



This report is an **EXCERPT** from the:

Iowa Criminal and Juvenile Justice Plan

1998 Update

CJJP Division of Criminal & Juvenile Justice Planning
Iowa Department of Human Rights

February, 1998

Restorative Justice

Community Policing

Electronic Monitoring
System

Substance Abuse
Treatment

Probation Entries To
Prison

Prison Population
Forecast
UPDATED! - SEE PUBLICATIONS -
RECENT REPORTS

Intermediate Criminal
Sanctions Plan

Equality In The Courts
Task Force

Sentencing Reform

Juvenile Justice
Comprehensive Strategy

Iowa Criminal and Juvenile Justice Plan -- 1998 Update

ABOUT THE REPORT

Pursuant to Iowa Code 216A, subchapter 9, CJJP is required to issue an annual report containing long-range systems goals, special issue planning recommendations and research findings. CJJP's 1998 response to its reporting requirement is replicated in the manner of the distribution of the 1997 Update. Again this year, CJJP is issuing one large document which contains many separate reports. Single-issue 1998 Update reports will be made available based on reader interest and need.

Having utilized this disseminating approach of CJJP research and reports in 1997, it proved to be cost effective and responsive to the planning activities and information needs of Iowa's policy makers, justice system officials and others.

On the cover of this document is a listing of various topics that are the subject of separate CJJP reports issued in February 1998. To receive other 1998 reports, please contact CJJP as indicated below.

Through the oversight of both the Iowa Juvenile Justice Advisory Council and the Iowa Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning Advisory Council, CJJP staff are engaged in a variety of research, data analysis, program and policy planning and grant administration activities. Annually, these two advisory councils review long-range justice system goals and identify current issues of concern to be addressed through CJJP's research and planning activities.

Reports on the issues listed below are being issued through CJJP's 1998 Update and are the result of the planning activities of the Iowa Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning Advisory Council (CJJPAC) and the Iowa Juvenile Justice Advisory Council (JJAC). A number of this year's reports contain council recommendations. Please note these recommendations were approved by CJJPAC.

- Restorative Justice
- Community Policing
- Electronic Monitoring System
- Substance Abuse Treatment
- Probation Entries to Prison
- Prison Population Forecast
- Intermediate Criminal Sanctions Plan
- Equality in the Courts Task Force
- Sentencing Reform
- Juvenile Justice Comprehensive Strategy

Note: Several of the study issues contain information on the various initiatives being conducted in Iowa's eight judicial districts. A map of these districts is located in Appendix A of this report. This map will accompany those individual reports where a judicial district is identified within its contents.

A number of CJJP staff were involved in the research and writing of the reports being issued through this 1998 Update. Primary authorship or significant contributions were as follows:

Richard Moore: CJJP Administrator

Clarence Key, Jr.: “Restorative Justice”
“Community Policing”
“Electronic Monitoring System”
“Substance Abuse Treatment”
“Intermediate Criminal Sanctions Plan”
“Equality in The Courts Task Force”
“Sentencing Reform”

Lettie Prell: “Probation Entries to Prison”
“Prison Population Forecast”

Laura Roeder: “Prison Population Forecast”

The state prison population forecast was made possible through partial funding by the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics and their program for State Statistical Analysis Centers. Points of view or opinions expressed in this report are those of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning, and do not necessarily reflect official positions of the U.S. Department of Justice.

TO RECEIVE ADDITIONAL CJJP 1998 UPDATE REPORTS

Reports on the issues listed on the previous page can be obtained by contacting CJJP:

Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning
Iowa Department of Human Rights
Lucas State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Phone: 515-242-5823
Fax: 515-242-6119
email: cjpp@max.state.ia.us

AVAILABILITY OF RELATED REPORTS:

The following CJJP reports are being released at this time separately from the Plan Update. To receive copies of the below listed reports, contact CJJP as described above.

- “Delinquency Resource Guide”, Dave Kuker, CJJP, 1998
- “Juvenile Crime Prevention Community Grant Fund Program”, Dave Kuker, 1998

MULTI-YEAR GOALS

INTRODUCTION

Iowa Code Section 216A.135 requires the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning Advisory Council (CJJPAC) to submit a long-range plan for Iowa's justice system to the Governor and General Assembly every five years. The first plan developed after the creation of the Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning was issued in 1990 and annually updated through 1994. Since 1992, appropriation law has required the CJJPAC to coordinate their planning activities with those of the Iowa Juvenile Justice Advisory Council (JJAC).

In 1995, these two councils developed a new plan consisting of a set of long-range justice system goals to assist policy makers and justice system practitioners as they plan and operate the justice system through the next twenty years. The statutory mandate for such long-range planning requires the identification of goals specific enough to provide guidance, but broad enough to be of relevance over a long period of time. The long-range goals adopted by these councils cover a wide variety of topics and attempt to offer a framework within which current practices can be defined and assessed. Collectively, these long-range goals are meant to provide a single source of direction to the complex assortment of practitioners and policy-makers whose individual concerns and decisions, collectively, define the nature and effectiveness of Iowa's justice system.

The twenty-year goals established in 1995 will be reviewed throughout the councils' statutorily defined five year planning period. They are presented again this year and will continue to be repeated until the councils' next five-year plan is due in the year 2000 or until their direction is deemed inappropriate or unnecessary. The goals presented and discussed below are meant to facilitate analyses and directions for the following areas of justice system issues and concerns:

PLANNING AREAS:

- **VIOLENCE REDUCTION AND CRIME PREVENTION**
- **PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM**
- **MINORITY OVERREPRESENTATION IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM**
- **COORDINATION OF GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND SYSTEM OPERATIONS**
- **INFORMATION SYSTEMS -- PLANNING AND MONITORING**
- **TECHNOLOGY**
- **SANCTIONS, SUPERVISION, TREATMENT AND SERVICES FOR ADULT OFFENDERS**
- **SANCTIONS, SUPERVISION, TREATMENT AND SERVICES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS**

To update the 1995 Plan, the CJJPAC and the JJAC directed staff to conduct new research and continue several initiatives during 1998. Following the review of the many studies, planning efforts, policy debates and other developments now underway in Iowa's justice system, the following concerns and initiatives were selected as most appropriate for the development of 1998 reports and recommendations:

1998 REPORTS:

Promising Approaches in dealing with Criminal Offenders

Restorative Justice
Community Policing
Electronic Monitoring System

Study Issues

Substance Abuse Treatment
Probation Entries to Prison
Prison Population Forecast

Systemic Planning and Development Activities/Updates

Intermediate Criminal Sanctions Plan
Equality in the Courts Task Force/Criminal Issues Committee/
Disproportionate Incarceration Rate of African Americans
Sentencing Reform
Juvenile Justice Comprehensive Strategy

Concerns and developments within these areas are considered by the councils to be of particular importance to the planning and administration of the justice system over the next several years. Much attention is being devoted to these areas, and it is the councils' hope that the information presented in this report will be of help as they and others continue to plan and implement system improvements around these areas.

LONG-RANGE JUSTICE SYSTEM GOALS FOR IOWA

No single goal adopted by the CJJPAC and the JJAC and presented below is meant to take precedence over another. Just as the justice system is a complex system of many interrelated and overlapping components, these long-range goals should be viewed collectively as complementary to each other. In developing this plan, the CJJPAC and the JJAC determined that such interrelated goals should be established to guide decision-making in the following issue areas:

VIOLENCE REDUCTION AND CRIME PREVENTION

GOAL: TO ESTABLISH IOWA AS THE STATE WITH THE LOWEST VIOLENT AND PROPERTY CRIME RATES IN THE NATION.

Achieve and maintain this status by preventing crime and reducing crime levels through:

- Community-specific crime prevention and early intervention leadership, plans and activities involving public officials, service organizations and community coalitions to address:
 - ◊ DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
 - ◊ CHILD ABUSE
 - ◊ SUBSTANCE ABUSE
 - ◊ TEEN PREGNANCY
 - ◊ PARENTING SKILLS AND FAMILY STABILITY
 - ◊ CITIZEN AND NEIGHBORHOOD EMPOWERMENT
 - ◊ TRUANCY AND DROPOUTS
 - ◊ MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE NEEDS
 - ◊ CRIMINAL GANG ACTIVITIES AND YOUTH PARTICIPATION IN GANGS
 - ◊ UNEMPLOYMENT
 - ◊ ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES
 - ◊ ILLITERACY
 - ◊ HOMELESSNESS
- Coordination of state, county and local law enforcement efforts that assures an appropriate sharing of costs, resources and intelligence information for crime prevention, criminal investigations and the apprehension of law violators.
- Defining, structuring, implementing and evaluating a continuum of sanctions and an array of services for adult offenders, delinquents and their families in their home communities that promote law-abiding behavior, family stability and community responsibility.
- Defining, structuring, implementing and evaluating monitoring practices that manage the risks presented by those delinquents and adult offenders providing community service and restitution or receiving community-based sanctions, education, training or counseling.
- Defining, structuring, implementing and evaluating a limited number of secure and other highly structured treatment facilities for a targeted group of delinquents selected according to their need for specialized services and their risk of reoffending.
- Developing and implementing policies and practices that assure the availability of jail and prison space to incapacitate habitual serious offenders and violent criminals.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

GOAL: TO ESTABLISH STRONG PUBLIC OPINION THAT THE JUSTICE SYSTEM IS OPERATING EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY.

Public opinion could be affected through:

- Visible enhancement of efforts to improve system efficiency and effectiveness.
- Acknowledgment and acceptance of a responsibility to educate the public (by elected officials, system practitioners, the media and others) of the inherent limitations of a system largely designed to react to individual's and society's problems and shortcomings.
- Better identification, documentation and reporting of effective policies, programs and sanctions.
- Increased likelihood of sanctions that hold offenders accountable and provide restitution to their victims and their communities.
- Increased likelihood of sanctions and offender programming, services and treatment that reduce repeat offending.
- Statewide consensus on appropriate sentence lengths, terms of imprisonment and the retributive and punitive nature of other sanctions.
- Increased citizen participation in the system through community and neighborhood crime prevention groups, use of volunteers in system agencies, and public participation in the development and review of system policies and activities.
- Better reporting and increased awareness of actual volume and nature of crime in Iowa.
- Increased victim supports and participation in the system.

MINORITY OVERREPRESENTATION IN THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

GOAL: TO HAVE ALL ASPECTS OF THE JUSTICE SYSTEM FREE OF BIAS, PERCEIVED BIAS AND DISPARATE TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS, VICTIMS OR WITNESSES.

Bias within the justice system has been documented or has been perceived to exist throughout system components and proceedings. Elimination of bias and the perception of bias can be sought through:

- Increased citizen participation in the system through community and neighborhood crime prevention groups, use of volunteers in system agencies and public participation in the development and review of system policies and activities.
- Increased public awareness of system policies, practices, operations and limitations.
- Appropriate and ongoing training of system officials and agency personnel.
- Development and strengthening of state, local and agency policies and practices that assure equality in offenders' and alleged offenders' exposure and access to the justice system's many and varied types of procedures, sanctions, levels of supervision, services and treatment.
- Development of supervision approaches, treatment programs and other services culturally and environmentally specific and appropriate to meet the needs of persons with diverse cultural backgrounds and life-styles.
- Recruitment and retention of minority persons in all levels of employment and volunteer activities throughout the justice systems.
- Identification and monitoring of statewide, local and agency-specific indicators of bias to enhance public awareness.
- Demonstration of efforts to eliminate bias in the justice system as a model for improving other social systems and institutions (e.g. education, child welfare, employment services, income assistance, substance abuse, mental health, economic development, etc.) whose effectiveness affects the size and nature of the justice system's case load.

COORDINATION OF GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITIES AND SYSTEM OPERATIONS

GOAL: TO ESTABLISH COMMUNITY-LEVEL PLANS AND ACTIVITIES THAT ASSURE EQUITABLE AND VIABLE JUSTICE SYSTEM SANCTIONS AND SERVICES THROUGH STATE POLICIES THAT PROMOTE EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE:

- **DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES AMONG LOCAL, COUNTY, STATE, EXECUTIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT;**

- **COORDINATION OF ALL COMPONENTS OF THE CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM; and,**

- **COORDINATION AMONG THE JUSTICE SYSTEM AND OTHER SOCIAL AND GOVERNMENTAL SYSTEMS AND INSTITUTIONS.**

The list found below describes justice system components and responsibilities with interrelated purposes. The responsibilities for funding, administering and otherwise overseeing these components are now spread among the various branches and units of government. No readily visible, unifying principles or mandates assure their integration. Decisions may be made within one component that have a major impact on other components, but such impact may be either unforeseen or not planned for. Such a lack of coordination may occur at both the specific-case level and within local, regional and state level planning and policy development activities.

The funding and operational responsibilities for some of these components are currently undefined. For others, responsibilities may be shared to varying degrees by a number of governmental units. Still others may be administered unilaterally within narrow applications of component-specific mandates. Justice system components:

- Crime Prevention Programs and Services
- Early Intervention Programs and Services
- Law Enforcement
- Prosecution
- Defense
- Adjudication, Sentencing and Dispositions
- Victim Services
- Delinquency Intake and Waiver Proceedings
- Juvenile Diversion Programs and Services
- Juvenile Detention
- Case Management and Community Supervision of Delinquents

- Placement & Non-placement Programs and Services for Delinquents
- Adult Offender Diversion Programs and Services
- Pre-trial Release Procedures, Programs and Services
- Pre-trial Confinement in Jails and Lockups
- Case Management and Community Supervision of Adult Offenders
- Community-based Programs and Services for Adult Offenders
- Jails and [sentenced] Inmate Programming and Services
- Prisons and Inmate Programming and Services
- Probation Revocation Procedures
- Prison, Probation and Jail Release Procedures
- Parole Revocation Procedures

The decision-makers and various operational activities within some components of the justice system are, in many ways, the same for the criminal justice system and the juvenile justice system (e.g. crime prevention, law enforcement, prosecution, etc.). Many policies and components of the justice system, however, are unique to one or the other of these two related systems. ***Achieving the coordination of all components of the justice system will require additional intergovernmental and multi-agency efforts to plan and manage the interaction of programs and policies within and between the criminal and the juvenile justice systems.***

Both the criminal and the juvenile justice systems rely to a great extent on the resources and programs of other social and governmental systems and institutions to provide treatment and other services to offenders and victims and to support agency operations. Also, the justice system often intervenes in situations involving interactions among other systems' programs, services and clients. ***Equally important as a coordinated justice system is a justice system whose policies and practices are coordinated with the policies and practices of other governmental systems, including:***

- Education
- Public Health
- Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities
- Civil Rights
- Employment & Job Training
- Substance Abuse
- Public Welfare
- Child Abuse and Neglect

It is at the community level where system inefficiencies and ineffectiveness are most visible, and it is at the community level where the best chance exists for achieving true coordination of activities. ***State and county policies controlling funding, programs and operations should empower communities to develop and support coordinated approaches that are efficient and effective and that are consistent with the statewide goals of assuring equitable and viable justice system sanctions and services.*** Officials and agencies should be given the authority, responsibility and resources to accomplish these goals at the community level.

INFORMATION SYSTEMS—PLANNING AND MONITORING

GOAL: TO ESTABLISH INTEGRATED JUSTICE SYSTEM INFORMATION REPORTING CAPABILITIES AND PROCEDURES THAT PROVIDE PRACTITIONERS, OFFICIALS AND POLICY MAKERS WITH THE INFORMATION THEY NEED TO CARRY OUT THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES AND TO MONITOR AND EVALUATE JUSTICE SYSTEM POLICIES AND PROGRAMS.

Information systems to more fully develop, improve and integrate:

- Incident-Based Uniform Crime Reports
- Criminal History Records
- Prosecution Activities and Outcomes
- Iowa Court Information System
- Department of Corrections Information Systems
- Department of Human Services Information Systems
- Division of Substance Abuse and Health Promotion Information Systems
- Other

Information needed from data systems:

Case-specific data for:

- Investigations and arrests
- Background checks
- Release/custody decisions
- Adult court charging and sentencing decisions
- Juvenile court intake and disposition decisions
- Supervision, service and treatment planning and monitoring
- Program and service eligibility determinations
- Other

State, local and program-specific aggregate data for:

- Budget development and resource allocation
- Policy & program evaluation and monitoring
- Other

TECHNOLOGY

GOAL: TO UTILIZE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGIES THAT MAXIMIZE EFFICIENCY, SUPPORT PROGRAM AND POLICY EVALUATIONS AND PROMOTE EFFECTIVE AND EQUITABLE JUSTICE, SERVICES, AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

System operations include:

- Investigation and discovery
- Court proceedings
- Incarceration and detention
- Offender supervision, services and treatment
- Fine assessment and collection
- Victim services and treatment
- Mediation services
- Witness assistance
- Jury selection and support
- Community crime prevention and public participation
- Administration, planning, evaluation and monitoring
- Other

Advanced technology areas:

- Data collection, management and reporting
- Communications
- Transportation
- Forensics
- Surveillance, monitoring and supervision
- Crime prevention through environmental design
- Office and facility operations
- Planning and evaluation methodology
- Education and training for:
 - ◊ offenders
 - ◊ system officials and practitioners
 - ◊ citizen groups and general public

SANCTIONS, SUPERVISION, TREATMENT, AND SERVICES FOR ADULT OFFENDERS

GOAL: TO ADMINISTER SANCTIONS, SUPERVISION, TREATMENT AND SERVICES FOR ADULT OFFENDERS THAT ARE EQUALLY ACCESSIBLE AND APPLIED CONSISTENTLY ACROSS THE STATE AND THAT HAVE BEEN DOCUMENTED AS EFFECTIVE IN THEIR ABILITY TO:

• DETER OFFENDERS AND POTENTIAL OFFENDERS FROM ENGAGING IN FUTURE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR;

• PROTECT THE PUBLIC AND MANAGE OFFENDER RISKS IN A COST EFFECTIVE MANNER USING LEAST RESTRICTIVE, APPROPRIATE MEASURES;

• PROVIDE ADULT OFFENDERS WITH THE REQUIREMENT AND OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE REPARATION TO THEIR VICTIMS; and,

• PROVIDE ADULT OFFENDERS THE OPPORTUNITY TO MAINTAIN, REGAIN OR ACHIEVE THE CAPACITY TO REMAIN IN, OR RETURN TO, THE GENERAL POPULATION AS LAW ABIDING, CONTRIBUTING CITIZENS.

Achieving this goal will involve the continuation or development of a variety of activities and initiatives:

- Determining the relative deterrent effects of sanctions with different conditions, intensities and time periods (jail, prison, probation monitoring and programming, intensive supervision, community service, fines, etc.) and determining how such deterrent effects vary for people with different backgrounds, education and skill levels, impulse control and rational-thinking capacities, ties to family and community, etc.
- Establishing or strengthening risk assessment and risk management procedures for all stages of justice system decision-making.
- Defining, structuring and supporting the use of intermediate sanctions and improving offender assessment and monitoring tools to help court, parole, and correctional officials select and provide sanctions, supervision, treatment and other services that are appropriate to offenders' needs and the public safety risks they present.

- Ongoing review and improvement of the ability of prisons and jails to serve as deterrents, to incapacitate habitual repeat offenders and violent predators, and to provide treatment and services needed by incarcerated offenders who will be returning to the general population to increase their skills and capacities to be law abiding, contributing citizens.
- Expanding current capacity to evaluate the effectiveness of sanctions, supervision and monitoring procedures, offender treatment and other services.
- Enhancing prison and jail work programs to provide inmates with income with which to make restitution, and strengthening community-based programs' activities to facilitate offender restitution, community service and other forms of victim/community reparation.
- Providing initial, ongoing and coordinated training for the system's many officials and practitioners to facilitate system improvements and to encourage more effective integration of system components.

SANCTIONS, SUPERVISION, TREATMENT AND SERVICES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS

GOAL: TO ADMINISTER SANCTIONS, SUPERVISION, TREATMENT AND SERVICES FOR JUVENILE OFFENDERS THAT ARE EQUALLY ACCESSIBLE ACROSS THE STATE AND THAT HAVE BEEN DOCUMENTED AS EFFECTIVE IN THEIR ABILITY TO:

• DETER JUVENILE OFFENDERS AND POTENTIAL OFFENDERS FROM ENGAGING IN FUTURE CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR;

• PROTECT THE PUBLIC AND MANAGE OFFENDER RISKS IN A COST EFFECTIVE MANNER USING LEAST RESTRICTIVE, APPROPRIATE MEASURES;

• PROVIDE JUVENILE OFFENDERS WITH THE REQUIREMENT AND OPPORTUNITY TO MAKE REPARATION TO THEIR VICTIMS; and,

• ASSURE THAT JUVENILE OFFENDERS RECEIVE THE PROTECTION, TRAINING, DISCIPLINE, BASIC LIVING NECESSITIES AND CARE AND TREATMENT GUARANTEED ALL CHILDREN IN IOWA.

Achieving this goal will involve the continuation or development of a variety of activities and initiatives:

- Determining the relative deterrent effects that sanctions with different conditions, intensities and time periods have on children and youth (group placement and treatment facilities, State Training School, probation monitoring and programming, intensive supervision, community service, restitution, waivers to adult court, etc.) and determining how such deterrent effects vary for children and youth with different backgrounds, education and skill levels, impulse control and rational-thinking capacities, ties to family and community, etc.
- Establishing or strengthening risk assessment and risk management procedures for all stages of juvenile justice system decision-making.
- Defining, structuring and supporting the use of a range of community-specific early intervention services and dispositional options and improving assessment and monitoring tools to help the court and human service officials select and provide supervision, treatment and other services to juveniles and their families

that are least restrictive and appropriate to the needs of juvenile offenders and to the public safety risks they present.

- Expanding current capacities to evaluate the effectiveness of sanctions, supervision and monitoring procedures, treatment and other services to juveniles and their families.
- Strengthening efforts in cases involving both placement and non-placement supervision and services to facilitate restitution, community service and other forms of victim/community reparation.
- Developing policies, procedures and funding approaches that allow for offender-specific continuity between the juvenile justice and adult correctional systems of supervision, treatment and services.
- Providing initial, ongoing and coordinated training for the system's many officials and practitioners to facilitate system improvements and to encourage more effective integration of system components.
- Providing training to community members to assist them identify community risks and protective factors related to juvenile delinquency, and to aid their efforts to reduce risks, strengthen protective factors, prevent juvenile crime and respond appropriately to the needs of their children and youth.

HOW CAN THESE GOALS BE ATTAINED?

As was stated when these goals were first introduced, many officials, practitioners and others will need to agree with these goals and work towards them cooperatively. This report, however, is primarily intended to serve as a guide to the Governor and General Assembly as they continue to respond to proposals and to develop initiatives to address immediate justice system issues and concerns. The goals were developed in recognition of much-publicized concerns and debates over crime and delinquency; they are offered to provide the state with a long-range vision with which to view the appropriateness of proposed reactions to current concerns.

When these goals were first established in 1995, it was recommended that no justice system policy or program change be made without a documented consideration of the extent to which the change will assist, and not hinder, the state's ability to attain these long-range goals. Because this has not occurred, the above information accompanying each goal statement is repeated again this year with the hope that it will assist decision makers as they seek funding priorities and policy and program initiatives to achieve comprehensive, long-term system improvements and a more effective criminal and juvenile justice system.

STUDY ISSUE

COMMUNITY POLICING

Community policing is a collaborative effort between the police, other city government and the city's communities where focus is placed on solving community problems; challenging the community to accept their share of responsibility for the quality of life within their community; identifying, through a police/community relationship, proactive responses to crime issues; and developing long term solutions for community concerns.

Community policing can have a positive impact on reducing neighborhood crime, helping reduce fear of crime and enhancing the quality of life in the community. It accomplishes these goals by combining the efforts and resources of the police, local government and community members.

Urban and rural communities throughout the nation have adopted the concept of community policing as an effective approach that empowers the community, builds trust with its citizens and law enforcement and safeguards neighborhoods from criminal activity. At the center of community policing is the development of community/police partnerships, encouragement of collaborative community/police problem solving and proactive police management to address crime issues and neighborhood concerns.

Community/police partnerships recognize the value of getting neighborhood residents involved in law enforcement. Collaborative problem solving requires the identification of specific concerns in a community and eliminating those potentially dangerous influences that pose a threat to the safety and well-being of neighborhoods. Proactive police management establishes a distinct understanding by law enforcement agencies that in order for community policing to be demonstrably effective, it has to take the initiative to gather input from within its own ranks and from the community. This form of police management promotes proactive responses to crime issues and other neighborhood concerns related to public safety.

Community policing can take many forms to enhance ways that officers can actively participate in the betterment of the community. Officers speak to neighborhood groups, participate in business and civic events, consult with social agencies and take part in educational programs for school children. In some communities, police officers patrol neighborhoods by bike, foot and in some instances by horseback. In other areas, police departments require officers to reside in specific neighborhoods they are assigned to protect and serve. Such community policing methods can produce a sense of security for neighborhoods and establish a foundation of trust between the officers who work and live among citizens who also are their neighbors. These approaches and others have been utilized by many police departments across the country.

Community policing has been hailed as an effective tool that not only has proven it can reduce crime rates, but also improve a community's self worth and strengthen its cohesiveness. As a result, the federal government has supported many cities across the country and in Iowa with funding to enhance their community policing initiatives.

To some, the term “community-policing” has become one that is difficult to define and could, theoretically, be used to describe any police activity designed to serve the community. In smaller Iowa communities, “community-policing” has occurred naturally; with police officers who personally know many, if not most, of the town’s residents. In other communities, there have been long-standing efforts to provide neighborhood and community groups with more direct access to police officers to receive crime prevention and other helpful information. The extent to which “community-policing” is involving new ways of connecting police officers with neighborhoods, schools, civic groups and other citizens varies across the state and country.

This report will focus on two Iowa communities, Sioux City and Newton. Both of these communities have developed community policing strategies to meet the individual needs of their respective locales. Both of these cities illustrate how community policing can be developed, implemented and successfully utilized.

Sioux City

In 1993, in an effort to increase community collaboration and develop community/police relationships via a community police concept and philosophy, the Sioux City Police Department issued a citywide survey to gauge their effectiveness in protecting and serving citizens. The results of the survey indicated there were actual community concerns that required a definitive response from the police department that would demonstrate it had recognized their needs and were willing to address them.

Based on the survey results and other input, in 1994, the Sioux City Police Department implemented the Community Action Support Team (CAST). CAST was established to provide a more creative way to solve community problems than the usual “traditional” police methods. The police department sought to develop a community/police relationship where everyone would accept responsibility for the quality of life in their area and work together proactively to respond to community concerns, issues and crime.

In June of 1995, nine police officers were assigned to nine specific areas within the city. These locations were selected based on the department’s analysis of crime statistics, calls for police service and officer work-hours dedicated to those areas. A walk-through was also conducted of various neighborhoods to determine visual signs of decay and/or any activity of disorder. It should be noted that federal funding was acquired to support the CAST initiative.

Upon the initiation of this program, assigned officers established community core groups. Presently, there are seven community core groups representing eight of the nine communities. Each core group meets monthly. The community core group is representative of its neighborhood where citizens and officers discuss crime concerns, neighborhood problems and other citizen concerns. What these meetings allow for is a collaborative dialogue that provides for the exchange of information in reference to crime in specific areas. It also gives officers and citizens an accurate focus on the type and frequency of the criminal offenses that are occurring in their respective areas.

CAST has developed a number of community policing programs and projects designed to improve community/police relationships. They have become involved in many community programs, projects and other activities to further solidify the bond. Below is a sample of the various programs and projects CAST has developed and implemented as a community police unit. A complete listing of over twenty community policing programs and projects can be obtained by contacting the Sioux City Police Department.

CAST Community Policing Programs and Projects

Department Tours

CAST officers extend invitations to the public, organizations and groups to tour the Sioux City Police Department. The response to this invitation has been productive as they receive an idea on the internal day-to-day operations of the Police Department. This program continually builds rapport with the community and its youth.

Neighborhood Fliers/Newsletter

CAST officers provide their assigned communities information on community meetings, community activities and tips on crime prevention through flyers and newsletters. This communication within neighborhoods strengthens and solidifies relationships among community members as well as officers. It increases the ownership for everyone to be responsible for the betterment and quality of life in their communities.

Bi-Lingual Emergency Card

A number of community members residing in various CAST areas are non-English speaking. In emergency situations, language barriers could impair an immediate response from police officers. To enhance the response time, emergency cards were printed and distributed to members of non-English speaking communities in the CAST areas. The cards are printed in various languages and briefly describe a common emergency situation with corresponding English translation. While these descriptions are extremely brief, the card provides responding personnel with a scenario of a given emergency that helps them to more quickly and appropriately respond to the situation.

HUD Housing Availability

In several areas across the country, a program funded by City Housing and HUD deals with the placement of officers within community policing areas. The program offers refurbished homes for sale to lower income individuals. This program initially restricted city employees from purchasing this property due to income guidelines. The restriction has since been removed and police officers are now permitted to purchase these properties at a reasonable cost. This incentive was designed to attract officers to move into their community policing areas. Since the inception of this program in Sioux City, several homes have been available for purchase. However, to date no officers have participated in the program.

ACTION TEAM

The ACTION Team (Agency Coalition Team in our Neighborhood) is a multi-agency organization established in Sioux City to determine, identify and address specific

community needs. The ACTION Team has members that represent the Department of Human Services, Adult Corrections, Juvenile Court Services, City/County Health Departments, the Sioux City Community Schools and CAST officers. The organization created boundaries by geographical grid that includes two CAST areas. This organization's collaboration among its representatives provides an organized approach to providing and exposing the community and its citizens to a multitude of services with minimal duplication.

It should also be noted that the ACTION Team and the CAST officers work closely in a collaborative effort consisting of community and business leaders with two community police area schools, West Middle and Woodrow Wilson Middle Schools. Officers are able to develop positive relationships with these and other youth in their areas. They also participate in various youth oriented programs and activities.

Outcomes

The Sioux City Police Department indicates that it conducted an evaluation of their programs and projects in 1995 based upon their initial 1993 survey that was the impetus for the implementation of their community policing initiative. A second evaluation was conducted in 1996. These evaluations were based largely on the number of calls for service to the nine areas served by CAST.

The findings indicated that in the areas of Sioux City where community police are assigned, there has been, for the most part, a significant decline in neighborhood criminal activity. The offenses that were monitored in the evaluation were theft, robbery, rape, larceny of motor vehicle, murder, burglary, assault and arson.

In addition to the evaluation, citizens in the CAST areas were surveyed for their opinion on the changes they have seen in their neighborhoods since the implementation of community policing. Results found citizens felt there was an improved relationship between themselves, their neighborhoods and law enforcement. Furthermore, the quality of life, for the most part, in CAST areas has improved.

Since the inception of CAST and implementation of the community police concept, there has been demonstrable improvement in the neighborhoods for which this initiative has been active. The Sioux City Police Department will conduct a new evaluation and review the current status of the CAST areas. This review could result in expanding the current geographical CAST areas to include other parts of the city. CAST assignments may be restructured and various programs and projects modified to meet current community needs.

As CAST communities continue to strengthen themselves by way of their community core groups, ownership and responsibility for their areas will shift from the police to community members and leaders. This shift will allow CAST officers to begin taking more of an active participant role leaving the leadership roles to other community leaders.

The City of Newton

The Newton Police Department has thirteen community policing programs it utilizes across its city. A community placement officer on staff oversees the department's numerous initiatives. The Newton Police Department is involved in extensive collaborative initiatives with its government officials, private business leaders and community leaders to assist in the development and implementation of their community policing programs.

In addition, the police department is embarking on an initiative similar to the CAST project in Sioux City. Newton is in the beginning stages of surveying its citizens to identify specific areas for placement of community police officers. The police department wants to continue to strengthen those initiatives that are currently in place, and by having assigned officers in various communities, will continue to solidify the rapport, trust and respect the community and the police have for each other. Implementation for neighborhoods to have community police officers is tentatively targeted for mid-spring, 1998.

The following is a sample of the thirteen community policing programs or projects with which the Newton Police Department is involved. A complete listing of the community policing programs and projects can be obtained by contacting the Newton Police Department.

Newton Police Departments Community Policing Programs and Projects

Bicycle Patrol

This program originated out of the need for more community action by the police. It allows bike officers to perform numerous enforcement efforts regarding traffic, bicycle safety and community interaction. The program originally was designed for two officers to patrol designated sections of the city and handle calls for service. Since its inception, the program has grown to include more officers with a wider area of responsibility.

School Resource Officer (SRO)

The School Resource Officer Program started in 1994. The SRO program provides a uniformed police officer in the Newton Community School systems, spending sixty percent of their time at the high school, twenty percent at the middle school and twenty percent in the combined elementary schools. Several different prevention oriented programs are headed by the SRO officer. One such program is called the **WOW!** Program. Anyone associated with the school system, including faculty, maintenance and bus drivers, may nominate a student for recognition of some positive act, and, if nominated and awarded, the SRO presents them with a WOW! Award. The award includes anything from a koozie, to pencil and pens.

There is also a "**Hello From SRO**" which enables the SRO to personally contact students with frequent absentee problems within the school system. A personalized card with a "Wish You Were Here" theme is sent to each student after their fourth absence.

The note is to highlight the person's absences from school, demonstrates the SRO's concern and asks if the SRO can be of any assistance. This effort is helping to improve attendance.

V.I.P. Volunteer Program

The department continues to examine ways to cultivate citizen interaction and involvement in police operations. As each segment of the department is reviewed and refined, special service focuses are revised to help increase citizen awareness while broadening agency performance. Since June of 1996, VIP Volunteers have spoken with 378 victims in hopes of generating new information. The volunteers work two hours per week both during the daytime and evening hours.

STRIKE Program

The STRIKE Program is a community effort that unites a local community coalition entitled SAFE (Substance Abuse Free Environment). This group consists of area tobacco retail businesses and the police department to provide education for retail employees as to their requirements for selling tobacco products. Compliance checks are also conducted by the police department in cooperation with the local community substance abuse prevention agency to target tobacco use of those under the age of eighteen.

KYN-SHIP

KYN-SHIP is a neighborhood program which is known as "Know Your Neighbor Program." This effort is currently under development to go into neighborhoods for the purposes of interacting with neighborhoods promoting the "Know Your Neighbor," watching out for one another within the neighborhood and to allow information to flow freely from neighborhoods into the police department for follow-up investigations as well as community information and community event planning.

Outcomes

Currently, the Newton Police Department is in the developmental stages of creating a statistical measuring tool that will be able to provide some insight on what impact these community policing programs and projects have had on the quality of life and on reducing neighborhood crime. The development of this instrument is currently underway and its scheduled utilization is to be determined.

Comments

These two cities illustrate what can be accomplished when citizens and law enforcement work together to develop and implement a community policing strategy that involves local leaders and municipal governments. Based on the programs and projects established in these two cities, it appears the effectiveness of their community policing initiatives derived from their belief that collectively they could solve their problems with crime. These communities felt it was their collective responsibility to address their problems. They accomplished it by having honest and open constructive communication. Citizens and public and private sector officials got involved, put forth the effort to develop their strategies and were determined to meet the goals and objectives they set for themselves.

These kinds of community policing efforts are effective because of the “can do” attitude on the part of local law enforcement, citizens and local community leaders. In addition, it appears that in these communities, their local law enforcement agencies were able to alleviate the “them versus us” posture that can hinder relations between police and citizens/communities. Instead of being “reactionary” to crime, they became proactive in utilizing crime prevention methods to address the concerns of their communities.

There does not appear to be any uniform community policing program that all communities should replicate. Each community must identify its own concerns and how to address them. With that having been said, the approach these communities have taken can certainly be used as guides for other communities contemplating community policing strategies in their area.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- **There are numerous municipalities across the state whose police departments have implemented community policing projects and programs. Generally, these initiatives appear to have a good impact on building positive and improved relationships between citizens, neighborhoods and police departments.**

The Council supports community policing efforts such as those in the Sioux City and Newton Police Departments. Their commitment to improving the quality of life in their respective areas as well as having a positive impact on the reduction of criminal activity is vital to protecting and serving its citizens.

- **The Council recommends that police departments who implement community policing programs and projects conduct routine evaluations of their programs and projects. Such an assessment may reveal strengths and weaknesses in some efforts and provide for appropriate readjustments, if deemed necessary, to existing programs.**