

## **STRATEGIC GOAL TWO: Prevent and Reduce Crime and Violence by Assisting State, Tribal, Local and Community–Based Programs**

---

To provide leadership in the area of crime prevention and control, the Department of Justice (DOJ) continually searches for ways to strengthen the criminal and juvenile justice capabilities of state, local and tribal governments. Three DOJ components are at the forefront of the Department's efforts to fortify community safety across the nation. The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) administers formula and discretionary grant programs, as well as provides targeted training and technical assistance on a wide range of criminal and juvenile justice system improvements. In addition, OJP conducts research, evaluates programs and collects and publishes crime-related statistical information. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) supports local efforts to hire and deploy additional police officers and adopt community policing practices. And finally, the Community Relations Service (CRS) assists state and local officials and civic leaders to prevent and resolve disputes and conflicts emanating from racial or ethnic tension. In support of this strategic goal, the Department's OJP assists the state, local, and tribal governments through its Bureaus and Program Offices.

In support of Strategic Goal II, OJP works in partnership with federal, state, local and tribal governments to carry out its mission to improve the nation's capacity to prevent and control crime, administer justice, and assist crime victims. Its five Bureaus administer a variety of activities:

The *Bureau of Justice Assistance* (BJA) provides leadership and assistance in support of state, local and tribal justice strategies to achieve safer communities. Its program activities focus on reducing and preventing crime, violence and drug abuse and improving the overall functioning of the criminal justice system.

The *Bureau of Justice Statistics* (BJS), the statistical arm of the Department, collects and reports on a portfolio of statistics focusing on crime and the operation of the justice system. BJS, through its grant activities, also assists state and local governments with the development of justice information systems and the collection, analysis and dissemination of statistical data.

The *National Institute of Justice* (NIJ) is the principal federal agency for research on crime. Its role is to build knowledge regarding "best practices" and "lessons learned" and to develop tools and technologies to help the criminal justice community prevent and control crime.

The *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention* (OJJDP) provides national leadership, coordination and resources to develop, implement and support effective methods to prevent and respond to juvenile delinquency and child victimization.

The *Office for Victims of Crime* (OVC) provides federal resources to support victims' assistance and compensation programs around the country. OVC activities enhance the nation's capacity to assist crime victims and provide leadership in changing the attitudes, policies and practices to promote justice and healing for all crime victims.

In addition, OJP's six program offices administer program activities designed to assist state, local and tribal governments as follows:

The *Corrections Program Office* (CPO) provides financial and technical assistance to state, local and tribal governments to implement correction-related programs, including corrections facility construction and corrections-based drug treatment programs.

The *Drug Court Program Office* (DCPO) supports the development, implementation and improvement of drug courts by providing resources, training and technical assistance to state, local, and tribal governments, and courts.

The *Violence Against Women Office (VAWO)* coordinates the Department's legislative and other initiatives relating to violence against women and administers a series of grant programs to help prevent, detect, and stop violence against women, including domestic violence, stalking and sexual assault.

The *Executive Office for Weed and Seed (EOWS)* helps communities build stronger, safer neighborhoods by implementing the Weed and Seed strategy, a community-based, multi-disciplinary approach to combating crime.

The *Office for State and Local Domestic Preparedness Support (OSLDPS)* is responsible for enhancing the capacity and capability of state and local jurisdictions to prepare for and respond to incidents of domestic terrorism.

The *Office of the Police Corps and Law Enforcement Education (OPCLEE)* provides college educational assistance and professional leadership training to students who commit to public service in law enforcement, and scholarships with no service commitment to dependents of law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty.

## MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

There are no existing material weaknesses that will hinder the achievement of goals in this area in FY 2002.

However, the DOJ Office of Inspector General (OIG), in its December 2000 list of the ten most serious management challenges facing the DOJ, listed two issues related to this area:

Grant Management - The OIG states that the Department's grant programs have a high risk for fraud given the large amount of money involved and the tens of thousands of grantees. Due to DOJ grant programs averaging slightly more than \$900 million per year, the OIG highlighted the need for proper dispensation and monitoring of funds, including complete on-site monitoring reviews; grantee compliance with reporting rules; and appropriate methodologies for compensating applicants for grants. Note that since this challenge affects all aspects of mission in this area, it is reported under STRATEGIC GOAL SEVEN: Ensure Excellence, Accountability and Integrity.

Performance measures related to these management challenges are noted.

## PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

**Evaluation of the Services, Training, Officers and Prosecutors (STOP) Formula Grants** - An evaluation of the STOP Formula Grants was completed and published during FY 2000. Over the course of the evaluation, with assistance of the STOP program, states have made great strides in implementing their own strategies for helping victims of all three areas of violence against women; domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Statistics on arrests, prosecution, and other justice system activities are beginning to show the impact of the changes stimulated by STOP.

The findings of the evaluation revealed significant achievements. With the assistance of STOP, grantees reported increases in the people they have served. In addition to serving more victims, practitioners reported that their jobs have been made easier by working together with agencies in their community. Many subgrantees noted that the receipt of funding is essential for continued improvements in services for victims of violence. In their view, if funding decreased, they would lose the progress they have made using STOP funding. STOP subgrantees perceive that their STOP funding has helped communities make major improvements in all three areas of violence against women mentioned above.

In reviewing the programs across the country that stand out as having accomplished the goals of STOP, several key elements emerge. There must be solid working relationships among all the players: law

enforcement, prosecution, nonprofit victim service agencies, any victim witness assistance units that exist, and medical establishments (for sexual assault). There must be willingness to work together on every case unless there is a compelling reason not to, and participating agencies must develop and adopt protocols requiring them to contact the appropriate partner agencies in response to every call. In addition, protocol development must be a cross-disciplinary process from beginning to end. Law enforcement, medical personnel, and victim service providers should be on the team developing the prosecution protocol, and the same cross-disciplinary representation should be applied to developing protocols for law enforcement, victim services, and medical services.

Effective programs have transformed the way the criminal justice system handles domestic violence and/or sexual assault victims in their communities. The lessons learned from observing these programs may guide us in developing more comprehensive domestic violence and sexual assault services across the country.

Now that the shared qualities of accomplished programs have been extracted, we can begin to build the foundation for a structure to be used in guiding other programs to success. However, following this template is not enough. A critical starting point is to focus on increasing awareness among the state grantees about the prevalence of stalking offenses, their seriousness, and the existence of many programs that can be used as models for replication.

**National Evaluation of the COPS Program** - An evaluation of the first four years of the COPS program was completed during FY 2000, examining the following areas:

***Client satisfaction***

For many small jurisdictions, COPS was their first federal grant experience. A simplified application process and customer service orientation was successful with law enforcement agencies serving these smaller areas. Additionally, small and large agencies with prior federal grants experience found the COPS grants easier than others to request and administer. The grantees reported high levels of satisfaction with the application and administration processes.

***Effect on level of policing***

Preliminary findings by an external evaluator estimated that by 2003, the COPS program will have raised the level of policing to a figure between 62,700 and 83,900 full-time officers. The report noted, however, that preliminary count estimates "should be treated with extreme caution." The COPS Office has expressed its concerns about some of the methodology used to develop that projection. The COPS Office's internal survey of grantees indicated that as of August 2000 there were 73,692 COPS funded officers on the street. Unlike the evaluator, who contacted 800 grantees and extrapolated results based on FY 1998 data, COPS contacted every grantee at least twice. This current data provides strong support for the COPS Office projection that all 100,000 officers will be on the street by FY 2002.

The COPS program accelerated transitions to locally defined versions of community policing in at least two ways. First, COPS funds stimulated a national conversation about community policing and provided training and technical assistance. With the assistance of the COPS program, the idea of adopting an approach labeled *community policing* was very enticing to chief executives. Second, COPS hiring funds and innovative policing grants provided the opportunity to chief executives to add new community policing programs without immediately having to cut back other programs, increase response time, or suffer other adverse consequences.

***Effects on organizational and technological innovation***

The COPS application produced a foundation that was crucial to the success of the COPS program. The application required specification of a community policing strategy, thereby offering an occasion for engaging broad segments of the agency and community in planning that strategy. Additionally, COPS resources allowed agencies the opportunity to add new modes of policing without drawing resources away from existing priorities.

### ***Effects on crime***

Although the program is too young to determine its effect on crime, the adoption of new policing tactics by so many agencies presents an opportunity to investigate which tactics had beneficial effects on crime rates. By statistically relating local crime trends to the adoption of new tactics, it should be possible to identify promising strategies that are more likely than not to reduce crime more rapidly than the national average.

In conclusion, until promising strategies are identified, a series of site observations should prove helpful in distinguishing between effective and ineffective uses of these promising strategies.

Evaluations expected to be completed during FY 2001:

**Violence Against Women Act - Evaluation of Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies Program** - The Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies evaluation will examine processes related to program implementation, and will assess the impact of programs in the states of Arizona, California, New York, Tennessee, Texas and Wisconsin.

**Byrne - Tribal Strategies Against Violence Initiative** - The Tribal Strategies Against Violence Initiative evaluation will document the processes used by tribal communities to develop and implement strategies to reduce violence in seven sites, analyze and document differences and similarities related to the development and implementation of local strategies, and report local and national findings.

**High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) Assessment** - The evaluation will examine local problems targeted by the original five HIDTA gateways; Houston, Los Angeles, Miami, New York City, and the Southwest Border (Texas to California). The assessment is examining local problems targeted by these gateways and will address the approaches adopted to resolve problems and progress to date.

**COPS - 311 Evaluation** - This evaluation will study program participation and implementation to assess the extent to which there is a reduction in the volume of inappropriate emergency calls for service as a result of implementing the 311 alternative.

**COPS - Youth Firearms Violence Initiative Evaluation** - This evaluation will include a number of case studies assessing the effectiveness of targeted enforcement in reducing youth firearm violence, reducing violent gang activity, and firearms related drug offenses.

**Operation Drug Test Evaluation** - This evaluation will include an examination of the processes involved in implementation, context, resource needs and allocations, and evaluation of programs nationally. Also included in the assessment will be the impact of changes in local policy and practice, and changes in characteristics of the defendant population.

**Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth-in-Sentencing Grants Evaluation** - This evaluation will examine legislative actions, sentencing patterns, correctional populations, system costs, and crime rates in all 50 states. Seven states have been selected for an in-depth examination of sentencing and correctional reforms: California, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Texas and Virginia.

During FY 2002, NIJ will be involved in the following program evaluations:

**Violence Against Women Act** - This will include an evaluation of grants to combat violent crimes against women on campuses (the evaluation will analyze the program characteristics and effectiveness) and an evaluation of the Civil Legal Assistance program. This study will document local programs funded, examine grantee planning and implementation, evaluate the need for and adequacy of special conditions pertaining to victim confidentiality, and determine the effectiveness of these programs.

**Community Prosecution Initiative** - NIJ will undertake a national evaluation examining both the process of how this major initiative is being implemented, and the impact of community prosecution on local crime problems. Findings in best practices and lessons learned will be disseminated to the field. The process evaluation was recently funded and the outcome will follow by FY 2002.

**COPS School Resource Officer (SRO) Program Assessment** - This national assessment will provide a description of various models implemented under the SRO Program and measurement of the impact of various SRO programs on selected indicators of school safety.

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.1: LAW ENFORCEMENT**

**Improve the crime-fighting and criminal/juvenile justice system capabilities of state, tribal, and local governments.**

**Annual Goal 2.1: Improve the crime-fighting and criminal/juvenile justice system capabilities of state, tribal, and local governments.**

**STRATEGIES**

- Provide funding to support state and local criminal justice system initiatives.
- Focus resources to reduce crime and improve criminal justice services and operations in Indian Country.
- Improve the capacity of the nation's "first responder" community to respond to terrorist incidents, including those involving weapons of mass destruction, by providing consultation, training, equipment, and other resources.
- Improve the capacity of state and local law enforcement to respond to emerging or specialized crime issues, such as white collar crime and computer related crime, by providing targeted training, technical assistance, or other technological innovations.
- Provide direct technical support to state, tribal, and local enforcement, when appropriate.
- Develop and support programs and services that target the reduction of the incidence and consequences of family violence, including domestic violence and child victimization.
- Build knowledge about crime and justice by conducting research and evaluation, developing and testing new technologies, gathering statistics, and disseminating results.

OJP continues to invest significant resources in establishing partnerships with state, local and tribal governments and, through its program activities, provides federal leadership regarding matters of crime and the justice system.

For example, the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program provides grants to the states and territories, which, in turn, allocate funds to the local level. Funds awarded under this program can be used in one or more of the program's 28 purposes areas including: demand reduction education programs; multi-jurisdictional task forces; and innovative programs that demonstrate new and different

approaches to enforcement, prosecution, and adjudication of drug offenses and other serious crimes.

Another example of how OJP's programs have evolved to respond to the needs of state, local, and tribal governments is the program work being done with respect to domestic terrorism. While the federal government plays a major role in preventing and responding to terrorist incidents, the state and local public safety community serve as our nation's "first responders." Unfortunately, most state and local governments lack the specialized equipment and skills needed to respond effectively -- especially to attacks involving chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. In coordination with its federal partners, such as the FBI's National Domestic Preparedness Office, OJP sponsors basic and advanced first responder training, provides targeted technical assistance and grants to help states and localities obtain needed equipment and participate in situational exercises.

Advances in technology have greatly increased criminal intelligence, information sharing among jurisdictions, and the ability to track and analyze local crime trends. In addition, technology has provided valuable tools to help criminal justice agencies enhance their ability to lower crime and improve their operations. For example, with OJP's assistance, schools across the nation are enhancing safety by implementing concealed weapons detection systems and surveillance technologies. In addition, OJP is developing other law enforcement applications, including investigative and forensics tools, less-than-lethal devices, crime mapping, and vehicle stopping devices. Through OJP programs, states and local jurisdictions have interstate and national access to criminal records and have improved the quality of data maintained by and submitted to these systems. Accurate state data helps to improve the FBI administered national criminal record systems, such as the Interstate Identification Index, the National Protection Order File, the National Sex Offender File, and the

National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), which provides pre-sale record checks pursuant to the Brady Act. OJP is also promoting integrated criminal justice information technology and design to facilitate and assist state and local integration efforts. The goal is to achieve a national integrated justice information environment that will facilitate the development of information sharing systems by federal, state, and local criminal justice agencies.

OJP is working to ensure that tribal governments are included in efforts to improve access to and integration of criminal justice and information technology. To do this, OJP has increased its efforts to channel justice-related resources to make existing programs, traditionally available to states and local entities, more relevant to the needs of tribal governments. A DOJ priority is to assist tribal governments in building comprehensive and effective law enforcement and public safety systems to provide a foundation for healthy communities through comprehensive problem-solving based on indigenous justice practices and systems. For example, the goal of the Comprehensive Indian Resources for Community and Law Enforcement Project is to enhance tribal governments' response to public safety and to improve the quality of life in three tribal communities.

**MEANS – Annual Goal 2.1**

**Dollars/FTE**

Appropriation	FY 2000 Obligated		FY 2001 Enacted		FY 2002 Requested	
	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE
Tribal Prison Grants	0	0	0	0	35	0
Tribal Courts	5	0	8	0	8	0
Byrne Formula Grants	487	0	499	0	500	0
Byrne Discretionary Grants	59	0	78	0	0	0
Community Policing	270	15	311	20	387	20
Local Law Enforcement Block Grants	591	0	522	0	400	0
Correctional Facilities Grants	646	0	685	0	0	0
Cooperative Agreement Program	0	0	0	0	35	0
Violence Against Women Act Programs	288	0	274	0	375	0
State Criminal Alien Assistance Program	12	0	399	0	265	0
Crime Control - State & Local Law Enforce.	2	0	1	0	1	0
Crime Control - Federal	0	0	3	0	3	0
PSOB – Disability and FLEDA Programs	0	0	2	0	2	0
PSOB – Death Benefits	29	0	33	0	33	0
Asset Forfeiture Fund – Permanent Bud. Auth.	463	0	619	0	432	0
Telecommunications Carrier Compliance	262	0	201	0	0	0
FBI Salaries and Expenses	223	3215	256	3,112	265	3058
FBI Construction	6	0	5	0	0	0
National Institute of Justice	51	0	70	0	55	0
Bureau of Justice Statistics	26	0	29	0	32	0
Regional Information Sharing System (OJP)	21	0	25	0	25	0
White Collar Crime Information Center	9	0	9	0	9	0
Crime Control Program	1	0	0	0	0	0
Counterterrorism (OJP)	77	0	220	0	220	0
Management and Administration (OJP)	39	551	23	626	28	637
Drug Demonstration	2	0	11	0	11	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3569</b>	<b>3781</b>	<b>4283</b>	<b>3,758</b>	<b>3121</b>	<b>3715</b>

**Skills**

**OJP requires skilled administrators with expertise in program development, grant administration, technical assistance, evaluation and implementation. In addition, OJP seeks staff with expertise in social science research including the collection and analysis of**





**Information  
Technology**

FBI programs in this area rely upon: NICS (a national name check system that compares the identity of firearm purchasers against several databases to determine eligibility for firearm purchase), IAFIS (identifies individuals through name, date of birth, and fingerprint comparisons), QGIS (tracks all training conducted at Quantico). The OJP program is supported by the NCJRS system. OJP relies upon data from the Program Accountability Library (PAL), which is an internal, automated grant cataloging system.

**PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT – Annual Goal 2.1**

**2.1A Support Local Criminal Justice**

**Background/ Program Objectives:**

The Byrne Law Enforcement Assistance Program is composed of two grant programs: the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program and the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Discretionary Grant Program (which will be discontinued in FY 2002). The Byrne Formula Grant Program assists states and units of local government in carrying out programs that offer a high probability of improving the functioning of the criminal justice system, with a special emphasis on nationwide and multi-level drug control strategies and violent crime prevention. The states, in consultation with local officials, develop statewide drug and violent crime strategies and funding priorities to address and to improve the functioning of their criminal justice systems, while supporting national priorities and objectives. Grantees may direct the funds received under the Byrne Formula Grant Program in one or more of the 28 program purpose areas authorized by the law. While the discretionary program was intended to provide competitive funding for innovative programs, unrequested, non-competitive projects here significantly eroded its flexibility.

**FY 2000 Actual Performance:**

**Performance Measure:** Byrne Programs Exhibiting High Probability of Improving the Criminal Justice System

**Target:** 50      **Actual:** 50

**Discussion:** Each year, BJA awards funds to 56 eligible states and territories based on a formula specified in the legislation, unless an applicant fails to comply with statutory program requirements. These funds are used to develop and implement projects that improve the functioning of the criminal justice system. States use their own planning process and subgrants funds to local criminal justice agencies for use within 28 purpose areas. Each grant is for a period of three years with the possibility of additional extension. The funding results in hundreds of projects throughout the United States. Each year, BJA grant managers conduct on-site visits that identify exemplary programs. At least one on-site visit to each state and territory was conducted in FY 2000. In addition, states are required to submit Annual Reports to BJA that provide program accomplishments as well as reports on any evaluations conducted that year. Through review of these reports, BJA grant managers identify other projects that may be exemplary.

**Public Benefit:** The Byrne Formula Grant Program assists states and units of local government in carrying out programs that improve the functioning of the criminal justice system with an emphasis on drug control and violent crime aimed at improving public safety.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 goal. In FY 2001, BJA will begin planning and development activities for conversion from a paper-based grants administration process to an Internet based, end to end grants

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be collected from each state and territory receiving Byrne funding through Grantee Annual Reports submitted online through on-site monitoring.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data will be validated through on-site monitoring. Each year, BJA program monitors identify characteristics during on-site visits that identify programs as exemplary, therefore having a high probability of improving the functioning of the criminal justice system.

**Data Limitations:** BJA will not perform formal outcome evaluations on all projects identified as exhibiting a high probability of improving the criminal justice system.

management system. The new system will include performance reporting components that will assist BJA in tracking exemplary programs.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, the Byrne State and Local Law Enforcement Formula Assistance Program will continue to support programs that exhibit improvement of the criminal justice system. This effort will be accomplished by conducting extensive outreach and regional conferences for grantees. Also, through monitoring visits, OJP will continue to identify exemplary programs that show a high probability of improving the functioning of the criminal justice system throughout the 50 states and six territories. The OJP will continue to sponsor conferences which will provide training and technical assistance in the areas of criminal justice planning, address emerging trends and issues, discuss changes in program requirements, and allow opportunities for feedback from grantees. No funding is requested for the discretionary program.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

The BJA program activities involve on-going coordination by BJA and other DOJ staff members, as well as state, local, and tribal units of government.

**2.1B Reduce Crime and Improve Criminal Justice Systems and Operations in Indian Country**

**Background/ Program Objectives:**

Under the Tribal Resources Grant Program, the COPS office awards grants that fund additional law enforcement officers, training, and equipment. OJP established the Tribal Court Program as one method to reduce crime and improve the criminal justice systems and operations in Indian Country. Tribal courts have existed in one form or another for several hundred years. However, in the last ten years there has been an unparalleled growth in their vitality, importance, and workload. This growth is due to a number of factors including economic development on many reservations, which has increased the need for reliable means of settling disputes that arise in the ordinary course of business. For example, the need for annual adjudication in tribal courts is spurred by managing complex issues such as: regulation of gaming, air and water pollution control, mining, banking, and toxic waste disposal.

**FY 2000 Actual Performance:**

**Performance Measure:** Number of Grants Provided to Indian Tribes

**Target:** 250 **Actual:** 199

**Discussion:** COPS fell short of the targeted performance due to lack of funding. While the target was based on a budget request of \$45 million, only \$40 million was received. COPS will continue to award grants to tribal agencies contingent upon the amount received.

**Public Benefit:** American Indians are more likely to be the victim of a crime than the average U.S. resident. The grants awarded by the COPS office provide tribal agencies with funding that allows them to provide higher quality law enforcement services to their community, which contributes to a better quality of life.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, COPS does not expect to achieve the corresponding FY 2001 target, due to the funding shortage mentioned above.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data for this indicator will be taken from the COPS Management System (CMS). From CMS, information can be accessed regarding individual grants and grantees.

**Data Validation and Verification:** COPS will query CMS.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**Performance Measure:** Tribal Courts

**Target:** 10 new, 38 Enhancements

**Actual:** 41 new, 33 Enhancements

**Discussion:** BJA developed and issued a competitive program solicitation that was mailed to 1,224 eligible tribes in May 1999 and funded 41 planning grants, 33 enhancement/implementation grants and 7 other tribal court grants. Although the target for enhancements was not reached, the total number of grants far exceeded the original estimate. This program will be continued through FY 2002 and FY 2000 funds will be awarded in FY 2001.

**Public Benefit:** Tribal courts help Native American communities to develop the capability to address their own crime problems within their communities rather than having agencies outside Indian Country impose a criminal justice system upon them.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 goal. However, BJA's target numbers for FY 2001 and beyond are contingent entirely on Congressional appropriations, as well as applications received from tribal organizations.

**Data Definition:** Enhancement grants are designed to increase or improve the value and quality of existing programs for no more than two years.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Information is collected from Tribal Court files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** BJA closely monitors grantees to validate and verify performance through progress reports submitted by grantees, onsite monitoring and telephone contact.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

COPS will continue to award grants to tribal agencies in FY 2002. The funding provided, combined with technical assistance, will give grantees the tools they need to continue the level of service delivery to the community.

In FY 2002, the Tribal Court Program will continue to award development, implementation, and enhancement grants to continue operations of the tribal judicial systems. The Tribal Court Program will provide: financial and technical assistance for federally recognized Indian Tribal governments to further development; enhancement for continued operation of tribal judicial systems (enhancement grants are designed to increase or improve the value and quality of existing programs for no more than two years); education and training for tribal court personnel; and promote cooperation among tribal justice systems and the federal and state judiciary systems.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

OJP is responsible for programs affecting Indian Country and meets on a regular basis with representatives from the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs and DOJ's Office of Tribal Justice.

## 2.1C Improve Domestic Preparedness

### Background/ Program Objectives:

While the federal government plays an integral role in the prevention and response to terrorist threats, the state and local public safety community serves as our nation's first responders. Unfortunately, most state and local governments lack the specialized equipment and expertise needed to effectively respond to and manage terrorist attacks. In 1999, the OJP established the Office of State and Local Domestic Preparedness Support (OSLDPS) to provide state and local first responders with the most comprehensive training and support available to combat terrorist attacks, especially those involving weapons of mass destruction, such as chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.

The OJP's OSLDPS has made great strides in developing comprehensive training programs for our nation's first responder community by providing technical assistance and grants to states and localities for the purpose of procuring appropriate basic level first responder equipment. A key feature of this program is the Center for Domestic Preparedness (CDP), which is a "live agent" training facility that offers advanced level counterterrorism courses to a full spectrum of first responder personnel, including firefighters, emergency medical personnel, hazardous material units, and law enforcement officials. OSLDPS also provides funds to the National Domestic Preparedness Consortium, a five member consortium that brings a unique set of assets to OJP's domestic preparedness initiative and delivers specialized training to the emergency response community.

In FY 2000, \$8M was distributed to states for the development of comprehensive state plans. The goal is to have each state take full inventory of their state of readiness. These plans will be used by OSLDPS to make future funding decisions with respect to training, technical assistance, equipment and exercises.

### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** Number of First Responders Trained

**Target:** 2,000 **Actual:** 8,856

**Discussion:** OSLDPS provided state and local governments with the opportunity to train their first responders in a variety of courses on domestic preparedness. The program strategy will continue with new courses being developed to expand the range of training offered.

**Public Benefit:** OSLDPS has trained a large portion of the nation's first responders through an array of courses dealing with weapons of mass destruction and domestic preparedness. The strategy has increased state and local governments' ability to prepare for weapons of mass destruction terrorist incidents.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to exceed the projected FY 2001 target, with a current estimate of 9,200.

**Data Collection and Storage:** OSLDPS tracks the number of students trained in a simplified computer based system.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Application information is retained by the Center for Domestic Preparedness and in a database. The information is then cross-referenced against the electronic ticket issues by the onsite coordinator.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

### Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:

In FY 2002, based on the specific needs identified in each state plan, OJP will provide targeted training programs to first responders and grants to assist state and local emergency response agencies to procure equipment critical to an effective response capability.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

The OSLDPS coordinates with the FBI's National Domestic Preparedness Office. These offices are responsible for coordinating domestic preparedness programs and activities throughout the Federal Government to ensure that a robust crisis and consequence infrastructure is established nationwide to address the threat posed by terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction. In addition, OSLDPS works with the DOD, NSC, FEMA, and DOE in carrying out its mission to better serve state and local governments.

## 2.1D Improve Response Time to Crime

### Background/ Program Objectives:

The FBI's Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS) was developed to enhance the FBI's mission to provide identification services to the Nation's law enforcement community and to organizations where criminal background histories are a critical factor in consideration for employment. The IAFIS provides tenprint, latent print, subject search, and criminal history request services, document submission, and image request services to federal, state, and local law enforcement users. IAFIS was procured as three segments: the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS) segment, the Interstate Identification Index segment, and the Identification, Tasking, and Networking segment. Each segment provides discrete capabilities and works in conjunction with the other segments to support FBI Service Providers and external users in their law enforcement capacities.

Interstate availability of complete computerized criminal records is increasingly vital for criminal investigations, prosecution, sentencing, correctional supervision and release, and community notification. This information is also necessary to conduct thorough background checks for those applying for licenses, firearm purchases, and work involving the safety and well-being of children, the elderly, and the disabled.

The OJP's Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) provides direct technical support to states through the National Criminal History Improvement Program (NCHIP). The goal of NCHIP is to improve the quality and accessibility of the nation's criminal history records and records of protective orders involving domestic violence and stalking; support the development and enhancement of state sex offender registries; and promote the capability and participation in national systems including the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), Interstate Identification Index (III), and the National Sex Offender Registry. Currently, all states receive funding for automating their state criminal justice records.

The Police Corps Program is a leadership and training program that provides educational scholarships and training opportunities to highly qualified young people. In return, Police Corps participants agree to serve cities and counties as police officers and sheriff's deputies for four years after graduation. These graduates are placed in state and local police departments in geographic areas with the greatest need for additional police officers.

### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** Average Response Time for Fingerprint Submissions Under IAFIS (hours)

**Target:** Criminal: 2 hours Civil: 24 hours

**Actual:** Criminal: 13 hours Civil: 8 hours\*

\* Only six months of data was available (March - September 2000)

**Public Benefit:** The actual response time data provided above for criminal submissions is much higher than the targeted response time. This average response time is skewed dramatically by a small percentage of submissions that have taken a long time to compute. Although the number of submissions requiring manual intervention may be small, they have a significant effect on the average response time. Some of these submissions have taken months to resolve. Unfortunately, only limited data exists from which to extract submission response time reports for FY 2000. The figures shown for March through September 2000 represent the best available data. A new manual system will better capture the needed information beginning in March of 2001.

The response times for criminal electronic submissions is higher than civil electronic submissions for a number of reasons. The criminal submissions require additional

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data for FY 1998/99 was taken from the Identification Automated Services (IDAS) system. FY 2000+, the FBI will use data from IAFIS.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Analysis will be conducted on available systems statistics to measure response times.

**Data Limitations:** The IAFIS has both manual and electronic submission processes. The manual submission process has no tracking matrix. Data integrity will improve as the proportion of electronically fingerprints increase. NOTE that the two-hour response time for criminal electronic submissions applies to those that require a response.



processing steps (both automated and manual). One of the biggest factors affecting the response times on criminal submissions is the amount of manual effort involved in processing those requests. For example, in FY 2000 approximately 63% of the criminal submissions "hit" on an existing record. While only approximately 10% of the civil submissions "hit" on an existing record. When a criminal or civil submission "hits" on an existing record, the submitted fingerprints must be compared against the existing fingerprint record to determine whether they are identical. This comparison is completed by a fingerprint examiner. If the fingerprint examiner considers the two to be identical, the records are forwarded to another fingerprint examiner to "verify" that the submitting fingerprints and the existing fingerprint record are identical. Since approximately 10% of the civil submissions, in comparison to approximately 63% of the criminal submissions, require additional manual intervention, the average response time for civil submissions is much lower than the average response time for criminal submissions.

Also, the FBI's target response times for electronically submitted criminal and civil fingerprints were established without the expectation of some of the current factors that affect the actual results such as: 1) identifications to subjects with a manual arrest history, 2) search activity involving sensitive subjects, 3) search activity involving subjects with missing file data, 4) submissions whose workflow has been interrupted by a transient system anomaly, and 5) occasional workload spikes.

The FBI's original concept was that the manual arrest histories would be converted to automated records by the start of IAFIS. Due to the large backlog of fingerprint submissions experienced by the FBI in the years prior to IAFIS, available personnel were shifted from converting the criminal history records to processing fingerprints in an effort to reduce the backlog. With IAFIS, this backlog has been eliminated and the FBI has begun to address the remaining manual criminal history records. The continued conversion of the manual arrest history records will reduce the percentage of submissions requiring manual intervention.

Since FY 2000 was the first complete fiscal year of operation, the data presented above contains a high number of scheduled and unscheduled maintenance periods which is not unusual for a new system the size and complexity of IAFIS. The FBI has developed a comprehensive plan addressing system components that have the greatest potential to cause service disruptions and have outlined feasible and practical action to reduce service disruptions. Steps taken to date have shown steady improvement during the year 2000. For the first 25 days of March 2001, the new data indicates approximately 93% of electronic criminal answer required submissions are being responded to within two hours. The new data also indicates that approximately 99.7% of the civil electronic submissions are being responded to within twenty-four hours.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** We expect to achieve the corresponding FY 2001 target.

**Performance Measure:** Police Corps Graduates Serving One Year Community Patrol

**Target:** 350 **Actual:** 345

**Discussion:** The FY 2000 target was not met because training classes lost participants as a result of removal or resignation. In the future, to reduce removals and resignations, we are encouraging careful selection processes to correct the problem. Although the FY 2000 goal was not met, we will continue to coordinate with participating state Police Corps programs, review and revise state plans, and negotiate budgets. The past strategy of recruiting and providing technical assistance by phone, through site visits, and during national conferences has proved successful and will continue to be utilized.

**Public Benefit:** The Police Corps addresses violent crime by helping state and local law enforcement agencies increase the number of officers with advanced education and training assigned to community patrol. The program motivates highly qualified young people to serve as police officers and sheriffs' deputies in the municipalities, counties, and states that need them most.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data is collected by program managers through the lead agency in each participating state.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Program managers review information from the state (state has previously signed assurances that graduates will be on patrol in the appropriate areas) and verifies state assurances.

**Data Limitations:** Monitoring each participating police agency is difficult due to the volume of participating police agencies and the fact that state lead agencies do not visit every participating agency.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we do not expect to achieve the corresponding FY 2001 goal. Current estimates project that 444 police corps graduates will serve one year community patrol.

**Performance Measure:** Awards Made During the Fiscal Year to Assist States and Territories – Discontinued Measure

**Target:** 50 **Actual:** 48

**Discussion:** In FY 2000, BJS made grant awards to 48 states under the NCHIP program. Two states, Idaho and New Mexico, did not receive awards in FY 2000. Idaho did not submit an application for funding in FY 2000 because Idaho had adequate funds to continue activities supported under the NCHIP program. Due to state-level delays in submitting a revised application, New Mexico received its FY 2000 grant award in early FY 2001. Although the target was not met, due to external factors, BJS does not characterize these results as problematic to the effective administration of the NCHIP program and will not seek changes in implementation strategy. However, it was determined that this measure was too workload/output oriented. In addition, it does not adequately measure the performance of the NCHIP program, as all 50 states and territories are eligible to apply and receive annual funding under this program; therefore, it will be discontinued.

**Public Benefit:** The goal of the NCHIP program is to improve public safety by improving the accuracy and availability of the criminal records including records of domestic violence, sex offender data, and protection orders. Interstate access to complete and accurate criminal records are necessary to support the immediate identification of persons prohibited from firearm purchases or holding positions of responsibility involving children, the elderly, or the disabled. Reliable criminal history records are also necessary to ensure officer safety and to support criminal justice decisions on pretrial release, career criminal charging, sentencing, and correctional assignments. Background checks for national security and related purposes are also dependent upon the quality of the records on which they are based.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**  
In FY 2002, the FBI will maintain quick response times for fingerprint identification under IAFIS. In addition, the FBI Academy's Field Police Training Program will serve as the foundation for the FBI's comprehensive training assistance to local, county, and state law enforcement. This program provides training in the investigative, managerial, technical, and administrative aspects of law enforcement.

In FY 2002, BJS will continue to support the NCHIP program through technology-based criminal justice information grants to improve state computerization efforts. This includes efforts to continue automating state criminal records and conducting state-level surveys every two years to ensure the states are making progress in their automation goals. OJP will also continue to support the

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data is obtained by reviewing the Office of Comptroller records maintained in the Comptroller's repository.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Program managers review project report as well as grantee progress reports. This includes monitoring OC data, FBI reports and published survey findings.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data are obtained by reviewing the Office of Comptroller records maintained in the Comptroller's repository.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Program managers review project report as well as grantee progress reports. This includes monitoring OC data, FBI reports and published survey findings.

**Data Limitations:** Data are not available annually. The survey of state Criminal History Information Systems is conducted every two years. An additional year is then needed to analyze and publish results of survey findings. In addition, states receive funding to automate current records only and do not receive funds to automate archived criminal records.

Police Corps Program by providing resources to states for the purpose of providing educational scholarships and specialized leadership and training opportunities to Police Corps participants.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

A major goal of the NCHIP program is to assist states in supporting the FBI administered national information systems which include: the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, the Interstate Identification Index, the National Protective Order File, the National Sex Offender Registry, and the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System. As part of this effort, BJS works closely with the FBI, the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco and Firearms, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and with key representatives of the state law enforcement and court systems.

## 2.1E Provide Support to Law Enforcement

### Background/ Program Objectives:

The FBI Academy is located on the United States Marine Corps Base at Quantico, Virginia, and is responsible for providing five general areas of training. One area is the National Academy Program, which serves as the foundation for the FBI's comprehensive training assistance to local, county, and state law enforcement. This is a ten-week program that targets law enforcement managers; its goal is to render training assistance regarding investigative, managerial, technical, and administrative aspects of law enforcement. The FBI Academy also provides in-service training to local, county, and state law enforcement in many areas, such as forensic science. FBI police instructors located in field offices throughout the country also provide, upon request, education and training programs, thus, contributing to the enhanced professionalism in American law enforcement.

Through support of BJA, the National White Collar Crime Center provides a national resource for the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of multi-jurisdictional economic crimes. This center provides a wide range of technical assistance, including a national training and research institute focusing on economic crime issues. The National Cybercrime Training Partnership, part of the National White Collar Crime Center creates a national network of law enforcement trainers and specialists in computer crime related investigation and prosecution.

OJP's long standing relationship with state and local law enforcement facilitates our ability to provide a variety of resources to assist in capacity building. NIJ's Crime Lab Improvement Program (CLIP) is one example of how OJP resources are supporting law enforcement efforts to more efficiently manage crime. In the short-term, CLIP provides funds to assist states to rapidly accelerate the analysis of the DNA samples of convicted offenders across the nation. This accelerated process will allow states to provide Combined DNA Index System (CODIS) compatible data for state and national DNA databases so that law enforcement has access to critical investigative information in a timely manner. In the long-term, CLIP will help improve the technological capabilities and capacity of state and local forensic DNA labs to support the investigation and prosecution of violent crime. The NIJ's successes in this program include: development or establishment of forensic DNA testing capabilities in state and local forensic laboratories; improvements in the abilities of state DNA labs to meet national standards for DNA quality assurance and proficiency testing; and fostering cooperation and mutual assistance among forensic DNA laboratories by funding laboratory compliance with CODIS.

### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** Crime labs developing new forensic DNA technology capabilities

**Target:** 144 **Actual:** 144

**Discussion:** A major goal of the Crime Lab Improvement Program (CLIP) is the development of crime labs capable of using the latest in DNA Forensic technology. The funding level provided through Congressional appropriation has enabled the number of labs utilizing new technologies to increase at a steady rate with only minor setbacks.

**Public Benefit:** Given the increased emphasis law enforcement has placed on the use of forensic sciences in solving crimes, the demand for technologically sophisticated lab analysis work has never been greater. The CLIP program is a follow-on program to the DNA Identification Act program and was created to improve the capabilities and capacity of state and local forensic DNA laboratories to support the investigation and prosecution of violent crime. It is closely associated with the need to establish and improve DNA analysis. The number of laboratories successfully updated through this program continues to grow, thereby improving law enforcement's ability to solve crime.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Information is collected by the program manager and is maintained in local files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** NIJ validates and verifies performance measures for this program through information supplied from progress reports, on-site monitoring visits and telephone contacts between grantees and program managers.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to fall short of the projected FY 2001 target with a current estimate of 146.

**Performance Measure:** Research, Evaluations and Reports Provided in Millions – Discontinued Measure

**Target:** 2.4 Million      **Actual:** 2.3 Million

**Discussion:** This target relates to traditional means of dissemination, such as requests being filled by the Clearinghouse or mailing paper versions. The reduction in the actual number provided is attributable to a decrease in the customers' use of these traditional methods of dissemination (i.e., mailing paper versions) and an increase in the use of electronic dissemination, such as the Internet, which has seen a 55% increase in the average number of user sessions per month. At the time these targets were set, BJS underestimated the amount of time it would take to see the level of use decline in these categories. In addition, this measure will be discontinued as it does not effectively demonstrate the performance of either BJS or NIJ. This measure is composed of 24 separate indicators from BJS and NIJ describing many dissimilar activities. For instance, included in the 2.4 million figure are measures describing product/service use through a multitude of various dissemination mechanisms, research and technology grant awards, and forensic operational test sites. These activities are fundamentally different therefore cannot be combined to represent one indicator.

**Public Benefit:** The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the Nation's primary source for statistical information on crime, criminal offenders, victims of crime, and the operation of justice systems at all levels of government. These data are critical to federal, state, and local policymakers in combating crime and ensuring that justice is efficient and fair. BJS supports the information needs and operational demands of policy and decision-making officials of OJP, the Department of Justice, the Administration, and Congress. It provides financial and technical assistance to States in developing and improving capabilities in justice statistics and information systems. In addition, BJS provides customers with access to statistical information through both paper and electronic media.

**Performance Measure:** Law Enforcement and Regulatory Personnel Trained (NOTE: We have modified this indicator to include FBI training in the field at state, regional, and local training facilities).

**Target:** 2,000 trained in computer crime      **Actual:** 1,451

**Target:** 3,556 trained at the FBI Academy      **Actual:** 4,944

**Target:** Trained in the field -Not projected-new measure  
**Actual:** 120,233 trained in the field

**Discussion:** While we fell short on our training target for computer crime, we exceeded our target for the FBI Academy. During FY 2000, National White Collar Crime Center realized they would only be able to conduct fifty-three classes with a maximum capacity of 30 students

**DISCONTINUED MEASURE:**

**Data Collection and Storage:** The Justice Technology Information Network the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data and BJS' Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics Online, all have information systems which track use inquiries and responses.

**Data Validation and Verification:** The National Criminal Justice Reference Service, a collection of clearinghouses supporting all OJP bureaus and offices, validates and verifies requests for publications.

**Data Limitations:** Indicators are being reviewed to more clearly define categories (e.g., research, evaluations, statistics, and reports).

**Data Collection and Storage:** The Quantico Student Information System is used to track the volume of criminal training. The number trained in computer crime is based on the registered students and is collected and maintained by the National White Collar Crime Center.

**Data Validation and Verification:** The Quantico Administrative Manager reviews the data for validity. BJA program managers monitor the National White Collar Crime Center's data.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

in each Computer Crime class. Numbers of training participants were further limited by the fact that, some students who registered were unable to attend. In addition to the 4,944 trained at the Quantico Academy, the FBI trained an additional 120,233 state and local law enforcement officials in state, regional and local training facilities. The FBI's ability to train its own personnel and state and local law enforcement has met expectations consistently over the past several years.

**Public Benefit:** This program directly benefits state and local enforcement and prosecutorial agencies by enhancing the effectiveness of the investigation and prosecution of computer crime. More effective management of these cases, in turn, translates to lessening the effects of economic crime on our citizens; not just monetary losses, but also the demoralizing effects that deplete the quality of life.

The FBI provides instruction for state and local criminal justice practitioners, both at the FBI Academy and throughout the United States at state, regional, and local training facilities. These training sessions cover the full range of law enforcement training topics such as hostage negotiation, computer-related crimes, death investigations, violent crimes, criminal psychology, forensic science, and arson. During FY 2000, 120,233 criminal justice personnel received training at state, regional, and local training facilities from FBI instructors. In addition, because of the increasingly global nature and mandate of many of the FBI's investigative initiatives, the FBI has in recent years emphasized the need to train its foreign law enforcement partners through the International Training and Assistance Program. In 2000, the FBI provided training to 7,709 international police officers and executives representing 161 countries.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000 for training in computer crime, we do not expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 target of 3,000. Current estimates indicate that we will only train 1,800. However, we do expect to achieve our corresponding FY 2001 targets for FBI training efforts in this area.

#### **Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, BJA will continue to support the National White Collar Crime Center by providing technical assistance and training to local law enforcement and regulatory personnel. NIJ will continue to support CLIP efforts that improve technology capabilities and capacity of state and local forensic DNA labs through the development or establishment of forensic DNA testing capabilities in state and local forensic laboratories; monitoring improvements in the ability of state DNA labs to meet national standards for DNA quality assurance and proficiency testing; and fostering cooperation and mutual assistance among forensic DNA laboratories by funding laboratory compliance with the Combined DNA Index System.

#### **Crosscutting Activities:**

IAFIS represents a partnership among the FBI state, local, and other federal law enforcement agencies faced with the problem of criminals changing jurisdictions and their identities to avoid apprehension. OJP, in coordination with other federal agencies and state and local justice departments, provides training and assistance in implementing statewide strategies to improve criminal justice systems. This includes interactions with the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center system and the National Cybercrime Training Partnership.

**2.1F Expand Programs to Reduce Violence Against Women**

**Background/ Program Objectives:**

OJP’s Violence Against Women Office (VAWO) administers a combination of formula and discretionary grant programs that support the Violence Against Women Act and are designed to stop domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking of women. The VAWO works with victim advocates and law enforcement in developing programs that support a wide range of services for women, including: advocacy, emergency shelter, law enforcement agencies protection, and legal aid. Additionally, the VAWO is leading efforts nationally and abroad to intervene in and prosecute crimes of trafficking in women and children and is addressing domestic violence issues in international fora.

The VAWO’s Services, Training, Officers, and Prosecutors (STOP) formula grant program provides resources to assist in creating a coordinated justice approach to violent crimes against women. STOP grant funds may be used to train police officers, prosecutors, and other criminal justice practitioners to enable them to respond more effectively to violent crimes against women; the creation or enlargement of special units of police officers and prosecutors to handle cases involving violence against women; the creation or enhancement of services for victims; the development and implementation of more effective police and prosecution policies and procedures, protocols, orders, and services specifically dedicated to preventing, identifying, and responding to violent crimes against women; and the creation of programs addressing stalking.

The VAWO, under the Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement Protection Orders Program, provides discretionary grants to ensure victim safety and offender accountability by encouraging state, local, and tribal governments to treat domestic violence as a serious violation of criminal law. If arrests are to be an effective response to domestic violence, police, pretrial service professionals, prosecutors, judges, probation and parole officers, and victim advocates and service providers must be poised to follow through in a coordinated and integrated manner to enhance the safety of victims and hold offenders accountable for their violent behavior. One way of accomplishing this is through the implementation of mandatory arrests or pro-arrest programs and policies in police departments, for protection order violations that will enhance the safety of victims and hold offenders responsible for their violent behavior.

Under the Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Program, VAWO provides an opportunity for law enforcement and prosecution agencies, the courts, non-governmental victim services agencies, community organizations and businesses in rural communities and Indian Nations to collaborate in creating protocols and strategies tailored specifically to meet the needs of rural populations. The goals of this program are to: develop and implement policies, protocols, and services designed to promote the early identification, intervention, and prevention of domestic violence, and child victimization; increase victims’ safety and access to treatment and counseling; enhance the investigation and prosecution of domestic violence and child abuse cases; and develop and implement comprehensive strategies that draw on a rural jurisdiction’s unique characteristics and resources to enhance community understanding of violence.

**FY 2000 Actual Performance:**

**Performance Measure:** States, Localities, Tribal Gov’ts with Coordinated Justice Programs (STOP)

**Target:** 157 **Actual:** 157

**Discussion:** To achieve this goal, VAWO provided grants and technical assistance. VAWO’s strategy focused on issues of domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault through establishing coordinated community responses.

**Public Benefit:** STOP Violence Against Women

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees, on-site monitoring and data stored in VAWO program office files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data will be validated and verified through a review of progress reports submitted by grantees; telephone contact and onsite monitoring of grantee performance by grant program managers.

Grants are awarded to states, territories, the District of Columbia and tribal governments to support comprehensive and coordinated responses to sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking crimes. STOP grantees develop and implement victim-centered strategies by encouraging collaboration among law enforcement, prosecution, the judiciary, pre-trial services, probation and parole, as well as with private, nonprofit victim service providers and victims advocates.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 goal.

**Performance Measure: Performance Measure:**

Grantees with Mandatory or Pro-Arrest Policies

**Target: 60 Actual: 60**

**Discussion:** To achieve this goal, VAWO provided grants and technical assistance. This program, renamed Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement of Protection Orders Program under the VAWA II legislation, will continue at the same funding level. As a result of the legislatively mandated program, VAWO will continue to encourage policies that view treatment of domestic violence as a serious criminal offense.

**Public Benefit:** The benefits of these grant programs are the implementation of mandatory arrest or pro-arrest programs and policies in police departments, including mandatory arrest programs or pro-arrest programs and policies for protection order violations. Additional benefits extend to: improved tracking of cases involving domestic violence; centralization and coordination of police enforcement, prosecution, probation, parole, and the judiciary; coordination of computer tracking systems to ensure communication among police, prosecutors, and criminal and family courts; strengthening legal advocacy service programs for victims of domestic violence, improved judicial handling of domestic violence cases through education of judges and others responsible for judicial handling of domestic violence cases in criminal, tribal, and other courts.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** We expect to exceed the original target projected for FY 2001. We are currently on track to have 176 grantees with pro-arrest policies in place at the close of FY2001. Due to this enhanced performance and increased appropriations, we established the FY 2002 target at 256.

**Performance Measure: Jurisdictions Providing Services in Rural Areas Previously Under- Served**

**Target: 60 Actual: 60**

**Discussion:** To achieve this goal, VAWO provided grants and technical assistance. This goal is accomplished through a discretionary grant program to implement, expand, and establish cooperative efforts and projects between law enforcement officers, prosecutors, victim advocacy groups, and other related parties to investigate and prosecute incidents of domestic violence and child abuse; and to work in cooperation with the community to develop education and prevention strategies directed toward such issues.

**Public Benefit:** The ultimate goal of the program is to reduce domestic violence and child abuse in rural areas. This goal provides obvious benefit to the abused in the community.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 goal.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees, on-site monitoring and data stored in VAWO program office files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data will be validated and verified through a review of progress reports submitted by grantees; telephone contact and on-site monitoring of grantee performance by grant program managers.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees, on-site monitoring and data stored in VAWO program office files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data will be validated and verified through a review of progress reports submitted by grantees; telephone contact and on-site monitoring of grantee performance by grant program managers.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.





**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, the VAWO will continue leading the national effort to stop domestic violence through its grant programs to support state, local and tribal governments. In addition, the STOP program will strengthen tribal law enforcement and prosecutorial strategies to combat violent crimes against women and develop and enhance services for the victims of such crimes.

The Grants to Encourage Arrest Policies and Enforcement Protection Orders Program will continue to support mandatory or pro-arrest policies to shape and solidify a unified, coordinated response to domestic violence including aggressive enforcement of protection orders, arrest and prosecution of batterers, appropriate supervision of and intervention with batterers in the community, and legal and support services for domestic violence victims.

Additionally, VAWO will continue to target grant funds to rural areas to help eliminate obstacles such as fewer law enforcement resources, shortage of victim services, lack of privacy in tight-knit communities, geographical isolation, and an inability to keep locations of shelters confidential. Program resources will augment available resources by developing partnerships with nonprofit and governmental agencies, as well as local volunteers to enhance the capacity of rural jurisdictions to respond to domestic violence.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

VAWO works to examine the causes, treatment and prevention of violence against women and violence within the family along with several components within the Department of Health and Human Services. VAWO also coordinates within DOJ and has regular contact with other organizations such as the Legal Services Corporation, HUD, OPM, DOD, DOL, STATE, and the USIA.

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.2: JUVENILE JUSTICE**

**Reduce youth crime and victimization through targeted programs that emphasize both prevention and enforcement.**

**Annual Goal 2.2: Reduce youth crime and victimization through targeted programs that emphasize both prevention and enforcement.**

**STRATEGIES**

Provide financial assistance (formula and block grants) to eligible states to support improvements in their juvenile justice systems. Support targeted early intervention and prevention programs that reduce the impact of negative (risk) factors and enhance the influence of positive (protective) factors in the lives of youth at greatest risk of delinquency. Support targeted and comprehensive programs to counter youth violence. Focus resources to reduce youth crime and improve juvenile justice operations and services in Indian Country. Build knowledge about crime and delinquency.

The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) will continue to help states and communities implement initiatives to prevent, intervene in, and suppress crime by juveniles, as well as to protect youth from crime and abuse. OJP's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) works to address youth crime through a comprehensive program of research, evaluation, program development, and information dissemination. This multi-faceted approach targets youth who experience risk factors for delinquency, as well as youth arrested, processed, and sentenced in the juvenile justice system. OJP also focuses on status offenders and juvenile offenders who have been diverted from the system into alternative programs. OJJDP also addresses juvenile offenders who have been waived or transferred out of the juvenile justice system into adult criminal court, typically for the most serious and violent crimes. OJJDP's Comprehensive Strategy for Serious,

Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders is the foundation of much of OJP's juvenile justice programming to assist state, local, and tribal communities in addressing juvenile delinquency.

**MEANS – Annual Goal 2.2**

**Dollars/FTE**

Appropriation	FY 2000 Obligated		FY 2001 Enacted		FY 2002 Requested	
	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE
Missing Children	24	0	23	0	23	0
Management and Administration (OJP)	9	154	10	173	9	173
Juvenile Justice Programs	253	0	185	0	184	0
Title V (At-Risk Children's Grant Program)	0	0	95	0	95	0
Victims of Child Abuse	0	0	8	0	8	0
Juvenile Account Incentive Block Grants	239	0	249	0	249	0
Victims of Child Abuse*	13	0	14	0	15	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>154</b>	<b>584</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>583</b>	<b>173</b>

\* Includes Court Appointed Special Advocate

**Skills**

**OJP requires skilled administrators with expertise in program development, grant administration, technical assistance, evaluation and implementation. OJP also seeks staff**

**Information  
Technology**

OJP relies on data provided by its Program Accountability Library (PAL), which is an internal automated grant cataloging system.

## PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT – Annual Goal 2.2

### 2.2A Improve Juvenile Justice Systems

#### Background/ Program Objectives:

OJJDP provides national leadership, coordination, and resources to develop, implement, and support effective methods to prevent juvenile victimization and respond appropriately to juvenile delinquency. This is accomplished through prevention programs and a juvenile justice system that protects public safety, holds juvenile offenders accountable, and provides treatment and rehabilitative services based on the needs of each individual juvenile. In order to be eligible to receive a formula grant, a state must follow specific guidelines that include committing to achieve and maintain compliance with four core requirements outlined in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974. These statutory core requirements include: de-institutionalizing status offenders (a juvenile who has committed an act that would not be a crime if committed by an adult), confining juveniles separately from adults, taking steps on the state level to reduce the proportion of juveniles detained or confined in secure facilities who are members of a minority group, and removing juveniles from adult jail and lockup.

In addition, OJJDP administers the Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASA) Program. The CASA program funds local programs to support court appointed special advocates in their efforts to assist overburdened court officials and social workers. This program not only serves as a safety net for abused and neglected children, but also as an essential ally in delinquency prevention. Research shows that abused and neglected children are at increased risk of repeating the same violent behavior they experience, and are therefore at increased risk of becoming delinquents and adult criminals.

#### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** States/Territories in Compliance with the Four Statutory Core Requirements (of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974, as amended.)

**Target:** 56                      **Actual:** 45

**Discussion:** Although 11 states did not fully meet all four of the core requirements of the JJDP Act, seven of those states did receive 75% of their FY 2000 Formula Grants allocation. As a result, 52 states and territories actually received funding under the Formula Grants program in FY 2000. Two states were determined to be ineligible for funding due to current state statutes and judicial policies, and two states' Formula Grant Plans remain under review.

States that have been determined to be ineligible to receive any or all of their Formula Grant allocation, receive ongoing technical assistance on procedures and strategies to help them attain and maintain compliance with the JJDP Act. All states participating in the OJJDP Formula Grants program are required to submit an annual Compliance Monitoring Report. A state receives 25% of its fiscal year allocation for compliance with each of the four core requirements.

**Public Benefit:** The primary purpose of the four core requirements of the JJDP Act is to ensure the safety of children in the justice system, while being responsive to the expressed needs of states and localities.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Compliance monitoring data are submitted on an annual basis by the State Planning Agency to OJJDP and is maintained in OJJDP files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Compliance monitoring reports are reviewed annually by OJJDP and an audit of the State's compliance monitoring system is conducted at a minimum of once every five years.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 goal.

**Performance Measure:** Number of Children Served by the CASA Program

**Target:** 180,000      **Actual:** 207,000

**Discussion:** The National Court Appointed Special Advocate Association (NCASAA) administered 107 awards to local programs in FY2000. It provided 45 monitoring sites, 57,616 technical assistance consultations to programs nationwide as well as 134 training opportunities to its grantees. The number of CASA volunteers increased to 52,760 thus increasing the number of children represented. Through this process, the NCASAA successfully met its goal of increasing the number of abused and neglected children receiving quality representation in dependency hearings. For 2000, the actual number of children served was 207,000, an increase of 35,000 children since 1998.

**Public Benefit:** Children who are victims of abuse and neglect receive effective and quality representation in dependency hearings, thus ensuring that the child's best interest is given appropriate consideration by the court and the child welfare system. CASA volunteers work to ensure that children under the supervision of a court and the child protection system receive the services and attention as detailed in statutory mandates. These efforts assist court and child protection systems that are often overburdened. This program acts as a safety net for abused and neglected children and also supports delinquency prevention as abused and neglected children are at increased risk of delinquency and adult offending.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees, on-site monitoring and data stored in internal files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data will be validated and verified through a review of progress reports submitted by grantees; telephone contact, and on-site monitoring of grantee performance by grant program managers.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to exceed the corresponding FY 2001 target. Current estimates indicate that 248,000 children will be served by the CASA program.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, formula grant funding to states that comply with statutory core requirements related to juveniles will continue. However, OJJDP will continue to monitor compliance through on-site monitoring visits and audits of states' compliance monitoring system at least once every five years.

In addition, OJJDP will continue to provide grants to local programs supporting court appointed special advocates. The CASA program will continue to provide grants nationwide in the areas of: (1) new program development; (2) urban program expansion; (3) program expansion of state organizations; and (4) demonstration grants. Through the grant award process NCASAA will select existing CASA organizations that demonstrate continuing community need and support, and quality administrative and management practices, in order to build the capacity to recruit, train and supervise CASA volunteers as well as start-up programs that demonstrate the need for a CASA program in terms of under-served children and the capacity to implement a program. The NCASAA will also continue to administer funds to the selected grantees and provide training and technical assistance, both on-site, via phone and email consultation, and through training.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

OJJDP coordinates with other OJP Bureaus and Program Offices as well as COPS, the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the National Academy of Public Administration, and the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators.

**2.2B Support Early Intervention and Prevention Programs Focused on Youth Crimes**

**Background/ Program Objectives:**

Research has shown that early intervention and positive adult support make a difference in the lives of juveniles. Among the intervention and prevention activities supported by OJJDP are mentoring programs that link at-risk youth with responsible adults to provide guidance, promote personal and social responsibility, discourage gang involvement and encourage participation in community service and activities. Also included are programs to reduce the illegal use of tobacco, alcohol and drugs, decrease truancy, and increase healthy child development. The mentoring program is designed to support youth at risk of educational failure, dropping out of school, or involvement in delinquent activities, including gangs and drug abuse.

At the end of 1998, OJJDP completed a Report to Congress on the Juvenile Mentoring Program (JUMP) including preliminary results from an evaluation of the JUMP program, which will continue through the year 2001. The preliminary results indicate that JUMP shows promise as a preventive measure to reduce delinquency and give participating youth a better chance at success. OJJDP also funded a National Mentoring Center that provides training and technical assistance to mentoring programs through a variety of service, resources and conferences. In addition, OJJDP supports mentoring through the Safe Futures initiative, which assists communities in combating delinquency by developing a full range of coordinated services and formula grant funding to individual states.

**FY 2000 Actual Performance:**

**Performance Measure:** Total Number of Mentoring Programs Implemented

**Target:** 192                      **Actual:** 203

**Discussion:** OJJDP issued a revised solicitation in FY 2000, and as a result of an increased Congressional appropriation for mentoring, was able to exceed the target in FY 2000. These programs represent a cross-section of the nation, including rural, urban, suburban and tribal areas. After funding this effort for three years, it was apparent that the programs required a tremendous amount of support and guidance in order to implement their programs. In an effort to address barriers and challenges involved in implementing a mentoring program, OJJDP funded The National Mentoring Center. The Center provides training and technical assistance, dissemination of publications and bulletins, and conducts regional training to strengthen the ability of JUMP programs and other mentoring programs around the country.

**Public Benefit:** Studies have shown that the presence of a caring adult in the life of a child can have a major impact on a youth's ability to succeed and have a positive effect on reducing negative behaviors and risk factors. Mentoring has been seen as a promising approach. More than 9,500 youth have received onetoone mentoring, in 46 states and two territories. Two hundred and three (203) programs have been funded under this effort. JUMP forges supportive, collaborative relationships between schools and public agencies and/or private nonprofit organizations that cause the entities to work together for the benefit of the school, community and youth. In addition, youth that are involved in mentoring relationships are less likely to get involved in drugs and alcohol, have poor school attendance, to drop out of school and experience problems with family and peers.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 goal.

<p><b>Data Collection and Storage:</b> Information is obtained through program site data collections and maintained by the site and program monitor and stored in OJJDP files.</p> <p><b>Data Validation and Verification:</b> Grant monitors perform on-site monitoring of grantee performance as well as program evaluations.</p> <p><b>Data Limitations:</b> None known at this time.</p>
--

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, JUMP will continue to link at-risk youth with responsible adults to provide guidance, promote personal and social responsibility, increase educational participation, and discourage use of illegal drugs, violence, and other criminal activity. In addition, the mentoring training and technical assistance program will continue to provide technical training visits; on-site assistance to struggling mentoring programs with significant program operational needs; as well as training conferences at the local, state, regional, and national levels. In addition, Information Technology International, has completed a SelfEvaluation Workbook for JUMP projects. The purpose of this document is to provide projects with evaluation tools to collect data on project operation and effectiveness. This document has just been published and should be disseminated in the next several months. Training will be available to grantees on how to utilize the workbook.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

OJP is coordinating with internal program offices as well as with the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics.



**2.2C Support Programs to Counter Youth Violence**

**Background/ Program Objectives:**

Responding to youth gang violence, OJP’s OJJDP launched the Comprehensive Response to America’s Youth Gang Problem. This effort included five major components: 1) the National Gang Center; 2) a multi-site demonstration of the Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention and Suppression Program; 3) an independent evaluation of the Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach; 4) training and technical assistance in community-wide responses to youth gangs and violence related issues; and 5) targeted acquisition and dissemination of gang materials through OJJDP’s clearinghouse and the National Gang Center.

The demonstration sites under the Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention and Suppression Program (the Model) were selected to implement and test the comprehensive approach designed to reduce gang violence. The Model’s key strategies focus on community mobilization, social intervention, opportunities provision (academic/vocational), suppression/enforcement and organizational change and development.

The objectives of OJJDP’s Model, which are being implemented in all of the above initiatives, include: 1) reduce violent crime committed by targeted youth gang members; 2) reduce drug related crimes and drug use among targeted youth gang members; 3) reduce property crimes committed by targeted youth gang members; 4) increase public safety through community mobilization and the reduction of youth gang crime; 5) increase academic, social, and vocational competencies among targeted youth; and 6) enhance the strategy and capacity of public and private community agencies to address the youth gang problem in their community.

In recent years, OJJDP has developed a number of initiatives to address youth crime: The Rural Gang Initiative provided resources to four rural communities to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the local youth gang problem. These communities gathered various types of data to develop gang prevention services and to intervene with delinquent and gang involved youth. The Gang-Free Communities Program assists communities in responding to youth gang problems through a strategic, data-driven approach that includes prevention, intervention, and suppression of youth gang crime and violence. Communities participating in this program are required to leverage local resources. Finally, the Comprehensive Gang Model: An Enhanced School/Community Approach to Reducing Youth Gang Crime, will help develop an “enhanced” model approach or approaches that comprehensively address youth gang problems that exist in the community and the community’s schools.

**FY 2000 Actual Performance:**

**Performance Measure:** Comprehensive Gang Programs Implemented

**Target:** 16 new, 12 continuing

**Actual:** 0 new, 12 continuing

**Discussion:** In FY 2000, OJJDP released two new solicitations in anticipation of 16 new Comprehensive Gang Programs, thus increasing the number of Comprehensive Gang Programs to 28. These solicitations were released in the summer of 2000 and required that applications be submitted in August 2000. In response to these solicitations, OJJDP received 54 proposals for the new programs. Due to the time required to submit these proposals to outside peer review, review those with high scores, and make a final decision, the 16 new programs were not brought on-line in FY 2000. In addition, OJJDP has made a practice of conducting pre-award exploratory site visits to discuss the Model and share expectations about the program prior to selecting awardees. Due to this important,

<p><b>Data Collection and Storage:</b> Information is obtained from OJJDP files through program site collections and maintained by the site and program monitor.</p> <p><b>Data Validation and Verification:</b> Grant monitors perform on-site monitoring as well as program evaluation.</p> <p><b>Data Limitations:</b> None known at this time.</p>
--

but time consuming step in the review process, decisions were delayed beyond the end of the fiscal year.

**Public Benefit:** After a decline in the number of gangs and gang members in the United States during 1997 and 1998, the number of gang members in the U.S. increased in 1999. Additionally, citizens in major cities, suburban areas, and even small towns and cities are still witnessing the impact of gangs and the crime and violence associated with them. OJJDP's Comprehensive Gang Model is an approach designed to reduce gang violence that has met with considerable success over the last several years in communities across the country. Criminal and juvenile justice professionals, as well as citizens, are very satisfied with the model's approach and with the outcomes they have seen in their communities and youth. Additionally, early evaluation data suggests that the program is having a positive effect on those it serves - decreased gang violence, crime, drug sales and drug usage as well as increases in employment and education of those being targeted. Evidence is suggesting youth seem to be pulling away from negative activities and steering towards positive opportunities, thus making more productive citizens and safer communities.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 goal. OJJDP is moving quickly to make final award decisions on the FY 2000 gang programs. In some cases where applicants have submitted exceptionally strong proposals and have described in their proposal an understanding of what the model requires, OJJDP is considering conducting an "exploratory conference call" with key figures in the community as opposed to conducting an actual visit.

#### **Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY2002, OJJDP will continue its programs designed to respond to youth gang problems, especially violence, through a strategic, data-driven approach that includes prevention, intervention, and suppression of youth gang crime. Strategies will include community mobilization, social intervention, opportunities, suppression and enforcement, and organizational change and development to encourage communities to develop comprehensive approaches to gang violence. To accomplish this, OJJDP will be providing three-year grants to communities to implement the Comprehensive Model to increase the effectiveness of communities response to gang problems.

#### **Crosscutting Activities:**

OJJDP collaborates with its federal, state and local partners. Most recently, during its involvement with the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Program, OJJDP worked with the COPS Office, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education. Each agency pooled its resources and created a unified application process where school districts could apply for an array of funding to implement comprehensive strategies to address school violence.

**2.2D Reduce Youth Crime and Improve Juvenile Justice Operations in Indian Country**

**Background/ Program Objectives:**

To address the juvenile justice issues in Indian Country, financial and technical assistance and training is provided to tribal governments to support prevention initiatives and make juvenile justice system improvements. This is accomplished primarily through OJJDP's Tribal Youth Program. This is a flexible grant program designed to meet the unique needs of each American Indian community applicant to prevent and control delinquency and improve its juvenile justice system. In making funding decisions, OJJDP considers the size of the tribe, geographic location, and whether the tribe is in an urban or rural area. Also, to be eligible for the grants, applicants focus on one or more of the following categories of program activity:

*Category I--Reduce, control, and prevent crime and delinquency both by and against tribal youth.* Elements relevant to this objective include community needs assessments, risk factor identification, family strengthening, truancy reduction, dropout prevention, parenting, anti-gang education, conflict resolution, child abuse prevention, gang reduction strategies, youth gun violence reduction, and sex offender services.

*Category II--Interventions for court-involved tribal youth.* Elements relevant to this objective include graduated sanctions, restitution, diversion, home detention, foster and shelter care, community service, improved aftercare services, mental health services interventions (e.g., crisis intervention, screening, counseling for suicidal behavior), and mentoring.

*Category III--Improvement to tribal juvenile justice systems.* Elements relevant to this objective include indigenous justice; training for juvenile court personnel, including judges and prosecutors; intake assessments; model tribal juvenile codes; advocacy programs; genderspecific programming; probation services; and aftercare programs.

*Category IV--Prevention programs focusing on alcohol and drugs.* Elements relevant to this objective include case management, drug and alcohol education, drug testing, substance abuse counseling for juveniles and families, services for co-occurring substance abuse disorders, and training for treatment professionals.

**FY 2000 Actual Performance:**

**Performance Measure:** Tribal Youth Programs Implemented

**Target: 72 Actual: 44**

**Discussion:** In FY 2000, there were a total of 44 Tribal Youth Program grants. Thirty-eight federally recognized, applicant tribes were funded to address comprehensive delinquency prevention, control, and juvenile justice improvement for American Indian youth. Tribes designed programs that were culturally based and incorporated traditional practices where appropriate. In addition, six tribes were funded under the Tribal Youth Program/Mental Health Project. This solicitation was established to promote youth mental health, education, and substance abuse-related services and support for juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention through the creation and implementation of culturally sensitive programs. This program provides tribes the opportunity to apply for Tribal Youth Mental Health Initiative funds. The Mental Health Initiative provided tribes with easy-to-access assistance in developing innovative strategies that focus on mental health, substance abuse, and community safety needs of American Indian and Alaska Native young people and their families. However, the methods of disseminating solicitation information to the various tribes needs improvement. Existing tribal governments, consortiums, and general service providers should be engaged in

**Data Collection and Storage:** Information is obtained from reports and site data collection maintained by the sites and the program managers in OJJDP files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Grant monitors perform on-site monitoring of grantees performance as well as program evaluations. The OJJDP will continue to monitor the activities of continuing grantees while awarding new grants.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

getting the word out. To correct the problem, OJJDP will be updating mail logs by accessing other government service providers, contractors, tribal organizations, and the various web sites on the Internet.

**Public Benefit:** Tribal Youth Program anti-crime and delinquency prevention grants will be provided directly to Indian tribal governments. Additional information regarding other components of the Indian Country Law Enforcement Initiative through separate solicitations issued by other bureaus and offices will be made available. In addition, OJJDP will provide training and technical assistance to tribes with a component to support program-related research, evaluation, and statistics.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the corresponding FY 2001 target.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, OJJDP will continue funding the Tribal Youth Program to address juvenile crime and victimization prevention including truancy reduction, conflict resolution, and child abuse. The Tribal Youth Program will also continue to address issues such as: aftercare services, teen court and restitution programs, juvenile justice probation services, advocacy programs, drug testing, and substance abuse prevention for drugs and alcohol. In order to achieve this, OJJDP will continue to provide grants for training and technical assistance and fund evaluation activities for selected sites.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

OJJDP and other OJP functional areas are discussing partnering to provide services, programs, and funding to Native Americans with the Department of Health and Human Services.

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.3: SUBSTANCE ABUSE**

**Break the cycle of substance abuse and crime through testing, treatment and sanctions.**

**Annual Goal 2.3: Break the cycle of substance abuse and crime through testing, treatment and sanctions.**

**STRATEGIES**

Monitor and conduct research on substance use by criminal offenders (Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring - ADAM).  
Support programs providing drug testing, treatment and graduated sanctions for persons under the supervision of the criminal system.  
Prevent juvenile use and abuse of drugs and alcohol.

The OJP works to prevent use and abuse of drugs and alcohol through a variety of demonstration, educational, and public outreach programs. Research shows that drug use and crime are closely linked. The OJP funds a number of ongoing data collection programs used to monitor the drug/crime nexus, including: the National Institute of Justice's (NIJ) Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) Program and the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (BJS) National Crime Victimization Survey and Surveys of Jail Inmates, State Prisoners, Federal Prisoners, and Probationers. For more than a decade, the majority of detained arrestees tested positive for recent drug use within 48 hours of their arrest. Research indicates that combining criminal justice sanctions with substance abuse treatment is effective in decreasing drug and alcohol use and related crime. In addition, correctional agencies have begun to intervene in the cycle of substance abuse and crime by implementing intervention activities, drug testing, and/or treating this highrisk population while under custody or supervision. Under the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Program, research reveals that offenders who undergo drug testing and treatment while in prison are almost twice as likely to remain drugfree and crimefree after release as offenders who do not receive drug testing and treatment.

**MEANS – Annual Goal 2.3**

**Dollars/FTE**

Appropriation	FY 2000 Obligated		FY 2001 Enacted		FY 2002 Requested	
	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE
Management and Administration (OJP)	2	33	2	37	2	37
Alcohol and Substance Abuse	0	0	5	0	5	0
Drug Courts	37	0	50	0	50	0
Residential Substance Abuse Treatment	65	0	63	0	74	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>37</b>

**Skills**

**OJP requires skilled administrators with expertise in program development, grant administration, technical assistance, evaluation, and implementation. Expertise includes social science research and the collection and analysis of statistical data.**

**Information Technology**

OJP relies upon data from the Program Accountability Library (PAL), which is an internal automated grant cataloging system. These systems track and provide detailed, statistical reports.

## PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT – Annual Goal 2.3

### 2.3A Monitor Substance Abuse by Arrestees and Criminal Offenders

#### Background/ Program Objectives:

OJP's National Institute of Justice (NIJ) manages the Arrestee Drug Abuse Monitoring (ADAM) program, which provides valuable program planning and policy information on drug use and other characteristics of arrestees through quarterly interviews of incarcerated adults and juveniles in 35 sites across the country. Through interviews and drug testing, these 35 communities continue to assess the dimensions of their particular local substance abuse problems, evaluate programs and interventions with offender populations, and plan policy responses appropriate to these populations.

The ADAM program is the only federally-funded drug use prevalence program to directly address the relationship between drug use and criminal behavior. It is also the only program to provide drug use estimates based on urinalysis results, which have proven to be the most reliable method of determining recent drug use. The ADAM program obtains voluntary, anonymous interview and urine samples from arrestees at selected booking facilities throughout the United States.

#### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** Total Number of ADAM Sites

**Target:** 35                      **Actual:** 35

**Discussion:** NIJ provides discretionary funding and technical assistance to its grantees to operate ADAM sites. In addition, NIJ disseminates publications about the mission and strategy of the ADAM program to law enforcement, policy makers, researchers and practitioners.

**Public Benefit:** Few federal programs provide nationwide quarterly data on drug use among arrestees like the ADAM program. The expressed goal of the ADAM program is to be able to provide a "National Estimator" of drug use in the United States. While more sites are needed to meet this goal, operating 35 sites provided practitioners and policy makers with comprehensive data tending to show a statistical correlation between the use of drugs and certain types of criminal activity. Data also gave policy makers and law enforcement officials, in cities where ADAM sites were operational, an opportunity to target particular types of drug use that were associated with increased crime rates.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the projected FY 2001 goal.

**Data Collection and Storage:** ADAM site information is collected from active sites and stored in NIJ files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** NIJ verifies performance measures through progress reports submitted by grantees, onsite monitoring of grantee performance by grant program managers, and telephone contact.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

#### Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:

In FY 2002, NIJ will continue to fund ADAM sites in support of obtaining information pertaining to drug use and characteristics of the arrestees for a better understanding of substance abuse patterns in communities across the Country. The ADAM, network currently operates in 35 sites and the District of Columbia. When fully implemented, it is expected that ADAM sites will expand to a total of 75.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

OJP coordinates its substance abuse treatment programs with the Department of Health and Human Services' Center for Substance Abuse Treatment and the Office of National Drug Control Policy. The FBI, DEA, United States Marshals Service, and the United States Attorneys' Offices and other federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies are using ADAM data to determine detailed trends in drug use.

## 2.3B Support Programs Providing Drug Testing, Treatment and Graduated Sanctions

### Background/ Program Objectives:

The demand for treatment services is tremendous. According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, approximately 980,000 of the 1.4 million inmates (about 80 percent) in state prisons have used drugs in the past. However, only about 11 percent of prison inmates, and a smaller percentage of jail inmates, participate in drug treatment programs. About one in six reported committing their current offense to obtain money for drugs. The lack of substance abuse treatment is also a juvenile problem largely because little is known about what types of programs are effective for this population. As a result, very few programs exist.

The drug court movement began as a community-level response to reduce crime and substance abuse among criminal justice offenders. A drug court brings together the court, other criminal justice agencies and the treatment community to create a paradigm shift when intervening with substance abusing offenders. The OJP's Drug Court Program Office (DCPO) provides financial and technical assistance for states, state drug courts, units of local government, local courts and tribal governments to develop and implement drug treatment courts. Drug courts employ the coercive power of the judicial system to subject non-violent offenders to an integrated mix of treatment, drug testing, incentives and sanctions to break the cycle of substance abuse and crime. The DCPO fully supports this community-level movement by awarding drug court grants and providing targeted technical assistance and training.

The OJP's Correction Program Office (CPO) administers the Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) for State Prisoners Program. This formula grant program assists states and units of local government in developing and implementing these programs within state and local correctional and detention facilities in which prisoners are incarcerated for a period of time sufficient to permit substance abuse treatment (6 - 12 months).

### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** Number of New Drug Courts

**Target:** 75      **Actual:** 56

**Discussion:** The chart reflects the original target of 75 new drug courts. However, after reassessing that target mid-year, a new target was set at 40. The reduction is due to a change in the implementation grant period (increasing from two to three years) which reduced the number of grants in FY 2000 and the corresponding drug courts expected to come on-line. DCPO will continue to award implementation grants to communities to provide training and technical assistance. Also, DCPO will continue to work with communities interested in planning an adult, juvenile and/or family court.

**Public Benefit:** Drug courts provide an effective alternative to traditional methods of dealing with the devastating impact of drugs and drug-related crime.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the corresponding FY 2001 target.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data are obtained from reports submitted by grantees; telephone contact, and on-site monitoring of grantees' performance by grant program managers. Additionally, the OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project, a collaborative effort with American University, provides data to measure performance.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data will be validated and verified through a review of the data by Drug Courts monitors surveying grantees and reviewing data.

**Data Limitations:** The number of new drug courts' data is supported by evaluative measures.



**Performance Measure:** Percentage of Drug Court Participants not Committing Crimes (During Program Performance)

**Target:** 80%    **Actual:** 80%

**Discussion:** DCPO requires grantees to provide an array of substance abuse and ancillary services to drug court program participants. These services help to ensure that program participants receive the help they need to remain drug free and reduce and/or eliminate recidivism.

**Public Benefit:** In 1998, Columbia University's National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse provided the first major academic review and analysis of drug courts and concluded that "drug courts provide closer and more comprehensive supervision and much more frequent drug testing and monitoring during the program than other forms of community supervision. More importantly, drug use and criminal behavior are substantially reduced while offenders are participating in drug court." The initiatives undertaken by DCPO to ensure that drug courts retain participants in the program benefit the public.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the corresponding FY 2001 target.

**Performance Measure:** Number of Offenders Treated for Substance Abuse (RSAT)

**Target:** 22,000    **Actual:** 29,172

**Discussion:** During FY 2000, CPO undertook numerous initiatives to further the implementation of the RSAT for State Inmates Formula Grant Program. In December, DCPO highlighted the program at the National Assembly, and then in March, CPO brought all of our Grantees to Washington for another of our series of Grant Management Workshops.

CPO will continue to provide technical assistance to states and territories on effective treatment modalities for incarcerated offenders with substance use disorders. CPO will continue to provide training and assistance in treating special populations (e.g. women, elderly, and prisoners with co-occurring substance use and mental disorders) and is committed to providing culturally-specific treatment programs to grantees. CPO grant managers work to ensure that grantees make appropriate and the most effective choices for their treatment programs and that they comply with regulations set forth in the application for, and administration of, grant funds. CPO is also actively involved in several intra- and interagency groups that promote use of the best and most current science in the development of drug treatment strategies and that evaluate programs in order to identify best practices in the field of substance abuse treatment. These best practices are then made available to practitioners who use these innovative programs to achieve more successful treatment outcomes with their corrections populations. As the main provider of technical assistance for the Federal Interagency Public Health/Corrections Working Group, CPO has provided resources for states to hold state assemblies to promote the public health and public safety partnerships on the state and local level.

**Public Benefit:** Providing these services to incarcerated offenders means that they will be less likely to use drugs upon release which will enable them to be more employable, more likely to build strong relationships with their families and communities, and less of a strain on community substance abuse resources as they continue to heal and maintain abstinence.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data are obtained from reports submitted by grantees; telephone contact, and onsite monitoring of grantees' performance by grant program managers. Additionally, the OJP Drug Court Clearinghouse and Technical Assistance Project, a collaborative effort with American University, provides data to measure performance.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data will be validated and verifies through a review of the data by Drug Courts and RSAT Program Office Program monitors surveying grantees and reviewing data.

**Data Limitations:** For a percent of drug court participants not committing crimes, this is self reported and data are not verified through evaluative measures.

Given the long established link between drugs and crime, offenders who remain drug free are less likely to commit crimes. This adds a public safety benefit as a result of addressing their treatment needs. Additionally, if they remain crime and drug-free, they will not continue to cycle through the criminal justice system. This allows the resources of law enforcement, the courts and corrections to be focused on more serious and violent offenders, which is another public benefit.

***FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:*** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to exceed the corresponding FY 2001 target. Our current estimate is 36,465.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, funding for the Drug Courts Program will be used to establish new drug courts and provide the additional assistance needed for new grantees, as well as further the national evaluation of drug courts. Additionally in FY 2002, efforts will continue under the RSAT program. This funding will be used to support the substance abuse treatment programs and offenders receiving the treatment. The funding will be used to conduct technical assistance workshops and conferences on effective treatment programs and strategies. These conferences will provide training for corrections practitioners on the essential elements of an effective program.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

DCPO coordinates with other DOJ components, as well as the Department of Health and Human Services' Center for Substance Abuse Treatment, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the State Justice Institute, and the Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.4: VICTIMS OF CRIME**  
***Uphold the rights of, and improve services to, America's crime victims.***

**Annual Goal 2.4: Uphold the rights of, and improve services to, America's crime victims.**

**STRATEGIES**

Provide financial and technical assistance (including training) to meet the needs of crime victims.  
 Support programs to meet the particular needs of child victims, including those who are missing, abused or neglected.  
 Develop knowledge about the needs of child victims, including those who are missing, abused or neglected.

OJP's Office for Victims of Crime (OVC) is dedicated to serving our nation's victims, including those in traditionally under served populations. OVC, in carrying out its mission, (1) enacts and enforces consistent, fundamental rights for crime victims in federal, state, juvenile, military, and tribal justice systems through a Victims Rights Constitutional Amendment; (2) provides comprehensive quality services for all victims; (3) integrates crime victims' issues into all levels of the country's education system to increase public awareness; (4) provides comprehensive quality training for service providers who work with crime victims; (5) develops a National Crime Victims Agenda to provide a guide for long term action; (6) serves in an international leadership role in promoting effective and sensitive victim services and rights around the world; and (7) ensures a central role for crime victims in the country's response to violence and victimization.

OVC administers a mix of formula and discretionary grant programs. Through its National Crime Victim Assistance program, OVC provides funds for programs that provide direct services to crime victims. OVC's compensation program helps reimburse victims for their outofpocket expenses related to crime. In order to more accurately measure the effectiveness of OVC's programs, and provide the appropriate kinds of services victims most need and want, the OVC and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) are funding a study to identify victims' needs (estimated completion in March 2002), the sources of aid they seek to meet those needs, the adequacy of the aid they receive, the role of victim assistance and compensation programs in delivering needed aid, and whether victims are accorded their full rights under applicable statutes. Additionally, OJP's other components offer a wide range of such training programs on a variety of victimrelated topics.

**MEANS – Annual Goal 2.4**

**Dollars/FTE**

Appropriation	FY 2000 Obligated		FY 2001 Enacted		FY 2002 Requested	
	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE
U.S. Attorneys	23	36	25	38	27	39
Management and Administration (OJP)	3	51	3	57	3	57
Crime Victims Fund	481	0	538	0	575	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>507</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>566</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>605</b>	<b>96</b>

**Skills**

**The program requires skilled administrators with expertise in program development, grant administration, technical assistance, evaluation and implementation. Expertise includes social science research and the collection and analysis of statistical data.**

Information  
Technology

OJP relies upon data from the Program Accountability Library (PAL), which is an internal, automated grant cataloging system. These systems track and provide detailed, statistical

**PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT – Annual Goal 2.4**

**2.4A Provide Victim Services**

**Background/ Program Objectives:**

OJP's OVC is committed to enhancing the Nation's capacity to assist crime victims and to provide leadership through policies and practices that promote justice and healing for crime victims. OVC works with national, international, state, military, and tribal victim assistance, and criminal justice agencies, as well as other professional organizations, to promote fundamental rights and comprehensive services for crime victims. OVC strives to improve the criminal justice system's response to victims of crime, including Native Americans, through the delivery of direct service and funding, training and technical assistance, and through monitoring the implementation of statutes providing victims rights and assistance. Additionally, the program is enhanced through demonstration projects with national impact and by publishing and disseminating publications highlighting promising practices in the effective treatment of crime victims, which can be replicated throughout the country.

**FY 2000 Actual Performance:**

**Performance Measure:** % of States with Long Range Funding Strategies for Victim Programs – Discontinued Measure

**Target:** 90%                      **Actual:** 49%

**Discussion:** OVC was unable to meet the target of 90%. This measure was an OVC pilot project. In FY 2000, several states submitted their applications late and/or incorrectly and missed the deadline. As this was a limited pilot project, this measure was discontinued beginning in FY 2001.

**Public Benefit:** States who did use the financial planning tools in combination with needs assessment were better able to direct funding to where needed the most which provide victims/public better services.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** This measure has been discontinued.

**Performance Measure:** % of States Implementing Needs Assessments to Identify Gaps in Victim Services – Discontinued Measure

**Target:** 95%                      **Actual:** 95%

**Discussion:** OVC is participating in OJP's statewide community initiative project in an effort to gather needs assessment information. The current strategy has been successful, however, the program will be discontinued in FY 2001 as the needs assessments on the state level should be completed.

**Public Benefit:** States using needs assessment tools were able to identify gaps in services and then provide funding for these "missing" services for victims/public.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees onsite monitoring, telephone contacts and technical assistance visits. The data will be stored in files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** OVC closely monitors grantees to validate and verify data by using progress reports submitted by grantees, onsite monitoring and telephone contact.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees onsite monitoring, telephone contacts and technical assistance visits. The data will be stored in files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** OVC closely monitors grantees to validate and verify data by using progress reports submitted by grantees, onsite monitoring and telephone contact.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Resources for this program are no longer funded through NIJ, therefore, the measure has been discontinued.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

As indicated above, resources for the program providing long range funding strategies for victim programs, and implementing needs assessments to identify gaps in victim services are no longer being funded. However, in FY 2001, OVC will increase the number of subgrants awarded to law enforcement agencies providing direct services for crime victims three percent above the FY 1999 base of 157. This is a relatively new program. Once a three percent increase has been achieved, OVC will set new performance targets for future increases.

In FY 2002, OVC will continue to support crime victims through its programs, training and technical assistance. In addition, to the increase in subgrants, OVC will use best practices of successful program as well as informational encouragement to achieve its goal.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

OVC closely coordinates with those involved with community justice initiatives (COPS, community corrections, local and state officials) in jurisdictions across the country.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees on-site monitoring, telephone contacts and technical assistance visits. The data will be stored in files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** OVC closely monitors grantees to validate and verify data by using progress reports submitted by grantees, onsite monitoring and telephone contact.

## 2.4B Implement Child Victim Support

### Background/ Program Objectives:

The OJP's Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) administers the Missing and Exploited Children's Program. This program coordinates activities under the Missing Children's Assistance Act, including preventing abductions, investigating the exploitation of children, locating missing children and reuniting them with their families, and addressing the psychological impact of abduction on the child and the family. Program funds are used to enhance the efforts of state and local communities in their comprehensive response to missing and exploited children issues through direct assistance in planning and program development; developing and disseminating policies, procedures and programmatic information related to search teams, investigations, and crisis intervention activities; reunification of youth with their families; and issues related to victimization of families and youth involved in the missing and exploitation problem.

### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** Personnel Trained in Missing & Exploited Children Issues

**Target:** 40,000 (cumulative) **Actual:** 52,037

**Discussion:** Since April 1, 1984, the date of the Title IV Cooperative Agreements, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) and Fox Valley Technical College trainers have provided technical assistance orientation/ training to law enforcement, criminal and justice, healthcare and social service professionals nationwide and in Canada in child sexual exploitation and missing-child case detection, identification, investigation, and prevention. Since the Jimmy Ryce Law Enforcement Center was dedicated on April 14, 1997, the center has trained chiefs of police and sheriffs with representation from all fifty states and Guam.

**Public Benefit:** The NCMEC and Fox Valley Technical College training programs offer multi-tiered training and promotes awareness of and encourages the use of existing FBI and other federal resources to assist law-enforcement agencies investigating missing and exploited children cases. The purpose is to better equip local law enforcement with the tools they need to rapidly respond when a child disappears or is being exploited in cyberspace. These programs also provide on-site specialized training to prosecutors and judges on the legal, technical, and victim issues involved in prosecuting and adjudicating persons charged with victimizing children online. The Comprehensive School Safety Leadership Initiative provides standardized and comprehensive training for law enforcement, school administrators, juvenile justice agencies, and social service administrators.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to exceed the corresponding FY 2001 target. Current estimates indicate that we will train 53,000 personnel.

**Data Collection and Storage:** Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees, onsite monitoring and data stored in internal files.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data will be validated and verified through a review of progress reports submitted by grantees; telephone contact, and onsite monitoring of grantees' performance by grant program managers. Additionally, the Fox Valley Technical College has management information systems, that have the capacity to verify and validate training components.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

**Performance Measure:** Number of Missing Children Hotline Calls Received Annually

**Target:** 135,000      **Actual:** 143,015

**Discussion:** For FY 2000, the actual number of calls received on all National Center for Missing and Exploited Children toll-free lines, including CyberTipline, was 143,015, exceeding the projected 135,000. The program will be enhanced through the deployment of computer assisted statistics collection and two new toll-free numbers that direct calls to staff without cycling through the Hotline.

The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children's Hotline consists of 23 incoming 800 lines plus a line for the hearing impaired. The system operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year. Calls on runaways are transferred directly to the National Runaway Switchboard. A Dictaphone ProLog Recording System provides 24 hour taping of all calls to assist law enforcement. The system can also forward incoming 800 calls directly to nonprofit organizations, State clearinghouses, and cellular phones of on-call staff. The hotline has bilingual operators and can handle more than 140 languages via AT&T's Language Line Service. Since 1984 the total calls to NCMEC for services is 1,527,197.

On March 9, 1998, NCMEC launched the CyberTipline initiative to serve as the national online clearinghouse for tips and leads about child sexual exploitation. The CyberTipline, [www.cybertipline.com](http://www.cybertipline.com), was created by Congressional mandate to allow persons to report online (and via toll-free telephone) the enticement of children for sexual acts, child sexual molestation (non-familial), child pornography, child sex tourism, and child prostitution. The total number of reports received on the CyberTipline since 1998 is 33,579.

**Public Benefit:** The benefit to the public of NCMEC's hotline numbers and CyberTipline is that this system allows immediate responsiveness to the general public for assistance, information, publications, leads and sighting reporting for missing and exploited children. This system allows for the immediate collection and dissemination of information to enhance case management and case analysis in missing and exploited children cases. It expands networking of federal agencies with non-profits, state clearinghouses, and law enforcement agencies in providing crucial and timely assistance in missing and exploited children cases.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to exceed the corresponding FY 2001 target. Current estimates project that we will receive 145,000 calls.

<p><b>Data Collection and Storage:</b> Data will be obtained through progress reports submitted by grantees, onsite monitoring and data stored in internal files.</p> <p><b>Data Validation and Verification:</b> Data will be validated and verified through a review of progress reports submitted by grantees; telephone contact, and onsite monitoring of grantees' performance by grant program managers. Additionally, the Exploited Children management information system has the capacity to verify and validate hot line calls.</p> <p><b>Data Limitations:</b> None known at this time.</p>
--

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, OJJDP will continue to provide grants to enhance state and local community efforts in their comprehensive response to missing and exploited/neglected children. OJJDP plans to continue to offer training and technical assistance to support grantees.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

OJP's OJJDP works with national, international, state, military, and tribal victim assistance, and criminal justice agencies, as well as other professional organization, to promote fundamental rights and comprehensive services for crime victims.



**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2.5 COMMUNITY SERVICE**

**Support innovative, community-based programs aimed at reducing crime and violence in our communities.**

**Annual Goal 2.5: Support innovative, effective, community-based programs aimed at reducing crime and violence in our communities.**

**STRATEGIES**

Encourage community-based approaches to crime and justice at the state and local level by comprehensive and collaborative programs such as Weed and Seed.  
Support community policing initiatives.  
Support community justice initiatives.  
Assist communities in responding to and resolving racial and ethnic tension.

Through the Community Relations Service, the Department will continue to provide conflict resolution, conflict prevention and resolution training, and technical assistance to communities. Through the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), and the Community Relations Service (CRS), DOJ will continue to provide assistance to state and local governments with community-based strategies to fight crime and reduce violence and racial tension. As part of this strategy, CRS and OJP will engage communities in developing strategies that focus on bringing together the energy of community leaders, organizations, and citizens to work towards crime-

prevention and providing safe neighborhoods and communities for all Americans. Community policing opens lines of communication between the police and residents. Police officers and sheriffs deputies, as public servants who interact with citizens on a daily basis, have a unique opportunity to demonstrate the importance of citizen involvement in the community. In turn, they realize that their authority and effectiveness are linked directly to the support they receive from citizens.

In FY 2002, DOJ, through the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), will continue to provide funds to state and local jurisdictions for the direct hiring of law enforcement officers and the advancement of community policing. In light of the growing concern of crime in and around the nation's primary and secondary schools, the COPS Office will focus hiring efforts on increasing the number of school resource officers (SROs) serving in our nation's schools. In addition, the Office will continue to advance the concept of community policing through the COPS Police Integrity Initiative.

OJP firmly supports efforts to involve the community in identifying, combating, and preventing crime. OJP also supports community involvement in the choice, design, and implementation of programs; flexible use of federal funding and creative integration of local, state, and federal resources that allow for maximum leveraging and sustain ability of effort. Through the various OJP formula and discretionary grant programs, "bottom up" planning is emphasized to ensure federal resources are integrated with state, local, and private resources to solve public safety problems in communities nationwide. OJP encourages communities, residents, or communitybased groups to learn about these programs and to work in partnership with their local government to ensure that they have the resources needed to address crime. For example, Operation Weed and Seed facilitates a multiagency approach to law enforcement, crime prevention, and community revitalization. The Weed and Seed strategy is based on the active participation of community residents, faithbased organizations, schools, and businesses in partnership with criminal justice and nonjustice systems such as mental health, social service, and drug treatment providers to the develop of safe and healthy communities.

**MEANS – Annual Goal 2.5**

**Dollars/FTE**

Appropriation	FY 2000 Obligated		FY 2001 Enacted		FY 2002 Requested	
	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE	\$ mil	FTE
Community Relations Service	8	48	8	56	9	56
Management and Administration (OJP)	3	44	3	54	3	62
Weed and Seed	33	0	34	0	59	0
Community Policing*	741	192	726	215	468	215
<i>Other Crime Control Program - Prevention</i>	1	0	1	0	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>786</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>772</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>333</b>

\* Includes Criminal Records Upgrade and DNA Identification Grants

**Skills**

**CRS requires conciliation specialists, managers, and program specialists in order to meet the performance goals. Conciliation specialists must be skilled in conflict resolution and violence prevention techniques. In addition, the managers and program specialists require skills in needs analysis; technical assistance; and program development, implementation, and evaluation. COPS and OJP require skilled administrators with expertise in program development, grant administration, technical assistance, evaluation and implementation. In addition, OJP seeks staff with expertise in social science research, including the collection**

**Information Technology**

OJP relies upon data from the Program Accountability Library (PAL). These systems track and provide detailed, statistical reports. In addition, COPS relies on its own case management system.

## PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT – Annual Goal 2.5

### 2.5A Support Community-Based Initiatives and Assist in the Reduction of Violent Crime

#### Background/ Program Objectives:

The Weed and Seed strategy is administered by the OJP's Executive Office for Weed and Seed (EOWS). Since 1991, this strategy has grown from three to over 200 sites nationwide. The Weed and Seed strategy assists communities in establishing strategies that link federal, state and local law enforcement and criminal justice efforts with private sector and community efforts. It assists communities in "weeding out" violent crime, gang activity, drug use and drug trafficking in targeted neighborhoods and then "seeding" the targeted areas with programs that lead to social and economic rehabilitation and revitalization. In addition to the weeding and seeding aspects of the strategy, the Weed and Seed sites engage in community policing activities that foster pro-active police-community engagement and problem solving.

In 1999, ABT Associates published its national evaluation of Weed and Seed. In six of the eight Weed and Seed sites evaluated, clear evidence exists that Part I crime (homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny and auto theft) declined more rapidly than in comparable areas over the course of the program, attributable to Weed and Seed Program efforts. Furthermore, the evaluation found that Weed and Seed funding acted as a significant catalyst for general community revitalization efforts and that most target area communities have undertaken programs and created beneficial community organizations that likely would not have come into existence without Weed and Seed.

One of the initiatives incorporated in the Weed and Seed strategy is the establishment of safe havens. A safe haven is a facility that provides a variety of youth and adult services that are coordinated in a highly visible, accessible facility secure against crime and illegal drug activity (e.g., a neighborhood school). This facility allows youth and other residents to access needed services, develop relationships, find opportunities to be productive and successful, and enhance skills. Through its visibility, proximity, and program diversity for residents of all ages, it fosters resistance to drugs, crime and other neighborhood problems. The safe haven also provides services and support programs like educational, cultural, recreational, health, and justice-related, with emphasis on coordinated delivery of these services. A safe haven provides a platform for which residents and service providers can revitalize their neighborhoods.

#### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** Percent of Participants who Feel that Safe Havens are Working to Reduce Crime (% of responses, customer survey)

**Target:** 80% **Actual:** 88%

**Discussion:** Survey results indicate the effectiveness of the Weed and Seed program to support innovation, community-based strategies aimed at reducing crime, delinquency and violence in our communities.

**Public Benefit:** The Weed and Seed strategy has stimulated a much greater self-help approach to the problem of distressed communities. This comes from the emphasis on broad based community participation and from the requirement that local progress flows from local involvement.

**Data Collection and Storage:** EOWS collects data from grantees annually on a voluntary basis. The surveys are sent to grantees who distribute them to police departments, USAOs, residents and other agencies/programs (e.g. school districts).

**Data Validation and Verification:** EOWS validates and verifies data through a review of progress reports submitted by grantees, telephone contact and onsite monitoring of grantee performance by program managers.

**Data Limitations:** These activities are reflective of respondents' perceptions and projections are difficult to make. Additionally, because the surveys are voluntary, percentages can vary due to the number of surveys that are answered. Furthermore, the data are only collected by the program office during the summer of current year for the previous year (e.g., data for 2000 will not be available until May 2001).

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the corresponding FY 2001 target.

**Performance Measure:** Community Policing Activities Used by Sites Participating in Weed and Seed (% of responses, customer survey) – Discontinued Measure

**Target:** NA **Actual:** Data collection unsuccessful

**Discussion:** The chart does not project targets for outyears due to the fact that these figures are established through voluntary surveys of grantees, community members, safe haven participants, etc. This measure has been discontinued as annual data collection has been unsuccessful.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, the EOWS will continue to support communities in the development and implementation of the Weed and Seed strategy including safe havens and community policing. The Weed and Seed strategy will encourage community-based approaches to crime and justice at the state and local level. The program will continue to provide grant funding to communities to help develop and implement comprehensive strategies to weed out violent crime, drug and gun trafficking, and gang activity and seed the neighborhood with programs that achieve and maintain crime prevention and economic revitalization.

**DISCONTINUED MEASURE:  
Annual Data Collection Unsuccessful**

<b>Community Policing Activities Used by Sites Participating in Weed and Seed (FY98) [OJP]</b>	
<b>Foot Patrols</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>Bike Patrols</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>Substations</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Crime Watch</b>	<b>142</b>

**Data Collection and Storage:** EOWS collects data from grantees annually on a voluntary basis. The surveys are sent to grantees who distribute them to police departments, USAOs, residents and other agencies/programs (e.g. school districts).

**Data Validation and Verification:** EOWS validates and verifies data through a review of progress reports submitted by grantees, telephone contact and onsite monitoring of grantee performance by program managers.

**Data Limitations:** These activities are reflective of respondents' perceptions and projections are difficult to make. Additionally, because the surveys are voluntary, percentages can vary due to the number of surveys that are answered. Furthermore, the data are only collected by the program office during the summer of current year for the previous year (e.g., data for 2000 will not be available until May 2001).

NIJ impact evaluation final report and GAO findings have assisted EOWS in improving data collection efforts. EOWS is establishing a Weed and Seed Data Center. This will include maps showing each site's geographic area and Safe Haven locations, the most recent Government Performance and Results Act reports submitted to EOWS, and selected demographic data that has been estimated for each site's service area.

**Crosscutting Activities:** OJP works with the U.S. Attorneys, the National Governors Association, local law enforcement, and various community and civic leaders. In addition, it partners with the Departments of Labor and Education.

## 2.5B Support Community Policing Initiatives

### Background/ Program Objectives:

As crime and the fear of crime rose in the 1970s and 1980s, it became apparent that the traditional law enforcement response was not effective. Police found themselves reacting to crime, rather than preventing it and communities felt law enforcement was unresponsive to their concerns. A few cities began experimenting with community involvement in solving problems and addressing the conditions that lead to crime. They found it surprisingly effective. As the practice grew and developed, it came to be known as community policing.

The COPS Office has three primary objectives: reduce the fear of crime; increase community trust in law enforcement; and contribute to the reduction in locally-identified, targeted crime and disorder. Community policing rests on three primary principles: 1.) continuous community-law enforcement partnership to address issues in the community; 2.) a problem-solving approach to the causes of crime; and 3.) sustained organizational change in the law enforcement agency that decentralizes command and empowers front-line officers to build partnerships in the community and address crime using innovative problem-solving techniques.

Through the efforts of local officials and the assistance of the COPS Office, more than 86 percent of the Nation is served by departments that employ community policing. The COPS Office provides advanced community policing training through a network of 28 Regional Community Policing Institutes (RCPIs) across the Nation.

The COPS Office awards grants based on the number of officers a jurisdiction estimates it can afford to fund, however, the actual number of officers can either increase or decrease from that initial estimate based on many factors including: the success of a jurisdiction's officer recruitment efforts; the actual availability of local matching funds (which could vary from initial estimates based on funding appropriated by local governments); and the number of officers that successfully complete academy training.

In addition, COPS in Schools program provides funding to hire School Resource Officers (SROs) to work in and around schools. SROs are community policing officers who patrol the school as their community policing beat. While the specific activities of an SRO are usually determined by local communities to address the unique needs of their school, SROs generally serve as liaisons with the community, school-based problem solvers, law-related educators, and law enforcement officers. COPS in Schools Officers are not security guards; they are an integral part of the protective fabric of the school. They develop relationships with students, faculty and staff allowing them to build respect between law enforcement and schools, and prevent problems before they occur.

### FY 2000 Actual Performance:

**Performance Measure:** New Police Officers Funded and On the Street

**Target:** 109,151 funded 84,500 on the street

**Actual:** 109,212 funded 73,629 on the street

**Discussion:** Although COPS exceed the target for officers funded, COPS fell short of the target for the number of officers on the street. The projections have been revised to more accurately reflect the time it takes for an officer to reach the street. In addition, if we find that grantees are encountering difficulties implementing their grant, COPS will provide training ranging from distance learning to on-site technical assistance.

**Public Benefit:** Through COPS grants we have helped foster law enforcement-community relationships, that contribute to greater public safety. Our grantees

**Data Collection and Storage:** The COPS Management system tracks all individual grants. The COPS Count Survey collects data from police agencies on the number of COPS funded officers on the street.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data review is conducted as part of the grants management function.

**Data Limitations:** None known at this time.

provide a range of services to the public, from problem solving partnerships with schools and promoting school safety to increased technology that allows officers to be more pro-active in fighting crimes.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance COPS does not expect to meet the corresponding FY 2001 target. Current projections (revised to include extended grant implementation time) indicate that COPS will have 90,200 officers on the street by the end of FY 2001.

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

In FY 2002, the COPS Office will continue to award hiring, technology and crime prevention grants; provide training to law enforcement agencies and citizens; and conduct conferences to share information on community policing. In addition, the COPS Office intends to study and evaluate the effects of community policing on crime, fear of crime, and trust in law enforcement in a representative group of law enforcement agencies.

The COPS Office will use a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses to measure its impact. Using publicly available data such as the Uniform Crime Report and the National Crime Victimization Survey, COPS will examine the effect of COPS funding on the outcome measures, controlling for known demographic variables. Using evaluation of existing COPS programs, the agency will compile case studies to examine the effect of COPS funding on grantee communities. In a similar effort, COPS will examine completed NIJ-funded studies for the relationship between community policing and the outcome measures adopted by the agency. A group of grantees will survey community members on their fear of crime and their level of trust in their local law enforcement agency. COPS will study the incidence of particular kinds of crime over a period of years in a group of COPS grantees and a control group that has not received any COPS grants. Preliminary results will be available in FY 2002, to be followed in subsequent years by more complete data. For each of these activities, COPS will track results for small (population under 150,000) and large jurisdictions (population over 150,000) to determine whether or not the effectiveness of community policing varies with the size of the community.

In FY 2002 COPS will continue to award grants for SROs.

In addition, COPS requires grantees to attend a practical team-based community policing training that provides educators and school resource officers with resources and skills to help them collaborate to promote safer schools.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

The COPS Office works on joint projects with other bureaus within the OJP such as NIJ, BJA, and OJJDP as well as other agencies. One example is the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Program, where DOJ, HHS, and the Department of Education pooled resources and created a unified application process. A national evaluation of COPS in Schools is also being conducted with the assistance of NIJ.

National Assessment of COPS Grants	FY 2002 Target
% Reduction in Locally Identified, Targeted Crime & Disorder (FY2000 = Baseline)	1 - 4 %
% Reduction in Fear of Crime in Surveyed Communities (FY2000 = Baseline)	1 - 4 %
% Increase in Trust in Local Law Enforcement in Surveyed Communities (FY2000 = Baseline)	1 - 4 %

**Data Collection and Storage:** The COPS Management system tracks all individual grants. The methodology for conducting the National Assessment and collecting assessment data has not yet been determined.

**Data Validation and Verification:** Data review is conducted as part of the grants management function.

**Data Limitations:** For the National Assessment data, COPS will rely on third parties for much of its data collection and anticipates variation in data collection and interpretation, therefore, data reliability will vary among program participants.

**2.5C Assist Communities in the Resolution of Ethnic and Racial Tension**

**Background/ Program Objectives:**

Through the Community Relations Service (CRS), DOJ will continue to improve and expand delivery of conflict resolution and violence reduction services to local jurisdictions in FY 2002. These services include: direct mediation and conciliation services to states and local communities; establishment of partnerships and mechanisms for community cooperation; improvement of preparedness for civil disorders and unrest; and assistance in enhancing the local capacity to resolve conflicts.

**FY 2000 Actual Performance:**

**Performance Measure:** Cases Where CRS Assistance Averted Potential Violence or Disorder (CRS)

**Target:** 154                      **Actual:** 310

**Discussion:** CRS provides conciliation services to states and local communities to help avert potential violence or disorder related to issues of race, color, or national origin. Both prevention and crisis response services are provided to vulnerable communities where CRS assesses that there is a potential for or existence of violence. CRS leverages its conciliation services by providing tools and resources that communities can use themselves to prevent and resolve future conflicts. CRS partners with other federal agencies and serves as a bridge between local officials and leaders of involved communities. While available data indicates that CRS exceeded its established goal for FY 2000, CRS will seek in subsequent reports to show more specific and direct outcomes from its services.

**Public Benefit:** CRS services directly benefit states and local communities. The most immediate benefit is the reduction of imminent or existing racial violence. CRS services also help states and communities reduce the prospect of racial conflict or violence occurring again by providing new or refined methods and approaches to reduce the prospect of racial conflict or violence occurring again.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to exceed the corresponding FY 2001 goal. Current estimates indicate the communities capable of responding to racial and ethnic tension will reach 341 in FY 2001.

**Performance Measure:** Communities Capable of Responding to Racial and Ethnic Tension (CRS)

**Target:** 288                      **Actual:** 324

**Discussion:** Through the application of established mediation and conciliation processes and techniques, CRS helps state and local officials find local solutions to local problems. Necessarily, CRS focuses its services on quelling those racial conflicts that place communities at the greatest vulnerability. Experience has

shown that these conflicts often involve controversies regarding police use of force, hate crimes, profiling, racial violence in schools, and large-scale demonstrations and marches. CRS leverages its limited resources by providing tools and resources that communities can use after CRS leaves. CRS establishes cooperative relationships with federal and state agencies, builds the skills and capacity of local communities to manage and resolve racial conflicts themselves; and helps officials learn how to anticipate and identify brewing racial

**Data Collection and Storage:** CRS collects and maintains data in a case management system, CRSIS. CRSIS establishes standard criteria for recording and classifying casework.

**Data Validation and Verification:** CRS regional directors review and approve case information entered into CRSIS; the data is reviewed and verified by analysts and managers at CRS headquarters.

**Data Limitations:** In FY 2002, CRS will develop and implement a revised case management system to: improve the accuracy of data collection; better described the work undertaken; and permit easier extraction of information required for various reports and information requests. This revised system will provide CRS with tools to allow better assessment and evaluation of the patterns of casework for

tensions. It enlists the active engagement of local officials and other leaders to lead efforts in racial reconciliation. CRS exceeded the target for FY 2000 and will work on establishing more precise measures of increased community capacity resulting from CRS impact.

**Public Benefit:** CRS services directly benefit states and local communities. The most immediate benefit to state and local officials and leaders are refined tools and methods to reduce the prospect of racial conflict or violence, so that CRS services may no longer be necessary. When communities develop their own capacity for prevention and management of racial violence and disorder, states, local communities, and the federal government all benefit.

**FY 2001 Performance Plan Evaluation:** Based on program performance in FY 2000, we expect to achieve the corresponding FY 2001 goal(s).

**Strategies and Initiatives to Achieve the FY 2002 Goal:**

CRS will continue providing conciliation services to state and local communities in FY 2002. In addition, CRS will provide training and other assistance to help state, local and tribal governments and communities create the local capacity to prevent and resolve tension, conflict, and violence resulting from racial and ethnic conflict of hate crimes.

**Crosscutting Activities:**

CRS works with state and local governments and community groups to develop strategies to prevent and respond to civil disorder. CRS collaborates with the U.S. Attorneys (USAs), Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Criminal Division, CRT, Immigration and Naturalization Services (INS), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), Office of Tribal Justice (OTJ), and state and local officials to improve communications and cooperation between minority communities and law enforcement agencies.



(This page intentionally blank.)