upon such properties.
11. It will comply, and assure the compliance of all its subgrantees and contractors, with the applicable provisions of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act, or the Victims of Crime Act, as appropriate; the provisions of the current edition of the Office of Justice Programs Financial and Administrative Guide for Grants, M7100.1; and all other applicable Federal laws, orders, circulars, or regulations.
12. It will comply with the provisions of 28 CFR applicable to grants and cooperative agreements including Part 18, Administrative Review Procedure; Part 20, Criminal Justice Information Systems; Part 22, Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information; Part 23, Criminal Intelligence Systems Operating Policies; Part 30, Intergovernmental Review of Department of Justice Programs and Activities; Part 42, Nondiscrimination/Equal Employment Opportunity Policies and Procedures; Part 61, Procedures for Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act; Part 63, Floodplain Management and Wetland Protection Procedures; and Federal laws or regulations applicable to Federal Assistance Programs.
13. It will comply, and all its contractors will comply, with the non-discrimination requirements of the Justice Assistance Act or Victims of Crime Act (as appropriate); Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975; and the Department of Justice Non-Discrimination Regulations 28 CFR Part 42, Subparts C, D, E, and G.
14. In the event a Federal or State court or Federal or State administrative agency makes a finding of discrimination after a due process hearing on the grounds of race, color, religion, national origin or sex against a recipient of funds, the recipient will forward a copy of the finding to the Office of Civil Rights Compliance (OCRC) of the Office of Justice Programs.
15. It will provide an Equal Employment Opportunity Program if required to maintain one, where the application is for \$ 500,000 or more.
16. It will comply with the provisions of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (P.L. 97-348) dated October 19, 1982 (16 USC 3501 et seq.) which prohibits the expenditure of most new Federal funds within the units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System.



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING LOBBYING; DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS; AND DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE REQUIREMENTS

Applicants should refer to the regulations cited below to determine the certification to which they are required to attest. Applicants should also review the instructions for certification included in the regulations before completing this form. Signature of this form provides for compliance with certification requirements under 28 CFR Part 69, "New Restrictions on Lobbying" and 28 CFR Part 67, "Government-wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement) and Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Grants)." The certifications shall be treated as a material representation of fact upon which reliance will be placed when the Department of Justice determines to award the covered transaction, grant, or cooperative agreement.

1. LOBBYING

As required by Section 1352, Title 31 of the U.S. Code, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 69, for persons entering into a grant or cooperative agreement over \$100,000, as defined at 28 CFR Part 69, the applicant certifies that:

(a) No Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned, to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making of any Federal grant, the entering into of any cooperative agreement, and the extension, continuation, renewal, amendment, or modification of any Federal grant or cooperative agreement;

(b) If any funds other than Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with this Federal grant or cooperative agreement, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form - LLL, "Disclosure of Lobbying Activities," in accordance with its instructions;

(c) The undersigned shall require that the language of this certification be included in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers (including subgrants, contracts under grants and cooperative agreements, and subcontracts) and that all subrecipients shall certify and disclose accordingly.

2. DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS (DIRECT RECIPIENT)

As required by Executive Order 12549, Debarment and Suspension, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, for prospective participants in primary covered transactions, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67, Section 67.510—

A. The applicant certifies that it and its principals:

(a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible, sentenced to a denial of Federal benefits by a State or Federal court, or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal department or agency;

(b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a

public (Federal, State, or local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property;

(c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity (Federal, State, or local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (1)(b) of this certification; and

(d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application had one or more public transactions (Federal, State, or local) terminated for cause or default; and

B. Where the applicant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, he or she shall attach an explanation to this application.

3. DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE (GRANTEES OTHER THAN INDIVIDUALS)

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67 Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. The applicant certifies that it will or will continue to provide a drug-free workplace by:

(a) Publishing a statement notifying employees that the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance is prohibited in the grantee's workplace and specifying the actions that will be taken against employees for violation of such prohibition;

(b) Establishing an on-going drug-free awareness program to inform employees about—

(1) The dangers of drug abuse in the workplace;

(2) The grantee's policy of maintaining a drug-free workplace;

(3) Any available drug counseling, rehabilitation, and employee assistance programs; and

(4) The penalties that may be imposed upon employees for drug abuse violations occurring in the workplace;

(c) Making it a requirement that each employee to be engaged in the performance of the grant be given a copy of the statement required by paragraph (a);

(d) Notifying the employee in the statement required by paragraph (a) that, as a condition of employment under the grant, the employee will—

- (1) Abide by the terms of the statement; and
- (2) Notify the employer in writing of his or her conviction for a violation of a criminal drug statute occurring in the workplace no later than five calendar days after such conviction;

(e) Notifying the agency, in writing, within 10 calendar days after receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2) from an employee or otherwise receiving actual notice of such conviction. Employers of convicted employees must provide notice, including position title, to: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531. Notice shall include the identification number(s) of each affected grant;

(f) Taking one of the following actions, within 30 calendar days of receiving notice under subparagraph (d)(2), with respect to any employee who is so convicted—

(1) Taking appropriate personnel action against such an employee, up to and including termination, consistent with the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; or

(2) Requiring such employee to participate satisfactorily in a drug abuse assistance or rehabilitation program approved for such purposes by a Federal, State, or local health, law enforcement, or other appropriate agency;

(g) Making a good faith effort to continue to maintain a drug-free workplace through implementation of paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f).

B. The grantee may insert in the space provided below the site(s) for the performance of work done in connection with the specific grant:

Place of Performance (Street address, city, county, state; zip code)

Check if there are workplaces on file that are not identified here.

Section 67, 630 of the regulations provides that a grantee that is a State may elect to make one certification in each Federal fiscal year. A copy of which should be included with each application for Department of Justice funding. States and State agencies may elect to use OJP Form 4061/7.

Check if the State has elected to complete OJP Form 4061/7.

**DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE
(GRANTEES WHO ARE INDIVIDUALS)**

As required by the Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, and implemented at 28 CFR Part 67, Subpart F, for grantees, as defined at 28 CFR Part 67; Sections 67.615 and 67.620—

A. As a condition of the grant, I certify that I will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensing, possession, or use of a controlled substance in conducting any activity with the grant; and

B. If convicted of a criminal drug offense resulting from a violation occurring during the conduct of any grant activity, I will report the conviction, in writing, within 10 calendar days of the conviction, to: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, ATTN: Control Desk, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I hereby certify that the applicant will comply with the above certifications.

1. Grantee Name and Address:

2. Application Number and/or Project Name

3. Grantee IRS/Vendor Number

4. Typed Name and Title of Authorized Representative

5. Signature

6. Date