U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Innovative Community Partnerships: Working Together for Change

Program Summary

A Publication of the
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) was established by the President and Congress through the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, Public Law 93–415, as amended. Located within the Office of Justice Programs of the U.S. Department of Justice, OJJDP's goal is to provide National leadership in addressing the issues of juvenile delinquency and improving juvenile justice.

OJJDP sponsors a broad array of research, program, and training initiatives to improve the juvenile justice system as a whole, as well as to benefit individual youth-serving agencies. These initiatives are carried out by seven components within OJJDP, described below.

Research and Program Development Division develops knowledge on national trends in juvenile delinquency; supports a program for data collection and information sharing that incorporates elements of statistical and systems development; identifies how delinquency develops and the best methods for its prevention, intervention, and treatment; and analyzes practices and trends in the juvenile justice system.

Training and Technical Assistance Division provides juvenile justice training and technical assistance to Federal, State, and local governments; law enforcement, judiciary, and corrections personnel; and private agencies, educational institutions, and community organizations.

Special Emphasis Division provides discretionary funds to public and private agencies, organizations, and individuals to replicate tested approaches to delinquency prevention, treatment, and control in such pertinent areas as chronic juvenile offenders, community-based sanctions, and the disproportionate representation of minorities in the juvenile justice system.

State Relations and Assistance Division supports collaborative efforts by States to carry out the mandates of the JJDP Act by providing formula grant funds to States; furnishing technical assistance to States, local governments, and private agencies; and monitoring State compliance with the JJDP Act.

Information Dissemination and Planning Unit informs individuals and organizations of OJJDP initiatives; disseminates information on juvenile justice, delinquency prevention, and missing children; and coordinates program planning efforts within OJJDP. The unit's activities include publishing research and statistical reports, bulletins, and other documents, as well as overseeing the operations of the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse.

Concentration of Federal Efforts Program promotes interagency cooperation and coordination among Federal agencies with responsibilities in the area of juvenile justice. The program primarily carries out this responsibility through the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, an independent body within the executive branch that was established by Congress through the JJDP Act.

Missing and Exploited Children Program seeks to promote effective policies and procedures for addressing the problem of missing and exploited children. Established by the Missing Children's Assistance Act of 1984, the program provides funds for a variety of activities to support and coordinate a network of resources such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children; training and technical assistance to a network of 43 State clearinghouses, nonprofit organizations, law enforcement personnel, and attorneys; and research and demonstration programs.

OJJDP provides leadership, direction, and resources to the juvenile justice community to help prevent and control delinquency throughout the country.

Innovative Community Partnerships: Working Together for Change

Program Summary

Prepared by
Roberta C. Cronin

John J. Wilson, Acting Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

May 1994

This document was prepared by Roberta C. Cronin for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Ms. Cronin serves as a consultant with the American Institutes for Research and has extensive experience in criminal and juvenile justice research, program development, and program evaluation.

Points of view or opinions expressed in this document are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Foreword

Old problems often benefit from new perspectives. Juvenile justice professionals, social service providers, youth advocates, community leaders, and public officials committed to working for change should be equally committed to working together to achieve it.

The weaving of community policing and human service initiatives provides the fabric for fashioning the innovative community partnerships featured in this Summary. Like the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's comprehensive strategy for serious, violent, and chronic juvenile offenders, such partnerships address the multifaceted factors that place youth—and their communities—at risk of crime and delinquency.

The stories of Dade County, Florida; Lansing, Michigan; and Norfolk, Virginia, described in the following pages represent a beginning, not an end. We look forward to working with communities across the country to write the next chapter.

John J. Wilson
Acting Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Acknowledgments

This report would not have been possible without the help of program staff, public officials, and residents of Miami/Dade County, Florida; Lansing, Michigan; and Norfolk, Virginia. They were unfailingly generous with their time and their insights. Special appreciation is due to the people who coordinated our visits in these sites: in Miami, Officer Ronald Tookes of the Metro-Dade Police Department and the Neighborhood Resource Team; in Lansing, Officer Don Christy of the Lansing Police Department and the Neighborhood Network Center; and in Norfolk, George Crawley, Assistant City Manager.

Special thanks also go to Jonathan Budd, Program Manager for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, who helped plan this study, participated in all site visits, and provided thoughtful feedback at every step of the writing process.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Three cities are bringing together community policing and human service initiatives in troubled neighborhoods.

Communities confronted by the problems of juvenile delinquency, crime, and drugs are looking for new solutions. Traditional methods of law enforcement have often failed to halt the deterioration of many urban neighborhoods into havens for drug dealers and drug addicts, while families watch helplessly as their children are recruited by drug traffickers. Human services professionals find themselves frustrated by the poverty, unemployment, disease, and family disruption that coexist with crime and drugs. As a result, police departments and human service agencies are turning to new approaches. A growing number of police departments are implementing community policing. For human service agencies, the new watchwords are collaboration and service integration.

This summary describes how three cities are taking these innovations a step further by bringing together community policing and human service initiatives in troubled neighborhoods. In Dade County, Florida; Lansing, Michigan; and Norfolk, Virginia, police and human service providers are working in partnership with neighborhood residents to reclaim communities and improve their quality of life.

These approaches to service delivery complement the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's commitment to a strategy to prevent juvenile delinquency.[1] A fundamental principle of this comprehensive strategy is the need to address the multiple factors that place children at risk. The programs described in this summary seek to ameliorate multiple risk factors, placing particular emphasis on families and communities as points of intervention.

This summary—intended for policymakers and program developers—begins with a brief overview of community policing and human service integration, and describes how the programs reviewed apply these principles. Next, the history and experiences of the three programs are described. An assessment of their history highlights potential replication issues.[2]

[1]John J. Wilson and James C. Howell, *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders*, Program Summary (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, August 1993).

[2]In 1993, OJJDP representatives visited each city to observe the program in action and interview city officials, program staff, and neighborhood residents. OJJDP also reviewed reports and other relevant materials.

Community police officers, who enjoy greater flexibility than traditional patrols, are encouraged to team up with residents to identify community problems.

Why Partnership?

Community policing

Over the last decade, urban police departments have come to acknowledge the limits of standard police procedures. In present-day policing (which replaced the older tradition in which officers walked beats), police officers generally work under central control, with limited discretion. They react to crime, responding to criminal incidents or calls for service, and using patrol cars to cover large territories and respond quickly. Success is measured by calls answered, crimes cleared, and arrests made.

This model has several disadvantages. First, it removes police from the communities they serve and means that most contacts with residents involve negative activities, such as crime. Consequently, this limited interaction distances police from citizens—a situation that may degenerate into alienation. Residents who distrust police are less likely to pass along the information that police require to solve crimes. In turn, police become less accountable to citizens.

A second drawback is that the traditional model neglects opportunities for prevention. To head off problems before they become law enforcement matters, police must understand the day-to-day conditions in a community: its assets and its deficits. However, officers in patrol cars have limited opportunities to acquire such knowledge, and often are discouraged from acting on it by the current organizational structure of policing and the lack of incentives for solving problems rather than crimes.

A further disadvantage of contemporary practice is its inattention to the complexity of community problems. Crime is just one. Poverty, inadequate housing, lack of recreation for youth, abused and neglected children, and drug abuse also contribute to the dynamics of community deterioration. This social decay is a vicious cycle in which areas plagued by housing problems and increasing social disorder attract drug dealers and other criminals, while law-abiding citizens leave or hide behind locked doors. In the end, police are left alone to shoulder responsibility for public safety and crime control—virtually an impossible task.

Increasingly, police departments are turning to community policing as a remedy for such shortcomings. Community policing returns police officers to neighborhood beats, where they go door to door and get to know the community residents. Community police officers enjoy greater flexibility and discretion than traditional patrols and are often relieved of responsibility for answering routine service calls. Instead, they are encouraged to team up with residents to identify and prioritize community problems. Police and residents address not only crime but conditions such as inadequate trash collection, rundown housing, and lack of drug treatment that may contribute to social deterioration. Community police officers are expected to coordinate with other police units, other public agencies, and private resources in seeking solutions.

In sum, community policing puts officers back in touch with their communities and reduces estrangement. It seeks to reverse the tide of neighborhood deterioration, by creating a climate where citizens feel safe and empowered to share in solving community problems.

Service integration

Providers of other human services: schools, courts, social services, and health and mental health agencies have been confronting the limits of traditional approaches as well.

Like police, human service agencies often have centralized professional structures that make them less accessible to the individuals and families who need their help. Other factors limit accessibility. Many urban neighborhoods are so dangerous that providers are reluctant to spend time in them. Human service budgets have not kept pace with needs and have even shrunk. Meanwhile, responsibilities have become increasingly compartmentalized, funded through a profusion of different budgetary programs and authorizations, each with distinctive purposes, eligibility rules, and procedures.

Often, communication among human service providers has been inadequate. Although the same family may show up on the caseloads of several agencies, no one may be addressing the family's multiple needs. Human service agencies, like police, have responded to crises, with little time left to work on underlying problems.

To remedy these defects human service agencies have adopted service integration with families and children at high risk of such negative developments as child abuse, school dropout and delinquency. Service integration efforts take a variety of forms. Some attempt to realign and restructure agencies and budgets. Others more limited in scope use methods like coordinated case management[3] and locating service providers closer to their clients.[4]

Service integration efforts always involve formal or informal collaboration and cooperation across agencies. They place a premium on improving the flow of information between agencies. The intent is to make services more accessible, more holistic, and less reactive, and to involve residents in solving their own problems.

Service integration has helped human service agencies to work on underlying problems rather than respond mostly to crises.

[3]Typically, case management involves assigning responsibility to one agency for overseeing a family and monitoring the full package of services, as well as helping the family to identify problems and set its own goals.

[4]One recent review concluded that efforts at the service delivery level have been more successful than efforts to restructure entire systems (General Accounting Office, 1992).

High-risk families and high-risk neighborhoods coincide, and teamwork can bring mutual benefits.

Working together

The movements toward community policing and integration of human services share some common themes:

- Disaffection with incident-oriented or crisis-oriented responses.
- Recognition that problems of families and communities are too complex for any one agency to handle alone.
- A belief that problem solving is most effective when it is shared between government, communities, and clients.
- Acknowledgment that to promote sharing of responsibility, barriers between services providers and communities must be reduced.

It is not surprising that community police officers and human service providers in some cities are joining forces in troubled neighborhoods. High-risk families and high-risk neighborhoods coincide, and teamwork can bring mutual benefits. For service providers, the presence of a police officer may alleviate concerns about personal safety when working in high-crime areas. For community police, the presence of human service agencies can expedite identifying and brokering resources. For both, the coordination can streamline the process of interagency referrals and keep partners well informed about changes in each others' programs, procedures, and capabilities.

Of course, the most logical developments are often the most difficult. Efforts to enhance collaborations frequently face organizational and financial obstacles, as broad agreements are translated into practical plans. In the next chapter, we shall examine the way in which three jurisdictions built partnerships between police and human service providers at the neighborhood level.[5]

[5]The discussion in Chapter 2 is indebted to a variety of sources. For a more extensive review, see the following:

Atelia I. Melaville, with Martin J. Blank, *What It Takes: Structuring Interagency Partnerships to Connect Children and Families with Comprehensive Services* (Washington, D.C.: Education and Human Service Consortium, 1991).

The National Institute of Justice's *Series on Perspectives in Policing*, which includes over a dozen reports, many of them describing the theory and practice of community policing. Information about the series is available from NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850 (Tel. 800–851–3420).

Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux, Tina McLanus, and David Sinclair, *The Neighborhood Network Center: Part One--Basic Issues and Planning and Implementation in Lansing, Michigan* (Lansing, MI: National Center for Community Policing, Michigan State University, no date).

U.S. General Accounting Office, *Integrating Human Services: Linking At-Risk Families with Services More Successful Than System Reform Efforts* (Washington, D.C.: Author, September 1992).

Police and Human Service Partnerships in Action

Overview

The following three programs were examined for this study:

- The Neighborhood Resource Team, which operates in a suburb of Miami, Florida, in south Dade County.
- The Neighborhood Network Center in Lansing, Michigan.
- The PACE (Police-Assisted Community Enforcement) Program in Norfolk, Virginia.

Although their programmatic philosophies and strategies have much in common, these jurisdictions and their residents are diverse. As table 1 details, the jurisdictions' populations range in size from 127,000 to 1.9 million. The Neighborhood Resource Team in Dade County focuses on a single public housing project, while Lansing's Neighborhood Network Center focuses on two neighborhoods composed of private housing. The PACE Program serves 10 target areas in Norfolk: 6 public housing complexes and 4 private residential neighborhoods.

Table 1: Key Characteristics of the Jurisdictions Served by Partnership Programs

Characteristic	Neighborhood Resource Team, Dade County, FL	Neighborhood Network Center, Lansing, MI	PACE Norfolk, VA
Size of city or county	1,937,094	127,321	261,227
Primary target area	Public housing complex	Two adjacent residential neighborhoods	6 public housing complexes 4 residential neighborhoods
Size of primary target area(s)	550 people, 158 units	1300 people, 20 blocks	800 to 1900 people in each public housing area 3200 to 9000 people in each private residential neighborhood
Resident characteristics	Predominantly African-American Predominantly low income	White, Hispanic, African-American, and Asian Predominantly low income	Predominantly African-American or White and African-American Predominantly low income
Other characteristics of the target area(s)	High concentration of drug-related activity	High concentration of drug-related activity High concentration of rental property	High concentration of drug-related activity High concentration of rental property

Their program philosophies and strategies have much in common, but these jurisdictions and their residents are diverse.

When drug dealers murdered a respected local businessman and community activist in 1989, the Miami community of West Perrine had enough.

Although the target areas vary in ethnic composition, all of the areas are predominantly low-income and troubled by chronic drug-related crime. The private-housing neighborhoods have a low proportion of owner-occupied properties, a factor contributing to the deterioration of the housing.

Programs are in a state of transition. Dade County is developing a second resource team in a residential neighborhood not far from the original target area. Lansing's Neighborhood Network Center team is stretching its resources to incorporate a third neighborhood that borders the other two. In Norfolk, city officials have launched an effort to extend the PACE program citywide.

The Neighborhood Resource Team, Dade County, Florida

Background

When drug dealers murdered a respected local businessman and community activist in 1989, the metropolitan Miami community of West Perrine had enough. The shooting was the latest in a series of crimes that demonstrated the neighborhood was out of control.

To take back the community, 27 local pastors banded together, attracting other community advocates to their cause. Supported by Metro-Dade County police, they began by marching through neighborhood streets every week. State, county, and private agencies formed an interagency task force with citizen activists.

Although the task force identified a host of community concerns, ranging from commercial revitalization to health care to law enforcement, progress toward solutions was slow. However, in February 1992, Dade County State Attorney Janet Reno, the County's chief prosecutor, persuaded participating agencies to establish a multiagency resource team, based in West Perrine.

Three agencies offered personnel: the Metro-Dade Police Department; the State Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services (HRS), which administers health, welfare, and juvenile delinquency programs in Dade County; and the local Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Office. HUD volunteered space in one of its most troubled public housing developments as a base of operations.

In April 1992, the new Neighborhood Resource Team (NRT) moved into Perrine Gardens complex. A little more than four months into its operations, the program was disrupted by Hurricane Andrew, which devastated south Florida and made Perrine Gardens virtually uninhabitable. Staff regrouped quickly in a temporary office and expanded their activities to the neighborhoods surrounding Perrine Gardens as tenants moved out of the complex to facilitate repairs. Tenants began returning to Perrine Gardens in the summer of 1993, and the complex was back at full occupancy by the end of 1993.

The territory. The NRT began without a formal agenda. Establishing working relationships and settling on strategy took some time.

The West Perrine neighborhood is a predominantly African-American neighborhood, consisting of 16 blocks with about 9,000 residents— a mix of single-family homes, public and private apartment complexes, and businesses. Residents face low incomes and high rates of unemployment, teen pregnancy, substance abuse, poor health, and crime.

The NRT began with the tenants of Perrine Gardens: a single-story complex where drugs, gang violence, and crime were rampant. Many of its 550 residents lived in fear, staying indoors at night and even sleeping on the floor to avoid stray bullets. Health and social service personnel were reluctant to visit tenants, unless accompanied by police.

NRT members saw the problems of Perrine Gardens and its residents as multi-faceted, necessitating a holistic approach to problem solving. For the team to succeed, residents needed to participate in identifying and solving their own problems and learn to be more self-sufficient.

The team. The original NRT consisted of four members: a police officer, a housing representative, a public health nurse, and a social worker from the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services. A fifth member, a social worker from the Metro-Dade Department of Youth and Family Services, joined the team in its second year.

Team members are assigned to the program and operate in roles with no standard position descriptions. All members are experienced professionals, knowledgeable about the resources of their agencies. Not only have these professionals worked in West Perrine, they reside there.

The program operates on the basis of an informal understanding without written agreements. Team members enjoy ready access to top officials of the police department, HRS, and HUD, who are committed to help the team cut red tape and access whatever agency resources are needed to help families.

The NRT elected the police officer to serve as coordinator. He assumes most of the responsibility for program administration and publicity, and the team holds regular staff meetings.

The Neighborhood Resource Team in action

The team uses a two-part intervention strategy, comprising voluntary family-centered and communitywide intervention.

Family-centered intervention. The NRT uses a sequential process to work with families, consisting of the following:

- **Family assessments** conducted by the entire Team in the resident's home.
- **Immediate response to emergency needs** identified during the assessment process.
- **Development of a case plan** to be used as a framework for meeting longer term needs of the family.

For the team to succeed, residents needed to participate in identifying and solving their own problems and learn to be more self-sufficient.

NRT's immediate response to tenant problems enhanced their acceptance.

- **Monitoring and followup on the case plan** to determine that needs have been met and referrals completed.

The team began with 15 families, identified by HUD managers as being particularly in need of help. The fact that most of these families were already known to more than one team member reinforced their commitment to a multi-agency approach.

The entire team would talk with the family, using a comprehensive assessment form to document family composition, sources of support, housing conditions, prenatal and child care, health and social services needs, and the range of services they received. Some situations were so complex that the assessment took the better part of a day.

Most families were receptive to the team. But when necessary, the one team member perceived as least threatening made the initial approach. NRT's immediate response to tenant problems enhanced their acceptance.

After the assessment, team members contacted resources or made referrals. As a result, housing repairs were ordered, applications for day care were made, health clinic visits were arranged, a delinquent child's court status was investigated. One family, whose assessment had taken a full day, required several days of staff time to address its most pressing needs. The presence of the team in the housing complex was an asset because members could check frequently to see whether tenants were following through on referrals.

During its first 2 months of operation, the NRT assessed 33 families. Although the team had originally planned to close cases once the interventions were completed, the initial families required long-term assistance. Consequently, no cases were closed.

Meanwhile, the NRT soon found itself inundated with self-referrals from other tenants and from residents elsewhere in West Perrine. In the case of self-referrals, the NRT generally did not complete an assessment, but simply tried to arrange whatever immediate help was needed. By July 1992, self-referrals were consuming a considerable proportion of the NRT's time.

When the hurricane struck in August 1992, the NRT shifted into a crisis mode, helping families with such emergency needs as food and clothing. Door-to-door assessments became impossible as Perrine Gardens emptied out. However, they continued to respond to specific referrals from former tenants and other residents of West Perrine. The NRT resumed family assessments in the summer of 1993 as tenants began returning to the housing complex.

Community wide intervention. While working with families and referrals, the NRT undertook activities designed to benefit the Perrine Gardens community.

- **Public safety.** Metro-Dade Police had made inroads into the crime problems at Perrine Gardens through a community hotline and other efforts. In addition, residents said the presence of the police officer and other team members in the community made a significant difference. In May 1992, the month after the program started, calls for police service were down 33

percent over the previous May; calls for serious crimes had dropped even more.

- **Public perceptions.** The NRT stopped calling the complex "Circle Plaza"—an infamous appellation—and revived its legal name of Perrine Gardens. The team thought that fighting the fear of crime was as important as fighting crime itself. Therefore, the new name would not trigger the same fears among residents or the surrounding community.

- **Tenant organizing.** The NRT created a Teen Council to work on recreational activities and revived Perrine Gardens' Tenant Council. The Tenant Council focused on ways to improve maintenance. HUD addressed persistent problems, such as broken screen doors, and provided landscaping. Tenants participated in a cleanup effort that included painting a graffiti-covered wall. Senior agency officials, including the State's Attorney, routinely attended the regular meeting the NRT held for tenants to discuss problems and solutions.

In the wake of Hurricane Andrew, the team branched out into a number of new activities.

- **Another housing complex.** Shortly after the hurricane, the NRT was called to a nearby private, federally subsidized, housing project where sewage was backing up because of electrical outages. Within hours, the Health Department and Army personnel had taken steps to avert an immediate health crisis. The NRT began working with tenants and management, reviving a dormant Tenant Council and encouraging tenants to bring residents closer together through social activities. They requested extra police patrols when drug sale activity flared up across the street. They also arranged a publicly funded summer meals program for children and persuaded the Department of Parks and Recreation to provide lifeguards to allow the complex to open its pool.

- **Administering a jobs program.** The hurricane and a subsequent wind storm brought emergency relief funds to southern Florida. The NRT assumed responsibility for hiring and supervising workers in a job program. Most positions went to tenants of Perrine Gardens and the other housing complex where the NRT had become active. Jobs were limited to 6 months or $6,000 in income and involved cleanup work. However, the team expanded workers' responsibilities to include attending tenant meetings and supervising fellow employees. The NRT helped employees prepare resumes and obtain job interviews at the end of their temporary assignment. About 40 percent of the workers were able to go on to some other employment after their participation in the program ended, often through references and referrals from the team. Although most of the jobs ended in May 1993, the NRT retained eight positions for clerical staff in the NRT office and visiting homemakers working with elderly residents.

  The temporary job program caused one of the few instances when the NRT called on top officials for assistance. The team discovered that wages from these short-term jobs would reduce or eliminate AFDC, food stamp,

The NRT assumed responsibility for hiring and supervising workers in a job program.

Housing tenants and observers applaud the NRT for significantly improving the safety and outlook of Perrine Gardens.

and Medicaid coverage, thus discouraging some tenants' first small step to self-reliance. After high-level discussions between the State Attorney, HRS, and the Department of Labor, a compromise was worked out that allowed workers to retain Medicaid coverage and subsidized child care.

- **Defusing community tension.** The hurricane and its aftermath increased tensions in an already distressed community. Besides delivering emergency services, the NRT organized group activities to provide an outlet for residents. These activities included a Thanksgiving banquet, special outings for senior citizens, and a series of "Andrew Anxiety" workshops offered by the team's nurse.

- **Youth activities.** Concerned about youth violence—not just in West Perrine, but throughout Dade County—the team's police officer recruited a full-time Community Street Coordinator. The street coordinator has since helped organize concerts and other alternative events for youth, in one instance arranging theater tickets for 3,400 high-risk youth from across Dade County. In addition, the police officer and street coordinator offered antiviolence seminars at the County's alternative schools.

  The coordinator works the streets, trying to defuse volatile situations and introduce youth to more positive pursuits. He has developed a cadre of more than a dozen volunteers to help out. Two of the volunteers—young men with troubled pasts—came to the NRT as temporary workers and graduated to outreach jobs with a local mental health agency.

Program results

Evidence for the success of the NRT is mostly anecdotal. Housing tenants and observers of the program applaud the NRT's efforts and credit the team with significantly improving the safety and outlook of Perrine Gardens residents, as well as the appearance of the complex in just a few months before the hurricane. The team also has increased access to services and jobs for tenants at Perrine Gardens and the other housing complex. Tenant Councils have been revitalized, as residents take greater control over their community.

Agency officials have not measured progress toward longer term goals such as community and tenant empowerment or reducing crime. Nonetheless, based on the NRT's experience, they are convinced the team approach is beneficial.

Program costs

The cost of the program is difficult to determine because the NRT operates with borrowed staff and donated space and equipment. However, staff recently estimated that it would cost $250,000 annually to copy the team in another neighborhood.

The primary costs of the program are the salaries of professional staff. The police officer has use of a police car, but other Team members rely on their personal vehicles. The HUD complex provides five offices and a reception area. A computer was acquired through a grant from a local foundation, while donations of goods furnished the NRT offices.

The program's future

Several developments are anticipated:

- **Revival of systematic family assessments.** The team plans to perform more thorough assessments of tenants who refer themselves for services now that tenants have returned to Perrine Gardens.
- **Greater formalization and structure.** NRT staff and agency officials plan to analyze what they have learned and reassess their objectives, activities, and priorities. Staff also plan to improve their rudimentary data collection and monitoring system.
- **Expansion to other neighborhoods.** A second Neighborhood Resource Team is being developed in south Dade County with grant funds. The original NRT also has been investigating another public housing project in West Perrine, with problems similar to those encountered at Perrine Gardens.
- **Greater targeting of delinquent youth.** The NRT police officer is developing a list of West Perrine youth with a history of substantial delinquent activity, in the hope that the NRT can develop a intervention plan for each youth. The plan would involve working with the youth's family as well as local service agencies.
- **Greater involvement with the school system.** The NRT members are considering working with an elementary school that serves the neighborhood. They have discussed adding a school representative to the team.

The Neighborhood Network Center, Lansing, Michigan

Background

In January 1990, Lansing, Michigan, launched its first community policing effort in one of the city's most troubled neighborhoods. Within a few months, Sparrow Estates, the pilot neighborhood produced positive results. The community police officer had already contributed to some noticeable improvements, including the closing of several crack houses and a neighborhood cleanup.

In spite of his successes, the officer's inability to handle many of the neighborhood's underlying problems frustrated him. Health care, social services, substance abuse treatment, good housing, and jobs were inadequate. Struggling to find solutions, the officer contacted other organizations in the community. One of them was nearby Bingham Elementary School, where the principal used a multiagency team to target her most troubled students and their families. The idea for the multiagency team originated with an Inter-Agency Group, composed of top administrators from the school district, public health, social services, mental health, and the probate (juvenile) court.

The pilot program in Sparrow Estates produced positive results within months after it was launched in January 1990.

The city of Lansing expanded community policing to 15 neighborhoods in 2 years, but Sparrow Estates/Green Oaks is the only community served by a Neighborhood Network Center.

Attracted by the team approach, the community police officer and two of his superiors began meeting with the Inter-Agency Group to determine whether the concept could be applied on a neighborhood level. Robert Trojanowicz, Director of the National Center for Community Policing at nearby Michigan State, soon joined the discussions. Mr. Trojanowicz wanted to expand the concept of community policing in Sparrow Estates into Neighborhood Network Centers in which community police officers and social service providers worked together.

Although the Inter-Agency Group, neighborhood residents, and police were enthusiastic about the idea of a Neighborhood Network Center, they would need to find a site and convince agencies to assign personnel to the Center. Fortunately, the community police officer persuaded a local landlord to donate the use of a floor in one of his buildings. Neighborhood residents helped clean up and renovate the space, and in January 1991, the officer moved in. At the same time, he expanded his territory to a second neighborhood, Green Oaks. The Neighborhood Network Center was located right on the main street dividing Sparrow Estates from Green Oaks.

However, bringing other agency representatives into the new Neighborhood Network Center (NNC) proved difficult. Michigan was experiencing a budget crisis and public agencies were reluctant to assign personnel to new ventures. Rather than wait indefinitely for government agency officials to commit staff, NNC offered rent-free space to any agency that would provide services to the neighborhood. Still, it was not until August 1991 that a second partner, the Lansing School District, moved in and brought a contract provider, Gateway Social Services.

Gradually, over the next 2 years other public and private agencies claimed most of the remaining space. Although the city of Lansing expanded community policing to 15 neighborhoods during that time, Sparrow Estates/Green Oaks remains the only community policing area in Lansing served by a Neighborhood Network Center.

The Neighborhood Network Center in action

Mission and target area. Essentially, the NNC is a group of public and private service agencies that share office space and have overlapping target areas and interests. The structure is informal, with agencies falling into two groups—core agencies and supporting agencies—according to their roles in the Center.

The NNC's goals are the following:

- Use an interagency approach to intervene with individuals and families in the neighborhood.
- Access all available resources, public and private, on behalf of the community.
- Improve the social, health, educational, and physical environment of neighborhood residents, and make the area a better and safer place to live.
- Involve neighborhood residents and families in the problem-solving process.

The target areas for the core team are the two neighborhoods covered by the community police officer. Sparrow Estates and Green Oaks consist of about 20 blocks, with about 1300 residents. The neighborhoods are composed of whites, Hispanics, African Americans, and Southeast Asian residents.

Sparrow Estates, the smaller of the two neighborhoods, was chosen as one of the city's first community policing areas because of its crime and housing profiles. Of particular significance were several known drug houses and the presence of prostitutes on the street. The area's many zoning and housing code violations and its high percentage of rental properties were important considerations. When the community police officer arrived, no neighborhood association existed in Sparrow Estates. Green Oaks had experienced many of the same problems as the area that came to be known as Sparrow Estates, but to a lesser extent. Unlike Sparrow Estates, Green Oaks already had a neighborhood association and a block watch organization.

Sparrow Estates was chosen as one of the city's first community policing areas because of its crime and housing profiles.

Although the core team works primarily in Sparrow Estates and Green Oaks, imposing a strict boundary limitation on the agencies in the Center proved to be impractical. The population of Sparrow Estates/Green Oaks is too small to generate a sufficient caseload for some of the providers, and each agency defines service territories differently. Willingness to work in the neighborhoods surrounding the Center is a requirement for operating in the NNC, however, and most supporting agencies have come there at least in part because they have a concentration of clients in the vicinity.

Core agencies and core staff team. The core agencies assume the primary responsibility for administering the facility and carrying out the Center's mission. They include the Lansing Police Department, the School District, and Gateway Social Services, a private agency that provides social services to the School District under a contract. Together, these three agencies supply the NNC's informal core staff team, consisting of the community police officer, a school program administrator, a social worker, and a secretary.

The community police officer and the school program administrator are the unofficial management team for the NNC. They decide which agencies can have space in the building, supervise the secretary, and handle the limited finances—consisting mainly of petty cash and rental income from a few of the tenants.

Besides providing the core staff, core agencies have placed other personnel at the NNC who can assist in handling neighborhood problems but who are responsible for a wider geographic area. Lansing Police support a police detective at the NNC whose territory includes Sparrow Estates, Green Oaks, and an adjoining neighborhood. The school system supports several additional social workers, a nurse supervisor, a learning specialist, and several child health advocates who work with children throughout Lansing.

Supporting agencies. The Center provides a base for several other agencies that pursue their own distinct agendas. These supporting agencies accept referrals from core agency staff and others in the Center and help with community events as their time and resources permit.

Identifying families or properties in trouble is one intervention approach NNC uses to help residents.

The supporting agencies include:

- Lao Family Community, Inc., which works with Lao families in the Lansing area, including an estimated 200 people near the Center. The organization often provides translator and interpreter support for others in the NNC.
- Legal Aid, which assigns a staff attorney to spend two days a month at the NNC helping neighborhood residents on housing, domestic problems, social security benefits, and other civil legal matters.
- Michigan State University (MSU), which uses the NNC as a site for bachelor's degree nursing students serving their community health practicum. Each semester, 18 to 20 students work out of the NNC, serving clients referred by NNC partners.
- Community Mental Health and Child Abuse Prevention Services, which use the NNC as an administrative base for a parent training/mentoring program and a preschool program.
- The Neighborhood Youth & Parent Prevention Partnership, a federally funded initiative that organizes neighborhood coalitions of youth and adults to work on substance abuse prevention.
- The Lansing Neighborhood Council, which provides a community/landlord organizer to work on identifying and upgrading problem rental properties in community policing neighborhoods.
- The Lansing Reinvestment Corporation, which rehabilitates rundown properties in Green Oaks and helps low-income residents obtain subsidized mortgages.

NNC tenants meet monthly to share information, to brainstorm about community problems, and to assign people to clean the facility.

Interventions. Identifying families or properties in trouble is one intervention approach NNC uses to help residents. The following components comprise the intervention process:

- **The Problem-Solving Team.** This group, composed of the community police officer, the detective, the school administrator, the social worker, a city code enforcement officer, a representative of the police drug unit, and several local patrol officers, meets weekly. Team members discuss families or properties that concern them and consider how best to intervene. Those diverse problems may involve drug dealing, vandalizing vacant houses, skipping school, drinking on the street corner, feuding among families, or leaving a child unattended. In response, police may increase patrols, code enforcement officials may order critical repairs, while the social worker may decide to investigate a family's situation. In the case of a suspected crack house, for example, several agencies may need to coordinate efforts to close it down.

- **Case management and followup.** The school program administrator keeps track of problem families and properties, which are reviewed at subsequent meetings. To help troubled families, the administrator and the social worker may, for example, ask the NNC nurse supervisor to schedule a visit or consult with a child's school principal. Although it is often convenient and appropriate to call upon their colleagues at the NNC, the team also works routinely with service agencies outside the organization.

- **Exchange of referrals.** Besides the formal process of problem solving, case management, and followup, agencies in the NNC often trade informal referrals. For instance, the community police officer and his colleagues routinely refer families with health-related problems to the MSU nursing team. Providers who need to contact a Lao family can call upon the Lao service agency to help overcome language and cultural barriers. The police officer can accompany service providers on home visits, when staff safety is a concern or when the officer can assist in getting the family to open their door.

Typically, providers see families who need services in their homes, or they visit a child's school, or sometimes families visit the NNC office to receive service.

Communitywide interventions. Another important facet of the NNC effort is working with the community at large to address community problems.

- **Initial community organization.** The community police officer began the process of community organization during the first year discussing with residents their needs and concerns. Gradually, the officer identified a nucleus of residents who formed Sparrow Estates' first neighborhood association. Eventually, the officer used information from neighbors and help from other police units to close several crack houses in the neighborhood. The officer also began organizing a series of community projects, beginning with a community trash cleanup in which residents filled more than 24 huge city dumpsters. This effort was followed up by neighbors planting flowers purchased with federal beautification funds. Each new project was celebrated with a community party or picnic. Other early efforts included a voter registration drive and a contest that produced the neighborhood name. In January 1991, when the community police officer added Green Oaks to his beat, he began working closely with that neighborhood's resident associations.

- **Working with neighborhood associations and neighborhood watches.** Continuing the pattern set by the community police officer, NNC team members regularly attend meetings of the neighborhood associations and block watch groups in Sparrow Estates/Green Oaks, and have begun to work with a third association organizing in nearby Oak Park. The team works with Caring Area Residents (CARS), an umbrella organization formed in 1993 to coordinate social activities across the three individual neighborhoods. These community organizations function as vehicles for communicating with the NNC team and for community problem-solving. For example, CARS recently met with the principal of the nearby high school to express concern about students loitering and littering in the

During the first year of community organization, the police officer used information from neighbors and other police units to close several crack houses.

The NNC now ranks as one of the probate court's most used community service placements for juvenile delinquents.

neighborhood during lunch hour. Residents also successfully lobbied the city to purchase and close down a convenience store that had become an eyesore and a persistent trouble spot.

- **Community social events.** The team works with neighborhood groups to organize holiday parties, cookouts, neighborhood beautification, school-community fairs, and other activities that bring area residents together, including fundraising events to pay for future projects. In addition, every month at the NNC they provide either neighborhood potlucks or free dinners and have childcare available. The dinners are followed by CARS meetings, which may include such educational programs as seminars on mortgages, presented by a local bank officer. Originally, the community police officers were responsible for most of these activities. As the NNC developed, other team members and residents have shared the responsibility.

- **Other special projects.** NNC team members also get involved in special projects, often developed in cooperation with residents and targeted to special needs. Last year, for example, the social worker worked with a parent/child summer program funded by another NNC tenant, the Neighborhood Youth & Parent Prevention Partnership. Team members also organized a community garden project that was particularly important to Southeast Asian residents. Other projects have included a food and community services cooperative and a breast cancer detection clinic.

Youth activities. Youth programs, which include community socials, are a special concern of the NNC. Two youth programs are noteworthy:

- **The High Adventure Group.** In 1990 the police officer organized a club for up to 10 boys in grade 5. A girls' program has since been added. The clubs target children from single-parent families, who are identified through the local elementary school. The groups meet every other week and have an adventure outing once a month. Originally, the program operated without liability insurance, but this problem disappeared when the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts welcomed the clubs under their organizational umbrellas. The latest partner in the High Adventure effort is Big Brothers/Big Sisters, which is recruiting adult volunteers to work with children in the newest groups. The Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and Big Brothers/Big Sisters have been flexible about their standard procedures—for example, no uniforms are necessary. For them, the High Adventure Groups are an innovative way to reach inner-city children.

- **Community service placements.** The NNC now ranks as one of the probate court's most used community service placements for juvenile delinquents.[6] The NNC accepts individual youth and teenage work crews, relying on college interns to help with supervision. Individual youth generally perform janitorial and secretarial duties at the Center, while work crews do cleanup, repairs, and yard work in the neighborhood. The NNC team believes that besides the direct labor the youth provide, the neighborhood

[6]Periodically, the NNC also accepts adults who have been sentenced to community service.

benefits indirectly because youth placed at the NNC will develop a sense of community ownership and be less inclined to vandalize or commit other crimes there.

Program results

The Neighborhood Network Center has not been formally evaluated, but city officials and neighborhood residents are enthusiastic about the positive changes in the Sparrow Estates/Green Oaks area.

First, the physical appearance of the neighborhood is much improved. Second, residents are better organized and are actively solving their own problems. One city official noted that residents now seem to better understand how to make government work for them. For example, voter registration and voter turnout are up.

Third, crime rates, particularly in Sparrow Estates, have dropped precipitously. In 1989, 121 reported crimes occurred in the area. This number climbed to 156 in the first year of community policing, a common pattern in neighborhoods where police become more accessible and trusted. However, reported crimes dropped to 110 in 1991 and 67 in 1992. Police expect reported crimes to fall below 50 in 1993.

Service providers who work in the NNC also are pleased because the location, which is closer to their clients, permits greater information sharing across agencies and results in more referrals.

In some respects, however, participants admit that the NNC has not realized its full potential. The agencies in the Center vary in their commitment to the original mission envisioned for the NNC. Some agencies are more involved than others in meeting the service needs of area residents, and key agencies, such as the Departments of Social Services and Health, are not yet represented on the team.

Program costs

NNC has no official budget for its operations. All personnel, including the core team, are funded through regular agency budgets, outside grants, or a combination of the two.

The NNC uses about 5,000 square feet of space, which includes offices, a reception area, and a large meeting room. The space is donated, but a few agencies contribute rent and the neighborhood holds fundraisers to help defray utility costs. The School District contributes a copying machine and office supplies for common use.

The NNC relies heavily on volunteers: neighborhood residents, area churches, businesses, and student interns to carry out its many activities. It uses space in the community, particularly churches, for parties, meetings, and youth recreational programs. One of the churches rents a house to the community, which serves as a clubhouse where residents can hold meetings or family parties.

The NNC relies heavily on volunteers: neighborhood residents, area churches, businesses, and student interns to carry out its many activities.

One of the core team's immediate priorities is to bring the Social Services and the Health Departments into closer partnership with the NNC.

The program's future

The Sparrow Estates/Green Oaks area. One of the core team's immediate priorities is to bring the Social Services and the Health Departments into closer partnership with the NNC. Social Services plans to put a family services worker in the Center on a full-time basis. The worker would join the problem-solving team and coordinate department services to families in the neighborhood. In addition, the Health Department is exploring the development of a primary care clinic either at the NNC or nearby, through a partnership with a local hospital.

Two other developments could negatively affect the NNC over the longer term. First, the NNC team fears that their building will be sold, raising the possibility that the NNC would have to move out or find the money to pay rent. Although the core problem-solving team could operate in a smaller space, they would lose the close proximity to other agencies, as well as the ability to host large community gatherings.

The second development involves the community police officer, who has served Sparrow Estates/Green Oaks since community policing began in January 1990. The residents all know him and credit his leadership for many of the neighborhood's successes. However, according to union agreements, the officer's community policing assignment should have ended in 1992. After residents protested, his tour was extended through 1994 but no further exceptions are expected. Meanwhile, the police department has not decided whether the officer will be replaced or the neighborhood will have to function alone.

Citywide efforts. At the city level, the Lansing Police Department has continued to designate new community policing areas as funding allows. New neighborhoods are chosen based on the frequency of certain nonemergency calls and complaints to the police—the kind of crimes that can be reduced by community policing.

Although city officials have no immediate plans for a second NNC, they are interested in trying the NNC concept in a community policing area with a strong private service agency to anchor the program.

Police Assisted Community Enforcement (PACE), Norfolk, Virginia

Background

By the late 1980's, Norfolk, Virginia, began to see disturbing signs of increased drug use and trafficking. Responding to growing public concern, Norfolk's mayor appointed a Task Force on Drugs, cochaired by city council members, to make recommendations. Consistent with Norfolk tradition, this task force comprised a broad cross-section of public officials and private citizens. Consequently, a Community Forum of more than 300 of these local leaders produced a report emphasizing that solutions to drug problems had to involve the entire community—families, neighbors, volunteers, religious groups, and civic leagues,[7] as well as city agencies.

Meanwhile, city officials considered how a shift to community-oriented policing might create a closer partnership between police and citizens in the drug war. However, it was apparent that Norfolk would need new funding to dramatically change its approach to policing. When attempts to find outside funding for the program failed, the Mayor urged the City Council to increase the local real estate tax. The Council agreed and, with $1.8 million in new revenues from the tax hike, the city enacted its plan in July of 1990.

The new program effort was called Police Assisted Community Enforcement, or PACE, a name deliberately chosen to convey the initiative's underlying philosophy—that communities must play the lead role in solving problems and that police (and other public agencies) were their helpers.

PACE devoted its first six months to planning, training police officers for their new roles, hiring personnel, and educating city employees and citizens about the new effort. The city manager had recently placed public safety (police and fire services) and human services under the supervision of an assistant city manager, who soon organized an interagency PACE Support Services Committee to oversee the program.

By January of 1991, Norfolk Police had targeted their first two PACE neighborhoods. Within a couple of months, community police officers were assigned to each targeted neighborhood, and teams of city employees and citizens were established to work with them. By the end of 1991, bolstered by additional funding from the Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance, PACE had moved into seven more neighborhoods. The final target neighborhood was included in July of 1992.

By early 1993, after 2 years in operation, PACE was viewed as the embodiment of Norfolk's commitment to "community-oriented government." A new Mayor's Task Force on Violence and Crime Reduction praised PACE not only as an effective program for the target neighborhoods, but as an exemplary model of government. Consequently, the group recommended that PACE be extended citywide.

Although PACE participants agreed in principle, it took time to develop a structure for citywide expansion. By mid-1993, the group decided to use the city's six police sectors as a framework and to establish sector-level PACE teams in each area. As of fall 1993, specific plans for each sector were still being formulated.

A new Mayor's Task Force on Violence and Crime Reduction praised PACE not only as an effective program but as an exemplary model of government.

PACE in action

Up to this point, PACE has been primarily a targeted initiative, focusing on ten specific neighborhoods. The next sections describe how that targeted program has operated, reserving discussion of the new citywide organization for later.

PACE mission and target areas. PACE's mission is to resolve community problems and to improve the quality of life through partnerships between city

[7]In Norfolk, civic league is the common term for neighborhood associations.

PACE target neighborhoods—plagued by drug trafficking and high crimes—were selected by police officials.

government and city residents. Although PACE's tactics evolved through trial and error, from the beginning city officials were clear on one principle— To engage citizens in effective partnerships, they would have to demonstrate that city employees were accessible and responsive to citizen concerns.

PACE target neighborhoods—plagued by drug trafficking and high crimes—were selected by police officials. One of the first target areas was Grandy Village, a predominantly African-American public housing community with about 1,500 residents. The other initial target area was East Ocean View, a community that had also suffered the ravages of drugs and crime. This community, which is near Norfolk Naval Base, is an extremely transient area with much absentee-owned rental property. It has more than 9,000 residents and is 68 percent white.

Of the eight neighborhoods that were subsequently selected as PACE targets, five were public housing communities, ranging in size from about 800 to 1,900 residents. The other three neighborhoods, with populations ranging from 3,200 to 7,500, were mixed residential and commercial areas, exhibiting the familiar symptoms of urban decay—predominance of rental housing, deterioration of the physical environment, open-air drug selling, and crime.

Organizational structure. Norfolk has a Council-City Manager form of government. Within that structure, PACE is assigned to the Assistant City Manager for Public Safety and Services, who provides administrative support and acts as an interpreter and flagbearer for the initiative among city employees and in the community.

PACE consists of several different committees and staff working at multiple organizational levels. The organization has three main types of committees:

- **The PACE Support Services Committee (PSSC)** is the key policymaking body. It began with members drawn from a dozen city agencies but has since expanded to represent additional agencies and include neighborhood groups and the business and religious communities. Police, the Health Department, Social Services, Juvenile Court, Youth Services, the Redevelopment and Housing Authority, Planning and Codes Administration, Code Enforcement, Parks and Recreation, the Community Services Board (responsible for mental health, mental retardation, and substance abuse services), the Office of Drug Awareness, and the School District are all represented, typically by middle managers, although some department heads attend. The committee meets monthly, providing a forum for information sharing, policy decisions, and problem solving around specific community issues identified through PACE. Ad hoc subcommittees are appointed to look at particular problems—for example, the proliferation of used needles and other drug paraphernalia on the streets in one neighborhood.

- **The Neighborhood Environmental Assessment Team (NEAT)** has the task of responding to environmental concerns in the targeted neighborhoods, such as vacant or dilapidated housing, abandoned vehicles, trash, and overgrown lots. This team, chaired by the PSSC representative from City Planning and Codes Enforcement, includes representatives from

Environmental Health, Public Works, Parks and Forestry, Police, the Redevelopment and Housing Authority, Existing Structures, and civic leagues. The team calls upon line staff from the various agencies and community representatives to carry out many neighborhood-based activities.

- **Family Assessment Services Teams (FAST's)** address the needs of multiproblem families in the targeted neighborhoods and serve as a vehicle for information sharing and problem solving at the neighborhood level. Members generally include line staff from Social Services, the Police, the Community Service Board, Parks and Recreation, Public Health, and the Public Schools. Other members include the Redevelopment and Housing Authority, nonprofit service agencies, leaders from civic leagues, tenant management organizations, and the business and religious communities. Each neighborhood has its own team, although in one case, two adjoining neighborhoods share a team. FAST's meet monthly and choose cochairs who rotate responsibilities every 6 months.

FAST's address the needs of multiproblem families and serve as a vehicle for information sharing and problem solving at the neighborhood level.

Besides committee and team units, the following key individuals keep PACE operating day-to-day:

- A full-time FAST Coordinator, provided by Social Services, who works with FAST's in all 10 target areas.
- Fifteen community police officers assigned to the ten target areas. Three neighborhoods have two-officer teams and one neighborhood has three officers. The remaining six neighborhoods are divided into two groups, each group sharing three officers.
- A PACE Coordinator, a police captain, who oversees all PACE activities for the Norfolk Police.

Intervention sequence. In each targeted neighborhood, PACE adopted a three-phased approach to intervention.

- In Phase I, Norfolk Police made a sweep of the neighborhood to arrest suspects identified through previous undercover operations and searches.
- During Phase II, police increased motorized patrols and assigned one or more PACE officers to work in the area. Moreover, city officials reached out to citizens through community meetings to identify their concerns and assembled the neighborhood's FAST team. Usually a month passed between the initial sweep and the first FAST meeting.
- In Phase III, the community partnership phase, PACE officers worked daily in the targeted area and FAST teams met monthly.

Recognizing that partnership-building is a long-term process, participants see the final community partnership phase as open-ended. They point out that partnerships are much stronger in some neighborhoods than in others.

Specific intervention approaches. As the previous discussion suggests, PACE incorporates a variety of tactics.

Police officers answer some service calls in the area, but they spend most of their time walking through the neighborhood, talking with citizens, and attending community meetings.

Law enforcement tactics include the following:

- **Traditional law enforcement tactics** such as undercover narcotics operations, increased patrol, and sweeps are employed. Although a sweep initiates activity in targeted neighborhoods, police can still do "minisweeps" later. Police also work with citizens on establishing block watches.
- **Targeted area officers.** Although Norfolk's entire police force has been trained in community policing, specific officers are assigned to PACE neighborhoods and relieved of routine patrol duties. Although they answer some service calls in their area, they spend considerable time walking through the neighborhood, talking with citizens informally, and attending community meetings. Police officers participate in NEAT and FAST, where they can refer specific problems for intervention. Officers also seek solutions to some problems on their own. For example, they notify owners about illegal drug activity on their property and ask them to post "no trespassing" signs, which allow the police to order nonresidents to leave.
- **Bicycle patrols.** Another aspect of community policing in Norfolk is bicycle patrol. Although bike patrols are not assigned exclusively to PACE, several of the bike officers spend a substantial amount of their time in targeted areas.
- **Collaboration with landlords and property managers.** Before PACE began, police had been meeting with property managers in one neighborhood to discuss solutions to problems such as neighborhood deterioration and drug trafficking, which threatened the value of rental property. Now similar groups in several neighborhoods hold monthly meetings on ways to effectively screen out drug-dealing tenants, to control on-street dealing and disorder, and to assist landlords in effective property management.

NEAT is the primary tool for intervening in the physical environment, where several tactics have been used:

- **Neighborhood tours.** As each new PACE neighborhood was targeted, NEAT members and civic leaders toured the area with the beat officers. The team compiled a list of problems and addresses and assigned them to team members who could seek solutions. In general, NEAT found that these initial neighborhood tours were particularly useful in nonpublic housing neighborhoods as public housing areas were fairly well maintained.
- **Followup tour.** The tours often resulted in towing abandoned cars, clearing trash-filled lots, taking action on code violations or, in extreme cases, tearing down buildings. Teams tried to speed up the normal procedures, although there were obstacles. Because of the high backlog of abandoned cars, for example, the city found that it needed to contract with more private towing firms.
- **Continuing partnership.** NEAT continues to respond to environmental issues in PACE neighborhoods as they are identified through FAST, resi-

dents, or other sources. NEAT agencies either collaborate on solutions or work with FAST. For example, in one case, PACE officers videotaped the activities around a vacant house, helping code enforcement staff to quickly make the case for razing the property as a public nuisance. In another in stance, a church leader recruited volunteers to help a family clean up its dwelling. Another activity spearheaded by NEAT was a needle-awareness program, designed to alert children and parents to the dangers associated with discarded drug paraphernalia.

The **FAST's** take the lead in addressing the **social and human service needs** of targeted neighborhoods through the following:

- **Initial community forums.** As PACE entered each new area, community meetings were scheduled as a way to build rapport with citizens of the targeted neighborhoods and to get them involved in the PACE partnership. PACE soon discovered that in some areas the meetings were the only vehicle for residents and agency representatives to get together and trade views. These meetings served to identify the community's most pressing concerns.

- **Regular town meetings.** Community meetings became a regular part of PACE, with a town meeting held in place of the regular FAST meeting each quarter. FAST's generate the best turnouts when town meetings combine refreshments and fun, such as door prizes or contests, with discussion of serious neighborhood issues. City officials attend to hear community concerns firsthand. However, in some neighborhoods it has been a challenge to keep residents involved. One FAST eventually joined forces with the area civic league, which decreased the number of meetings competing for residents' time and gave every FAST meeting a town meeting component. On the other hand, separate town meetings proved so popular in one area that they are now held every other month rather than quarterly.

- **Case staffings.** From the outset, FAST's expected to receive referrals of troubled families from member agencies and neighborhood residents. The plan was that FAST representatives from all the relevant city agencies would then hold a "case staffing" and work out a coordinated response. In fact, most FAST's were preoccupied with organizing residents and did not do staffings in the first year. By the second year, several FAST's were staffing cases, but referrals were sparse although the service had been well-publicized. At the end of 1992, seven of the nine FAST's were monitoring a total of 14 cases.

Staffings usually are held after FAST meetings and are confidential; police and community residents do not attend. Typically, the referring agency retains responsibility for case management, even though several agencies may be involved in working with the family. Referrals require a special referral form and a signed release from the family involved, authorizing the FAST agencies to share information about the case among themselves.

Community meetings were scheduled to build a rapport with citizens of targeted neighborhoods and to get them involved in the PACE partnership.

Youth partnerships allow PACE to intervene early with youth at risk and involve them in positive activities with positive role models.

- **Crisis intervention.** East Ocean View's FAST recently began testing another method of working with individual families. Under this program, PACE officers trained patrol officers to refer troubled families to FAST, focusing on cases where they had been called to a home but no arrest or summons had resulted. FAST members from city agencies take turns working in pairs to handle referrals of civilians. However, Navy families are referred to the Navy's Family Advocacy Center, which also participates in FAST. A public health nurse and a juvenile probation officer took the first month's rotation, handling eight referrals. Four other referrals were handled by the Navy. Most referrals were initiated by domestic disturbance calls, suicide threats, or children left unattended. In all cases, the goal is to link families with services quickly. Feedback is provided to the referring officer.

- **Other special projects.** Individual FAST's have worked on several special efforts, either on their own or in collaboration with other community groups. For example, one FAST obtained some small grants to support children's recreational activities and arranged for a GED class to be offered at the local recreation center. Another set up a tutoring program that serves more than 40 children a day. A third successfully lobbied the city to open a miniservices center in the neighborhood, and a fourth is planning to train FAST members and resident volunteers to counsel families traumatized by violence.

Youth partnerships. Youth partnerships are a particular priority for PACE because they offer a way to involve neighborhood youth in positive activities with positive role models and to intervene early with children and youth at risk. For example, PACE collaborates with the following:

- The Norfolk Interagency Consortium, which sets policy on placements for high-risk youth and uses interagency assessment teams to make placements.
- The Truancy Action Program, another multiagency initiative, which refers cases to FAST in one target neighborhood.
- The PACE Athletic League and the PACE/NCAA Program, a collaboration of Norfolk Police, the Boys and Girls Clubs, Norfolk State University, and other groups to provide opportunities for young people to participate in team sports.
- The Norfolk Youth Forum, an event involving more than 250 high school students who spoke out and proposed solutions to youth and community problems.
- The Berkley/Campostella Early Childhood Development Center, an innovative preschool and multiservice center, which has programs for students and their parents.

Other linkages. PACE partnerships are not limited to youth activities. PACE and its partners serve on each other's committees, volunteer for each other's activities, and sometimes share the same PACE logo. Over time, PACE has developed partnerships with a long list of initiatives spearheaded by community residents or city agencies. For example, PACE works with the following:

- Police ministations, established and staffed by citizens and local businesses in several parts of the city.
- The Diggs Economic Empowerment Demonstration, which focuses on increasing tenant self-sufficiency in one of the PACE public housing areas.
- PACE-ALERT, a training program to develop community leadership in two areas.
- PACE-SAFE, a coalition of religious organizations that works to build partnerships with the city and the entire community and also sponsors block parties, music, and other activities.

Program results

The PACE program has not been systematically evaluated. However, statistics show that crime has dropped markedly in the targeted neighborhoods. Crime decreased by an estimated 29 percent in these areas, according to one 1993 report, and violent crime has declined citywide. Police report fewer service calls in certain target areas and a significant drop in on-street drug trafficking and gunfire.

PACE participants believe the program has reduced fear of crime in their neighborhoods. City officials and private citizens are enthusiastic about other aspects of PACE. They contend that it has cut red tape, greatly improved communication among city agencies at all levels, and made city officials more accessible to citizens. Several citizens commented that their initial skepticism about the program was overcome when they saw how rapidly the program responded to pressing community concerns. Others commented approvingly that they were now on a first-name basis with police officers in their neighborhood. Police mention that they get a warmer reception in these areas.

City officials link the community meetings and committees initiated by PACE to the implementation of other multiagency service initiatives, including the establishment of two public health clinics in the community and the development of a multiservice center at an alternative school.

Participants concede that much work still needs to be done. In some areas, resident participation has been spotty, and PACE has barely scratched the surface of the problems that plague the more deeply troubled neighborhoods. FAST's have not worked as much with individual families as originally intended. Nevertheless, city officials and residents are strong supporters of the PACE approach, believing that it is their best hope of solving city and community problems.

Program costs

PACE costs are difficult to estimate because it is virtually impossible to disentangle them from other city activities. The police portion of the program depends on support from the city real estate tax increase, which generates $1.8 million dollars annually. In addition, State and Federal grants have contributed to the community policing effort. As a result, the department has trained the

The program overcame the initial skepticism of citizens when they saw how rapidly it responded to pressing community concerns.

The widespread enthusiasm for PACE at all levels of the community led to its adoption citywide.

entire force in community policing, hired 38 more officers and 11 civilians, and assigned 15 targeted-area officers to PACE.

Personnel from other city agencies are involved in PACE at all levels, serving on committees, following up with troubled families, and attending community meetings and events on the city's behalf. Two key roles in PACE, the police department's PACE Coordinator and Social Services' FAST Coordinator, have become full-time efforts, although many other agency staff contribute substantial time. In addition, residents and private organizations volunteer significant support.

Other than equipment for the targeted-area officers, PACE has not required any special facilities or equipment. Meetings are held at churches, multiservice centers, housing complexes, or schools, and city employees work out of their city offices.

At various points, PACE has provided training for FAST members, coordinators, and other participants. The Washington, D.C.-based National Crime Prevention Council facilitated training sessions in November 1992 and July 1993 on crime prevention techniques. Other training activities have been supported through outside funding or through the regular city budget.

The program's future

The widespread enthusiasm for PACE at all levels of the community led to its adoption citywide. Although many details are yet to be worked out, the cornerstone of the citywide plan is expected to be the police department's sector system. Norfolk has six police sectors, each headed by a police lieutenant who acts as "chief" for that area. PACE Sector Teams, chaired by the sector lieutenants, began meeting in the summer of 1993 to develop an agenda for their areas. The PACE Support Services Committee has encouraged each sector to tailor its plans to the needs of its own neighborhoods, recognizing that many neighborhoods do not require the same level of services as the original PACE neighborhoods.

For the immediate future, the basic PACE structure, including the PSSC, NEAT, and FAST's, is expected to remain intact. However, FAST functions may be redefined to focus on problem solving for individual families, while some community organization functions move to the Sector Team level.

PACE is still grappling with how to meet the increased demands of a citywide system, given that the efforts in the targeted areas already require a substantial time commitment. A partial solution may lie in increased citizen involvement in partnership formation. One idea that is close to fruition is a Codes Enforcement Auxiliary Program. Under this program, city-trained volunteers will survey properties in each sector and serve notices of code violations. Although the notices will not have the force of a city summons, officials hope that enough property owners will respond to make the effort worthwhile. PACE participants hope that the new sector team structure will encourage less troubled neighborhoods to begin helping the more troubled areas and foster a stronger role for private organizations whose interests transcend a single neighborhood.

The next chapter looks at some of the lessons learned from the experience of the Neighborhood Resource Team, the Neighborhood Network Center, and PACE.

Lessons Learned

Although the programs described in this summary are still evolving and have not been systematically evaluated, each has earned the respect of city officials and neighborhood residents. What lessons can other jurisdictions learn about neighborhood-based integration of police, human services, and citizen efforts from the experiences of these programs?

Factors contributing to success

Several factors appear significant in explaining the initial accomplishments of the Neighborhood Resource Team, the Neighborhood Network Center, and PACE. Other jurisdictions should carefully consider how they can apply these same organizational concepts to their own neighborhood-based partnerships.

Support from top officials. Community partnership programs require support from top officials in the form of tangible resources, including money, personnel, and both permission and encouragement to depart from traditional ways of doing business. Officials demonstrated their support by (a) making themselves available to program staff, for example, to help cut red tape, and (b) increasing their accessibility to neighborhood residents by making appearances at community meetings and other functions. Tenants in Dade County's Perrine Gardens were particularly emphatic that the consistent attendance of top officials at local meetings had been an important sign that public agencies were sincerely committed to helping the community.

A shared vision. Each partner agency generally has a specific mission that is unique—to protect housing quality or to work with high-risk teens or to combat crime. However, it is important that partners share a broad vision. This vision includes a commitment to improving the quality of life for neighborhood residents and avoiding fragmentation and duplication of services. Having a shared vision does not mean that partners will always agree about the best way to realize that vision. Partners in the programs visited freely admitted that sometimes they did not agree. But consensus on broad principles anchored the debate when disagreements arose.

Shared leadership. In successful programs, agencies and their staff share both the leadership and the credit. Perhaps one agency will appear to dominate during a particular phase. For example, police often play a particularly prominent role when the program first enters a crime-ridden neighborhood because at that point, public safety concerns are paramount. In Lansing and Norfolk, for example, police preceded human service providers on the program scene. But ultimately, the philosophy and purpose of a program is undermined if the initiative does not soon incorporate other partners equally.

Community partnership programs require support from top officials, including money, personnel, and encouragement to depart from tradition.

Programs begin by building trust and offering benefits, but over the long term they must join with residents as real partners in problem solving.

Ability to deliver immediate tangible benefits. To gain the trust of residents in troubled communities and convince residents that it is worthwhile to open their doors and become involved, police and human service providers must show that they can deliver something of value to the neighborhood. The sooner they can do this, the better. Typically, they first demonstrate their ability to tackle problems of crime and disorder by closing down crack houses or disrupting open-air drug markets with extra patrols. Fear of crime may cripple a neighborhood as much as crime itself, and the mere presence of a community police officer on foot reassured some residents in the target areas. The three sites OJJDP visited were able to deliver such immediate benefits as repairs to residences, fast action on housing code violations, and expedited access to publicly supported day care. Each jurisdiction needs to carefully consider what benefits it can deliver right away, while taking care to avoid raising expectations that all problems can be quickly solved.

Commitment to empowering residents. Although programs begin by building trust and offering benefits, over the long term they must join with residents as real partners in problem solving. The programs visited by OJJDP started early to nurture the skills and abilities of residents. For individual families, this training sometimes involved individualized case planning and goal setting. For neighborhoods as a whole, programs held social events to reduce isolation, involved residents in neighborhood cleanups, and encouraged voter registration. Other activities included organized councils or associations where citizens could practice leadership and learn the basics of planning, budgeting, and decision making. In addition, programs sometimes provided residents more formal training, such as leadership or other areas of interests. City officials should be forewarned, however, that newly empowered citizens may learn how to fight city hall!

Qualified, committed staff. Successful programs require people who know the resources of their own agencies, are flexible enough to work outside traditional job descriptions, and are able to develop a rapport with community residents. Program staff consistently emphasized that flexible or unconventional schedules were necessary because many of their tasks could only be accomplished after regular business hours or on weekends.

Initial simplicity of organizational and budgetary arrangements. At least initially, jurisdictions should consider minimizing the bureaucracy involved in establishing programs like these. Instead they should start small enough to avoid the need for massive restructuring of agency budgets, policies, or personnel allocations. During their pilot phase, none of the programs visited by OJJDP developed interagency agreements to define the scope of their effort or the relative contributions of each agency. Only Norfolk's PACE, the biggest of the three programs, relied on an infusion of new resources, specifically to support the police component. Otherwise, both in Norfolk and elsewhere, agencies "donated" personnel. Agencies did not micromanage their staff, instead allowing them to experiment to find the best ways to accomplish the job. However, this open-minded approach does not mean programs can avoid facing structural, policy, and budgetary issues. Still, initial simplicity seems to foster successful and rapid program implementation and staff creativity.

Other positive factors. The seven factors that contribute to success were those most consistently observed in the three sites visited by OJJDP. Several additional factors appeared to be important ingredients of success in one or two of the sites. In Norfolk, the program could build on a long tradition of interagency and public-private partnerships. Norfolk's use of a multitiered committee structure, which provided roles for both management and line staff of partner agencies, also appeared to be a strength, since it fostered communication at all levels of the city bureaucracy. In Dade County and Lansing, placement of program offices in the targeted neighborhoods encouraged frequent contact between residents, police, and service providers and promoted a strong sense of program ownership.

Challenges or obstacles

Not surprisingly, neighborhood-based partnerships between police, service providers, and the community face a number of obstacles and challenges. Several challenges were characteristic of the programs visited by OJJDP.

Lack of stable, institutionalized funding commitments. Although simple organizational and budgetary arrangements have their value in the short run, over the longer run they place programs in a precarious position. Partnerships and partner obligations based primarily on a handshake are vulnerable when budgets crises occur or agency leadership changes. Staff positions that are "donated" and that sometimes lack official job descriptions can easily be reclaimed. Grants also are usually temporary; therefore, public agencies need to build a structure that can sustain programs beyond their pilot phase. One of the sites visited by OJJDP, Norfolk's PACE, is now facing this challenge, while the others see it looming on the horizon. Nevertheless, this predicament does not mean that programs should depend entirely on public funding. In fact, it builds a sense of community ownership when local businesses, churches, and neighborhood residents donate time and resources to the program and help it raise private contributions.

Partnership building as a long-term process. Effective partnerships between agency staff and a neighborhood's citizens will not develop overnight. Programs should initially expect considerable skepticism from citizens, and later expressions of disillusionment when agencies fail to meet some residents' expectations. Furthermore, partnership building among staff from diverse agencies takes time. Partners from different professional backgrounds at the program sites admitted that they did not necessarily speak the same language or perceive problems and priorities in the same way. They needed to develop a common language and translate their unique vision into common objectives and activities. Because new issues and new debates continue to arise, this process was an ongoing one.

Complexity of problems. Each of these programs began with the knowledge that the target neighborhoods had complex and challenging problems. Yet even seasoned staff were surprised by the complexity of some neighborhood issues, including the amount of attention that could be required to meet a single troubled family's needs. Dade County's Neighborhood Resource Team found,

Programs should initially expect skepticism from citizens and later disillusionment when agencies fail to meet some residents' expectations.

Programs face a continuous challenge in setting priorities and reconciling diverse interests, while retaining resident enthusiasm and participation.

for example, that with some families an initial assessment could take an entire day. Often, the process of grappling with community problems at the three sites indicated a need to recruit additional partners to the team.

Heterogeneity of neighborhoods. Even relatively small neighborhoods contain rival interest groups with different views of community needs. Property owners are often preoccupied with activities that protect their property values, while tenants are more concerned with recreation or tutoring programs for their children. Multiple citizens' associations sometimes compete for turf, or factions develop within groups. Lansing initially found, for example, that it was hard to reach a consensus about the optimum use of Neighborhood Network Center space. Programs face a continuous challenge in setting priorities and reconciling diverse interests, while retaining resident enthusiasm and participation.

Staff stress. Neighborhood-based programs demand much staff time and energy. For some staff, working outside the traditional framework with irregular demands and hours can be stressful. A bigger problem for staff working in a neighborhood is that they are constantly confronted, and sometimes overwhelmed by, the unmet needs of residents. Having become psychologically invested in the well-being of the residents, they often respond by working many hours beyond the standard 40-hour week—a situation that contributes to burnout. At each site, staff reported that this was a problem with no easy solution.

Other implementation issues

Programs of this type face a number of other implementation issues that policymakers and program developers need to consider.

Determining the partnership or staff team. Ideally, the needs of the neighborhood should guide the shaping of the partnership. Police, social services, health, housing, and code enforcement professionals play key roles in all the locations visited although their affiliations and specific responsibilities vary. School personnel play a critical role at one site and are involved to some degree at the other two. The three programs differ considerably, however, in the total number, types, and role of additional partners.

Defining target areas. Targeted areas in Dade County, Lansing, and Norfolk range in size from several hundred to several thousand residents. A key factor in defining target areas is the amount of territory that a single community police officer or community policing team can handle, but no hard and fast rules are available for making this determination because the nature of the crime problem, housing density, and many other variables will influence the equation. The three sites were conservative initially, but the teams expanded their target areas when it was warranted.

Matching personnel policies and practices to program needs. Personnel involved in programs of this type need flexible working hours and freedom from some traditional job requirements—such as, in the case of police officers, answering routine calls for service. In some cases, union agreements or agency

policies may pose obstacles. Another key consideration involves differences in personnel policies and practices, including salary levels, among the agencies that contribute to a multidisciplinary team. Although it is not necessary to have identical personnel policies and practices, partners should review these issues to avoid disparate treatment of staff who will be functioning as equals in the field.

Evaluating the program. Each of the programs visited has some data suggesting that program activities reduced reported crimes in target areas. However, none of the programs' staff has attempted to document how their services have affected other conditions of neighborhoods or families. Admittedly, results are hard to measure and busy staff are understandably reluctant to get bogged down in more paperwork. Nonetheless, agencies need to give increased attention to translating broad goals such as "improving quality of life" into performance indicators and developing a measurement strategy for them. Otherwise, program staff will be forced to depend primarily on anecdotal information or their self perceptions to judge their effectiveness. More important, top agency officials will lack the documentation they may need to justify continuing program funding or expansion.

Coping with popularity. Judging by the experience of Dade County, Lansing, and Norfolk, citizens and their elected representatives are attracted to these types of programs, however limited the evaluation evidence. Public officials should not be surprised if untargeted neighborhoods lobby to have the program extended to their areas. However, meeting these demands has two pitfalls. One is that the program may be pressured to expand too quickly before it has consolidated gains in the original target areas. The other is that the program may be pressured to move into areas of lesser need, simply because their residents have more political clout than residents of more troubled neighborhoods. One technique that may help combat the latter pitfall is to develop an impartial selection process, based on objective written criteria. Lansing has used this technique to select its community policing neighborhoods, with good results.

Conclusion

Communities around the Nation are experimenting with neighborhood-based partnerships that bring together local residents, police, and human service providers. They aim to reverse community deterioration by empowering neighborhoods and residents to address crime and delinquency, to access and use community services, and to revive a sense of neighborhood and community. Although these programs face many challenges, they have gained acceptance from neighborhood residents and public officials and appear to be making progress in improving the quality of life. Although the longer term outcomes of the programs have yet to be evaluated, other jurisdictions can learn valuable lessons from these programs and benefit from their early experiences.

The longer term outcomes of partnerships are undetermined, but other communities can learn valuable lessons from these programs.

For Further Information

To obtain more information about the three programs described in this report, contact the following sources.

The Neighborhood Resource Team, Dade County, Florida

Contact: Lt. Eleasa Brown
Metro-Dade Police Department
27325 South Dixie Highway
Miami, FL 33032
305–245–5330
305–245–8970 (fax)

The Neighborhood Network Center, Lansing, Michigan

Contact: Officer Don Christy
Neighborhood Network Center
735 East Michigan Avenue
Lansing, MI 48912
517–483–766

PACE, Norfolk, Virginia

Contact: Martha Raiss
Chairperson, PACE Support Group
302 City Hall Building
Norfolk, VA 23501
804–441–5272
804–626–0952 (fax)

*U.S. Government Printing Office: 1994 — 301-174/14296

Publications From OJJDP

The following lists OJJDP publications available from the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse. To obtain copies, call or write:

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20850
800–638–8736

Most OJJDP publications are available free of charge from the Clearinghouse; requests for more than 10 documents require payment for postage and handling. To obtain information on payment procedures or to speak to a juvenile justice information specialist about additional services offered, contact the Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 5:15 p.m., e.s.t.

Delinquency Prevention

Education in the Law: Promoting Citizenship in the Schools. 1990, NCJ 125548.

Mobilizing Community Support for Law-Related Education. 1989, NCJ 118217, $9.75.

OJJDP and Boys and Girls Clubs of America: Public Housing and High-Risk Youth. 1992, NCJ 128412.

Preserving Families To Prevent Delinquency. 1992, NCJ 136397.

Strengthening America's Families: Promising Parenting Strategies for Delinquency Prevention. 1993, NCJ 140781, $9.15.

Missing and Exploited Children

America's Missing and Exploited Children—Their Safety and Their Future. 1986, NCJ 100581.

Child Abuse—Prelude to Delinquency? 1985, NCJ 104275, $7.10.

Investigator's Guide to Missing Child Cases: For Law Enforcement Officers Locating Missing Children. 1987, NCJ 108768.

Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children in America, First Report: Numbers and Characteristics, National Incidence Studies. 1990, NCJ 123668, $14.40.

Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children in America, First Report: Numbers and Characteristics, National Incidence Studies—Executive Summary. 1990, NCJ 123667.

Missing Children: Found Facts. 1990, NCJ 130916.

Obstacles to the Recovery and Return of Parentally Abducted Children—Full Report. 1993, NCJ 144535, $22.80.

OJJDP Annual Report on Missing Children. 1990, NCJ 130582.

Sexual Exploitation of Missing Children: A Research Review. 1988, NCJ 114273.

Stranger Abduction Homicides of Children. 1989, NCJ 115213.

Status Offenders

Assessing the Effects of the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders. 1989, NCJ 115211.

Runaways in Juvenile Courts. 1990, NCJ 124881.

Law Enforcement

Drug Recognition Techniques: A Training Program for Juvenile Justice Professionals. 1990, NCJ 128795.

Evaluation of the Habitual Serious and Violent Juvenile Offender Program—Executive Summary. 1986, NCJ 105230.

Innovative Law Enforcement Training Programs: Meeting State and Local Needs. 1991, NCJ 131735.

Joint Investigations of Child Abuse. 1993, NCJ 142056.

Law Enforcement Custody of Juveniles: Video. 1992, NCJ 137387, $13.50.

Law Enforcement Custody of Juveniles: Video Training Guide. 1992, NCJ 133012.

Law Enforcement Policies and Practices Regarding Missing Children and Homeless Youth—Full Report. 1993, NCJ 143397, $13.00.

Targeting Serious Juvenile Offenders Can Make a Difference. 1988, NCJ 114218.

Courts

The Child Victim as a Witness. 1989, NCJ 118315.

Court Careers of Juvenile Offenders. 1988, NCJ 110854, $8.40.

Helping Victims and Witnesses in the Juvenile Justice System: A Program Handbook. 1991, NCJ 139731, $15.

Juvenile Court Property Cases. 1990, NCJ 125625.

Juvenile Court's Response to Violent Crime. 1989, NCJ 115338.

Juvenile Court Statistics 1990. 1993, NCJ 145127.

Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1990. 1993, NCJ 145128.

Offenders in Juvenile Court, 1989. 1992, NCJ 138740.

Restitution

Guide to Juvenile Restitution. 1985, NCJ 098466, $12.50.

Juvenile Restitution Management Audit. 1989, NCJ 115215.

Liability and Legal Issues in Juvenile Restitution. 1990, NCJ 115405.

National Directory of Juvenile Restitution Programs 1987. 1987, NCJ 105188.

National Trends in Juvenile Restitution Programming. 1989, NCJ 115214.

Restitution and Juvenile Recidivism. 1992, NCJ 137774.

Restitution Experience in Youth Employment: A Monograph and Training Guide to Jobs Components. 1989, NCJ 115404.

Restitution Improvement Curriculum: A Guidebook for Juvenile Restitution Workshop Planners. 1988, NCJ 110007.

Corrections

American Probation and Parole Association's Drug Testing Guidelines and Practices for Juvenile Probation and Parole Agencies. 1992, NCJ 136450.

Conditions of Confinement: Juvenile Detention and Corrections Facilities—Research Summary. 1994, NCJ 141873.

Desktop Guide to Good Juvenile Probation Practice. 1991, NCJ 128218.

National Juvenile Custody Trends: 1978–1989. 1992, NCJ 131649.

National Survey of Reading Programs for Incarcerated Juvenile Offenders. 1993, NCJ 144017.

OJJDP Helps States Remove Juveniles From Adult Jails and Lockups. 1990, NCJ 126869.

Private-Sector Corrections Program for Juveniles: Paint Creek Youth Center. 1988, NCJ 113214.

Privatizing Juvenile Probation Services: Five Local Experiences. 1988, NCJ 121507.

Public Juvenile Facilities: Children in Custody 1989. 1991, NCJ 127189.

Reduced Recidivism and Increased Employment Opportunity Through Research-Based Reading Instruction. 1993, NCJ 141324, $7.70.

General Juvenile Justice

Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders. 1993, NCJ 143453.

Gould-Wysinger Awards (1992): Mark of Achievement. 1993, NCJ 142730.

Guide to the Data Sets in the National Juvenile Court Data Archive. 1991, NCJ 132073.

Habitual Juvenile Offenders: Guidelines for Citizen Action and Public Responses. 1991, NCJ 141235.

Juvenile Justice. Volume 1, Number 2, Fall/Winter 1993, NCJ 145300.

Juvenile Justice. Volume 1, Number 1, Spring/Summer 1993, NCJ 141870.

Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System. 1992, NCJ 139556, $11.50.

Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System—Research Summary. 1993, NCJ 145849.

OJJDP Brochure. 1993, BC 144527.

OJJDP Funds 21 New Projects During Fiscal Year 1988. 1989, NCJ 116872.

Urban Delinquency and Substance Abuse: Initial Findings—Research Summary. 1993, NCJ 143454.

Violent Juvenile Offenders: An Anthology. 1984, NCJ 095108, $28.00.

Statistics

National Juvenile Justice Statistics Assessment: An Agenda for Action. 1989, NCJ 119764.

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

Washington, D.C. 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/OJJDP
Permit No. G-91

NCJ 147483