



Association of
Prosecuting Attorneys

Innovations in Criminal Justice Summit
2011 Conference Report

Hon. John T. Chisholm
Chairman & Milwaukee County
District Attorney

David LaBahn
President, CEO

Steven Jansen
Vice-President, COO



PROSECUTOR'S REPORT V

© 2011 by the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys

All rights reserved. No part of the publication may be reproduced in any manner without written permission.

This project was supported by Grant No. 2010-DG-BX-K027 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Association of Prosecuting Attorneys

1615 L St. NW, Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20036

www.APAInc.org

Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs

United States Department of Justice

810 Seventh Street NW

Washington, DC 20531

<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA>



Association of
Prosecuting Attorneys

Innovations in Criminal Justice Summit

2011 Conference Report

Hon. John T. Chisholm
Chairman & Milwaukee County
District Attorney

David LaBahn
President, CEO

Steven Jansen
Vice-President, COO



PROSECUTOR'S REPORT V

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Association of Prosecuting Attorneys would like to thank the following people for serving as faculty during the Summit: Hallie Fader-Towe, Courts Senior Policy Analyst, Council of State Governments; Melissa A. Knopp, Esq., Specialized Docket Section Manager, Supreme Court of Ohio; Robin Steinberg, Executive Director, The Bronx Defenders; Seann Riley, Deputy Project Director, Center for Holistic Defense; Kristin Conklin, Assistant District Attorney, Rockland County, NY; Lt. Robert Donaldson, Special Operations, Clarkstown Police Department; Clinton Lacey, Deputy Commissioner of Adult Operations, NYC Department of Probation; Wayne McKenzie, General Counsel, NYC Department of Probation; Susan Segal, City Attorney, Minneapolis, MN; Lois Conroy, Assistant City Attorney II and Downtown 100 Leader, Minneapolis City Attorney's Office; Martha Holton Dimick, Deputy City Attorney, Minneapolis City Attorney's Office; Inspector Kris Arneson, First Precinct, Minneapolis Police Department; Gail Baez, Senior Attorney and Head of Community Prosecution, Hennepin County Attorney's Office; Shane Zahn, Operations Director, Minneapolis Downtown Improvement District; Dominick Bouza, Operations Manager, Salvation Army; Monica Nilsson, Director, St. Stephen's Homeless Outreach; Bill Hobson, Executive Director, Downtown Emergency Services Center; Jens Ludwig, Director, University of Chicago Crime Lab; Mallory O'Brien, Ph.D., Director, Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission; Jacob Corr, Community Prosecution Team Captain, Milwaukee County District Attorney's Office; Commander Robert Nash (Ret.), Nashville Police Department; Natalie Kroovand-Hipple, Research Specialist, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University; Honorable Steven Alm, Judge, First Judicial Circuit, Hawaii; Cheryl Inouye, Integrated Community Sanctions Section Administrator, Adult Client Services Branch, State of Hawaii; Debbie Boar, Task Force Coordinator; Harlem Community Justice Center; and Chris Watler, Project Director, Harlem Community Justice Center. The Summit would not have been a success without your hard work and dedication to innovative criminal justice practices.

We would also like to thank Honorable Anita Alvarez, Cook County (IL) State's Attorney; Judge Paul Biebel, Jr., Criminal Division Presiding Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County (IL); Honorable Abishi Cunningham, Cook County Public Defender; Kim Ball, J.D., Senior Policy Advisor for Adjudication, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice; Honorable Patricia Banks, Elder Law and Miscellaneous Remedies Division Presiding Judge, Circuit Court of Cook County (IL); Honorable John Chisholm, Milwaukee County District Attorney; and Seth Williams, Philadelphia District Attorney for their attendance and remarks during the Summit.

APA owes much gratitude to CCI for their continued efforts and collaboration in providing trainings and resources to criminal justice professionals. Special thanks to David LaBahn, Steven Jansen, Julius Lang, Brett Taylor, Robert Hood, Syrita Simpkins, Kelsey Doty, Gena Gonzales and Emily Gold for their work before, during and after the Summit. APA and CCI would also like to extend many thanks to BJA for their continuous support and dedication to innovation in the criminal justice field.

Innovations in Criminal Justice Summit

2011 Conference Report

Preface

In difficult economic times, with shrinking budgets and rising costs, it is more important than ever to efficiently and effectively manage the operations of the criminal justice system. To meet this challenge, criminal justice agencies are increasingly turning to innovative, cost-effective interventions that show promise in improving public safety while providing effective alternatives to incarceration. These “bottom up” innovations are numerous and often catalysts for more widespread systemic reform within their local criminal justice systems.

But the innovators behind these reforms face a range of challenges. These practices are often locally grown and therefore operate under the national radar, limiting attention in the field that could support both program development and replication. When news of the promising practice does spread, jurisdictions may not have the materials and support needed to ensure successful implementation. Advocates of these interventions may also have a difficult time measuring outcomes that demonstrate the program’s value.

The concept for the *Innovations in Criminal Justice Summit* was born in an effort to support practitioners in tackling these challenges. The Association of Prosecuting Attorneys (APA), in partnership with the U.S. Department of Justice’s Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) and the Center for Court Innovation (CCI), sought to generate well-deserved attention around a group of promising interventions. The goals of the summit were two-fold: first, to arm participants with a concrete understanding of ten effective practices that can be brought back to their home jurisdictions, and second, to celebrate an increasing national commitment to innovation in the field. As Kim Ball, Senior Policy Advisor at BJA, said in her opening remarks, “it takes a long time to implement innovation—and it’s not easy. This conference is a well-timed opportunity to support innovators and learn from their experiences.” The conference attracted a multi-disciplinary group of practitioners—judges, prosecutors, defenders, law enforcement, etc.—from around the country (as well as a few international guests). The attendees’ professional diversity reflected the reality that today’s innovations are often built on a strategic partnership of relevant public agencies and community-based partners.

The summit was hosted in Chicago, IL, a city well-known for testing new ideas within its justice system. In recent years, Chicago has employed innovative strategies to target gun possession among gang members, create specialized prosecution units to address issues like human trafficking and mortgage fraud, and bring resources to the local level by creating neighborhood-based community justice centers. The city is also home to the University of Chicago’s renowned Crime Lab which was a recipient of the 2011 I.C.E (Innovative Community Engagement) Award presented at the Summit for their work in criminal justice evaluation and best practices.

This report provides a summary of the summit, including a description of the ten highlighted innovations, how they were selected, and the common themes drawn from them as a whole. The report concludes with a look forward at possible next steps for the field in continuing the process of fostering and promoting reform, both locally and at the national level.

Selection Process for 10 Innovative Practices

Setting out to choose just ten practices among the thousands of innovations around the country was a formidable task. To guide the selection process, APA staff convened a blue ribbon committee in March 2011 consisting of representatives from a range of local and national agencies, including the Bureau of Justice Assistance and the Center for Court Innovation. Other members of the committee included representatives from the American Probation and Parole Association, International Association of Chiefs of Police, National Criminal Justice Association, National Legal Aid and Defender Association, University of Chicago Crime Lab and the Urban Institute. The committee began by conducting online research and soliciting nominations through professional associations and listservs, looking for programs that fostered collaboration between multiple criminal justice partners. The programs' objectives differed, but they were all animated by the broader goals of increasing public safety and cost-efficiency.

The committee used the following domains and accompanying questions to evaluate each of the nominated programs:

- **Clarity of the problem and program design**
Does the innovation clearly identify the problem it aims to address?
What is the gravity and national relevance of the problem?
How clear is the program design?
- **Type and level of support**
What level of support has the program received from policymakers?
How has the media been involved, and how do they portray the program?
- **Evaluation results**
Has an implementation or impact evaluation and/or cost-benefit analysis been conducted?
If the initiative has been replicated, is there research about the effectiveness of the replications?
- **Opportunities for replication**
Is the program design 'teachable'?
What front-end costs are required?

By asking these guiding questions, the selection committee identified ten programs out of nearly 40 nominations.

Highlighted Innovations for 2011

The ten innovations featured at the 2011 summit were a diverse group. Some are being tested contemporaneously for the first-time; others are iterations of longer-standing criminal justice approaches. They have different lead agencies, different goals, and a range of driving philosophies and operational strategies. Despite these differences, they share a handful of common themes that were explored during the summit's plenary sessions: leadership; broad-based partnerships; systemic reform; data-driven strategies; cost-effective outcomes; and focused problem-solving philosophy. Each innovation, as well as these five broad themes, are described below.

1811 Eastlake (Seattle, WA)

Problem: A significant number of homeless and chronic public drinkers were cycling through Seattle's emergency rooms, jails, and other crisis institutions, consuming large amounts of taxpayer-funded services in the healthcare and criminal justice systems. A list of 388 chronic homeless individuals were identified as the highest utilizers of these services.

Innovation: Created in 2005, 1811 Eastlake is a 75-unit residential building aimed at providing a safe, supportive environment where "pre-recovery" individuals are encouraged—but not required—to reduce their drinking and receive treatment. The facility provides round-the-clock support for its residents, including chemical dependency counseling, nursing support, meals, and general supervision. Facility rules restrict alcohol, but do not outright prohibit it in an effort not to alienate the very people it is designed to serve.

Collaborators: The King County Mental Health Chemical Abuse and Dependency Services Division, the Public Health Department, and the Downtown Emergency Service Center are the primary partners.

Evaluation: A *Journal of American Medical Association (JAMA)* study found that the program saved taxpayers more than \$4,000,000 over the first year of operation. During the first six months, the study reported an average net cost-savings of 53 percent—nearly \$2,500 per month per person in health and social services, compared to the costs of a wait-list control group of comparable homeless persons. The study also found reduced drinking and intoxication by program participants that continued to improved over time, with some residents attaining sobriety.

The Bronx Defenders (New York, NY)

Problem: The traditional justice process may do little to address the root causes of a defendant's involvement in the system, such as addiction, mental illness, and joblessness. Furthermore, a "win" in court (e.g. a dismissal or acquittal) may still have significant collateral consequences and/or leave defendants feeling dissatisfied with how they were treated in the process.

Innovation: The Bronx Defenders is a holistic public defender office located in the South Bronx in New York City. Holistic defense combines aggressive legal advocacy with a broader recognition that for most poor people arrested and charged with a crime, the criminal case is not the only issue with which they struggle. Interdisciplinary teams of criminal, civil, and family defense lawyers, social workers, parent advocates,

COMMON THEME:

Leadership

Strong leadership is an obvious but essential ingredient to spurring and sustaining innovation. **"Leadership is the ability to see innovation and change by motivating awareness and facilitating action,"** APA Vice-President Steven Jansen said during the conference.

Leadership requires involving staff at all levels of an organization and getting the requisite buy-in. **"Innovation often starts with a leader's vision,"** said Wayne McKenzie of the New York City Department of Probation. **"But you can't take off running with the plan without first building the support of the rank and file staff. Most staff have seen several commissioners come and go: they can wait you out."**

investigators, and community organizers work with clients and their families to identify and overcome the challenges they face, both legal and non-legal.

Collaborators: The Bronx Defenders is built upon multi-disciplinary teams of advocates, including criminal and civil attorneys, social workers, and investigators who all work as equal members of the defense team. The organization also collaborates with a range of community-partners and service providers.

Evaluation: Practicing holistic defense has shown promising results for clients. Clients who are in the process of addressing some of their underlying life issues generally fare better either when plea-bargaining or at trial because, according to Project Director Alex Sierck, holistically-oriented public defenders seek to broaden the scope of their representation and convince justice system stakeholders such as judges and prosecutors about the importance and necessity of looking at the whole client. Case outcomes are also better (and defense counsel more likely to render effective assistance of counsel) when clients are fully informed of the collateral consequences of their criminal case and therefore are in a better position to make a truly informed choice about how to proceed. Clients of holistic defenders tend to come away from their experience with increased confidence in their representation in the criminal justice system. An independent evaluation is currently being undertaken by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

**COMMON THEME:
Broad-Based Partnerships**

Partners are valuable sources of the ideas, resources, and support needed to launch and sustain new programs. Shauna Boliker, First Assistant State's Attorney in Cook County (IL), said during the summit's opening remarks, **"without our partners, none of us could be doing what we are."**

The Downtown 100 program in Minneapolis has brought together a wide range of partners to address their crime problems. Of the group, Assistant City Attorney Lois Conroy has said, **"the right partners for the Downtown 100 were the public and private entities that shared our common goals to reduce crime, help improve offenders' lives and a willingness to innovate solutions to long-standing crime problems."**

Downtown 100 Initiative (Minneapolis, MN)

Problem: Open-air drug dealing and property crimes in downtown Minneapolis created an environment that felt unsafe to local residents and workers and was not conducive to the vitality of the city's economic hub.

Innovation: The Downtown 100 initiative, started in April 2010, seeks to improve the safety of downtown Minneapolis through a holistic, team-based prosecution approach towards the area's most chronic property and drug crime offenders. Prosecutors are co-located in the downtown police precinct, and targeted offenders are

assigned to a designated prosecutor, allowing for more consistent case outcomes.

Collaborators: The initiative involves a collaboration between the Minneapolis Police Department, Minneapolis City Attorney's Office, the SafeZone, the Hennepin County Attorney's Office, St. Stephen's, Hennepin County Community Corrections, the Salvation Army, 1st Precinct neighborhood associations and other community and business stakeholders. The project is funded by the Minneapolis Downtown Improvement District (DID).

Evaluation: The initiative has resulted in a significant reduction in recidivism by the Downtown 100 offenders, along with the provision of housing and treatment services for the offenders who are in need of such assistance. Statistics kept by the program indicate serious crime in the downtown business area has been reduced by 11% and 50% of offenders were housed at the end of 2010, 36 % received chemical dependency services and 32% received mental health services. There was a 74% reduction in recidivism by Downtown 100 offenders.

Hawaii's Opportunity Probation through Enforcement (HOPE) program (Honolulu, HI)

Problem: Felony probationers were escaping sanction for repeated probation violations, only to be recommended for revocation and lengthy prison sentences after the violations mounted up. Enforcement was both unpredictable and disproportionate.

Innovation: In 2004, First Circuit Judge Steven Alm launched a pilot program called HOPE Probation aimed at reducing probation violations by drug offenders and others at high risk of recidivism. Probationers in HOPE are subjected to random drug testing and receive swift, predictable, and immediate sanctions—typically resulting in several days in jail—for each detected violation, such as detected drug use or missed appointments with a probation officer. “HOPE is a mechanism to make everything else in probation work better,” said Judge Alm.

Collaborators: The project's primary collaborators are the First Circuit Court and the Hawaii Department of Probation. The Federal Fugitive Task Force and Attorney General's Office each provided support during the project's pilot.

Evaluation: An independent impact evaluation concluded that HOPE participants were significantly less likely to miss their probation appointments or test positive for drug use than traditional probationers. And while HOPE participants were more than three times as likely to have their probation status revoked, they served approximately the same number of days in jail.

Mental Health Courts (nationwide)

Problem: A significant number of criminal defendants have mental health issues that contribute to their frequent contact with the justice system. Traditional courts are often unprepared to effectively respond to those issues and link defendants to needed treatment and social services.

Innovation: Mental health courts are specialized criminal court dockets for certain defendants with mental illnesses. Mental health courts seek to use a problem-solving model to improve public safety, court operations, and the well-being of people with mental illness by linking to court-supervised, community-based treatment defendants whose mental illness is related to their current criminal justice involvement and whose participation in the mental health court will not create an increased risk to public safety. Participants are identified through mental health screening and assessment and voluntarily participate in a judicially supervised treatment plan developed jointly by a team of court staff and mental health professionals.

Collaborators: Mental health courts are a collaboration of the court system, prosecutor's office, defenders, and an array of local mental health and other service providers.

Evaluation: A small but growing body of research indicates that mental health courts, compared to traditional courts: can help to reduce recidivism, even after graduation when individuals are no longer under court supervision; are more effective at connecting offenders with mental health treatment services; and have the potential to save money through reduced recidivism (and the associated jail and court costs that are avoided) and the decreased use of the most expensive treatment options, such as inpatient care.

COMMON THEME: *Systemic Reform*

Implementing innovation can require changes within not only one office, but an entire criminal justice system. Because of this, corralling partners under a common vision is not always easy. **“It's hard enough to get clients to change—getting systems to change is even tougher,”** said Chris Watler, project director of the Harlem Community Justice Center.

Alex Sierck, Project Director at The Bronx Defender's Center for Holistic Defense, explains that, **“as holistic defenders we are seeking nothing less than a wholesale revolution in the way the justice system sees our clients. We are demanding an acknowledgement by justice system stakeholders . . . and seek support from the justice system as we attempt to change [our client's] circumstances in an effort to stabilize lives and to help people leave behind the criminal justice system permanently.”**

Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission (Milwaukee, WI)

Problem: The Milwaukee District Attorney’s Office and Police Department sought to better utilize crime data to reduce the city’s homicide rate, particularly domestic violence homicides.

Innovation: The Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission approaches violence from a public health perspective, which focuses on prevention and improving the health and safety of the population as a whole. The Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission (MHRC) strives to reduce homicide and non-fatal shootings through a multi-level, multi-disciplinary and multi-agency homicide review process. The MHRC makes recommendations based on trends identified through the case review process, ranging from micro-level law enforcement strategies and tactics to macro-level policy change.

Collaborators: The MHRC is comprised of law enforcement professionals, criminal justice professionals, and community service providers who meet regularly to exchange information regarding the city’s homicides and identify methods of prevention from both public health and criminal justice perspectives.

Evaluation: A study by the National Institute of Justice concluded that MHRC was associated with a statistically significant reduction in homicides in Milwaukee. The NIJ study showed there was a 52% decrease in the monthly homicide count in districts participating in MHRC review versus a 9.2% reduction in control districts.

COMMON THEME: *Data-Driven Strategies*

Data analysis provides essential guidance in both the planning and implementation phases of successful interventions. **“In order to be effective and efficient,”** says Rockland County Assistant District Attorney Kristen Conklin, **“data is one of the elements that needs to be combined with information and knowledge to make focused, intelligent decisions.”**

Analyzing data is at the heart of models like the Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission. **“Getting the police department to open up their databases to outside analysis was not easy, though,”** said Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission director Mallory O’Brien. **“I had to convince them that I wasn’t there to criticize their work, but rather to look for opportunities for intervention.”**

Nashville Drug Market Initiative (Nashville, TN)

Problem: Crime data in certain areas of Nashville showed that a relatively small group of chronic offenders were responsible for a sizeable open-air drug market and much of its associated crime and violence. Traditional policing strategies did not seem to be having a lasting effect on those areas.

Innovation: The Drug Market Initiative (DMI) strategy, first implemented in High Point, North Carolina, is a focused, data-driven, problem-solving program aimed at permanently closing down open-air drug markets. Implementation calls for an assessment of the local drug market through crime mapping and incident reviews to delineate the nature of the drug market and identify the sellers involved in it. Law enforcement use undercover buys to build cases against the key players. Major players and violent offenders are prosecuted traditionally with heavy sentences sought, while lower-level offenders are invited to a community “call in” meeting at which law enforcement and prosecutors explain that their next act of dealing or violence will result in immediate prosecution. Individuals at the call in are offered a broad array of social services to help get their lives on the right track.

Collaborators: DMI is led by law enforcement, prosecutors, and local community leaders, with support from community-based service providers.

Evaluation: A formal impact evaluation conducted by the University of Michigan found that there was a statistically significant decline in drug offenses and crime overall in the neighborhoods targeted by DMI.

New York City Department of Probation (New York, NY)

Problem: Previous case management strategies utilized a “trail ‘em and nail ‘em” philosophy, erring on the side of revocation in the face of probation violations to minimize risk. This approach lost credibility among the courts and did little to support probationers ready to make positive changes. Also, while the majority of probationers live in a handful of specific neighborhood in the city, centralized reporting meant that probationers had to travel lengthy distances to meet with their probation officers.

Innovation: The New York City Department of Probation is creating an individualized and neighborhood-based approach to probation. Staff will use probationer input and a validated risk/needs assessment instrument to develop an “Individual Achievement Plan (IAP)” for every probationer. The risk assessment will help staff dedicate scarce resources to the highest need clients. The IAPs will also utilize a series of incentives for good behavior that build on probationers’ assets. Community-based Neighborhood Opportunity Networks (“NeONs”) will be established in five selected neighborhoods in the city to allow high-use communities to have easier access to their assigned probation officer, as well as co-located community partners.

Collaborators: The New York City Department of Probation is working with the State Office of Probation and Correctional Alternatives and the Council of Probation Administrators to effectuate changes both in how a probationer’s individualized case plan is developed and how the probationer has access to their probation officer. Probation is also contracting with community-based organizations to provide academic, vocational, and mentoring programs.

Evaluation: Once enacted, these initiatives aim to create a system whereby (1) people’s length of probation will be longer or shorter based on their initial risk and offense severity and (2) they can earn further reductions in their probation terms based on their behavior. The goal is to (1) reduce recidivism; (2) save probation costs and (3) save jail costs.

Rockland County Community Prosecution (Rockland County, NY)

Problem: Statistical analysis provides only a partial picture of a community’s crime and associated problems. With prosecutors working in centralized offices, they have a limited perspective on those issues and how to best serve their constituents.

Innovation: In 2008, Rockland County District Attorney Thomas Zugibe implemented a community prosecution strategy called IL3CP (Intelligence Led Approach to Public Safety through Community Policing, Community Prosecution and Community Partnerships). The initiative embraced the community prosecution philosophy among all levels of staffing and assigned Assistant District Attorneys (ADAs) to work primarily out of the local police agency(s) in specific towns and/or villages. These ADAs attend local community meetings, whether formal or informal, to develop relationships with residents to help identify local concerns. In addition to vigorous prosecutions, solutions to specific issues often take more non-traditional responses, i.e. mediation or civil action, as opposed to solely focusing on prosecution.

Collaborators: Community prosecution is built on the collaboration between the district attorney’s office, law enforcement, and the community, including local business associations, neighborhood watch groups, school representatives, religious leaders, and other community groups.

COMMON THEME:

Cost-Effective Outcomes

In the current economic climate, being able to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of a new intervention may be its best selling point.

Even small-scale outcomes can translate into significant cost-savings.

“Staff on the ground level may not notice a 6% reduction in recidivism,” said Jens Ludwig of the University of Chicago Crime Lab, **“but that small drop can translate into huge savings when you do a benefit-cost analysis. An intervention that makes even a small dent can pay for itself.”**

Evaluation: IL3CP has demonstrated promising statistics in reducing recidivism. A cost-savings analysis is currently pending.

**COMMON THEME:
Focused Problem-Solving**

Thinking outside the box can help tackle even the most entrenched problems.

“One of the reasons HOPE worked is that Probation was willing to try something new,” said Judge Alm of Hawaii’s Opportunity Probation through Enforcement. **“We all agreed that what we had been doing wasn’t working, so we were open to trying something different.”**

Upper Manhattan Reentry Task Force (New York, NY)

Problem: New York City has been the biggest provider of inmates in New York State, and the vast majority come from about seven city neighborhoods, including Harlem. Upper Manhattan has about 36 percent of Manhattan’s residents, but approximately half of all individuals returning from incarceration.

Innovation: In October of 2007, the Center for Court Innovation, in partnership with the New York City’s Mayor’s Office of the Criminal Justice Coordinator, created the Upper Manhattan Reentry Task Force. The Task Force is housed in the Harlem Community Justice Center, a community-based court and resource center that works to solve neighborhood problems in East and Central Harlem. The Task Force aims to enhance coordination between local precincts and parole, promote the community’s understanding of reentry, achieve access to a living wage, social services, and housing for reentrants, develop social capital for reentrants through civic engagement, and encourage a more effective discharge planning process.

Collaborators: The Task Force is a partnership between the Center for Court Innovation, the New York City’s Mayor’s Office of the Criminal Justice Coordinator, the New York State Division of Parole, and a host of community-based leaders and service providers.

Evaluation: A formal evaluation of the Reentry Task Force is currently in progress.

For more information on individual programs and to obtain implementation guides, please visit the Innovative Criminal Justice Programs page on the APA website at www.APAInc.org.

If you would like more detailed information or to contact a project or program director, please email your request to info@APAInc.org.

Looking Ahead

The inaugural year of the *Innovations in Criminal Justice Summit* celebrated the beginning of a newfound tradition in the field of sharing what works among a diverse group of agency and community-based partners. Through the presentations and dialogue at the summit, the aim is for innovative players nationwide to continue the conversation among themselves as they pursue innovative solutions to today's (and tomorrow's) challenges. The following questions may serve as a guide for this discourse:

What is the problem?

Narrowing in on an issue to tackle can be overwhelming, but framing the problem is a crucial first step in finding an effective response. “HOPE really grew out of a specific problem,” said Judge Alm. “From the first week in state court, I could tell that the probation system wasn’t working well for a lot of people. The problem was obvious: probation as usual was delayed, uncertain, and when something finally happened, it was severe.”

Identifying the problem first will reduce the temptation to waste time and resources responding to the wrong issue. When Commander Bob Nash learned about the “overnight miracle” that seemed to happen after the Drug Market Initiative was launched in High Point, NC, he asked an important question before proceeding with a replication effort: does Nashville have neighborhoods with an open-air drug market problem? The answer was yes in Nashville, but might not be in all jurisdictions.

What promising or evidence-based solutions might work here?

As the evidence-based practices movement continues to gain steam, there is no shortage of publicity around criminal justice interventions with documented results. Jens Ludwig advises: “Don’t limit your ‘best practices’ search to criminal justice.” Scour other fields for good ideas and inspiration. And don’t hold your breath waiting for the silver bullet solution: “Ten interventions that are each able to reduce recidivism by 5% are more feasible than one miracle that will reduce recidivism by 50%,” said Ludwig.

Also, keep it simple. “Criminal justice logic says that you have to worry about everything,” said Ludwig, “which leads to ‘kitchen sink’ or ‘synergy’ interventions. But those are hard to do small, let alone at scale.” Start with a manageable pilot that directly addresses the identified problem.

Who are the right partners?

Seek out partners who are willing to take a risk and try something new. “It’s always exciting to meet with folks who are interested in trying something new,” said Judge Alm. In Hawaii, that key partner was the department of probation. In New York City, Chris Watler identified the state division of parole as a crucial partner and in Minneapolis, City Attorney Susan Segal sought out service providers and the local county prosecutor’s office as key partners for the Downtown 100 program.

Be strategic about who will lead the front, too. “Build out a good team,” said Watler. “Don’t just pick the most senior or the most convenient person to lead a new initiative.” As Wayne McKenzie at the New York City Department of Probation explained, “among the top five leaders at Probation, we all had experience in system changes in the criminal justice system, even if we didn’t have experience with probation.”

How can collaboration be leveraged to our advantage?

Cultivating buy-in through group problem-solving—both with line staff and with agency partners—can be a good investment. “If you want folks to land with you,” said Wayne McKenzie, “they have to take off with you. You have to include the rank and file—the individuals responsible for carrying out your vision—in the planning phases.” In developing the Upper Manhattan Reentry Task Force, project staff worked closely with Parole to shape the project. “We enhanced parole operations *with* Parole,” said Chris Watler. “That kind of joint problem-solving really helped bring people together.”

Also, think about who can help unblock the roadblocks that stand in the way of successful implementation. In Minneapolis, the business community was a driving force behind the Downtown 100 program, bringing financial and political mobilization strengths to the project. The 1811 Eastlake project in Seattle was met with much opposition from NIMBY-ists (Not In My Backyard) during the planning and initial implementation phases. Bill Hobson, director of Downtown Emergency Services that operates 1811 Eastlake, says the most natural partners were those with the “same goals as homeless providers; the business community plagued by panhandling who want chronic homeless off the streets, law enforcement that continuously deal with the same offenders, and emergency departments in hospitals that serve indigent populations.” With these partners supporting the project and evidence of cost avoidance on public health and criminal justice systems as a result of the program, other NIMBYism opponents were assuaged with promises of responsible management of the project. “Well thought out planning, detailed organization and supportive evidence in the initial stages can help the project maneuver roadblocks throughout the entire planning process,” says Hobson.

How will we demonstrate success?

Concrete, measurable outcomes help show the value of a program—more powerfully than anecdotes alone. While it can be difficult to identify evaluation partners and funding sources, Jens Ludwig said that “the money is there for evaluation. Academics are dying to link with local organizations and can help write grant proposals.”

Judge Alm used data collection services offered by the state’s attorney in the early days of HOPE. This allowed the program to launch without any funding. “By the time we needed to ask for funding from the state, we had demonstrated favorable results that we could show them,” said Alm. Rethinking the types of metrics to track can be useful: the Minneapolis City Attorney’s Office now reports on metrics such as the community’s perceptions of public safety, in addition to prosecution statistics.

How can we promote innovation—both ours and our neighbors’?

Promoting the success of an innovation can help sustain support through the inevitable ups and downs of program implementation. “When you are able to show positive results early on, it’s going to be more difficult for someone to come in and change things up,” said Wayne McKenzie. Likewise, publicizing success can help reinforce support from community partners and allies—working to solidify their investment in the process and help see it through. Rockland County Assistant District Attorney Kristen Conklin says “we have found something that truly works in practice; we will leave it up to Washington to see if it works in theory.”

Seek out other innovators outside of your jurisdiction who are taking risks and trying new things. Innovators should be “partners in crisis,” as Cook County Judge Paul Biebel, Jr. said during the Summit. Doing so will not only breathe fresh ideas into your own jurisdiction, but will help cultivate awareness for promising practices and a robust network of innovative practitioners at the national level.

Conclusion

There are far more than ten promising innovations across the criminal justice field today. Due to their very nature as locally generated interventions, many more comparably impressive programs exist nationwide—undetected by the larger field—each making significant contributions to reform. As Kim Ball of the Bureau of Justice Assistance explained of the innovations featured at the Summit, “these ten were selected only among the ones the committee knew about. Let us know what you’re doing in your jurisdiction.”

To be notified about the next Innovations in Criminal Justice Summit, follow APA on www.APAInc.org.

DRAFT