

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Tribal Strategies Against Violence: Cross-Sites Evaluation Report

Author(s): V. Richard Nichols ; Anne Litchfield ; Ted Holappa ; Kit Van Stelle

Document No.: 195790

Date Received: 08/08/2002

Award Number: 97-DD-BX-0031

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Tribal Strategies Against Violence

Cross-Sites Evaluation Report

Prepared by
ORBIS Associates

V. Richard Nichols
Principal Investigator

Anne Litchfield
Senior Researcher/Editor

Ted Holappa
Investigator

Kit Van Stelle
Criminal Justice Consultant

January 2002

NIJ # 97-DD-BX 0031

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Prepared for the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, by ORBIS Associates under contract # 97-DD-BX 0031. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

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

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In completing this Evaluation of the *Tribal Strategies Against Violence* Initiative, we have many people to thank. Most importantly, we wish to thank the local TSAV Coordinators, Directors and Supervisors: Darrell Walker (Chickasaw Nation), Colleen Clark (Fort Peck Sioux and Assiniboine Tribes), Regina St. James (Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians), and Marilyn Davis (Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians). These individuals helped us in immeasurable ways as we proceeded with conducting this evaluation. In addition to remaining available to us as we needed information, they were extremely helpful in arranging interviews of different TSAV partners, facilitating collection of statistical and other data, and assisting in ensuring that surveys and other types of impact documentation were forthcoming.

We wish to also thank the many members of the local communities and the TSAV Planning and Implementation Groups who shared with us their insights and perceptions about the TSAV Initiative. They were very helpful, cooperative and forthright during both impromptu and scheduled interviews both on-site and at the TSAV Networking Conferences. These individuals include:

Chickasaw Nation. Jay Carroll, Kellie Potter, Larry Hoklatubbe, Lisa Johnson Billy, Judy Goforth-Parker, Mooniene Ogee, Lisa Blackmon, Cathy Wood, Lisa Aday, Billy Ward, Susan Webb, Jay Keel, Johanna Walker, Governor Bill Anoatubby, David Brown, Billy Jack, Jason Burwell, Wanda Welch, Shanella Arnette, Gwen Postoak, Sandy Poe, Rebecca Kingsley, Judge George Tahbone, Charles Morris, Police Chief Mike Miller, and Officer Gary Parkinson.

Fort Peck Sioux and Assiniboine Tribes. Rita Weeks, Jackie Miller, Calvin Red Thunder, Police Chief Ron Kemp, Patty McGeshick, Ray Parales, Ray Dolizilek, Roxanne Gourneau, Darlene Johnson, Donna Buckles, Abe Grey Bear, Dale Headress, Darrell (Curly) Youpee, Caleb Shields, Ray Eder, Spike Bighorn, Bill Whitehead, Robert Welch, Pat Crawford, Karen Dubois, Dr. John Jones, Nancy Dumont, Judge A. T. Stafne, Georgia Dupuis, Barry Bighorn, John Christian, Bryce Wildcat, Doris Red Dog, Lonnie Headdress, Juanita Azure, Captain Dale Headdress, Robert War Club, Jody Schwan, Ann Baker, Sandy Stellflug, Teena Holecek, Rick Hamblin and also the many members of the Community Corrections Council.

Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians. Yolanda Murphy, Judge Mike Petoskey, Joanne Miller, Mike Shananaquat, Cathy John, Suzanne McSawby, Bill Gregory, Paul Raphael, Ruth Bussey, Robin Milstead, Pat Putney, Linda Stewart, Danny Hadebank, Phyllis Loonsfoot, Mary O'Connor, Tom Fine, Kenny Pheasant, Judy Concannon, Mary Lou Bonacci, Barbara Keelan, Mark Jarvis, Carlo Carcino, Susan Cronander, Terri Cobb, Jim Chambers, Steven Perry, Police Captain Tim Warner, Bob Bailey, Matt Anderson, Jay Loonsfoot, Bill LeBlanc, George Bennett, Helen Paul, Jamie Barirentoz, John Concannon, Lou Scott, Tanya Raphael and members of the Junior Tribal Council.

Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians. Charles Trottier, Yvette Falcon, Police Captain Delmar Langon, Les Jensen, Sheila Trottier, Dale Brien, Colin Brunelle, Gordon Brien, Police Chief Rod Trottier, Laurie Davis, Marie Faine, Denise Poitra, Dale Brien, Rebecca Anderson, Beverly Davis, Bruce Morin, Jackie Davis, Judge Sharon Malaterre, Linus Faine, Jackie Brien, Kenny Davis, Ernest

Patenaud, Rapheal Decoteau, Richard LaFramboise, Bruce Morin, Ron Pelchier, Ron Trottier, and Elmer Davis.

Additionally, we thank several individuals in the U.S. Department of Justice who generously gave of their time and provided us access to files and records we needed for our evaluation efforts. They provided us important perspectives about the TSAV initiative and critical background information about it. These individuals include Robert H. (Bob) Brown, Jr., Senior Advisor for Prevention; Trish Thackston, Program Manager, Bureau of Justice Assistance; Winnie Reed, National Institute of Justice; and Norena Henry, Office of Justice Programs.

We also want to give special thanks to four individuals at the National Crime Prevention Council for allowing evaluation team members to participate in the TSAV Networking Conferences and for continuously sharing with us their insights about the local TSAV sites. These individuals are Dr. Robert Coates, Director of Training and Community Policing Services; Betty Steger, Director of Human Resources and TSAV Cultural Advisor; and Amy Schapiro, former TSAV Program Manager, Tom Stanchfield, Program Manager.

Two members of our TSAV Evaluation Resource Group also receive our gratitude, namely Ada Pecos Mellon and Marcia Chaiken. They provided us very valuable guidance and insights, at several junctures during the evaluation, with respect to the original design and subsequent implementation of the evaluation. We are also grateful to them for their critiques and reviews of our draft Case Studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I. Overview of the Tribal Strategies Against Violence Initiative	1
A. Goals and Objectives of the Initiative	2
B. TSAV Sites and Federal Funding Levels	3
C. Evaluation Sites Included in this Evaluation	3
D. Program Staffing	5
E. Evolution of the Initiative	5
F. BJA Assumptions and Expectations	7
 Evaluation Methodology	 8
 Chapter II. TSAV Program Implementation at Four Tribes: Extent to Which BJA Objectives Were Addressed or Met	 12
A. Establish and/or Enhance Diverse Planning Teams and Build Partnerships	12
B. Develop and Implement Cost-effective Crime and Violence Reduction Strategies	15
C. Provide Youth With Alternatives to Substance Abuse and Gang Involvement	21
D. Enhance Local Capabilities to Identify Public and Private Resources	22
 Chapter III. Factors Affecting Implementation of TSAV Program/ Strategies	 25
A. Factors that Facilitated Planning and Implementation of the TSAV Program	25
B. Obstacles to Planning and Implementation of the TSAV Program	28
 Chapter IV. Stakeholder Perceptions of TSAV Effectiveness	 33
A. Local Issues/Problems Perceived as Effectively Addressed by TSAV	34
B. Local Issues/Problems Less Effectively Addressed by TSAV	37
C. Summary of Perceived TSAV Impacts	39
 Chapter V. Assessing the TSAV Program: Summary and Conclusions	 40
A. Differing Perspectives about the Purpose of the TSAV Initiative	41
B. Transformation of Local Criminal Justice Systems and Related TSAV Accomplishments	43
C. Limitations and/or Shortcomings of the TSAV Initiative	47
D. Efficacy of TSAV Model in Indian Country	50

APPENDICES

- A. Crime and Violence in Indian Country: The Context of the TSAV Initiative
- B. *Table:* Perceived Effectiveness of the TSAV Program at Each Tribe
- C. *Form:* TSAV Survey Questionnaire

Chapter I. Overview of the Tribal Strategies Against Violence Initiative

In FY 1995, the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) — working in conjunction with the Office of Justice Programs' (OJP) American Indian and Alaska Native Desk — developed the *Tribal Strategies Against Violence* (TSAV) initiative. As a federal-tribal partnership, this TSAV initiative was designed to empower American Indian Tribes to improve the quality of life of their communities by fostering strategic planning to identify community problems and to implement locally developed partnerships for addressing those problems. The ultimate purpose of the TSAV initiative was the development of comprehensive reservation-/community-wide strategies to reduce crime, violence and substance abuse.

In FY 1995, two American Indian Tribes were invited to apply for grants to serve as *pilot* sites for the TSAV planning model. These Tribes were: the Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes (Montana) and the Rosebud Sioux Tribe (South Dakota). Both Tribes had been prior grantees of other DOJ programs. Both had also been visited by DOJ representatives to discuss whether they were interested in serving as pilot sites.

The National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC) was contracted by BJA to provide grantees with technical assistance in designing the TSAV planning model and to assist the two pilot sites, as well as subsequent demonstration sites, develop their TSAV Workplans for implementing locally determined strategies. This technical assistance in developing local TSAV Workplans was provided through two-three day site visits to the local site.

NCPC also provided ongoing technical assistance throughout implementation of the local TSAV strategies. This technical assistance included facilitation of four semi-annual Training Workshops for TSAV grantees and arranging for consultants to assist local TSAV sites implement specific strategies (e.g., gang identification and prevention). Additionally, NCPC staff were instrumental in periodically identifying potential resources to help local TSAV programs meet their broader TSAV goals.

In FY 1996, five more Tribes were selected — under a competitive program announcement — to participate as *demonstration* sites in this BJA program. These five Tribes were: the Chickasaw Nation (Oklahoma), Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute Tribes (Nevada), Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians (Michigan), Puyallup Tribe of Indians (Washington), and the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians (North Dakota).

Federal oversight responsibility for the TSAV program rested within the Bureau of Justice Assistance. In FY 1995, BJA awarded \$380,000 in TSAV grant funds; \$1,330,00 was awarded in FY 1996; and \$735,000 was awarded in FY 1998. The first two grants commenced in October 1995. All seven TSAV grants ended in Fall 1999. To date, no further funds have been set aside by DOJ to continue support for the TSAV initiative.

In July 1997, ORBIS Associates was contracted by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) to conduct an evaluation of the TSAV initiative. Four of the seven TSAV sites were selected by BJA to be included in that evaluation.

A. Goals and Objectives of the Initiative

The FY 1996 TSAV Program Announcement listed three *goals* for the Tribal Strategies Against Violence initiative. These were to:

Goal 1: *Improve a community's capability to comprehensively address issues of crime, violence, and drug demand reduction*

Goal 2: *Promote community-based program development involving the active participation of youth, community residents, educators, spiritual leaders, businesses, social services, criminal justice representatives, and elected officials*

Goal 3: *Develop an effective culturally sensitive program model that can be replicated by other Native American communities*

As identified by BJA in the FY 1996 Program Announcement, there were also four *key* local objectives for the Tribal Strategies Against Violence initiative.¹ These objectives were expected to advance individual communities towards the overall TSAV goals cited above.

- **Establish and/or enhance a diverse planning team and build partnerships** — representative of tribal service providers (i.e., law enforcement and courts, prosecution, social services, education, etc.), spiritual leaders, businesses, community residents, and youth
- **Develop and implement cost-effective crime and violence reduction strategies** (including community policing, prosecution and prevention initiatives)
- **Provide youth with alternatives** to substance abuse and gang involvement
- **Enhance local capability to identify public and private resources**

BJA and NCPC staff continually stated to local participants in the initiative that “*TSAV is a process, not a project.*” This phrase became the underlying theme for the Tribal Strategies Against Violence initiative. This concept was regularly reiterated and reinforced by both BJA staff and the staff of the National Crime Prevention Council as it provided technical assistance to grantees throughout the duration of the TSAV initiative. Promotion of this phrase was intended to emphasize that TSAV was supposed to leave in place a local planning “process,” i.e., a mechanism for implementing and institutionalizing a community-wide, cross-agency problem-solving approach to address crime, violence and substance abuse prevention in participating reservations and/or American Indian communities. Essentially, the phrase was to directly counter any perception of TSAV being just a “project,” i.e., activities that would receive attention and focus for only a prescribed project period.

¹ There were a total of seven objectives in the FY 1996 TSAV Program Announcement; one related to provision of full-time staff to help guide the planning team in development and implementation of a Workplan; another related to provision of technical assistance to Core Team members by BJA. Neither of these objectives pertained directly to the content of the local programs. Another objective which related to community policing, prosecution and prevention initiatives was, for purposes of facilitating discussion of strategies in this report, subsumed under the second objective cited above.

B. TSAV Sites and Federal Funding Levels

A total of seven American Indian Tribes were provided TSAV grant funds. This was accomplished over three funding cycles:

- (1) FY 1995: the *Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes* and the *Rosebud Sioux Tribe* were each awarded \$190,000 for an 18-month period.
- (2) In FY 1996, under a competitive process, the *Chickasaw Nation*, the *Duck Valley Shoshone-Paiute Tribes*, the *Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians*, the *Puyallup Tribe of Indians*, and the *Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians* were each awarded \$190,000 grants for an 18-month period. The initial two pilot sites, cited in (1) above, were also each awarded \$190,000 continuation grants for 18 months.
- (3) In FY 1998, all seven sites were awarded \$105,000 continuation grants for a 15-month period.

C. Evaluation Sites Included in this Evaluation

The Bureau of Justice Assistance selected four of the seven TSAV sites to be participants in this NIJ evaluation. Those four sites were:

- (1) The *Chickasaw Nation*,
- (2) The *Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes*,
- (3) The *Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians*, and
- (4) The *Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians*.

Chickasaw Nation. The Chickasaw Nation in Oklahoma is a non-reservation Tribe with a service population of both Chickasaw and other American Indians who reside in a 13 county area. The Chickasaw Nation has 2,610 acres of trust land and 73,753 acres of allotment lands owned by individual tribal members. Of the total tribal membership of 35,000, approximately 24,600 (70%) reside in the 13 county area. Lacking reservation status or any substantial land base over which it may exercise jurisdiction, the Chickasaw Nation does not maintain its own law enforcement agency. The primary law enforcement agency on tribal properties and tribal lands is the Bureau of Indian Affairs Police at the BIA Chickasaw Agency. However, law enforcement responsibility in the jurisdictions where most tribal members reside is vested in the municipal police departments (e.g., Ada and Ardmore City Police Departments), county sheriff's offices, and the Oklahoma State Police. For similar reasons of lacking jurisdiction, the Chickasaw Nation does not maintain its own Tribal Court² for handling criminal, civil and/or juvenile cases among tribal members. Tribal members are primarily subject to the state court system. However, the BIA Court of Indian Offenses does have authority to act on both criminal cases on the Chickasaw Nation trust lands and civil cases among tribal members. The BIA Police and the Ada City Police both participated in the local Chickasaw Nation's TSAV program. No court systems were involved, however.

² A "Tribal Judiciary" does exist, but it is for the sole purpose of ruling on the constitutionality of laws passed by the Tribal Legislature (i.e., Council).

Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes. The Fort Peck Tribes in Montana has the largest land area and second largest tribal resident population of the four TSAV evaluation sites. The Fort Peck Indian Reservation boundaries encompass 2.09 million acres, of which 46% are either tribal trust lands (378,00 acres) or allotments owned by individual tribal members (548,000 acres). The remaining lands are owned by non-Indians. The on-reservation tribal resident population is approximately 6,600 tribal members. This constitutes about 62% of the total tribal membership of 10,600. The Fort Peck Tribes have their own tribal police force; they also operate a Juvenile Services/Detention unit and an Adult Corrections unit. All of these are lodged under the tribes' Department of Law and Justice. Four other law enforcement agencies also operate within the reservation boundaries: the Wolf Point City Police, the Poplar City Police, the Roosevelt County Sheriff's Office and the Montana State Police. The Fort Peck Tribal Court is the primary court system dealing with criminal, civil and juvenile cases among tribal members. All four law enforcement agencies, as well as the Tribal Court, participated in the local Fort Peck Tribes TSAV program.

Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians. The Grand Traverse Band's service area includes a small reservation as well as several tribal population centers in a six county area. This Tribe represents the smallest tribe (in terms of tribal membership) of the four TSAV evaluation sites. The Grand Traverse Indian Reservation consists of 600 acres of trust land centered around Peshawbestown — the tribe's historic Ottawa/Chippewa settlement. There is an additional 566 acres of trust land nearby. Approximately 1,576 tribal members reside either on the reservation (723) or within the tribe's six county service area (853). This figure represents about 44% of the total tribal enrollment of 3,352. The Grand Traverse Band maintains its own Tribal Police Department which has primary responsibility for law enforcement on tribal lands. However, several other law enforcement agencies also have jurisdiction within the tribe's service area. These include the Sheriff's Offices for Antrim, Grand Traverse and Leelanau Counties and the Michigan State Police.

The Turtle Mountain Tribal Court carries primary responsibility for criminal, civil and juvenile cases among tribal members. The Tribal Court has a full faith and credit reciprocity agreement with the state court system. The Grand Traverse Tribal Police and Tribal Court participated in the local TSAV program only to a limited degree.

Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians. The Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation in North Dakota has the largest population and the densest concentration of tribal population of the four evaluation sites. The Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation consists of 46,080 acres,³ which is relatively evenly divided between tribal trust lands and individual Indian allotments. The center of the small reservation is Belcourt, ND, where almost all tribal administrative offices are located. The Bureau of Indian Affairs Turtle Mountain Agency is also located in Belcourt. Approximately 16,600 tribal members live on or just adjacent to the reservation. These residents represent about 64% of the total tribal membership of 26,000. The Belcourt Police Department consists of a joint tribal/BIA police force. A separate jail/detention unit, operated by the BIA, is also part of the Turtle Mountain Law Enforcement Center. The other law enforcement agencies operating within the reservation boundaries are the Rollette County Sheriff's Office and the North Dakota State Police. The Turtle Mountain Tribal Court is the primary court system dealing with criminal, civil and

³ The Turtle Mountain Band also has 69,860 acres in what is known as the Trenton Service Area approximately 250 miles west. This area was not a target for TSAV activities.

juvenile cases among tribal members. The Tribal Court maintains a full faith and credit reciprocity agreement with the state court system. Only the Belcourt Police Department and the Tribal Court participated in the local Turtle Mountain Band TSAV program.

[Note: Readers are referred to the individual Case Studies for more descriptive information on the characteristics of each Tribe participating in this TSAV evaluation, as well as for information regarding specific TSAV strategies undertaken by each site.]

D. Program Staffing

The staff positions provided for implementing the TSAV initiative at the four local evaluation sites are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Staffing at TSAV Evaluation Sites

Entity	Position	Time
Chickasaw Nation	TSAV Coordinator TSAV Violence Educ. Specialist	FY 96 100%; FY 98 50% 100% FY 96 & 98
Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes	TSAV Project Manager Technical Advisor	FY 96 100%; FY 98 50% Consultant basis
Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians	TSAV Program Director TSAV Community Organizer	FY 96 100%; FY 98 50% 100% FY 96 & 98
Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians	TSAV Director TSAV Community Organizer ¹	FY 96 100%; FY 98 50% 100% FY 96 & 98

¹ In FY 1996, this site actually had two Organizer Positions; half of the salary for each of these two positions was paid with tribal, not TSAV, funds.

The third column in Table 1 specifies the percentage of each position’s salary which was derived from TSAV grant funds. In the interest of promoting local institutionalization of a TSAV-like planning and partnership generating function, during the last year of TSAV funding BJA required that tribes assume financial responsibility for 50% of their TSAV Director/Coordinator position. This was a logical first step for what BJA anticipated would occur when all TSAV funding ceased – namely, that the tribes would institutionalize (and cover costs for) a TSAV-like position in their on-going organizational structures. Unfortunately, after the close of the last TSAV gant, there was no indication that any of the sites did actually do such institutionalization of the position.

E. Evolution of the TSAV Concept

The initial two pilot sites selected by BJA for participation in the TSAV initiative were invited to submit an application “to support crime and violence reduction activities.” The invitation letter to the pilot sites asked that the tribes submit a narrative incorporating several elements:

- brief descriptions of local partnerships and of economic, social and crime problems on the reservation;
- identification of key decision makers to be involved in the TSAV planning process and how those decision makers would participate in the planning process;

- a brief description of already existing coordination/cooperation efforts among tribal, private, county state and federal agencies;
- a brief description of the existing community policing program and efforts directed at improving police-community relations; and
- an inventory of resources that could be directed toward the problems of family violence and juvenile delinquency.

From December 1995 through May 1996, BJA expanded further on its initial conceptualization of the TSAV initiative through correspondence with the two participating Tribes. The two pilot sites were told that the framework of the TSAV initiative was essentially to promote and implement comprehensive community-based program development regarding crime and violence issues. They were also told that the TSAV program was crafted to “promote the integration and practice of community policing and prosecution, reduce incidents of family violence and juvenile delinquency, and better assist residents through the strengthening of partnerships among tribal service providers.”⁴

This gradual progression of guidance and explanatory correspondence indicate that BJA was fine-tuning its TSAV program goals and objectives as it accumulated insights and experience from working with the two pilot sites. That fine-tuning was certainly reflected in the subsequent 1996 program announcement for the new TSAV sites, i.e., for the five demonstration projects. [Note: language in that same 1996 funding announcement applied for continuation grant awards for the initial two pilot sites.]

Essentially, as the TSAV initiative evolved from pilot projects at two sites to demonstration projects at five additional sites, the initiative’s goals and objectives changed somewhat. In FY 1995, the pilot project goals were:

- to educate, motivate, organize and mobilize Native American communities to work closer together to take action against crime, violence and illicit drug use;
- to improve a community’s capacity to address issues of crime, violence and drug demand reduction;
- to promote the adoption and implementation of comprehensive community-based program development which involves the participation of youth, residents, educators, spiritual leaders, business persons, social service providers and criminal justice representatives; and
- to support the implementation of community policing and prosecution strategies.

However, in the FY 1996 program announcement for the demonstration projects, the first and last goals cited above were eliminated, the third goal was slightly reworded, and a new goal was added, although it was not directed at grantees but, rather at DOJ. That goal stated that DOJ would try:

- to develop an effective culturally sensitive program model that can be replicated by other Native American communities.

Like the goals, the initial 1995 TSAV objectives were also a mixture of focuses — with some relating to anticipated local TSAV program accomplishments, while others related to DOJ itself (e.g., “to provide technical assistance and training to core planning team members and tribal leaders,

⁴ 2/14/1996 letter from Todd Brightman (TSAV Program Manager at BJA) to Fort Peck Tribes TSAV Program Administrator.

as appropriate”). Moreover, like the goals, the initial TSAV objectives were also modified by time the FY 1996 program announcement for the new demonstration grants was issued.

These modifications reflect lessons learned by BJA during its experiences working with the initial pilot sites. This evolving conceptualization was also demonstrated by BJA’s change in policy to allow use of grant monies to fund TSAV staff positions. Based on our Fort Peck Tribes file review, it appears that BJA had originally assumed that, rather than using grant funds, someone local could be identified (from the various tribal government agencies’ personnel) to take on the role of guiding the TSAV planning process. As it turned out, that did not occur at Fork Peck; there, the person initially assigned this responsibility found it too time consuming and subsequently gave up the responsibility. Thus, by the time the FY 1996 program announcement was issued, BJA permitted grant funds to be used for hiring a director/coordinator to work with “lead policy makers” in facilitating planning, as well as to subsequently implement the local TSAV program.

F. BJA Assumptions and Expectations

In formulating its TSAV initiative, BJA built upon lessons learned from several previous DOJ funded community-based prevention demonstration projects. Two premises, in particular, underlay the TSAV design: (1) while individual/agency actions are necessary, they are not sufficient to prevent crime and delinquency; and (2) by working together, people can make a difference in the quality of life for themselves, their neighborhoods and their communities.

The 1996 TSAV program announcement specifically noted that successful programs, as evidenced by other DOJ community-based policing and prevention initiatives — albeit not in Indian communities — emphasized the importance of the following features:

- formation of a diverse (“multi-faceted”) planning team for establishing, implementing and monitoring crime control strategies;
- engagement of law enforcement and the courts as partners;
- identification of specific geographic target area(s); and
- active involvement of community representatives in all facets of the program.

It was also noted that effective programs often begin with small, tangible victories — such as reclaiming a street corner — and then, using the confidence gained, they tackle larger issues.

By including these references in the program announcement, it would appear that BJA hoped that these same features were both feasible and appropriate for Tribal sites. However, their applicability had not yet been tested in the context of federally recognized Indian Tribes and their communities — a context which, due to the unique nature of tribal governments and related constructs associated with those governmental structures, provides settings not necessarily comparable to the non-tribal government settings in which those same program features had previously been successful.

BJA also expected that the required local planning teams, which were intended to develop local TSAV Workplans, would identify appropriate local partners for subsequent Workgroups to help implement the local objectives and activities. BJA also expected that the *TSAV Process* — as a community-oriented problem solving process for addressing local crime, violence, and substance abuse — would ultimately become institutionalized within each participating Tribe’s organizational

structure. As part of that institutionalization, it was expected that Tribes would use their own resources to underwrite costs for supporting an on-going the TSAV Director/Coordinator type position – i.e., the position for which BJA, through the demonstration project grants, had provided the seed money.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

ORBIS Associates' evaluation of the TSAV initiative consisted of both process and impact evaluation. Our evaluation goals, as approved by NIJ, were to:

- document how TSAV approaches had evolved at each of the four TSAV sites;
- document how each site had implemented its comprehensive strategies;
- analyze and report how differences in local cultures, physical environments or government structures at the sites may have affected implementation at the sites and may or may not have implications for potential success of TSAV in other American Indian communities; and
- provide useful evaluation findings for tribal and DOJ decision makers, as well as other criminal justice stakeholders.

The first evaluation goal focuses on process evaluation; the other goals focus on the evaluation of primarily qualitative impacts.

TSAV Case Studies, one for each of the four Tribes included in this evaluation, present impact evaluation findings for the individual sites. As noted by Yin (1984), when attempting to understand complex social phenomena, “case studies are the preferred strategy when ‘how’ or ‘why’ questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context.”

This cross-sites report, on the other hand, is intended to serve as the final technical report reflecting TSAV impact at the four Tribes that participated in the evaluation. One of the major intents of this report is to identify those factors that affected TSAV planning and implementation across sites in order to provide findings for NIJ to take into consideration in planning similar future DOJ initiatives. Furthermore, an important consideration was to determine the impacts — in terms of transformations in local systems and changes in participating communities — as a result of the initiative. Finally, a central evaluation issue was to determine the appropriateness of the TSAV model for replication in other Tribes.

Approach

This evaluation was both a process and impact evaluation. From the onset of this project, we made the assumption that there would be some difficulty obtaining meaningful quantitative data. Therefore, our proposed evaluation design focused heavily on a qualitative approach. That decision was readily substantiated by the realization that neither the individual TSAV applications nor the individual site Workplans contain much quantitative data.

We have relied heavily on field research for this evaluation. Collection of data was primarily achieved through six strategies:

- *site visits* (two each for all four TSAV evaluation sites)
- *observation and interviews during semi-annual TSAV training workshops* (presented by BJA in partnership with NCPC)
- *telephone interviews*
- *survey of local TSAV stakeholders (individuals involved in TSAV partnerships)*
- *document review (both grantee and BJA documents)*
- *analysis of crime data from law enforcement agencies and Tribal Courts (because data were inconsistent across sites, these data were not compared for this report and are presented only in the Case Studies)*

Extensive document review was conducted by the evaluation team to familiarize itself with the initiative and local TSAV sites. Pertinent program-related materials in BJA files were collected in order to reconstruct the development of the initiative. The BJA files of individual TSAV grantees were also reviewed to understand how each local TSAV initiative was being implemented. Furthermore, pertinent local documents were collected by the team members while physically on-site. These materials were analyzed both to identify new information and to verify data collected from other sources.

The collection and analysis of quantitative crime data, as available and accessible, was integrated into the evaluation process to the extent possible. Quantitative data — e.g., law enforcement statistics, court data, incident reports from domestic violence shelters, etc. — were collected. These data were analyzed for statistically significant findings and reported in the individual Case Studies. Given the nature of the TSAV strategies and given the two-year time frame of local implementation of TSAV strategies, however, it was not anticipated that statistically significant changes would yet be evident. Because crime data consistent across sites was not available, no analysis of crime data was conducted nor provided in this report.⁵

Site Visits

Two site visits were made to each of the four participating TSAV sites. The first visits were conducted in Winter 1997/1998. Occurring after TSAV sites had begun implementation of their local TSAV programs, each of these visits involved three evaluation team members and lasted for a period of four and one-half days. The second site visits occurred in Fall 1999 and involved two evaluation team members each. Scheduled as local TSAV programs were ending, these visits varied from three to four days, depending on the site.

⁵ Crime statistics — either law enforcement and/or court data — were quite difficult to obtain. Furthermore, even when available, data from all the sites were often inconsistent; moreover, in many instances, data could not be used for purposes of comparative analyses over time even within a site, let alone across sites. Additionally, at one site, the applicability of available data to targeted TSAV populations was questionable. Despite these problems, these data were discussed in the Case Studies. Nevertheless, in almost all cases, no statistically significant results were found.

For both sets of site visits, protocols were developed for conducting face-to-face, in-depth interviews. These protocols contained questions directed at specific types of TSAV stakeholders — specifically, TSAV staff, Core Team members, law enforcement personnel, court personnel, human services providers, and educators. In a few cases, when interviewees were not available during the visit, follow-up telephone interviews, using the same Protocol questions, were conducted with those individuals.

The first set of field visits to each Tribe participating in the evaluation resulted in four process evaluation reports.⁶ These process evaluation reports included descriptive data on relevant characteristics of the Tribe, progress of each local TSAV initiative, factors influencing implementation of TSAV, and concerns and issues for future consideration. The reports identified specific site-based issues that the evaluation team members felt needed to be addressed by local TSAV partners at each TSAV evaluation site. These process evaluation reports were provided to all seven TSAV sites, including the TSAV sites not participating in this evaluation. The reports were also submitted to BJA, NIJ and NCPC.

In addition to the eight site visits, members of the evaluation team participated in four of the semi-annual TSAV training workshops presented by BJA in partnership with NCPC. The evaluation team also took part in one other final meeting of TSAV directors in September 1999. To each of these workshops, grantees brought four to five staff and partners. These settings proved to be excellent forums for collection of further evaluation data — both through observation and interview of local TSAV staff and partners .

Survey

In order not to be solely dependent on interview and observation data, other methods of data collection were also incorporated into the evaluation. A survey of TSAV stakeholders was conducted to provide for consistency of data regarding key evaluation questions — such as perceived impacts, meeting of expectations and factors that had an impact on local implementation. This survey utilized a questionnaire consisting of 207 items addressing 16 topic areas. These items helped place qualitative findings in context and helped verify perceptions of relative success as well as remaining crime, violence, and quality of life issues in each respective community. The questionnaire was adapted from one utilized by the Comprehensive Communities Program, another BJA initiative, which also was based on building community partnerships. A list of 35 potential respondents were developed for each site and the Core Team members were asked to identify those respondents who would be most familiar with the local TSAV initiative. Twenty-four stakeholders, including TSAV staff, were identified as survey respondents for each site.

⁶ These were the *Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians TSAV Site Visit Report - May 1998*, the *Chickasaw Nation TSAV Evaluation Site Visit Report - June 1998*, the *Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians TSAV Evaluation Site Visit Report - July 1998*, and the *Fort Peck Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes TSAV Evaluation Site Visit Report - August 1998*.

Accessibility of Data

During both sets of site visits, key TSAV partners were available for interviews with the evaluation team. These interviews ranged from one to two hours each. Only at one site did we experience some resistance (due to the amount of interview time required) from a few local TSAV partners — and this only occurred during the second set of site visits to that Tribe. However, problems were experienced in getting local community members to comment on the TSAV initiative.⁷

Problems with respect to collection of survey data were also encountered. Of the 24 TSAV partners identified for each site, the response rates were: 46% (11 respondents) at one site, 75% (18 respondents) at two sites, and 79% (19 respondents) at the fourth site. Additionally, the degree to which individual survey items were fully completed varied from site to site. Four questions in particular were problematic, namely the questions which asked respondents to identify, from a list of 33-36 potential partner agencies, the extent to which each agency was involved, reasons for non-involvement, reasons for stopping involvement, etc. The degree of response to those questions was far less than to most other questions, probably due to time required to answer them. In fact, the majority of respondents did not answer those four items; thus, no analysis was conducted of the responses we did receive.

Upon completion of our individual draft Case Studies, one key contact person on the local TSAV Core Team at each site was identified and sent multiple copies of the report. We asked that person to distribute copies of the report to other Team members for their review and comment on substantive factual errors — e.g., numbers of tribal members, crime data, etc. We received brief comments from only two sites; the other two sites declined to make any comments at all.

Reference

1. Yin, Robert K., *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, Sage Publications, 1984, p.13

⁷ To assess the general perceptions of “community members” with respect to the local TSAV program’s impact, during the second set of site visits, each site was asked to (a) announce the pending visit of the ORBIS evaluation team members in some community forum — local newspaper, flyers, brochures, etc., and (b) arrange for a community meeting at which the team could discuss such perceptions. At two sites, no such meeting occurred. At the other two sites, the meetings did occur but had varied levels of participation, ranging from three individuals to 12 individuals. Based on data collected at those two meetings, it appeared that, in general, community members were unfamiliar with the TSAV initiative other than when a specific community member had him or herself been directly involved in a specific TSAV strategy.

Chapter II. TSAV Program Implementation at Four Tribes: Extent to Which BJA Objectives Were Addressed or Met

An important consideration in this evaluation has been to carefully examine the ways in which the TSAV program was planned and actually implemented by local grantees/partners — as well as by federal administrators. It is hoped that identification of commonalities in the success of approaches and in obstacles to implementation will provide the Bureau of Justice Assistance with useful information about factors that might affect other initiatives in Indian Country.

This chapter, therefore, discusses how the program planning and implementation elements of the TSAV initiative actually occurred. The discussion is presented within the framework of the four key objectives cited found in the FY 1996 Tribal Strategies Against Violence program announcement. The discussion covers the extent to which BJA's objectives were both addressed and met by the conclusion of the TSAV initiative.

A. Establish and/or Enhance Diverse Planning Teams and Build Partnerships

Planning/Oversight Teams. It was the intent of the BJA to assist participating Tribes establish planning groups that were comprised of a diverse range of tribal and non-tribal entities. In addition to involvement of tribal leadership (administrative and/or legislative), BJA also encouraged that tribal service providers, such as law enforcement and courts, prosecution, social services, education, etc., be part of the planning group. Additionally, BJA's planning model envisioned other community members as being either part of "community-based program development" or active *partners* in TSAV program activities. These other community participants included youth, community residents, educators, spiritual leaders and businesses.

Table 2 on the next page shows the composition — as recognized by local TSAV staff and partners interviewed on site — of what BJA usually referred to as the *Core Team*. From BJA's perspective, the Core Team was supposed to consist of about five individuals whom it would formally acknowledge or recognize as having primary planning and oversight responsibility for the local TSAV initiative. In theory, this Team was to be a relatively consistent body of local representatives. On paper, it often appeared that way. In reality, however, the initial planning and oversight groups at each site were actually larger. Furthermore, at some sites, membership on the Team was fluid, varying in both number and composition as the initiative progressed.

During the initial phase of TSAV, each site involved a relatively sizeable group of people (25-35) in the planning process. As the TSAV program progressed, however, participation in these oversight groups waned, as a rule. As shown in Table 2, at three of the four sites, 10-13 individuals remained relatively active as TSAV partners. At the fourth site, about seven remained active in the planning and oversight group. At that site, a rift developed between the TSAV Director and Core Team members. For that reason, Team members withdrew for a period of time and did not really become involved again until after receiving BJA's Community Analysis and Planning Strategies (CAPS) training in January 1999 (see Grand Traverse Band Case Study). Even then, however, the Core Team remained quite separate from TSAV staff, unlike at the other three sites.

Table 2. Composition of Ongoing Local TSAV Planning & Oversight Teams

Agencies Represented	<i>Chickasaw Nation</i>	<i>Fort Peck Tribes</i>	<i>Grand Traverse Band</i>	<i>Turtle Mountain Band</i>
Law enforcement	- BIA Police Supervisor - Ada City Police DARE Officer	- Wolf Pt. Police Chief - Poplar Police Chief - Dir., FP Law & Justice		BIA Police Captain
Prosecution			Tribal Prosecutor (1 st year only)	Tribal Prosecutor (2 nd year only)
Courts		Tribal Court Administrator	Assoc. Judge (1 st year only)	- Chief Clerk of Tribal Court - Judicial Comm.
Social Services	- Dir., Dept. of Family Advocacy - Violence Prev. Mgr. - Dir., City Family Crisis Center - CN Drug Elim. Prog.	- Dir. of Crisis Center - Human Res. Director	Dir. of Women’s Shelter	VOCA Director
Education	- Dir., Div. of Educ. & Family Services	Tribal Educ. Comm.		- Supt., Dunseith Public Schools - Tribal College rep.
Tribal Admin.		Tribal Operations Sp.	Dir., Division of Admin. Services	Tribal Planner
Tribal Council	1 Tribal Legislator	2 Tribal Executive Board members	1 Tribal Council member (1 st year)	1 Tribal Council member
TSAV Staff	- TSAV Coordinator - Violence Prev. Spec.	- TSAV Program Mgr. - Tech. Advisor	- TSAV Director - Comm. Organizer	- TSAV Director - Comm. Organizer

Two of the key premises of BJA’s TSAV planning model was that (a) both law enforcement and courts should be involved, and (b) that the TSAV planning and oversight group should be drawn from a diverse array of tribal and other service providers, including “community members” and “residents.” As shown in Table 2, the involvement of both law enforcement and courts did not occur at all sites. Nor was the makeup of the planning group membership as diverse as BJA may have desired — especially in terms of including a broader spectrum of “citizenry” participation — at least as that concept is usually applied in the programs upon which BJA had based its TSAV planning model.

A relevant note here is that the words “community members” and “residents” probably have different interpretations for BJA and for the Tribes participating in this TSAV evaluation. A comment made by one TSAV Director during the last round of evaluation site visits may best exemplify this difference in interpretation. That TSAV Director voiced the belief that in many Indian communities, little distinction is made between “community member” involvement (i.e., involvement of the general public) and involvement of tribal agency staff (i.e., involvement of

professional positions filled by tribal members). In other words, tribal citizens (and residents of the community) who are employed as service providers or who are elected tribal officials, etc., see themselves as reflecting community perspectives and concerns, and thus as being just as illustrative of “community members” or “residents” as other residents of the community. This is a markedly different view than in many non-Indian communities, where the *us* versus *them* distinction is often strong when applied to the general public as opposed to government employees. Thus, the need to elicit the same type of citizenship participation as is often desirable in non-Indian communities is not necessarily seen as relevant in Indian Country.

If one accepts this difference in interpretation of community involvement, then it can be said that BJA’s expectation of involvement from community members and residents was met. If one does not accept the difference in interpretation, then, for the most part, this BJA expectation was not met — but then again, it might also not be relevant for all American Indian communities.

One further observation that may have bearing on the breadth of involvement in Core Team involvement at given sites has to do with a factor that is somewhat serendipitous, namely family relationships. For example, at one site, two Team members were siblings and thus may have mutually reinforced each others’ ongoing participation. At another site, the DARE Officer for the municipal police was also the spouse of one TSAV staff member; thus, since no other officers were involved on the Team, his involvement may have been more related to the familial connection, than to the TSAV program’s emphasis on law enforcement representation.

Partnerships. It was an expectation of BJA that Tribes receiving TSAV would build partnerships with both tribal and non-tribal public agencies, as well as with tribal and non-tribal private entities such as businesses, religious institutions, civic groups, community agencies, etc. It was thought that these partnerships would then assist the TSAV Core Teams with implementation of the Workplan developed by the Tribe (“the jurisdiction”).

All four sites certainly developed, or enhanced, partnerships with tribal public agencies. The breadth of agency type and the number of partnerships did, however, vary from site to site.

On the other hand, the extent to which partnerships were established or nurtured with non-tribal entities and with businesses, religious institutions and civic organizations differed sharply when compared across sites. Among two of the three reservation-based Tribes (the Grand Traverse Band and the Turtle Mountain Band), partnerships with non-tribal entities, or private agencies of any sort, was actualized only to a limited degree. At the Fort Peck Tribes, on the other hand, partnerships — albeit, in some cases, short-term — were established with a number of non-tribal criminal justice entities. For example, the U.S. Attorney’s Office for Montana, the Wolf Point Police Department, the FBI, public schools and a variety of non-tribal service agencies were involved, at some juncture, in that Tribe’s TSAV efforts. However, even at that site, businesses, churches and civic organizations were involved only minimally. The case of the Boys and Girls Club, established under the Fort Peck Tribes TSAV program, may be illustrative of certain Indian and non-Indian community dynamics (i.e., as one TSAV staff member noted, “how things really operate on the rez”) that are at the root of this minimal participation. Specifically, since its establishment, the Wolf Point Boys and Girls Club has experienced certain impediments to sustainability. While some of these impediments relate to staff turnover, other impediments had to do with insufficient Board participation and support as well as with overall lack of community support. Management at the Club turned over at least three times; at one point, the Club actually closed. The latest Director (and

sole Club staff) noted there were few volunteers at the Club, either Indian or non-Indian, other than the police officers who sometimes donated time. He also pointed to lack of support from the local community, noting that he couldn't even get a business to donate a free video rental for the Club's members. Furthermore, it was felt that the Wolf Point community tended to view the Boys and Girls Club as "something only for Native Americans," when, in fact, its very purpose was to bring together all youth in the community to participate in healthy activities.

Thus, when reference is made to TSAV *partners* — in this report and in the Case Studies — we are referring either to the members of the planning and oversight team representing various tribal entities and other agencies (e.g., schools, non-tribal law enforcement, etc.) or to entities who interacted, to some substantive degree, under one or several local TSAV-supported objectives. In other words, some businesses, religious institutions, civic organizations, etc., may have participated in a specific *TSAV activity* level (as opposed to at the broader objective level); however, their participation was limited primarily to specific events such as graffiti paint-outs or Violence Awareness Month activities.

On the other hand, at the Chickasaw Nation, there was quite substantial involvement and support from non-Indian community agencies and private organizations. This may, in part, be attributable to the fact that the Chickasaw Nation was the only non-reservation based TSAV site. Located in the midst of a non-Indian municipality, it has a 13-county service area. Moreover, it has no tribal law enforcement or court system (other than one which rules exclusively on the constitutionality of laws passed by the tribal legislature). Perhaps most important, unlike the reservation-based TSAV sites, the Chickasaw Nation focused most of its TSAV approach at the *activity*, rather than *strategy*, level. These differences in setting and in approach to TSAV design may account for why local civic organizations and others were more active participants. It takes less full commitment of resources and less collaboration about philosophies and long-range goals to participate in short-term *events*, such as Fun Runs and graffiti paint-outs, than it does to invest in long-term collaborative strategies.

B. Develop and Implement Cost-effective Crime and Violence Reduction Strategies (including community policing, prosecution and prevention initiatives)

It was BJA's expectation that the participating Tribes' TSAV Workplans would include strategies for (a) reducing family violence and juvenile delinquency, and (b) rehabilitating and/or revitalizing crime and violence ridden neighborhoods. Strategies related to community policing initiatives, improving prosecution efforts and establishing prevention initiatives were to be emphasized. The models that the TSAV Program were based on also encouraged targeting of "neighborhoods," i.e., actual housing areas or sectors within a community. BJA, therefore, expected that this same targeting of neighborhoods should occur at the TSAV sites.

The TSAV goals contained in the Workplans developed by the four evaluation sites are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. TSAV Goals of Four Tribes in Evaluation

Tribe	TSAV Goals*
Chickasaw Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preventing Alcohol Abuse for Youth (Ages 3-10) in Tishomingo ○ Teaching Violence Reduction Strategies to Teachers and Counselors (for Grades PreK-7) ○ Mobilizing the Community Reduce Gang-related Criminal Activities
Fort Peck Tribes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Implementing Community Policing and Enhancing Prosecution ○ Reducing Incidents of Juvenile Violence, Gang Activity and Substance Abuse ○ Developing and Enhancing Community Partnerships
Grand Traverse Band	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reducing Family Violence ○ Reducing Youth Substance (Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs) Abuse ○ Strengthening Partnerships Among Tribal Service Providers ○ Preventing Youth Crime and Violence ○ Establishing a Youth-Initiated and Planned Native Youth Conference
Turtle Mountain Band	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Building a Safer and Healthier Community by Strengthening Families ○ Reducing Family Violence ○ Reducing Youth Involvement in Substance Abuse and Illegal Activities

* Goal language has been changed slightly for consistency across sites.

The Tribes participating in the TSAV initiative fulfilled these program requirements to varying degrees. All four had some strategies that addressed family violence and juvenile delinquency (e.g., substance abuse and gang prevention). However, community policing initiatives, while operative at all sites, were not in all cases substantively connected with the local TSAV program. Moreover, prosecution-related issues were addressed at only some sites. As to targeting of specific neighborhoods, only the non-reservation TSAV site actually reflected that expectation in its Workplan. At the other sites, the Workplan strategies were directed either reservation-wide or to a specific town or community within the reservation. (Toward the end of the TSAV project period, however, although not in its Workplan, one other site did target a tribal housing area for a graffiti paint-out and beautification activity.)

In general, the *crime and violence reduction* strategies contained in the TSAV Workplans developed by the four evaluation sites fell into the five broad categories discussed below. In discussing these, where relevant we have attempted to distinguish between longer-term strategies and shorter-term strategies (or activities.) The reader will note that a preponderance of the TSAV strategies are youth-oriented.

1. Amending Tribal Legal Codes. One TSAV strategy, in particular, that is likely to have long-term impact on crime, violence and substance abuse prevention among the participating Tribes, is the amending of tribal codes — particularly to the extent that such amendments helped strengthen tribal court systems and law enforcement. All three reservation-based Tribes (the Fort Peck Tribes, the Grand Traverse Band and the Turtle Mountain Band) pursued this strategy as part of their TSAV programs. Each of these Tribes has a Tribal Court system with jurisdiction over criminal, civil and juvenile matters among tribal members.⁸ Thus, these Tribes pursued either establishing or strengthening Domestic/Family Violence laws, enacting mandatory arrest policies, and enacting laws prohibiting sales to juveniles and use of alcohol, tobacco and/or inhalants by juveniles. (Since

⁸ At the Chickasaw Nation, the other Tribe in the evaluation, similar cases are under the jurisdiction of the BIA Court of Indian Offenses or state court system.

the Chickasaw Nation does not have a tribal court with comparable jurisdiction, the amendment of tribal codes was not part of its TSAV program.)

Each of these Tribes also amended their tribal codes in other ways. For example, the Turtle Mountain Band enacted curfew laws for juveniles. It also enacted new laws enhancing the tribal court's authority to prosecute child abuse and child support cases and, through agreements with the state court system, increased the tribal court's ability to enforce child support judgements in other jurisdictions. The Fort Peck Tribes modified the status of various offenses (e.g., statutory rape), changing the status from a Class A misdemeanor to a felony. The Tribes also strengthened the DUI laws for juveniles by increasing the penalties per offense. The Grand Traverse Band enacted no-smoking ordinances for tribal offices/facilities and developed a new sexual harassment policy for tribal employees. The Grand Traverse Band also enacted laws prohibiting illegal drug use and sales in tribal housing.

Many of these new laws then led to changes in each Tribes' law enforcement policies (e.g., mandatory arrest policies for domestic abuse) or to the establishing of new protocols for dealing with particular types of cases, such as rape, domestic violence and child abuse.

It should be noted that some of the laws these Tribes were particularly concerned about dealt with crimes (such as child sexual abuse) that fall under the Major Crimes Act. These crimes are normally referred to the federal courts. However, such cases are often not prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney's Office, unless there is a strong likelihood of their being won. This is a serious concern in Indian Country. In an effort to provide tribal recourse when a federal Court defers prosecution, new tribal laws were passed allowing the prosecution of such cases in tribal courts.

2. Providing Violence Awareness and Prevention Programs for Youth. Youth were an emphasis for each TSAV site included in this evaluation. Specific programs for youth violence prevention were used as both short- or long-term TSAV strategies among the four Tribes included in this evaluation. While these efforts were largely school-based, they also involved some degree of outreach to parents and to other community members.

Two evaluation sites – the Fort Peck Tribes and the Chickasaw Nation – pursued the long-term strategy of establishing youth school-based violence prevention programs as part of their TSAV programs. The Fort Peck Tribes site was very successful in implementing this TSAV strategy; the Chickasaw Nation was not as successful. The Fort Peck Tribes successfully implemented the Second Step violence reduction curriculum in the reservation schools. Initially started in the Wolf Point Public Schools, by the end of the TSAV program this strategy had been expanded into all school districts on the reservation. The Chickasaw Nation TSAV program, in its first year, attempted to similarly implement the Second Step curriculum in its local public school district; however, due to TSAV staff turnover which impeded progress, this effort was not ultimately very successful. In the second year, new TSAV staff (unfamiliar with the Second Step curriculum) tried to establish a different school-based conflict resolution curriculum. Despite this strategy being part of the TSAV Workplan, for a number of reasons it was never successfully implemented by the end of the TSAV program (refer to Case Study for further discussion).

The TSAV Program at all four Tribes provided programs directed at youth gang prevention. Each site identified the presence of gang “wannabe” behaviors among some youth, noting that such behaviors are often the precursors to actual gang activity. All four TSAV sites arranged for

presentations to be made by Wauneta Lone Wolf, a nationally known Indian youth gang prevention and intervention expert. Ms. Lone Wolf's training on gang identification and prevention was offered to youth, school staff, law enforcement personnel and community members.

At the Turtle Mountain Band, Ms. Lone Wolf's presentations ultimately led to enactment of school policies prohibiting students from wearing clothing associated with gang membership. The Turtle Mountain Band's TSAV program supplemented Ms. Lone Wolf's training by sponsoring a tribal police officer's presentation of the Counteract Program — a five-week gang-/drug-/violence-prevention program — in local schools. At the Grand Traverse Band, Ms. Lone Wolf's presentations were part of an annual state-wide Native American Youth Conference — planned and implemented by the TSAV-sponsored Junior Tribal Council. The overall focus of the conference was to address issues affecting American Indian youth, including the links between crime, violence and substance abuse. At the Fort Peck Tribes, in addition to the Lone Wolf presentations, the Targeted Outreach program — a Boys and Girls Club program aimed at youth gang prevention — was implemented in the local Boys and Girls Club. This Targeted Outreach Program also served as the basis for subsequent training of local school staffs, students and parents to raise their awareness of potential gang problems in the community/reservation. At the Chickasaw Nation, Ms. Lone Wolf's presentations were done as a one-time training session for local law enforcement personnel, tribal program staff affiliated with TSAV, youth and interested school personnel. These anti-youth gang strategies were, however, never formally institutionalized within the TSAV program.

3. Instituting Alcohol/Substance Abuse Prevention and Supportive Services for Youth. In addition to providing alternative activities for youth — as a way of preventing them from getting involved with alcohol and drugs — all four Tribes pursued TSAV strategies designed to address youth substance abuse prevention.

The Fort Peck Tribes, the Turtle Mountain Band and the Chickasaw Nation all enlisted local schools and law enforcement officers, trained as Drug Awareness and Resistance Education (DARE) officers, as partners in their TSAV programs. The Grand Traverse Band initiated a program to teach youth about traditional uses of tobacco in order to encourage youth not to become involved in recreational use of tobacco.

Other substance abuse prevention outcomes at the Turtle Mountain Band, were that the community schools enacted Zero Tolerance policies as a result of the tribes' new substance use/abuse laws for juveniles and a Special Agent with the California Department of Justice made presentations on identification of illegal drug use to students and staff at local schools as well as to community members.

The Smart Moves program, a Boys and Girls Club program to address substance abuse prevention, was instituted at the Fort Peck Tribes' Boys and Girls Club. In addition, the substance abuse treatment center at the Fort Peck Tribes, which served as one of the local TSAV partners, began a Children of Alcoholics support group which was specifically targeted at the community's youth.

Two Tribes in the evaluation developed specific culture-based intervention programs for youth as alternatives to prosecution and detention for substance abuse offenses. In conjunction with its Peacemaker Court, the Grand Traverse Band instituted an alternative sentencing program which utilizes a Young Men's (mentorship) Program for teaching about the traditional values and behaviors associated with traditional roles of Chippewa/Ottawa men and women. This year-long program also

utilizes various physical challenge activities which culminates in youth participating in a 10-day, 300-mile canoe trip.

The Fort Peck Tribes instituted an Adolescent Survival Skills Program, a research- and culture-based program that utilizes cultural preservation activities that revive and enhance traditions in order to build youth self-esteem and resistance to substance abuse. This program utilizes a 16-day survival trek along the reservation rivers as the basis for teaching traditional values and cultural skills. Started as an alternative sentencing program for 18 tribal youth in the criminal justice system, the program was expanded to benefit all tribal youth wanting to participate and resulted in serving 35 youth in its second year. Similarly, the participation of adults — law enforcement personnel, treatment and detention staff and parents — increased from 15 in 1998 to approximately 60 in 1999.

The Fort Peck Tribes and Turtle Mountain Band both developed DUI (Drug) Courts to promote treatment of offenders rather than incarceration. The Fort Peck Tribes also developed a Youth/Family Wellness (Drug) Court to ensure that youth involved in alcohol and other substance abuse be provided alternatives to detention as well as opportunities for their parents to participate in the rehabilitative process.

4. Strengthening Families and Enhancing Services for Adults. All four Tribes in the evaluation addressed, to varying degrees, the needs of adults and families in their communities.

One site, the Chickasaw Nation, chose to place some of its TSAV focus specifically on violence perpetrated against senior citizens. Among several activities in this regard, the Chickasaw Nation TSAV staff made presentations at the tribe's Senior Citizens Centers. These presentations addressed overall violence and prevention awareness issues and also focused specifically on scams which were targeting the senior citizen population. This TSAV program also sponsored several Senior Citizen Fun Runs/Walks.

With respect to a more general focus on strengthening families, all four Tribes developed certain comprehensive long-term strategies. One strategy, utilized by three of the TSAV sites, was to increase awareness among community members about the range of services available to families in need. For example, both the Fort Peck Tribes and Turtle Mountain Band published directories (with phone numbers) of available human and social service agencies — tribal, county, federal/BIA, etc. — including those which address criminal justice, violence and substance abuse-related needs of families. These directories continue to be updated annually. As an alternative to a directory, the Grand Traverse Band used its tribal newsletter to provide information about comparable services for its communities.

The Turtle Mountain Band TSAV partners implemented various strategies aimed at improving the skills of at-risk families. These strategies included supporting a Parent Outreach Social Worker, in conjunction with the Tribe's Indian Child Welfare program, who worked with families to teach them "living skills" such as parenting, budgeting, and anger management; integrating a Living Skills course into the high school curriculum for teen and unwed parents; and, in concert with two TSAV partners — the local tribal college and a county-wide alternative education consortium — offering adult literacy and basic education courses to at-risk parents and families. As a direct result of efforts undertaken by several TSAV partners, by the conclusion of the TSAV Program, the Turtle Mountain Band had obtained funds to open a Family Emergency Shelter.

The Fort Peck Tribes approached skills development among its at-risk families from a slightly different vantage point. They chose to use a cultural resource, namely the Women's Kinship Council, to develop a culture-based Positive Indian Parenting curriculum which was used at local high schools, at the Tribe's Crisis Center and at the Treatment Center. The TSAV staff also helped promote the Indian Parent Committee at local schools to serve as a cultural mediator between teachers and parents for the purpose of reconciling disciplinary problems and incidents involving Indian students.

The Grand Traverse Band instigated the development of Family Advocacy Centers in its six-county service area. Each center is designed to provide a network of services to promote family preservation. Services include prevention/intervention programs, protective services linkages, licensed foster care and adoption services, etc.

At the Chickasaw Nation, the TSAV Workplan itself did not address family preservation per se. Nevertheless, as a result of heightened awareness of potential resources — gained through participation in the TSAV initiative — the tribe began focusing on new approaches for strengthening families and serving the needs of adults affected by crime and violence. The tribe successfully obtained funds under several DOJ programs and, in support of a Tribal Legislature initiative on domestic violence prevention and intervention, an Office of Violence Prevention was established. Additionally, in collaboration with county/state officials, the Chickasaw Nation opened a Domestic Violence Shelter for both Indian and non-Indian victims of family violence.

All four Tribes also utilized short-term strategies such as sponsoring Family Violence Awareness month activities; conducting community forums; and promoting media campaigns to raise community awareness about specific crime, violence and substance abuse problems facing the respective American Indian Nations.

One further TSAV-related outcome benefitting adults and families was the establishment of Men's Anger Management groups for court-referred domestic abuse perpetrators. This occurred at the Turtle Mountain Band and the Grand Traverse Band; in both cases this was instigated through the TSAV partnership with tribal substance abuse treatment programs.

5. Community Policing. According to the FY 1996 TSAV Program Announcement, TSAV applicants' project designs (and subsequent Workplans) were to include strategies for integrating community policing into the Tribes' own, or partner, law enforcement agencies. Certainly this did occur, in some manner, at all four Tribe sites participating in this TSAV evaluation. However, the extent to which it occurred, and the extent to which the TSAV program either initiated or supported those efforts, varied a great deal from one site to another.

It was at the one non-reservation based Tribe, namely the Chickasaw Nation, that the TSAV program placed greatest focus on implementing various community policing strategies at tribal and municipal housing sites. In concert with the Ada City Police's COPS program, TSAV strategies included implementation of Neighborhood Watches, phone trees, graffiti paint-outs, and installation of speed-limit signs and speed bumps in tribal housing areas. During the second TSAV grant cycle at the Chickasaw Nation, the TSAV Coordinator (himself a former County Deputy Sheriff) provided 80 hours of community policing training to the tribe's Housing Department's Drug Elimination Program staff and to housing residents. Through collaboration with TSAV efforts, the Drug Elimination Program directed some of its funds to hiring an armed/uniformed security

company to monitor two tribal housing sites for criminal activity. Having been provided radios which were monitored by both the BIA Agency Police and the local municipal police department, these security company personnel were authorized to make citizen's arrests — “stop and holds” — for BIA police. Cases stemming from these security company actions were to be prosecuted through the local BIA Court of Federal Regulations.

At the other three TSAV sites, TSAV strategies associated with community policing were far more limited. For example, at the Turtle Mountain Band, as a supplement to the tribes' COPS programs, the TSAV program initiated a Neighborhood Watch program, graffiti paint-outs, and beautification projects at one of the older tribal housing areas. These efforts resulted in restoration of the original name of the housing development (La Belle Coeur or “beautiful heart”) after many years of residents referring to the neighborhood as just “Old Housing.” Similarly, at the Fort Peck Tribes Neighborhood Watch programs were initiated in the municipalities of Wolf Point and Poplar.

At the Grand Traverse Band, the tribe's community policing efforts were relatively extraneous to the TSAV initiative itself. Rather, community policing was largely undertaken under the tribe's various Community-Oriented Policing Strategies (COPS) grants. While coordination between the COPS programs and the TSAV program did occur, it was minimal and, for the most part, tangential to the real thrust of TSAV strategies. In fact, the Grand Traverse Band Police Chief expressed confusion as to why BJA even suggested community policing strategies under the TSAV program, since, from his perspective, the community's COPS grants had assumed that responsibility.

C. Provide Youth With Alternatives to Substance Abuse and Gang Involvement

All four TSAV sites included in this evaluation successfully addressed this TSAV objective. Three of the Tribes did so through developing several comprehensive alternative programs for youth and by reaching out to a relatively wide spectrum of the youth population. The fourth Tribe implemented only one long-term strategy for this purpose.

The establishment of a Boys and Girls Club occurred at all sites except the Grand Traverse Band. At two sites, the Clubs were fully operative by the conclusion of the TSAV funding; at the third site, the Club was just beginning its operations. At the Grand Traverse Band, establishing a Boys and Girls Club had, in fact, initially been intended; however, due to the requirement that a Club applicant have non-profit incorporation status, and given that the Grand Traverse Band regarded that requirement as being in conflict with their tribal sovereign status, the local TSAV partners ultimately declined pursuit of Club funding. [Actually, this same issue also arose at the Fort Peck Tribes; there, however, TSAV partners went ahead with establishing the Boys and Girls Club as a non-tribal entity; this resulted in the lack of support from the Tribe.]

In addition to establishing a Boys and Girls Club, at the Turtle Mountain Band another TSAV-initiated alternative for substance abuse and gang involvement was establishment of a \$750,000 Fitness Center. The benefits of such a facility actually emerged during the TSAV planning process. Motivated by the findings stemming from the planning process, local TSAV partners, including youth, pushed the Tribal Council to allocate funds for this facility. The success of this tribal commitment was a tribute to the collaborative TSAV process.

Both the Fort Peck Tribes and the Grand Traverse Band pursued establishment of Youth Cadet programs as another alternative opportunity for tribal youth. At the Fort Peck Tribes, the Youth Cadet programs were established under the Wolf Point municipal police department as well as under the tribe's own Department of Law and Justice in which the tribal police department is lodged. By conclusion of the TSAV program, the Wolf Point Police Youth Cadet program had 16 (mostly non-Indian) youth involved; the Tribal Police Youth Cadet program had eight Indian youth involved and there were plans to expand the program into five other tribal communities on the reservation. At the Grand Traverse Band, the Police Youth Cadet Program was also lodged under the Tribal Police Department and by the conclusion of the TSAV program, one youth had completed a year in the program and a second youth was just starting.

The Grand Traverse Band's TSAV program was also involved in the restructuring of tribal service delivery which resulted in the establishment of Youth Centers in at least two outlying communities. Additionally, a major TSAV-sponsored effort at the Grand Traverse Band was the revival of a long-dormant concept for involving youth in Tribal Government, namely, a Junior Tribal Council. Serving as a link between tribal youth in the Tribe's six-county service area and the Grand Traverse Band Tribal Council, the Junior Tribal Council was designed to build and nurture youth leadership skills.

At the Chickasaw Nation, establishment of a Boys and Girls Club was the only long-term strategy undertaken in relation to providing youth with alternatives to substance abuse and gang involvement.

A number of short-term alternative activities for youth were also promoted at all four TSAV sites. For the most part these focused on building youths' connection and commitment to their communities. Typical youth involvement activities included community beautification projects, graffiti paintouts, and Adopt-a-Mile projects.

D. Enhance Local Capabilities to Identify Public and Private Resources

During the course of the TSAV initiative, BJA and NCPC provided grantees with technical assistance directed at increasing each participating Tribe's capacity for identifying and obtaining a variety of public and private resources. For example, during the last year of the initiative, as part of the TSAV Networking Conference, grantees were taken to the Foundation Center and provided assistance in utilizing its resources.

The extent to which the four TSAV sites met this capacity enhancement objective varied from site to site. The accomplishments of each site is discussed separately below.

Turtle Mountain Band. As either a direct or tangential result of the local TSAV initiative, by the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, the Turtle Mountain Band had tapped a variety of new resources and obtained numerous new funding commitments. To begin with, the tribe itself allocated over \$750,000 to build a new Fitness Center in Belcourt. This facility was designed to play a major role in providing alternative activities for tribal youth and, in fact, was regarded by tribal youth as indicative of the tribe's sincere commitment to addressing youth concerns. The Turtle Mountain Band also obtained funding under nine different DOJ grants (including TSAV). These programs totaled over \$1.4 million. Among other things, these grants included funding for the tribe's Drug Court as well as a new COPS in Schools program which was being put into place

under new Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with the schools serving Turtle Mountain Band students. Start-up funding for a Boys and Girls Club was also generated as a result of TSAV efforts.

Fort Peck Tribes. By the Fiscal Year ending September 30, 1999, the Fort Peck Tribes had obtained several new sources of revenue, particularly from DOJ. These included Drug Court funding and STOP grant funds which were used to hire an Assistant Prosecutor to handle domestic abuse cases. Other potential resources had also been identified and applied for. Specifically, the Tribes had applied for a \$203,000 Transitional Living Facility; a \$2.3 million Tribal resources grant which would be used to expand and further train its tribal police force; a \$45,000 Juvenile Justice grant to train a resource officer in GREAT — who would also supervise the Tribal Police Cadet program; and a \$500,000 Tribal Youth Program to staff the Transitional Living Facility with a recreational therapist and counselors.

Chickasaw Nation. Through its TSAV program, the Chickasaw Nation generated \$50,000 in start-up funding for its Boys and Girls Club and an additional \$25,000 in continuation funds for the Club. Moreover, as a result of the Chickasaw Nation's TSAV partners' exposure to new information about available federal grant programs, numerous other potential funding resources were identified. DOJ funds had been obtained for a new Domestic Violence Shelter in Ada — to serve both American Indian and non-Indian victims and other DOJ funding was being sought for a Youth Violence Prevention program. Final funding decisions about the latter grant, as well as about several other pending tribal applications, had not yet been made when the local TSAV program ended.

Grand Traverse Band. At the Grand Traverse Band, because of their new awareness of effective problem-solving brought about by TSAV participation and CAPS training, the Core Team sought and obtained resources to implement a new data collection process. This funding came from the Administration for Native Americans, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and resulted in institutionalization of an evaluation team at the tribe — a team which was given responsibility for developing and monitoring program effectiveness and changes in crime, violence and substance abuse rates through baseline and other performance measures. According to the Chief Judge at the Grand Traverse Band, with the exception of that new resource, the TSAV partners consciously chose not to pursue other new funding sources, such as Drug Court monies. Their decision was based on the desire to proceed slowly and to, first, have time to assess, via this new evaluation team, how certain new tribal initiatives, such as the Peacemaker Court and the new Domestic Violence Code, were progressing.

While this BJA objective referenced both *public* and *private* resources, by the conclusion of the TSAV initiative, most new revenue generated by the participating Tribes was public — in fact, federal and mostly from DOJ. In that regard, the technical assistance NCPC provided to TSAV grantees in relation to this objective clearly paid off. While it is not possible to attribute acquisition of all these new resources directly to implementation of TSAV strategies or activities, involvement in TSAV was cited by TSAV partners, at each of the sites, as having been instrumental in heightening local awareness about a variety of potential, and previously unknown, resources.

As noted above, however, most new resources identified and/or tapped were public. Identification of private resources, on the other hand, was relatively minimal.

Chapter III. Factors Affecting Implementation of TSAV Program/Strategies

One of the objectives of this evaluation was to determine what factors, if any, affected (positively or negatively) implementation of the TSAV program at each of the four tribal sites included in this evaluation. In our initial evaluation design we anticipated that certain physical factors — such as geographic location, size of tribal membership, reservation size, etc., — might play a role in implementation. However, ultimately those issues had little impact since the TSAV planning process itself did not take those factors into consideration, i.e., some sites focused their strategies on specific communities, other sites focused on reservation-wide strategies, and across sites, there were also combinations of both. Furthermore, in most cases, strategies were targeted at specific populations such as youth, offenders/victims, families, etc.

It was also initially anticipated that certain cultural factors might have an impact on TSAV implementation, especially with respect to whether the planning model itself was culturally appropriate for replication in a wide spectrum of Indian Country. The issue of culture did arise as a central concern as the evaluation proceeded. This issue is discussed at length in Section VII.

A. Factors that Facilitated Planning and Implementation of the TSAV Program

Across the four sites, the evaluation identified several factors, which appear to have been the primary facilitators for planning and implementation of the TSAV programs at the four sites participating in this evaluation. These are cited in Table 4. These factors were identified from evaluation team interviews of local TSAV staff and partners (while on site and at semi-annual TSAV meetings) and from the evaluators’ qualitative assessments of TSAV program success at each of the four American Indian Nations participating in the TSAV evaluation.

Table 4. Common Facilitating Factors, Across Sites

	Chickasaw Nation	Fort Peck Tribes	Grand Traverse Band	Turtle Mountain Band
Program Manager’s role with Core Team was one of facilitator		U		U
Placement of TSAV within tribal structure		U		U
On-going Core Team involvement of key entities	U	U		U
CAPS training helped clarify TSAV purpose for partners	U	U	U	
Existence of a Tribal Court system		U	U	U
Program Director also on Tribe’s Judicial Board and Child Protection Team				U

Program Manager Role: As noted in Table 4 above, at both the Fort Peck Tribes and the Turtle Mountain Band, the type of role the TSAV Program Director/Manager played — namely, as a facilitator within the construct of the local TSAV Core Team — was a factor which clearly affected implementation of the local TSAV program. The factor not only facilitated implementation of the TSAV program in general, but they also (1) helped the local programs meet BJA’s expectations that the TSAV Director would provide guidance to the planning and oversight group, and (2) enhanced local understanding of TSAV as a *process*, rather than as just another federally funded local project. At the Turtle Mountain Band, this factor was further augmented by virtue of the fact that in addition to her role as TSAV Director, that individual simultaneously served on two other formal entities within the governance/organizational structure of the Tribe. The Director’s role on the Judicial Board and on the Child Protection Team also helped ensure that the TSAV program was viewed in a broader context than just a local project. Furthermore, her linkage to other judicial and social-service entities within the community gave broader authority to the TSAV partnership itself while simultaneously bringing an additional level of technical expertise to the facilitative function of her position. In similar future initiatives, BJA may want to consider these factors when giving technical guidance to Tribes regarding their local program staffing.

Organizational Placement of TSAV Program Locally. Related to these factors, at the same two TSAV sites, the actual placement of the TSAV program, within the Tribe’s organizational structure, also had an impact on how the local initiative was implemented. At the Fort Peck Tribes, the TSAV program was located within the structure of the tribe’s criminal justice system (including law enforcement, courts, corrections and juvenile services). At the Turtle Mountain Band, the TSAV program was lodged within the tribe’s judicial branch. These criminal justice-related contexts effectively reflected the crux of the TSAV philosophy. Thus, placement there served both local programs well, and ensured that supervision of the TSAV Director/Administrator rested with key TSAV stakeholders with vested interests in the overall criminal justice systems of the respective tribes. Moreover, lodging the TSAV Program within the criminal justice system ensured, in both cases, that both law enforcement and Tribal Courts would remain actively engaged in the TSAV effort. Also, the TSAV Directors at both of these sites answered directly to the Tribal Council and Tribal Chairperson. This provided an added advantage of giving the lead TSAV staff member access to a broader spectrum of local authorities and, thus, to be able to try building broader partnerships across tribal programs.

This situation at the Fort Peck Tribes and the Turtle Mountain Band was in marked contrast to the situation at either the Chickasaw Nation or the Grand Traverse Band. At both these latter Tribes, the TSAV programs were lodged at a level considerably lower within the tribal organizational structure. Moreover, both of those TSAV programs were lodged under departments responsible for specific services. At the Chickasaw Nation, the TSAV program was in the Department of Family Advocacy; at the Grand Traverse Band, the program was in the Division of Administrative Services. Thus, the programs were perceived, and ultimately functioned, more as “projects” than as implementers of a cross-agency, multi-entity “process” for ongoing community problem-solving.

Engagement of Key Stakeholders. Probably not surprisingly, it was at the same two sites that had lodged their TSAV programs strategically within the tribal structure that the TSAV partnership was most successful at actively engaging, and maintaining, participation from four key entities on the TSAV planning and oversight group — law enforcement, the Tribal Court, the tribal government and the tribal administration, namely, the Tribal Planner. At the other sites, while most of those

entities were involved in the TSAV initial planning phase, once TSAV became fully operative, active participation by all four entities waned.

1999 CAPS Training. In 1999, Community Analysis and Planning Strategies (CAPS) training was made available for interested American Indian Tribes. BJA encouraged TSAV sites to participate in the training and three of the TSAV evaluation sites did. As BJA noted,⁹ this CAPS training was, in part, developed from ‘lessons learned’ from preceding years of TSAV operation. All three TSAV sites that attended the CAPS training praised it. They also noted that it was not until that 1999 training that they fully understood the true potential of the TSAV collaborative *process* construct. Those statements reinforce our other evaluation findings that the TSAV design had not initially been shaped clearly enough, or at least articulated clearly enough, to maximize its local implementation. However, BJA is to be commended for having incorporated lessons learned from the TSAV initiative into its design of the 1999 CAPS training.

Existence of a Tribal Court System. The three reservation-based Tribes included in this evaluation all had tribal court systems. The very existence of these systems provided those TSAV programs a more comprehensive venue, within the purview of tribal authority, in which to implement their TSAV strategies. In other words, those Tribes were able to use the TSAV program to make substantive transformations in their tribal legal systems, particularly by amending Tribal Codes to better address crime, violence and substance abuse problems over which the court had jurisdiction. These amendments led to improved court systems and also modified law enforcement policies.

On the other hand, the non-reservation-based TSAV site, the Chickasaw Nation, does not have a comparable tribal court nor tribal law enforcement system because it does not have a concentrated land base of tribal residents over which its Tribal Judiciary exercises similar jurisdiction. Rather, the Tribal Judiciary’s authority is to oversee the constitutionality of laws passed by the Tribal Legislature. Moreover, most tribal members and other Indians receiving tribal services reside in various municipalities in a 13-county area and are, thus, subject to state laws. These other entities (e.g., County Courts, municipal law enforcement agencies, etc.) were not actively engaged by the Tribe in the TSAV planning process; nor, had they been engaged, would the Tribe probably have had much success in bringing about substantive changes in their systems. Even the BIA Court of Federal Regulations, which exercises criminal and civil jurisdiction for offenses committed on the limited areas of trust land and individual Indian allotments, was not involved in the TSAV program. There were two main reasons for that: (1) the court does not hear enough cases to warrant a full-time judge and/or prosecutor and thus, these positions are held by circuit personnel; and (2) since the court is a BIA Court, and therefore subject to federal regulations, trying to amend laws or to enact new ones would have been problematic. For these reasons, unlike at the reservation-based TSAV sites, it could not really be expected that the Chickasaw Nation’s TSAV’s program could have an impact on the tribe’s legal and law enforcement systems.

.....

Although relevant at the Fort Peck Tribes TSAV program site, there were two other facilitating factors that the evaluators believe warrant discussion. Those factors were (1) the prior experience the Fort Peck Tribes had with forming community partnerships, and (2) the multiple roles that this Tribe’s TSAV partners played within the community.

⁹ BJA response to draft TSAV Cross-Sites Evaluation Report.

Prior to the inception of its TSAV program, the Fort Peck Tribes had participated in several multi-agency collaborations which had involved various governmental agencies on the reservation. For example, one prior collaborative effort of the tribe's, namely the Fort Peck Community Partnership Coalition, was described in the initial TSAV application as "a collaboration effort of all existing tribal, state, federal and community social service provider programs." The Fort Peck Tribes also had prior experience in organizing and using multi-agency task forces as an approach to community problem solving. Furthermore, there were various Community Councils already existing at Fort Peck Tribes. These Councils are essentially subunits of the tribal government and, as such, provided TSAV partners with background experience in "community-oriented government," i.e., government that involves a broad spectrum of the community in problem solving and decision making about uses of community resources. All of these previous experiences provided an extremely useful framework from which the TSAV program could learn. [Note: Ironically, to some extent this very 'facilitator' may also, in some respects, have simultaneously been an 'inhibitor' to the TSAV process. By that we mean that this local prior experience may have contributed, in part, to the Fort Peck Tribes' initial resistance, early in the pilot phase, to certain aspects of the BJA specified TSAV Workplan development. While the Tribes wanted to use certain already existing processes as well as specific TA consultants with whom they already had an ongoing relationship for this type of effort, the Federal TSAV initiative had its own built-in approaches and TA consultants.]

B. Obstacles to Planning and Implementation of the TSAV Program

Just as there were common facilitators to TSAV implementation, so too were there common inhibitors. Among other sources we used for identifying such inhibitors was the survey administered to TSAV stakeholders at all four evaluation sites toward the end of the TSAV initiative. That survey data provided us considerable insight into the factors which stakeholders perceived as having affected TSAV implementation. Table 5 summarizes data from one survey item in particular which asked respondents to rank order the factors they perceived as having been major obstacles to successful implementation of the local TSAV strategies. The potential factors from which respondents could select on this survey item were derived from the evaluators' site visit interviews, document review and discussions with BJA and NCPC staff.

Table 5. Obstacles to Local TSAV Strategies

Chickasaw Nation (N=18)	Fort Peck Tribes (N=18)	Grand Traverse Band (N=20)	Turtle Mountain Band (N=11)
- TSAV staff/partner turnover	- finding funds for activities in TSAV Workplan	- getting partners to adhere to responsibilities in Workplan - generate community support for better addressing targeted problems/issues	- finding funds for activities in TSAV Workplan
- getting partners to adhere to responsibilities in Workplan	- getting partners to think beyond their own areas of focus and view problems across turf lines	- receiving appropriate or timely technical assistance	- getting partners to adhere to responsibilities in Workplan - dealing with changes in tribal government leadership
- finding funds for activities in TSAV Workplan	- generating community support for better addressing targeted problems/issues	- getting TSAV partners to think beyond their areas of focus and view problems across turf lines	- generating community support for better addressing targeted problems/issues
- dealing with changes in tribal government leadership	- acquiring adequate or appropriate data to backup targeted problems/issues	- acquiring adequate or appropriate data to backup targeted problems/issues	- TSAV staff/partner turnover
- getting TSAV partners to think beyond their areas of focus and view problems across turf lines	- conflict with BJA on priorities For TSAV goals/strategies	- conflict with BJA on priorities for TSAV goals/strategies	- getting active support from the Tribal Council on promoting TSAV goals in community - placement of TSAV Office w/in Tribal org. structure
- getting active support from the Tribal Council on promoting TSAV goals in community	- getting partners to adhere to responsibilities in Workplan	- TSAV staff/partner turnover	- conflict with BJA on priorities For TSAV goals/strategies
- receiving appropriate or timely technical assistance	- getting active support from the Tribal Council on promoting TSAV goals in community	- dealing with changes in tribal government leadership	- getting partners to think beyond their own areas of focus and view problems across turf lines
- acquire adequate or appropriate data to backup targeted problems/issues	- dealing with changes in tribal government leadership	- finding funds for activities in TSAV Workplan	- receiving appropriate or timely technical assistance
- placement of TSAV Office w/in Tribal org. structure	- receiving appropriate or timely technical assistance	- getting active support from the Tribal Council on promoting TSAV goals in community	- acquiring adequate or appropriate data to backup targeted problems/issues
- conflict with BJA on priorities For TSAV goals/strategies	- placement of TSAV Office w/in Tribal org. structure	- placement of TSAV Office w/in Tribal org. structure	
- generate community support for better addressing targeted problems/issues	- TSAV staff/partner turnover		

The obstacles listed in Table 5 are ranked in descending order of importance. Those which were ranked high in seriousness at one or more Tribes are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Getting partners to adhere to responsibilities in TSAV Workplan. This issue was ranked as a primary obstacle at three of the four TSAV sites: as #1 at one TSAV site; as #2 at two sites; and as #6 at the fourth site. The TSAV initiative was intended to bring together a variety of community entities (e.g. law enforcement, local government, etc.) and community groups (e.g., businesses, churches, civic groups, etc.) The assumption, implicit in the TSAV model, was that people representing these entities usually have sufficient flexibility in their jobs to participate in these types of collaborative processes and that such participation is regarded as part of their ongoing

professional and/or occupational responsibilities. Moreover, the TSAV model (which is based on experiences culled from other BJA community-based initiatives) assumes that partners will have time to participate in some voluntary activities that may, or may not, fall directly under their job responsibilities. Interviews at the Turtle Mountain Band and the Grand Traverse Band — where TSAV partners were drawn almost exclusively from tribal entities — indicated that it was difficult to enlist ongoing participation from partners who are functioning under other tribal or federally funded programs, and thus have specific tasks and budgets which do not always allow the needed freedom to participate in such “civic” activities. At the Chickasaw Nation, where the TSAV partnerships did extend to more non-tribal entities, identification of this issue as an obstacle is most likely related to the fact that there was turnover in the both TSAV staff positions midway through the TSAV program. These changes, one of which was quite abrupt and unanticipated, caused a certain amount of discontinuity in program implementation which in turn led to some languishing of TSAV partnerships. Some partnerships, in particular — such as the ones with the schools which entail close contact and concise planning of partner activities over the school calendar — never really recovered from these disruptions in TSAV program activity (indeed, staff turnover was ranked by the Chickasaw Nation survey respondents as the #1 obstacle). At the Fort Peck Tribes, where this concern was not regarded as a serious obstacle, it warrants noting that the TSAV partners had signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) committing to the TSAV partnership at the onset of the local program. This formal agreement probably served to solidify commitment from the partnership entities and smoothed the way for their ongoing participation in the process. Furthermore, with its history of past collaborative efforts, the Fort Peck Tribes had no doubt already mastered many of the hurdles about fostering and sustaining these efforts.

Finding funds for activities in TSAV Workplan. Securing the necessary funds to support TSAV Workplan activities was perceived as a serious obstacle for smooth TSAV implementation at three of the four sites: ranked #1 at two sites; #3 at another site; and #8 at the fourth site. The TSAV model is predicated on getting community entities and groups (such as businesses, churches and civic groups) to contribute resources toward collaborative local activities like graffiti paintouts, beautification projects and printing/airing and distribution of announcements. It is noteworthy that at all three reservation-based Tribes, the securing of community resources for this purpose was seen as problematic. The reality is that there is often a lack of interaction between the types of groups that BJA cited in its program announcement, namely business, churches and civic groups, and the respective Indian community that such groups are located in or near. A telling, and fairly typical, illustration of this is what the Wolf Point Boys and Girls Club experienced. The Club’s Director stated that he had been singularly unsuccessful in obtaining any local business or establishment to either donate funds for purchasing a video for the Club’s youth to watch or donate the video itself. His, and others’, perspective was that the Club was viewed as an “Indian” organization — and one for “bad” kids at that. In general, across sites, responsibility fell to the TSAV staff itself to plan and organize fundraising events such as Bingos, raffles, etc., in order to raise the revenue needed to pursue activities like paintouts that were included in the TSAV Workplans.

Generating community support for better addressing targeted problems/issues. This concern tied as the #1 ranked obstacle at one TSAV site; was ranked as the #3 obstacle at two other sites; and ranked as ‘least serious’ at the fourth site. Under the TSAV initiative, it was urged that each site mobilize community members to become active in “civic” activities and events. As in discussion about the preceding obstacle, it is noteworthy that the three reservation-based Tribes were the sites that ranked this issue as having been particularly problematic. A statement made by several Turtle Mountain Band TSAV partners alluded to the lack of a tribal tradition for active citizen participation

in governmental decision-making and activities. While tribal members certainly participate in various traditional and cultural community events, interviewees indicated that it is likely to take time for community members to become acclimated to the idea of active involvement in newer types of community activities — i.e., the types of activities that crime and violence reduction activities that were TSAV-sponsored.

Getting TSAV partners to . . . view problems across turf lines. The issue of *turfism* was regarded as having been an obstacle of some importance at only two of the four TSAV sites. It was ranked #2 at one site and #3 at another site. (At the remaining two sites it was not seen as having been a particularly serious problem, and was ranked as # 5 and # 7.) The TSAV model required formation of a diverse planning and oversight team at each site. The composition of this team was to be reflective of potential cross-agencies problem solvers. At both the Fort Peck Tribes and the Grand Traverse Band, a certain amount of turfism was seen as having impeded the implementation process. At the Grand Traverse Band, this concern probably stemmed from the rifts that developed between the Project Director and her supporters among some TSAV partners, and the other TSAV partners. (See Case Study for details.) At the Fort Peck Tribes, the fact that turf issues apparently came into play is somewhat surprising given the long history and prior experience this Tribe has had in cross-agency collaboration and problem-solving initiatives. Nevertheless, the Fort Peck Tribes described the development of the TSAV Workplan, and the process of getting various agencies to work together in that endeavor, as traumatic — “hate, sweat, blood and tears went into establishing the goals!” The implication was clearly that inter-agency turf consciousness had interfered with the smooth planning and Workplan development process.

Acquiring adequate or appropriate data. At two sites, lack of availability of or access to good data was regarded as a relatively serious obstacle to TSAV implementation. This issue was ranked as the #4 obstacle at both the Grand Traverse Band and the Fort Peck Tribes. (At the other two sites it was ranked as # 8 or below.) It is with some caution that we interpret that ranking, at least at the Fort Peck Tribes. The TSAV planning model is based on the assumption that local TSAV goals and strategies would emanate from the community’s definition of its crime and violence problems, predicated on crime and violence indicator data. The Fort Peck Tribes’ TSAV Workplan did use both Tribal Court and law enforcement data to justify its approach. Moreover, at that site, as an indirect outcome of participation in the TSAV initiative, both court and law enforcement data collection and monitoring systems were strengthened. Thus, it is likely that the site’s relatively high ranking of data being a problem primarily reflects an overall concern about improving internal data-collection systems, rather than having completely inadequate crime and violence data for the community. On the other hand, the Grand Traverse Band’s TSAV Workplan does indicate a lack of extensive, appropriate data to substantiate its selection of goals. Thus, the tribe’s perception that inadequate data was a problem seems appropriate. Of note, however, is that one of the outcomes of the TSAV program at this site was the institutionalization of performance-based measures for various tribal programs and entities, including the tribe’s courts and law enforcement agency.

It warrants noting that the TSAV site which the evaluators thought would be most likely to cite the absence of adequate data as having been a serious obstacle actually ranked that issue as one of the least important obstacles. Specifically, the Chickasaw Nation had access to virtually no tribal-specific data — either before, during or after its TSAV program. The data that the tribe used for purposes of its application and Workplan were county-wide and state data, and for all citizens residing within those geographic areas. The tribe had neither tribal specific, nor even Indian specific, data on which to base its TSAV goals or strategies. In fact, in recognition of this being a

problem, the first objective under every one of the Chickasaw Nation’s TSAV Workplan goals was to gather statistical data to “verify” needs and to justify the goals in the Workplan. The fact that the objectives were even developed is indicative of the tribe’s recognition that the absence of useful and tribal-specific data was problematic for their tribal problem-solving and decision-making efforts. Thus, despite the Chickasaw Nation’s TSAV partners’ response to this particular survey item, it can be asserted that this was, indeed, an obstacle to TSAV implementation at the Chickasaw Nation. This lack of tribal or Indian-specific data may also account for why the Tribes’ TSAV strategies were not focused on tribal members, or even solely on Indian people within the tribe’s service population, but rather were mostly focused on all the citizenry living in a given targeted area. (See Case Study for further discussion.)

.....

While not identified as such by TSAV survey respondents, there is one other factor that the evaluators feel was an obstacle at one of the sites. That factor had to do with staffing problems — problems which were of such magnitude that they warrant comment. The evaluators feel that these problems at the Grand Traverse Band may not have been as significant — or perhaps not have occurred at all — if the TSAV Director had been either a tribal member or, at least, a long-time resident of the tribal community, even if non-Indian. The person selected to fill the Director’s position was, however, both brand new to the community and non-Indian. Based on interviewee remarks, this placed her at a distinct disadvantage in working closely with the planning and oversight team and, as BJA envisioned, “helping guide the planning team members in the development and implementation” of TSAV strategies (as noted in the FY 1996 TSAV Program Announcement). This problem was probably even further magnified by the rapidity and expansiveness with which changes were occurring at this Tribe following its relatively recent federal recognition. Had the TSAV Director been from the community, she would have been more familiar with the TSAV partners, and the inner workings of the tribal residents which were associated with many of the fluctuations and changes which were occurring. In future comparable initiatives undertaken, BJA might want to consider these factors when providing guidance on the type of individual to fill key positions at the local level.

Chapter IV. Stakeholder Perceptions of TSAV Effectiveness

There are many challenges to evaluating the effectiveness of a comprehensive, locally targeted initiative such as the Tribal Strategies Against Violence initiative. Among those faced regarding the TSAV initiative are the following:

(1) Although the conceptual and philosophical construct of the initiative was to solidify an overall *community-wide planning processes* in the respective tribal communities, in some cases the BJA sponsored training and technical assistance resulted in development of local Workplans of a narrower scope. Specifically, Workplans themselves (which were approved by BJA) often focused less on institutionalizing a community-wide planning process and more on pursuing objectives and activities which targeted specific types of crime, violence or substance abuse, and doing so in specific geographic segments of the communities. In other words, some Workplans translated into ‘project objectives’ more typical of regular Federal grant projects, rather than focusing on the *planning processes* articulated in the overall philosophy of TSAV. In some respects, this could be construed as a fundamental inconsistency in implementation of this initiative.

(2) While BJA recognized from the outset that there would not be a sufficient passage of time during the initiative for the generation of meaningful data to show that the *planning processes* had made statistically significant changes in crime, violence or substance abuse rates, the way many Workplan objectives were written, such data would have been the most logical way of assessing program effectiveness.

In the absence of much meaningful statistical data, one evaluation measure we used for assessing effectiveness was stakeholder perceptions about TSAV impact on the community issues addressed locally by TSAV funding. The perceptions discussed in this chapter of the report were derived from surveys administered to TSAV partners and stakeholders in each of the four Tribes participating in this evaluation. This chapter summarizes perceptions about the community problems and issues that were both *most effectively* and *least effectively* addressed by local TSAV implementation. The survey derived data is also sometimes discussed in the context of other information collected through interviews of TSAV partners.

Tables 6 and 7 summarize responses from the specific survey item which asked respondents to rate, on a Likert scale,¹⁰ how effective they felt their respective own TSAV program had been in producing change across a range of response options. (A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix A). The response options offered in the survey were derived from a variety of sources, namely: our review of the TSAV program announcements and other BJA documents; the Tribes’ own TSAV Workplans; and public statements about the purposes of the TSAV initiative which were made by both BJA and NCPC staff (in various venues, including the semi-annual TSAV Training Workshops, interviews and conversations.)

Cumulatively, survey respondents at both the Fort Peck Tribes (N=18) and the Chickasaw Nation (N=18) rated their TSAV program as having been between “Very Effective” and “Somewhat Effective.” Specifically, cumulative ratings on the Likert scale for all respondents ranged between 1.75 and 2.87 at the Fort Peck Tribes, and between 1.69 and 2.70 at the Chickasaw Nation. None

¹⁰ Likert Scale: 1 = Very Effective; 2 = Somewhat Effective; 3 = Somewhat Ineffective; 4 = Very Ineffective

of the cumulative ratings across all respondents at either site fell below the “Somewhat Effective” (3.0) range.

At the Turtle Mountain Band (N=11), the overall TSAV effectiveness ratings were less positive than the two sites discussed above. None of the response categories elicited cumulative ratings of better than “Somewhat Effective.” For almost all response categories, the vast majority of cumulative ratings across all respondents at this site fell between 2.25 and 2.86 in the “Somewhat Effective” range. In one area — reducing substance abuse — the cumulative rating was “Somewhat *Ineffective*.”

At the Grand Traverse Band (N=20), the effectiveness ratings were the least positive of all four sites. In two thirds of the response categories, the cumulative ratings across all respondents fell between 2.0 and 2.86 in the “Somewhat Effective” range. Of note, is that fully one third of the response categories elicited cumulative ratings in the “Somewhat *Ineffective*” to “Very *Ineffective*” range.

[Note: Appendix B contains a table which shows the cumulative ratings of perceived effectiveness for all response options of the TSAV program for each Tribe. The response options are shown in descending order, i.e. from those with the most positive cumulative ratings about perceived effectiveness (the ones with the lowest scores) to those with the least positive ratings about perceived effectiveness (those with the highest scores.)

A. Local Issues/Problems Perceived as Most Effectively Addressed by TSAV

Despite the differences in comparative ratings, some patterns did emerge from the survey regarding perceptions of community problems/issues which were most effectively addressed by the TSAV programs. Commonalities emerged across several sites. These are shown in Table 6 below. Following that Table is elaboration about those perceptions and the extent to which other evaluation findings were consistent or inconsistent with them.

Table 6. Issues Perceived as Most Effectively Addressed by TSAV Program

Chickasaw Nation	Fort Peck Tribes	Grand Traverse Band	Turtle Mountain Band
- building community awareness about violence (1.69)	- building community awareness about violence (1.75)	- providing youth with healthful activities (2.00)	- building community awareness about violence (2.25)
- generating community involvement (1.80)	- fostering cooperation among TSAV partners (1.81)	- improving services among TSAV partner agencies (2.22)	- enhancing system for dealing with domestic violence (2.33)
- improving services among TSAV partner agencies (1.93)	- identifying additional funds to apply to targeted problems (1.87)	- identifying additional funds to apply to targeted problems (2.33)	- identifying additional funds to apply to targeted problems (2.38)
- providing youth with healthful activities (2.00)	- improving services among TSAV partner agencies (1.93)	- fostering cooperation among TSAV partners (2.38)	- generating community involvement (2.38)
- enhancing system for dealing with domestic violence (2.06)	- enhancing system for dealing with domestic violence (1.93)	- building community awareness about violence (2.43)	- improving services among TSAV partner agencies (2.50)
- fostering cooperation among the TSAV partners (2.06)	- generating community involvement (2.06)	- generating community involvement (2.75)	- fostering cooperation among the TSAV partners (2.50)

- identifying additional funding to apply to targeted problems (2.08)	- providing youth with healthful activities (2.33)	- enhancing system for dealing with domestic violence (2.86)	providing youth with healthful activities (2.71)
---	--	--	--

[Note: To facilitate the reader’s understanding, the Likert scale rankings are repeated here: 1 = “Very Effective”; 2 = “Somewhat Effective”; 3 = “Somewhat Ineffective”; 4 = “Very Ineffective”. The problem/issues at the top of the Table — i.e., the problems with the lowest ratings — were perceived as being the areas most effectively addressed by the local TSAV.]

Building community awareness about violence. As shown in Table 6, at three sites — the Chickasaw Nation, the Fort Peck Tribes and the Turtle Mountain Band — this issue was rated as the #1 most effective outcome of the TSAV program, and at two of those sites building community awareness about violence was perceived as having been “Very Effectively” addressed through the local TSAV program. Even the fourth site, the Grand Traverse Band, where the rating was a bit lower, it still fell within the “Somewhat Effective” range. This finding is consistent with the fact that every one of the TSAV programs undertook a variety of community awareness activities.

Identifying additional funds to apply to targeted problems. Across all four sites, this TSAV outcome was rated within either the “Very Effective” or “Somewhat Effective” range. These ratings are consistent with the evaluators’ overall findings regarding additional resources being generated or at least identified at the individual sites, particularly with respect to federal funding, including from DOJ.

Improving services among TSAV partner agencies. At all four sites, this TSAV outcome was rated within the “Very Effective” to “Somewhat Effective” range: “Very Effective at the Fort Peck Tribes and at the Chickasaw Nation, and “Somewhat Effective” the Grand Traverse Band and at the Turtle Mountain Band. These ratings indicate that, at all four Tribes, TSAV partners and stakeholders feel that the collaborative strategies they undertook in association with their TSAV program had enhanced the performance of the participating agencies. Among other strategies pursued, TSAV programs focused on improving dissemination of information — about the range and availability of services which address crime, violence and substance abuse problems and about the diverse needs of at-risk youth and families. Pursuit of these strategies may account for this perceived service improvement.

Enhancing the system for dealing with domestic violence. At three sites, this outcome was rated as among the most effective of the TSAV programs: at the Fort Peck Tribes (1.93); at the Chickasaw Nation (2.06); and at the Turtle Mountain Band (2.25). At both the Turtle Mountain Band and the Fort Peck Tribes, this perception was substantiated by the tribes’ significant enhancement of their domestic violence codes and the introduction of new programs to better serve both victims and perpetrators of domestic violence. At the Chickasaw Nation, the perception of TSAV effectiveness is supported by the tribe’s establishment of a specific Violence Prevention as a result of TSAV. At the Grand Traverse Band, “enhancing the system for dealing with domestic violence”, while rated as “Somewhat Effective” was still rated by TSAV partners as one of the least effective of the successful program outcomes. The evaluators find this stakeholder response odd given the fact that as part of its TSAV program the tribe did successfully enact its first Domestic Violence code. It’s possible that the low rating stems from the respondents’ perception of domestic violence remaining such a serious problem in the community.

Fostering cooperation among TSAV partners. Cross-agency cooperation and collaboration were key elements of the overall TSAV philosophy and a major focus of BJA’s TSAV initiative design.

Across sites, the extent to which TSAV partners perceived their own local programs as having been effective in fostering cross-agency cooperation ranged from the “Very Effective” level to the “Somewhat Effective” level. At the Fort Peck Tribes, this was the second highest rated effectiveness category and was considered to have been “Very Effective.” It was rated less high at the other three sites, but still within the “Somewhat Effective” range. Of note is that even at the Grand Traverse Band, where the rift between TSAV staff/Director and the TSAV partners was relatively serious, it was ultimately felt by the remaining partners that they would try to keep the collaboration networks ongoing. Also, the 1999 CAPS training may also have boosted the willingness to further collaborate among partners at the three Tribes that received that training.

Generating community involvement. At three Tribes, the local TSAV program was perceived as having been effective in bringing about community involvement — based on the ratings elicited. At the Chickasaw Nation, the TSAV program was perceived as having been “Very Effective” in addressing this issue. At the Fort Peck Tribes and the Turtle Mountain Band, the TSAV programs were perceived as having been “Somewhat Effective.” These ratings are consistent with the evaluators’ findings that many of the *short-term* TSAV activities undertaken — such as health fairs, Violence Awareness Month activities, graffiti paint-outs and other beautification projects — did successfully reach out to, and elicit participation from, community agencies and community members in general. This is particularly true at the Chickasaw Nation where the perception of effectiveness was the greatest. It was, in fact, at Chickasaw more than at any other site, that a relatively broad spectrum of non-tribal and civic entities were engaged in short-term TSAV activities. At the Grand Traverse Band, the cumulative rating of 2.75 was closest of all sites to the “Somewhat *Ineffective*” rating of 3.0. At this site, the preponderance of community involvement activities centered around only two annual conferences, one for Native American Youth and another for Native American Women. For all four Tribes, it is important to interpret these local perceptions about community involvement within the framework of the earlier discussion (see Section IV) about the definition, in some Indian communities, of the terms ‘community’ and community member.

Providing youth with healthy activities. At no tribal site was the provision of youth-oriented healthy activities rated at the “Very Effective” level. The highest effectiveness rating this issue received was 2.0 (exactly at the “Somewhat Effective” level). Both the Grand Traverse Band and the Chickasaw Nation had 2.0 as their cumulative ratings. At the Grand Traverse Band, that rating was probably a direct reflection of extensive youth involvement in the Junior Tribal Council and in planning/implementing the Native American Youth Conference. These efforts were the major focus of the TSAV Director at that site. At the Chickasaw Nation, the Somewhat Effective rating probably stemmed from TSAV involvement in establishing the Boys and Girls Club in Tishomingo, a community which had previously had very few activities for youth. At the Fort Peck Tribes and the Turtle Mountain Band, the TSAV program was also perceived as having been “Somewhat Effective”, although a little less so than at the other two sites. In the case of the Fort Peck Tribes, the rating was probably not higher because respondents were mindful of the problems encountered in sustaining the Boys and Girls Club in Wolf Point. In the case of the Turtle Mountain Band, the rating was probably not higher because the establishment of a Boys and Girls Club in Dunseith was only in the planning stage at the end of the TSAV program.

B. Local Issues/Problems Perceived as Less Effectively Addressed by TSAV

Survey responses indicate some commonality across sites as to which community issues/problems were perceived as less effectively addressed by local TSAV programs. Five issues stand out. Three of these issues, although broken down into more specific sub-issues below, are substance abuse related. Another has to do with family violence. The fifth issue/problem relates to gangs. In Table 7 below, the issues/problems appear in descending order of perceived ineffectiveness in being addressed. In other words, the issue/problem at the top of the Table was seen as having been the least effectively addressed by TSAV. Following the Table is discussion of possible explanations for the ratings.

As Table 7 illustrates, at Chickasaw Nation and the Fort Peck Tribes, not a single one of these community problem/issues was rated as having been less than “Somewhat Effectively” addressed by the local TSAV Program. Moreover, at the Turtle Mountain Band, only one of these five community issues was perceived as having been addressed “Somewhat *Ineffectively*” by the local program. The fact that so many community issues were perceived as having been at least “Somewhat Effectively” addressed is a positive finding about TSAV implementation.

Table 7. Community Problems/Issues Perceived as Less Effectively Addressed by TSAV Programs

Chickasaw Nation	Fort Peck Tribes	Grand Traverse Band	Turtle Mountain Band
- reducing drunk driving (2.70)	- preventing substance abuse (2.87)	- reducing drunk driving (3.42)	- preventing substance abuse (3.00)
- reducing drug use (2.46)	- reducing drug use (2.83)	- reducing drug use (3.36)	- reducing drug use (2.86)
- reducing gang activity (2.43)	- reducing drunk driving (2.82)	- preventing substance abuse (3.19)	- reducing gang activity (2.67)
- reducing family violence (2.31)	- reducing family violence (2.46)	- reducing family violence (3.08)	- reducing drunk driving (2.57)
- preventing substance abuse (2.31)	- reducing gang activity (2.42)	- reducing gang activity (3.00)	

Likert scale: 1 = Very Effective; 2 = Somewhat Effective; 3 = Somewhat Ineffective; 4 = Very Ineffective.

Preventing substance abuse. Across all four TSAV sites, the prevention of substance abuse was perceived as having been one of the community problem areas less effectively addressed by the TSAV programs, although both the Chickasaw Nation and the Fort Peck Tribes still perceived the issue as having been “Somewhat Effectively” addressed. At both the Turtle Mountain Band and the Grand Traverse Band, substance abuse prevention was perceived as having been “Somewhat *Ineffectively*” addressed. Considering the fact that all four sites had TSAV goals specifically directed at reducing or preventing substance abuse, it is noteworthy that this was still one of the lower rated community issues at all four sites. The perception that TSAV efforts were not more effective might, in part, stem from the entrenched nature of the substance abuse problem in these reservation communities. Additionally, the fact that insufficient time had lapsed (during the two-year timeframe of the TSAV initiative) for any significant changes in substance abuse rates to have been readily identifiable for TSAV stakeholders is probably a contributing factor to the perception of less effectiveness. It is worth noting, however, that as a direct result of their TSAV programs, both the Fort Peck Tribes and the Turtle Mountain Band have instituted new Drug Court programs. Those programs are likely to begin showing results in the near future.

Reducing drug use. This, like the preceding community problem, was perceived across all four sites as having been among the less effectively addressed community concerns. Again, at the Grand Traverse Band, the perception was that the TSAV program had been Somewhat *Ineffective*. This cross-site perception of less effectiveness may, in part, come from the fact that most of the local TSAV strategies were (a) aimed more at prevention, rather than specific interventions, and (b) primarily directed toward youth, rather than at the community at large. However, at two of the three Tribes that have Tribal Courts, there were laws enacted to enhance prosecution regarding drug use. It seems that the two-year timeframe of the TSAV initiative is too short a period within which to see actual reductions in drug use. It should be noted that no statistically significant reductions in crime, violence or substance abuse rates were found at any site based on the analysis of the law enforcement and/or court data (see Case Studies).

Reducing drunk driving. In all tribal communities participating in the TSAV initiative, interview data indicated that alcohol was a major co-factor in incidence of crime and violence. Nevertheless, this problem was perceived at all four sites as having been one that the TSAV program was less effective in addressing. Moreover, at the Grand Traverse Band, like for the preceding two community issues/problems, the TSAV program was definitely perceived as not having been very effective. In fact, this community issue was perceived as having been the least effective of all. The rating was 3.42, i.e., about half way between Somewhat *Ineffective* and Very *Ineffective*. As mentioned above, this issue's overall lower rating across sites may be colored by the entrenched nature of alcohol-related issues. Moreover, the fact that local TSAV program goals were aimed at substance abuse prevention in general, rather than at DUI issues in particular, and that strategies were primarily focused on youth, rather than on adults and community-wide, may also have shaped the low effectiveness ratings. It is worth noting that DUI Courts have been established with Drug Court funds (as part of the TSAV program) at both the Fort Peck Tribes and Turtle Mountain Band. Those programs should begin to address this problem and will perhaps show more effectiveness in the future.

Reducing gang activity. At three sites, the Fort Peck Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation and the Turtle Mountain Band, TSAV was seen as having been about half way between "Somewhat Effective" and "Somewhat *Ineffective*" in reducing gang activity. At the Grand Traverse Band, the TSAV program was rated as "Somewhat *Ineffective*" in addressing gang reduction. Gang-related strategies had been undertaken at all four participating Tribes. Yet, for the most part those strategies were prevention focused and directed primarily at youth. This narrower TSAV scope may have influenced TSAV partners' responses to this survey item. However, interview data from two of the Tribes indicated that local TSAV partners did not think that their community had a gang problem despite the fact that it was addressed as a preventive strategy. In those two sites, it was not until the NCPC planning assistance was provided on-site that this issue/problem was even identified as a potential problem for TSAV consideration. Thus, for those two sites, even though gang activity was addressed as a preventive measure in their Workplans, the fact that gang activity was not perceived as already existing could account for the survey response as to the extent the TSAV program effectively reduced gang activity.

Reducing family violence. At the Chickasaw Nation, the Fort Peck Tribes and the Grand Traverse Band, the reduction of family violence was seen as one of the community problems less effectively addressed by the local TSAV program. Again, the entrenched nature of this problem and the fact that it would have been difficult to show any significant changes in family violence rates in the short span of time the TSAV program was operational, no doubt affected the ratings. It should be noted,

however, that both the Grand Traverse Band and the Fort Peck Tribes did either establish or enhance tribal laws dealing with domestic violence as part of their TSAV strategies. In contrast with the other three sites, at the Turtle Mountain Band, reducing family violence was rated the seventh highest in effectiveness for community issues addressed by TSAV. This higher rating reflects the fact that, in addition to strengthening its Domestic Violence code, this Tribe also initiated several strategies directly aimed at strengthening families.

C. Summary of Perceived TSAV Impacts

Across sites, there was considerable commonality about which community problems were perceived as having been addressed relatively effectively by local TSAV programs and which problems were perceived as having been less effectively addressed. It is noteworthy that TSAV partners at only two sites (the Fort Peck Tribes and the Chickasaw Nation) perceived their local TSAV programs as having addressed any issues within the Very Effective level. Additionally, at only two sites (the Turtle Mountain Band and the Grand Traverse Band) did TSAV partners perceive TSAV effectiveness on any issue to have been Somewhat *Ineffective* or less. Actually, with the exception of the issue of substance abuse at the Turtle Mountain Band, only the respondents at the Grand Traverse Band rated any area as having been addressed *Ineffectively*. In fact, at the Grand Traverse Band six community problem areas were rated at 3.00 or higher. (Note, however, that one of those areas — namely ‘improving community policing’ — which received a rating of 3.00, may have received such a low rating simply because the TSAV program chose not to pursue community policing efforts since they were already being pursued under the Tribe’s COPS grants.) These overall ratings indicate that the TSAV partners at the Grand Traverse Band were less satisfied with the local program’s outcomes and efforts than were the TSAV partners at the other sites. Given the TSAV planning model’s focus on partnership, and given the model’s emphasis on developing sustained cross-agency collaboration and problem solving, these findings could indicate that institutionalization of the TSAV *process* at the Grand Traverse Band might be unlikely.

Chapter V. Assessing the TSAV Initiative: Summary and Conclusions

As noted elsewhere in this report, there are many challenges to evaluating a comprehensive initiative such as that of the Tribal Strategies Against Violence. One objective was to assess what, if any, effects TSAV had had on crime, violence and substance abuse rates and the extent to which any changes in those rates were statistically significant. (See individual Case Studies). Another overall objective of this evaluation has been to determine what impact the TSAV initiative has had on the participating Tribes' local systems of dealing with crime and violence. A third objective has been to assess whether the TSAV planning model was an appropriate model for the four participating TSAV sites, and, moreover, for American Indian Tribes in general.

This evaluation has been conducted mindful of the crime and violence context in which the TSAV initiative was implemented and also mindful of certain major issues of concern to Tribes regarding the degree to which their own tribal criminal justice systems can handle crime, violence and substance abuse issues. For those reasons, the following three points served as a backdrop for the evaluation's undertakings. [Note: See Appendix A for specific discussion on *Crime and Violence in Indian Country: A Context for the TSAV Initiative.*]

(a) First, per capita crime and violence rates are higher in Indian Country than they are for the nation as a whole; furthermore, crime and violence rates in Indian Country are rising while nationwide they are receding — according to a 1999 report.¹¹ Also, the rate of violent victimization for American Indians is more than twice as high as for non-Indians. In more than half of the violent crimes against Indians, alcohol and/or drug use were a factor. According to a 2000 report,¹² Indian youth represent an extremely disproportionate percentage of new state prison commitments in comparison to their proportion of all youth. In North Dakota, one of the four TSAV site's states, this disproportion was literally 500%.

(b) Secondly, to the extent to which their jurisdictional status allows, American Indian Tribes are attempting to more effectively address crime and violence issues with their own law enforcement and their own judicial systems. In line with this expressed desire, the Department of Justice has committed "to support and assist Indian tribes in the development of their law enforcement systems, tribal courts, and traditional justice systems."¹³ Nevertheless, the current system of justice places much of the jurisdiction for criminal investigation, prosecution and adjudication of crimes committed by American Indians in Indian Country in the hands of the federal or state criminal justice systems. Tribal justice systems are limited, by various statutes, to misdemeanor sanctions, with the maximum criminal penalties assessable by tribal courts being limited to one year in jail and/or a fine of \$5,000. These limitations are despite the fact that tribal courts may prosecute tribal members for the same crimes which may have already been prosecuted in federal court — where much stronger sanctions apply. Since the bar of double jeopardy does not apply to Tribes wishing to prosecute their own members, many Tribes, including some involved in the TSAV evaluation, are considering exercising this prosecutorial

¹¹ *American Indians and Crime*, Greenfield, L.A. & Smith, S. K., Bureau of Justice Statistics, February 1999.

¹² *And Justice for Some*, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Youth Law Center, May 2000.

¹³ *U.S. Department of Justice Commitment to American Indian Tribal Justice Systems*, Reno, J., Judicature, November-December 1995, U.S. DOJ.

discretion as a means of ensuring justice when federal courts fail to convict or when the respective U.S. Attorney's Office fails (for any number of reasons) to prosecute a case referred by a tribal law enforcement agency or tribal prosecutor.

(c) Lastly, because of the disproportionate representation of American Indians, especially American Indian youth, in the state and federal criminal justice systems, Tribes are concerned that their tribal members are not receiving equal justice under the law given the current structure of the criminal justice system and given Tribes' jurisdictional constraints.

A. Differing Expectations of the TSAV Initiative

As this evaluation progressed, it became readily apparent to the evaluators that there were differing expectations of the TSAV initiative between the Tribes and federal administrators. A discussion of those differing expectations is, therefore, warranted here.

In 1995, the Department of Justice actively sought two tribes to serve as pilot sites for the brand new TSAV initiative. One of these pilot sites was the Fort Peck Sioux and Assiniboine Tribes. Several Department officials¹⁴ met with the (then) Fort Peck Tribal Chairman and the Tribal Executive Board members to discuss Fort Peck's potential interest in becoming involved in this new DOJ undertaking. Fort Peck was very receptive to this DOJ overture. Receptivity was particularly enhanced by the fact that the reservation had just experienced a string of seven homicides in a two-year period of time. These homicides had placed the per capita murder rate on the reservation at seven times that of the state of Montana and at three times the national rate. Given that alarming statistic, it was not surprising that the Fort Peck Tribal Chairman and Tribal Executive Board (i.e., the tribal council) subsequently made their *Tribal Strategies Against Violence* initiative a priority.

As articulated by the former Tribal Chairman and now Councilman, Caleb Shields, the Fort Peck TSAV was initially envisioned by the Tribes as a reservation-wide programmatic initiative. Among other things, Fort Peck planned to have its local initiative address systemic or structural problems — such as the interactions between tribal and federal courts — that tribal leaders felt were impeding their ability to deal with crime and violence issues effectively. With this goal in mind, the Fort Peck vision of TSAV was seen as entailing the following tasks:

- Identifying instances of reservation crime by type and location;
- Identifying the entities that deal with specific types of crime in particular locations in order to develop or improve working relationships among all entities, including BIA/Tribal Police, Tribal Courts, municipal/county law enforcement agencies and courts, and all pertinent social services agencies providing victim/offender services, as well as other structural elements of Indian Country justice systems such as the relationship with the FBI and the U.S. Attorney's Office;
- Improving both reporting and referral systems among those agencies and, perhaps, centralizing those systems;

¹⁴ Interviewees at the Fort Peck Tribes identified these DOJ representatives as Elizabeth Homer, Brian Wong, and Todd Brightman.

- Identifying gaps in those agencies' abilities to be responsive to crime, violence and substance abuse and identifying resources — or additional *programs* needed — for filling the gaps in services or abilities; and
- Having the local TSAV Partnership serve as a forum for monitoring how the whole process was working — in terms of bridging obstacles to fulfilling entities/agencies' capacities to address crime, violence and substance abuse — in the various communities of the Fort Peck Reservation.

In other words, the Fort Peck Tribes' initial vision of TSAV encompassed a broader spectrum of entities (in the overall criminal justice system affecting the reservation and the tribal members) than the actual TSAV planning model took into account. Based on successful non-tribal DOJ community-/neighborhood-wide demonstration efforts, the TSAV planning model focused on building community partnerships involving local entities and agencies, and strategies appropriate to such entities; there was no particular emphasis on strategies for involving non-local entities, such as the U.S. Attorney's Office or the FBI. However, tribal leadership at the three reservation-based evaluation sites regarded involvement of these non-community entities as key to addressing their crime and violence problems. Their involvement was seen as important not only because of the implicit jurisdictional issues at play, but also because relationships with these non-community criminal justice entities had so often been strained and, in some cases, acrimonious in the past. These strained relationships were seen as being a major contributor to what tribal leadership regarded as an often inconsistent, and sometimes inefficient, processing of criminal justice cases in their communities.

At the time it was vested by the Office of Justice Programs with responsibility for establishing the TSAV program's parameters, BJA incorporated into the TSAV design certain common threads that NIJ evaluations of previous community-/neighborhood-wide programs had deemed successful,¹⁵ namely:

. . . (1) creating a diverse planning team; (2) acquiring a full-time coordinator who is responsible for helping to facilitate the development, implementation and monitoring of the project; (3) involving elected officials, law enforcement, the courts and other public and private service providers; (4) establishing a community-oriented problem solving process and assessing community needs; (5) identifying a geographic target area(s); and (6) celebrating tangible victories such as reclaiming a street corner, neighborhood, park, school, etc.

Thus, the planning model BJA – and NCPC as the technical assistance providers – used to assist participating Tribes to identify crime and violence prevention strategies concentrated on NIJ research-based strategies such as community policing, youth initiatives, and alternatives to incarceration. Indeed, an internal BJA memo specifically stated that the “intent of the TSAV program is to help promote the integration and practice of community policing and prosecution, reduce incidents of family violence and juvenile delinquency, and strengthen partnerships among tribal service providers.”¹⁶

¹⁵ BJA response to draft TSAV Cross-Sites Evaluation Report.

¹⁶ February 20, 1996, letter to Robert Coates, NCPC, from Todd Brightman, TSAV Program Manager, Crime Prevention Branch.

Therefore, the potential strategies to be used were already prescribed by BJA at the outset of the initiative. The development of other – let alone truly *Tribal* – strategies was, if not outrightly discouraged, at least not encouraged in the TSAV planning process. Neither BJA’s planning model nor the training provided by NCPC staff really considered the vital issue of inherent problems in the relationships among tribal, state and federal justice systems. Instead, during the planning meetings, TSAV sites appear to have been guided into focusing on cross-agency collaboration and cross-programmatic coordination. The actual structure of the systems in which justice was occurring for tribal members seems to have played a secondary role to the focus on strategies such as “graffiti paint-outs” for gang prevention and “awareness building” for substance abuse and family violence prevention. These strategies were Workplan themes common across the TSAV sites.

B. Transformations of Local Criminal Justice Systems and Related TSAV Accomplishments

One element of the TSAV evaluation design was to look for outcomes that could be characterized as “transformations” in local systems of handling crime, violence and substance abuse prevention. The discussion below summarizes identifiable categories of transformation across the four TSAV evaluation sites. The summary provides a context for assessing where further systemic changes at the local sites might still have been desired or needed. Additionally, this section of the report identifies certain local TSAV accomplishments which, although probably not dramatic or broad enough to constitute a ‘transformation’ per se, are significant enough to warrant note as possible preliminary steps leading to subsequent changes of a more systemic nature. These summaries reflect a combination of evaluator findings from document review, observation and interview data, particularly in response to a question local Core Team members were asked during the final evaluation site visit – namely, how they would assess the effect that TSAV had had on their respective Tribes and on participating communities.

Table 8. TSAV Transformations and Accomplishments at Four Tribes

	Chickasaw Nation	Fort Peck Tribes	Grand Traverse Band	Turtle Mountain Band
Changes in Tribal and Other Court Systems		U	U	U
Changes in Local Juvenile Justice System		U	U	
Changes in Tribal and Other Community Support Systems	U	U	U	U
Changes in Relationships Among Stakeholders	U	U	U	U
Changes in Community Perspectives	U	U	U	U
Improved Law Enforcement	U	U		U

Table 8 above shows the primary transformations in tribal justice systems and communities which Core Team members attributed to their local TSAV programs. Below are discussions about those transformations.

Changes in Tribal and Other Court Systems. Changes in the Tribal Codes and Tribal Court Systems occurred for all three of the Tribes that have their own courts with jurisdiction over criminal, civil and juvenile justice issues on their reservations. At those sites, Tribal Codes were amended to enhance prosecution in several areas including domestic violence, child abuse, sales/use of illegal substances by juveniles, stalking and menacing laws, etc. Changes were made to the adjudication processes to provide alternative sentencing options for juvenile offenders and to provide rehabilitative services for adult/juvenile offenders in need of drug/alcohol treatment. DOJ Drug Court program funds were accessed to establish Family Wellness Courts, DUI Courts, etc. Unique culture-based programs were also initiated as alternative sentencing and probation options. These were positive transformations directly attributable to TSAV funding.

Although not directly attributable to TSAV, changes in the relationships between Tribal Courts and state courts also occurred at two of the participating Tribes, namely the Turtle Mountain Band and the Grand Traverse Band. These changes primarily occurred through the establishment of full-faith and credit agreements, between Tribal Courts and state courts, for the purpose of recognizing protection orders and/or child support orders. It is probably noteworthy, however, that the impetus for development of these agreements appears to have largely been the personal relationships existing between certain tribal judges and other judges in the state court system, rather than through an impetus resulting from a larger and more objective systems-level change.

Areas in which accomplishments were considered to have been less substantial with respect to the judicial systems at the three reservation sites included: (a) the need to strengthen separation of powers between the respective Tribal Courts and Tribal Councils, (b) ensure prosecutorial independence and discretion, (c) build more areas of mutual reciprocity with state courts in recognizing tribal court orders, (d) bridge strained relationships between local/tribal law enforcement and the Tribal Courts/Prosecution, and (e) deal with perceived inaction/delays by the FBI or USAO on tribal referrals to the federal courts. It is noteworthy that those TSAV sites indicating improvement in their tribal/USAO relationships were the same sites where the USAO had recently acquired at least one Indian attorney on staff.

Changes in Local Juvenile Justice System. Only the Fort Peck Tribes had detention facilities and services specifically for youth offenders; however, the other three evaluation sites expressed the need for such facilities that would be in closer geographic proximity and with culturally appropriate programming. Under their TSAV programs, two of the four Tribes in the evaluation developed extensive services for dealing specifically with youth offenders through their TSAV efforts. These Tribes developed culture-based programs founded on physical challenge activities for juvenile offenders: (a) the Grand Traverse Band developed an alternative probation program which operated in conjunction with its Peacemaker Court's mentorship program, and (b) the Fort Peck Tribes developed a prevention/intervention research based Adolescent Survival Skills Program. Both of these Tribes opened up these programs, initially developed as alternative-sentencing options for juvenile offenders, to participation by other interested Indian youth in their respective communities.

Changes in Tribal and Other Community Support Systems. Through the TSAV initiative, most sites brought about key changes in their support systems for crime and violence victims and

perpetrators. For example, emergency shelters were established at three sites. At all sites, tribal substance abuse programs were involved in the TSAV partnerships and that involvement was key to developing a variety of new support services — such as Anger Management groups, etc. — for family violence perpetrators.

At three of the four TSAV evaluation sites Boys and Girls Clubs were established and these were anticipated to serve as important community support systems for providing youth with alternative after-school activities and as deterrents to substance abuse or gang involvement. However, while these Clubs were regarded by TSAV partners as representative of local TSAV success, there did remain concern that programs like the Boys and Girls Club (which are based on non-Indian models) were not necessarily sufficiently culture-based or compatible with tribal traditions/customs. Moreover, for the three Tribes that established Boys and Girls Clubs, problems arose with regard to the fact that the national Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Inc. restricts its funding resources to non-profit entities, i.e., entities that have incorporated under state laws. Considerable concern was voiced by tribal representatives regarding the lack of recognition of tribal corporations as viable alternatives to state-incorporated groups. This was regarded as a challenge to tribal sovereignty and, at the Grand Traverse Band, resulted in the decision to not establish a Boys and Girls Club.

Some of the Tribes, did develop other community support systems that were more successful in integrating tribal culture and values into their TSAV strategies dealing with local crime and violence and preventing substance abuse. Among these successes were: (a) creation of a culture-based parenting curricula for strengthening families, (b) teaching of tribal youth about traditional uses of tobacco as a method for preventing casual use of tobacco, and (c) using traditional tribal societies to assist and mentor young mothers involved in treatment and/or criminal justice supervision.

Involving tribal and public schools as critical players in the violence and substance abuse prevention strategies developed under the local TSAV programs was a less successful area of transformation with respect to community support systems. These efforts met with varying degrees of receptivity and success across the sites. Only at Fort Peck was a violence prevention curriculum — and related programming — actually institutionalized across reservation schools. A critical lesson learned was that appropriate timing is key to gaining school commitment and involvement, i.e., staff needs to work with school personnel while they are actually planning their upcoming school calendars, not when they are implementing those schedules. Unless such contacts are made at those critical junctures, school calendars (and, thus, teacher involvement opportunities) essentially remain inviolable for an entire year.

Changes in Relationships Among Stakeholders. The TSAV model was intended to build collaborative strategies across various tribal and community entities that have a stake in improving the capacity of local criminal justice systems to better address crime, violence and substance abuse prevention. Critical players in these collaborations — or partnerships — were to be local law enforcement agencies, Tribal Courts and prosecution, Tribal leadership (administrative and legislative), local human services providers, and educational institutions. Additionally, based on strategies previously utilized in non-Indian communities, the TSAV model stressed the need for participation from the common citizenry in the community-wide events and activities planned and implemented by TSAV to address crime-/violence-related problems.

The four Tribes involved in this evaluation focused on engaging different types of TSAV partners. The Turtle Mountain and Grand Traverse Bands chose to focus on partnering among tribal programs

and entities. The other two evaluation sites included non-tribal entities in their TSAV partnerships. At all four TSAV sites, there were clearly positive changes in relationships among important stakeholders. Moreover, among Core Team interviewees — who would be the best judges of this point — there had been an overall reduction in turfism among staff of various programs.

At three Tribes in particular, relationships with key stakeholders were clearly solidified and seemingly so with good potential for future continuance. As a direct result of TSAV efforts, new coordination linkages or partnerships were formalized for addressing overall crime and violence problems. For example, at the Fort Peck Tribes, the TSAV partners signed a Memorandum of Agreement establishing a *Law Enforcement Coordinating Council*. This Council was a formal body designed to continue the work achieved under the TSAV program. Additionally, a *Community Corrections Council* — representing a cross-section of key stakeholders involved in juvenile/youth programs — emerged as an outgrowth of a TSAV Workgroup. This Council has continued to function as the oversight group for promoting alternative sentencing programs and for promoting changes in the tribes' juvenile services programs. At the Chickasaw Nation, a new tribal Office of Violence Prevention was established to oversee all of the tribe's federal grants dealing with violence prevention. At the Grand Traverse Band, based on the motivational boost derived from the 1999 CAPS training they received, the TSAV partners who were still active at that point, formed a group called the *Dreamcatchers: Tribal Partnerships in Action*. This group vowed to keep working on the TSAV goals and objectives following conclusion of Federal TSAV funding.

At two Tribes, local TSAV partners also felt that certain less formal partnerships had been established as a result of the TSAV program and that those collaborations were very likely to continue beyond the TSAV initiative. For example, at the Chickasaw Nation it appears that, although no formal agreement has been written, the Tribe's TSAV program built relationships with local municipal enforcement agencies which were hope by the Tribe to be maintained beyond the TSAV initiative. At the Turtle Mountain Band, the local tribal program managers involved in the TSAV program felt that they would continue to work jointly on problem-solving efforts although they had not been formally institutionalized as a formal tribal collaboration.

With respect to TSAV efforts to engage individual citizens in the TSAV initiative, less change was evident at the four sites. Possible reasons for this lack of broader citizen or community member involvement have been discussed elsewhere in this report; nevertheless, they warrant comment again here. Specifically, in many tribal communities, traditional communal distinctions — i.e., kinship groups such as clans, tiospaye,¹⁷ kivas, etc. — might have served as more appropriate organizational rallying points for engendering community member involvement, than expecting to engage individuals in the same manner as in non-tribal settings. Had the TSAV model relied on communal or familial identification rather than personal initiative among individual community members, it might have more appropriately reflected a culturally appropriate community empowerment model.

Changes in Community Perspectives. A common factor in many Indian communities that affects a Tribe's ability to bring about changes in how it deals with crime and violence issues is its community members' tendency to deny that problems exist. This denial factor is referenced in much of the research literature dealing with American Indian substance abuse, domestic abuse and family violence, child neglect and abuse, and is most seriously noted in reference to child sexual abuse.

¹⁷ Formal extended family groups in Lakota/Dakota Tribes.

TSAV evaluation interview data confirmed that such ‘denial’ was a factor for all four Tribes involved in this evaluation. In some cases, it was noted by interviewees that even judicial system personnel, such as judges or prosecutors, often express unwillingness to recognize the extent to which dysfunctional behavior occurs within their communities.

To counter this “denial” element, certain sequential steps were determined important: first, heightening community awareness; second, shifting community attitudes; and third, bringing about change in individuals’ behaviors. By the conclusion of the TSAV initiative, the first of these steps had been quite successfully completed at all four sites. Interviewees at all four Tribes felt that their TSAV programs had been very effective in building community awareness about violence. Headway had also been made in changing community attitudes as evidenced by (a) the growing sobriety movements in those communities; (b) a resurgence of traditional cultural institutions to promote positive tribal values for spouses, parents, and children; and (c) increased interest in linking contemporary and tribal-specific strategies for community healing. There has been insufficient time, however, for meaningful behavior modification to have occurred. Nevertheless, the overall heightening of community awareness about violence and its serious ramifications for both individuals and the community as a whole, and the qualitative evidence of attitudinal shifts are positive transformations resulting directly from TSAV.

Improved law enforcement. TSAV efforts clearly led to improved law enforcement operations in at least three of the participating tribal communities. However, the extent to which these changes and accomplishments are sustainable, in the absence of direct TSAV support, was a matter of concern at several of the sites. For example, at the Chickasaw Nation, the TSAV partnership with the tribal Housing Department’s Drug Elimination Program led to significant improvement in surveillance of local low-middle income housing areas; local stakeholders did, however, question whether this collaborative effort would continue in the future. At the Fort Peck Tribes, the TSAV initiative resulted in community policing efforts being put into place in two municipalities; however, the tribal police indicated difficulties in enacting community policing efforts in other reservation communities. Through the Turtle Mountain Band’s TSAV partnership, various law enforcement-related practices were initiated (e.g., sobriety checks and seat belt checks). Local partners viewed these TSAV-related outcomes as being important steps in improving overall law enforcement efforts on behalf of community residents.

C. Limitations and/or Shortcomings of the TSAV Initiative

Inappropriate contextual approach. As noted elsewhere in this report, tribal leaders interviewed in the evaluation originally anticipated that the TSAV model would substantially focus on systemic issues – i.e., the development of comprehensive strategies for dealing with crime, violence and substance abuse prevention that would address problematic relationships with the federal courts and the U.S. Attorney’s Office. However, as the initiative began taking more shape, and as the model began to be better articulated by BJA, what emerged was a focus on strategies “that previous program administrators and evaluators had deemed successful in rural and urban communities that had high concentrations of minority populations.”¹⁸ For this reason, as TSAV sites started through their individual TSAV planning processes – guided by BJA and NCPC – many of the local partners

¹⁸ BJA response to draft TSAV Cross-Sites Evaluation Report.

came to feel that the planning process was actually restricting the scope of potential TSAV goals and strategies to a narrow selection of strategies that had emerged from non-Indian settings, where the unique governmental and jurisdictional structure of Indian Country had not been at play.

The validity of this local TSAV partner perception regarding local goal selection having been somewhat overly channeled by BJA is evidenced by the fact that the local TSAV Workplan goals, across sites, were quite similar, as were the selected TSAV strategies and activities. Given both the cultural and geographic differences in the TSAV Tribes, it is highly improbable that such similar goal and strategy identification would have emerged from the planning process had the TSAV planning model allowed for full local leadership consideration of the unique circumstances and needs of the individual communities.

In summary, the absence of TSAV focus on the more systemic concerns which are at issue in Indian Country, coupled with BJA's emphasis on utilization of strategies that had been demonstrated to be successful elsewhere — albeit not in Indian communities — were seen as shortcomings by the majority of TSAV partners interviewed.

A particularly salient finding of this evaluation has been that, of the four Tribes participating in the evaluation, the Chickasaw Nation – in light of the fact that it does not have a reservation setting – benefitted most from the transfer of 'lessons learned' from other non-Indian DOJ initiatives. From the evaluators' perspective, the strategies implemented at that site were essentially programmatic rather than systemic, and had less direct impact on the Tribe itself than they had on the non-Indian community at large with which the Tribe interacted (see Chickasaw Nation Case Study). Moreover, this site pursued more short-term crime prevention strategies targeted at specific neighborhoods. It is the only one of the four sites that truly selected targeted neighborhoods, as suggested by the TSAV planning model. Such 'targeting' was more appropriate for the non-reservation and mixed racial community settings within which this Tribe, unlike the others, existed. Overall, the TSAV initiative at that Tribe primarily helped build bridges between the Tribe and the non-Indian communities with which it interacted on a daily basis. However, unlike the three reservation-based sites, the TSAV initiative had very limited impact on engendering change in the Chickasaw Nation's own organizational capacity for problem-solving to deal with crime, violence and substance abuse issues among its membership.

Appropriateness of priorities addressed in TSAV Workplans. Toward the conclusion of the local TSAV initiatives, local stakeholders and partners were surveyed by the evaluators. One of the survey questions asked what respondents regarded as the most serious crime and violence issues still facing the community. The responses to this question were consistent across all four TSAV sites, for both the adult and juvenile categories and were as follows.

- Most serious **adult** crime/violence problems: Alcohol abuse
Illegal drug use/dealing
- Most serious **juvenile** crime/violence problems: Underage drinking
Illegal drug use

Particularly noteworthy is the fact that these same four problems had been considered among the most serious community issues when each of the four TSAV sites commenced its TSAV initiative.

Yet, while two Tribes did pursue strategies to change their Tribal Codes to enhance prosecution of juvenile offenders, DUI offenses, etc., across all sites, drug abuse problems were addressed primarily through preventive approaches. Given the singular nature of substance abuse as the most serious problem in these Tribes, it seemed odd to the evaluators why a more comprehensive *intervention* emphasis was not directed at this issue. At the Chickasaw Nation, youth alcohol abuse was really only addressed through TSAV efforts associated with establishment of a Boys and Girls Club in one of that Tribe's communities. At the other three sites, youth substance abuse prevention was primarily addressed through establishment of Boys and Girls Clubs, DARE officers' presentations in schools, and/or implementation of Zero Tolerance policies in Tribal Codes and school policies.

On the other hand, there seems to have been perhaps too much attention directed to an issue that may, in fact, not really have been a problem of such importance in the participating communities. Specifically, an inordinate emphasis may have been placed on *gang prevention* strategies in the initial planning and Workplan development, especially considering that little data were available to support this as such a significant focus area. This may explain why at all four Tribes the emphasis on gang prevention was eventually modified to be more inclusive of youth violence prevention concerns in general. Based on interview data and on review of the training topics covered under BJA sponsored TSAV workshops, such concentrated local TSAV focus on gang issues may have simply been an outgrowth of the emphasis BJA and its TA provider (NCPC) gave this topic during the planning phase. In other words, the federal interest in this issue — and the federal assumption that this would be as pertinent an issue in these Indian communities as it is in other minority communities they had been working with — may have superceded attention being given to locally perceived needs and issues of concerns.

Lack of Appropriate Data. The planning model which BJA had TSAV sites use for this initiative calls for identifying goals and strategies which are predicated on analysis of existing crime and violence data, or at least data which can be analyzed to assess the prevalence of crime and violence problems. In other words, the prior existence of appropriate data is essential. Moreover, ideally that data should enable the community to target its strategies to specific areas or neighborhoods of high crime or violence. In the context of the TSAV initiative, the existence of such data was definitely problematic — problematic for local Tribes in both the planning and implementation phases of the initiative, and problematic from an evaluation standpoint as well. This issue had repercussions that reverberated throughout the TSAV initiative process.

At one extreme was the non-reservation Tribe. This Tribe had virtually no tribal-specific crime, violence and substance abuse data at all. Thus, its Workplan could not be developed on the basis of needs data that were particular to tribal members. As a result, under each of the Workplan's goals at that site, the Tribe stated that it would use TSAV funds to gather the data required "to verify the [identified] need." [We note that such data collection did not ultimately occur.] The other three Tribes, on the other hand, did have access to some community-specific data. However, these data did not, in all cases, necessarily have anything to do with the specific areas they chose to pursue as Workplan goals. In other words, they didn't necessarily have data to reinforce the appropriateness of their TSAV program focus (see individual Case Studies for details). Furthermore, while BJA encouraged sites to identify specific neighborhood target areas, such as tribal housing sites, in only a few instances was there relevant data available to support selection of specific target areas. Moreover, from an evaluation standpoint, it was evident that even when useful and relevant data did

exist, it was neither being shared among the various criminal justice system agencies nor being used in any systematic manner across agencies.

D. Efficacy of TSAV Model in Indian Country

A central issue of this evaluation was to determine how appropriate the TSAV model was for the four American Indian Tribes that were the subjects of the TSAV Case Studies and to determine — based on the experiences of those four Tribes — whether the TSAV process/planning model is culturally appropriate for replication in other parts of Indian Country. To arrive at our evaluation conclusions in this regard, the model was examined from three perspectives: (1) as a specific *process* for cross-agency problem-solving; (2) its *planning* construct; and (3) its appropriateness in terms of the unique *political and cultural factors* under which Tribes operate. Each of these perspectives is discussed below.

Involvement of Critical Entities in Cross-agency Problem-solving Process: The TSAV model calls for establishing a local cross-agency partnership in order to put a problem-solving *process* in place. In summary, it can be said that the more successful a Tribe was in bringing together critical tribal entities — especially the Tribal Courts and law enforcement agencies — as partners in the TSAV initiative, the more successful it was in addressing a broad range of crime and violence issues and in employing a wider array of strategies to do so. To varying degrees, and with varying breadths of inclusive partnerships, all Tribes participating in this initiative were relatively successful in establishing an effective cross-agency process for problem-solving. However, only at two sites were cross-agency partnerships/entities formalized to extend beyond the TSAV initiative. Tribes that have their own law enforcement agencies and effective tribal court systems would seem to exercise more leverage in engaging these critical agencies in their local problem-solving efforts directed at crime, violence and substance abuse prevention and intervention.

A Data-Driven Planning Model. The planning model used by BJA for the TSAV initiative was based on sites having access to and use of crime and violence data upon which local planning teams could make informed decisions about the major problems that needed to be addressed, the strategies needed to be employed and the specific communities that needed to be targeted. The four participating Tribes differed significantly in their abilities to access appropriate data to identify specific local/tribal crime and violence problems and target areas. At three Tribes, in the absence of substantive data, surveys were proposed as alternative ways to identify problems and issues for the TSAV programs to address. Ultimately, only two of the sites actually conducted such a survey. Administrative burden and time constraints could possibly preclude alternative data collection methods in many other tribal communities.

Unique Political Context of American Indian Tribes. As noted in our previous discussions about limitations of the TSAV initiative, there was an ongoing difference of opinion between BJA administrators and local TSAV partners at each site with respect to which problems were the most appropriate for TSAV to address and which strategies should be employed to address those problems. This lack of agreement or consensus over the TSAV plans may account for why the planning phase had to be extended from six to nine months. Based on interviews during the last round of site visits, these differences of opinion were never adequately resolved, at least not at the three reservation-based sites. At those sites, at the conclusion of the TSAV initiative, tribal representatives remained adamant in their feelings that the planning process should have been both

more comprehensive and more responsive to their own locally perceived needs. In particular, those Tribes with their own Tribal Court systems felt that relationships with federal justice system entities should have been addressed through the TSAV model.

While BJA should be lauded for initiating TSAV, the fact that the TSAV planning model did not substantively attempt to address critical issues relevant to the structural relationships existing within Indian Country's tribal, federal and state criminal justice systems is viewed by the evaluators as a serious shortcoming of the TSAV model. While BJA may have believed that addressing such concerns was not within the purview of the initiative as intended and designed, because these relationships are so central to a Tribe's abilities to successfully address crime and violence problems, to not have included those considerations hampered the overall potential impact of the initiative.

Unique American Indian Cultural Contexts. As NCPC stated in its own report of the TSAV Initiative, "For Indian people, culture is vital."¹⁹ Indeed, the centrality of culture to most, if not all, American Indian Tribes is something that federal programs must acknowledge and account for in planning, implementing and evaluating federal program efficacy in Indian Country. Because the TSAV planning model was based on strategies culled from successful DOJ programs in other non-Indian "rural and urban communities that had high concentrations of minorities," the evaluators feel that not enough attention was given initially to identification and integration of unique culturally and tribally appropriate strategies in the TSAV Workplans.

Furthermore, instead of allowing for the integration of cultural considerations in the planning process, in fact, the opposite occurred as NCPC notes in the aforementioned document: ". . . adherence to the traditional hierarchy within the tribe for decision-making meant that members' traditional roles within the community had to be remolded to fit the TSAV process, a difficult task given the legacy of tradition."

In many Indian communities, there are varied types of cultural or traditional forums for problem solving to take place — for example, in meetings of non-traditional entities such as constitutional tribal governments or in more traditional forums such as in the context of tiospayes, clans, traditional societies, kiva groups, etc. Moreover, in these forums, the deliberative process is usually quite long as the deliberative process leads to consensus rather than a majority decision.

In this regard, the TSAV model has shortcomings as it does not allow for these cultural forums to be considered or integrated into the planning process and instead relies on non-cultural types of forums for the deliberative processes — i.e., Core Team meetings, with the Core Teams being comprised largely of governmental or criminal justice and other service agency (tribal or non-tribal) representatives. Many local TSAV partners perceived the TSAV planning process as not including opportunities for the Tribe's usual deliberative processes to identify what it perceived as the primary crime, violence and substance abuse needs in order to derive unique local solutions and strategies to address those needs. Furthermore, even though the TSAV planning process was ultimately extended by BJA, it was still felt by local TSAV partners that there was insufficient time given to consensus building about strategies deemed important to the community. As one interviewee stated,

¹⁹ *Hope and Harmony: How Seven Native American Tribes Reduced Crime and Violence*, National Crime Prevention Council, January 2001.

we got to the point where we said “okay, we’ll do it, but . . . it’s not really what we want or need.” In other words, the TSAV planning process as seen by many local stakeholders fell short in allowing for the development of truly local priorities and truly *Tribal* strategies for addressing them.

This is a serious drawback of the TSAV model, especially in view of how important most, if not all, American Indian Tribes feel it is to use a culture-based or culturally compatible methodology for identifying and addressing the types of personal and value-related issues which are often critical underlying factors in crime, violence and substance abuse.

Despite this shortcoming, certain culture-based models did evolve among some of the TSAV sites and were eventually integrated into TSAV Workplans by the end of the initiative. For example, at each of the sites, interviewees clearly felt that, for at-risk youth and families, enhancement of cultural identity was an important way to instill the pride and positive values that are needed to develop the healthy behaviors that are precursors to criminal and violent activity elimination. While during the first year of TSAV only one Tribe integrated such cultural elements into its TSAV Workplan, by the second year, the other sites also began to integrate more culture-based activities into their TSAV programs. Some of those activities involved implementing survival camps as a means of bringing at-risk youth and their families together to learn traditional values, using traditional kinship groups for mentoring families, bringing together traditionalist spiritual leaders and offenders together in support groups to instill traditional values and learn traditional roles and responsibilities, and teaching the traditional uses of tobacco to prevent smoking.

In conclusion, the TSAV model primarily allowed for incorporation of cultural considerations only at the short-term *activity* level. The model’s overall planning methodology and process for local identification of specific priorities fell short in cultural relevancy and appropriateness. Unless the model is adapted to become a *tribal* planning model — directly reflecting the centrality of cultural factors and the critical role that relationships with federal/state justice systems play — the model is not likely to be considered sufficiently culturally appropriate or viable in a wide spectrum of Indian Country.

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX A

Crime and Violence in Indian Country: The Context of the TSAV Initiative

In addressing the appropriateness of the TSAV planning model for American Indian Tribes, it is important to frame the purposes of the initiative within a discussion of the incidence of crime and violence in Indian Country. Such a discussion can help advance a clear understanding of the range and severity of issues faced by American Indian leaders as they attempt to address crime and violence problems on their reservations and in their communities. Below is a statistical backdrop for the criminal justice picture in Indian Country, based on various criminal justice indicators.

Crime and Violence and American Indians. In February 1999, the Department of Justice released a report²⁰ which revealed a disturbing picture of American Indians as both victims and offenders in crime. The report showed that the rate for violent victimization of American Indians was more than twice as high as the national average; it was also higher than for any other racial or ethnic group. Rates of violence among American Indians were higher across age groups, housing locations, income groups and sexes. At 124 per 1,000 persons age 12 or older — in comparison to 49 per 1,000 for Whites and 61 per 1,000 for Blacks — the average annual violent victimization rate among American Indians was 2½ times the national rate.

The types, as opposed to the rates, of violent crime experienced by American Indians were generally similar to those found among all groups nation-wide. Rates for American Indians were as follows: simple assault (56%), aggravated assault (28%), robbery (10%), rape/sexual assault (6%) and murder (0.7%). The aggravated assault rate among American Indians was more than three times the national rate. As true for other racial/ethnic groups, the murder rate among American Indians was declining. For American Indians under 40 years of age, the murder rate was, in fact, below the national average; for ages 40 or older, the rate was comparable to the national average.

As cited in the same 1999 report, unlike violent crime among Whites and Blacks, which is usually intra-racial, American Indians were more likely to experience violence at the hands of an offender from another race. The majority (60%) of American Indian victims of violent crime described their offenders as White. In only about 30% of the cases was the offender probably another American Indian. In cases of murder of American Indians, more than 40% were killed by an offender who was not American Indian; in 33% of the cases, the offender was White.

In more than half of violent crimes against American Indians, alcohol and/or drug use was a factor. If the offender was another American Indian, drinking was more likely to have been involved; in crimes where the offender was of another race, higher levels of drug use tended to be involved. Offender use of alcohol was a factor in nearly two-thirds of the violent victimizations in which the offender was American Indian. In cases of family violence, an estimated 3 out of 4 American Indian victims reported that the offender was perceived to have been drinking — in comparison, to all races, in which only about half of the victims reported a drinking offender.

About a third of violent victimizations across all races nationally occurred at or near home. In contrast, just over 40% of American Indian victimizations occurred in or around their own homes, or the homes of a relative, friend or neighbor.

²⁰ *American Indians and Crime*, Greenfield, L.A. & Smith, S. K., Bureau of Justice Statistics, February 1999.

From 1992 to 1995, American Indians and Asians were the only racial/ethnic groups to experience increases in the rates of child abuse or neglect. The per capita rate of child abuse/neglect for American Indian children was seven times that of Asian children.

American Indians in the Criminal Justice System. The February 1999 report cited above also reported estimates of the total number of American Indians under the custody or supervision of the criminal justice system. According to that report, in 1997, American Indians accounted for about 1% of the more than 5.7 million adults in correctional care, custody, or control. There were an estimated 62,600 American Indian adults in a correctional status — just over 4% of the American Indian adult population. In contrast, an estimated 2% of White adults, 10% of Black adults and less than half of 1% of Asian adults were under correctional supervision.

In 1997, the majority (54%) of American Indians under correctional supervision were in the community — 47% on probation and 7% on parole. The remaining 46% were held in local jails (25%), in state prisons (18%), or in federal prisons (3%). American Indians comprised just over 1% of the offenders on parole, probation or in state or federal prisons; in contrast, American Indians accounted for almost 3% of persons in local jails nationally. Of those in local jails, American Indians comprised 2.5% of detainees not yet convicted and 3% of convicted offenders in jail serving shorter sentences or awaiting transfer to other correctional facilities.

American Indian inmates were less likely to be in jail for violent crimes, compared to inmates of all races. Nearly 40% of American Indian inmates had been charged with a public order offense, most commonly driving while intoxicated (DWI). Compared to other races, American Indians have a higher rate of arrest for DWI. American Indian inmates in local jails accounted for 10% of unconvicted inmates charged with DWI and just over 4% of convicted DWI offenders in local jails.

Alcohol is a significant factor in both violent and non-violent crime among American Indian offenders. About half of convicted American Indian inmates in local jails had been consuming alcohol at the time they committed their offense. An estimated 7 in 10 American Indian inmates jailed for a violent crime had been drinking when they committed the offense.

Indian Youth in the Juvenile Justice System. Another recent report²¹ on youth in state correctional facilities notes that minority youth are over-represented in the juvenile justice system. While the statistics for African-American youth were more dire, American Indian youth custody rates were 2.5 times the custody rate of White youth. Nationally, non-Indian youth who were incarcerated at the rate of 356 per 100,000. For the four states in which TSAV evaluation sites were located, a state-by-state comparison of residential custody rates yields the following picture:

- *Michigan:* American Indian youth are in custody at a rate of 293 per 100,000 compared to a rate of 205 per 100,000 for White youth;
- *Montana:* American Indian youth are in custody at a rate of 524 per 100,000 compared to a rate of 221 per 100,000 for White youth;
- *North Dakota:* American Indian youth are in custody at a rate of 1,203 per 100,000 compared to a rate of 261 per 100,000 for White youth; and
- *Oklahoma:* American Indian youth are in custody at a rate of 282 per 100,000 compared to a rate of 123 per 100,000 for White youth.

²¹ *And Justice for Some*, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Youth Law Center, May 2000.

Minority youth are transferred to adult court and are sentenced to incarceration at a disproportionate rate when compared to White youth charged with similar offenses. Over-representation of American Indians was most notable in Nebraska and Minnesota; the ratio of American Indian youth as new prison commitments to the proportion of the American Indian population overall were respectively 17:1 and 11:2 for those two states. Data for only two of the four states in which TSAV sites were located were available in the Youth Law Center report. That data reflected the following:

- *North Dakota:* American Indian youth represent 40% of new prison commitments in comparison to the American Indian population being 8% of the state population — White youth represent 40% of new prison commitments in comparison to Whites being 89% of the population; and
- *Oklahoma:* American Indian youth represent 27% of new prison commitments in comparison to the American Indian population being 10% of the state population — White youth represent 33% of new prison commitments in comparison to Whites being 74% of the population.

It should be noted that the report points out these issues but does not address reasons for such sharp racial imbalances. However, in a press release for the report, it was acknowledged that “it is undeniable that race is a factor” in the systems’ outcomes.

Drug Abuse among American Indians. A recent federal government report²² indicated that among major race/ethnic groups, the rate of current illicit drug use was highest among American Indian/Alaska Natives. For the population 12 years or older, the American Indian rate was 10.6% in comparison to the national population estimate of 6.7%. The rate for illicit drug dependence was also highest, at 4.7%, among American Indians/Alaska Natives; this rate was at least double the rate for each other race/ethnic groups.

More direly, it was estimated that 19.6% of American Indian teenagers used illicit drugs, the highest rate for any group in the nation. In comparison, the national average for youth ages 12 to 17 was 9%. For the same age group, the report also indicated that 3.7% of American Indian youth used hallucinogens. This was the highest rate for all race/ethnic groups, the overall national rate being 1.1% for this age group. At 22.6%, the rate of underage binge drinking was also highest among American Indians/Alaska Natives in comparison to underage binge drinking of Whites (21.9%), African Americans (11.6), and Asians (6.8%) ages 12 to 20 years.

²² *Summary of Findings from the 1999 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, September 2000.*

Appendix B. Perceived Effectiveness of the TSAV Program at Each AIN

Chickasaw Nation	Fort Peck Tribes	Grand Traverse Band	Turtle Mountain Band
- building community awareness about violence (1.69)	- building community awareness about violence (1.75)	- providing youth with healthful activities (2.00)	- building community awareness about violence (2.25)
- generating community involvement (1.80)	- fostering cooperation among TSAV partners (1.81)	- improving services among TSAV partner agencies (2.22)	- enhancing system for dealing with domestic violence (2.33)
- planning specific programs for dealing with crime & violence (1.81)	- identifying additional funds to apply to targeted problems (1.87)	- creating consensus among TSAV partners about solutions to problems (2.25)	- identifying additional funds to apply to targeted problems (2.38)
- improving services among TSAV partner agencies (1.93)	- improving services among TSAV partner agencies (1.93)	- identifying additional funds to apply to targeted problems (2.33)	- generating community involvement (2.38)
- providing youth with healthful activities (2.00)	- enhancing system for dealing with domestic violence (1.93)	- fostering cooperation among TSAV partners (2.38)	- improving collection/tracking of data among police, courts, corrections, etc. (2.38)
- enhancing system for dealing with domestic violence (2.06)	- generating community involvement (2.06)	- building community awareness about violence (2.43)	- fostering information sharing among the law enforcement and courts (2.43)
- fostering cooperation among the TSAV partners (2.06)	- planning specific programs for dealing with crime and violence (2.07)	- fostering information sharing among law enforcement and courts (2.43)	- reducing family violence (2.50)
- institutionalizing TSAV process for data gathering and problem solving (2.08)	- fostering information sharing among law enforcement and courts (2.07)	- planning specific programs for dealing with crime and violence (2.50)	- improving services among TSAV partner agencies (2.50)
- identifying additional funding to apply to targeted problems (2.08)	- institutionalizing TSAV process for data gathering and problem solving (2.08)	- improving collection/tracking of data among police, courts, corrections, etc. (2.54)	- fostering cooperation among the TSAV partners (2.50)
- creating consensus among TSAV partners about solutions for targeted problems (2.13)	- creating consensus among TSAV partners about solutions for targeted problems (2.13)	- institutionalizing TSAV process for data gathering and problem solving (2.60)	- institutionalizing TSAV process for data gathering and problem solving (2.57)
- fostering information sharing among law enforcement and courts (2.13)	- improving community policing (2.13)	- generating community involvement (2.75)	- improving community policing (2.57)
- reducing family violence (2.31)	- improving collection/tracking of data among police, courts, corrections, etc. (2.20)	- enhancing system for dealing with domestic violence (2.86)	- reducing drunk driving (2.57)
- preventing substance abuse (2.31)	- providing youth with healthful activities (2.33)	- reducing gang activity (3.00)	- creating consensus among TSAV partners about solutions for targeted problems (2.63)
- improving collection/ tracking of data among police, courts, corrections, etc. (2.42)	- reducing gang activity (2.42)	- improving community policing (3.00)	- reducing gang activity (2.67)
- reducing gang activity (2.43)	- reducing family violence (2.46)	- reducing family violence (3.08)	- providing youth with healthful activities (2.71)
- improving community policing (2.43)	- reduce drunk driving (2.82)	- preventing substance abuse (3.19)	- planning specific programs for dealing with crime and violence (2.75)
- reducing drug use (2.46)	- reducing drug use (2.83)	- reducing drug use (3.36)	- reducing drug use (2.86)
- reducing drunk driving (2.70)	- preventing substance abuse (2.87)	- reducing drunk driving (3.42)	- preventing substance abuse (3.00)

Ratings: 1 = Very Effective; 2 = Somewhat Effective; 3 = Somewhat Ineffective; 4 = Very Ineffective

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

APPENDIX C

POSITION/TITLE

TRIBAL STRATEGIES AGAINST VIOLENCE (TSAV) SURVEY

1. In your opinion, what are the major crime and violence problems — associated with **adults** — facing the Turtle Mountain Band? Please rate the seriousness of the problems listed below. *(For each problem, circle one answer.)*

	No Problem	Some Problem	Big Problem	Don't Know
a. Illegal drug dealing by adults	1	2	3	9
b. Illegal drug use by adults	1	2	3	9
c. Alcohol abuse by adults	1	2	3	9
d. Sexual assault by adults	1	2	3	9
e. Family violence by adult perpetrators	1	2	3	9
f. Child abuse by adult perpetrators	1	2	3	9
g. Theft	1	2	3	9
h. Other property crimes by adults	1	2	3	9
I. Child neglect by adults	1	2	3	9
j. Adult gangs	1	2	3	9
k. Adult drunk driving/traffic accidents	1	2	3	9
l. Child sexual abuse by adult perpetrators	1	2	3	9
m. Other: (specify)	1	2	3	9
n. Other: (specify)	1	2	3	9

2. In your opinion, what are the major crime and violence problems — associated with **juveniles** — facing the Turtle Mountain Band? Please rate the seriousness of the problems listed below. *(For each problem, circle one answer.)*

	No Problem	Some Problem	Big Problem	Don't Know
a. Illegal drug use by juveniles	1	2	3	9
b. Underage drinking	1	2	3	9
c. Family violence by juvenile perpetrators	1	2	3	9
d. Child abuse by juvenile perpetrators	1	2	3	9
e. Theft by juveniles	1	2	3	9
f. Vandalism by juveniles	1	2	3	9
g. Youth gangs	1	2	3	9
h. Child sexual abuse by juvenile perpetrators	1	2	3	9
i. Drunk driving by juveniles	1	2	3	9
j. Curfew violations	1	2	3	9
k. Other: (specify).	1	2	3	9
l. Other: (specify).	1	2	3	9

3. In your opinion, what are the major **quality of life** issues facing the Turtle Mountain Band? Please rate the seriousness of the problems listed below. (For each problem/issue, circle one answer.)

	No Problem	Some Problem	Big Problem	Don't Know
a. Low educational achievement	1	2	3	9
b. Unemployment	1	2	3	9
c. Vagrancy	1	2	3	9
d. High youth dropout rates	1	2	3	9
e. Truancy	1	2	3	9
f. Poverty	1	2	3	9
g. Police misconduct	1	2	3	9
h. Other: (specify).	1	2	3	9
i. Other: (specify).	1	2	3	9

4. Please go back to questions 1-3, and for each set of problems, please select the one you think is the most serious for your community. (Below, please write down the problem that you selected as most serious in each category. Then indicate, to the right, whether the problem is being addressed by your community.)

Is this problem being addressed by your community?

Adult: _____	___ Yes	___ No	___ Don't Know
Juvenile: _____	___ Yes	___ No	___ Don't Know
Quality of Life: _____	___ Yes	___ No	___ Don't Know

5. Have you ever heard the phrase: "TSAV is a process, not a program"? Yes No

If YES, please check below which ONE option best describes what that means to you:

- TSAV is a process for finding additional funds to fight crime, violence and substance abuse.
- TSAV is a process to assist all branches of tribal government to work together.
- TSAV is a problem-solving model using data to prioritize problems and decide how to collaborate on strategies to attack the problems.
- TSAV is a way to build community coalitions to fight crime, violence and substance abuse.
- TSAV is a preventive process for addressing community policing, youth substance abuse and gang intervention problems.

6. Think about what the local TSAV Initiative has done to date. Overall, to what extent has the TSAV Initiative met your expectations in terms of impact in addressing crime, violence and substance abuse in your community? (Circle one)

Not At All	Less Than Expected	About As Expected	Somewhat More Than Expected	Great Deal More Than Expected	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	9

7. Think about what the local TSAV Initiative has done to date. Please indicate how effective it has been in the areas listed below. (Circle one answer for each statement)

	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective	Don't Know
a. Fostering cooperation among the TSAV partners	1	2	3	4	9
b. Fostering information sharing among the law enforcement and courts	1	2	3	4	9
c. Preventing substance abuse	1	2	3	4	9
d. Providing youth with healthful activities	1	2	3	4	9
e. Enhancing the system for dealing with domestic violence	1	2	3	4	9
f. Reducing drunk driving	1	2	3	4	9
g. Improving collection & tracking of data among police, courts, corrections and human service agencies	1	2	3	4	9
h. Building community awareness of violence	1	2	3	4	9
i. Generating community involvement	1	2	3	4	9
j. Reducing drug use	1	2	3	4	9
k. Planning specific programs for dealing with crime and violence	1	2	3	4	9
l. Identifying additional funding to apply to targeted problems	1	2	3	4	9
m. Improving services of TSAV partner agencies	1	2	3	4	9
n. Reducing family violence	1	2	3	4	9
o. Improving community policing	1	2	3	4	9
p. Creating consensus among TSAV partners about solutions for targeted problems	1	2	3	4	9
q. Reducing gang activity	1	2	3	4	9
r. Institutionalizing TSAV process for data gathering & problem solving	1	2	3	4	9

8. What do you think were the major obstacles to getting the TSAV Initiative successfully implemented in your community? (Please rank order from the options below, those factors that impeded your TSAV progress. Rank only those factors that applied to your site. Use "1" to denote the most serious obstacle and so forth.)

- ___ Acquiring adequate or appropriate data to back up targeted problems/issues.
- ___ Getting partners to adhere to responsibilities in Work Plan or MOAs/MOUs.
- ___ TSAV staff/partner turnover.
- ___ Finding funds for activities that were planned as part of the TSAV Workplan.
- ___ Generating community support for better addressing targeted problems/issues.
- ___ Conflict with BJA over priorities for TSAV goals or strategies.
- ___ Getting TSAV partners to think beyond their own area of focus and view problems across turf lines.
- ___ Dealing with changes in tribal government leadership — e.g., regaining momentum and/or support.
- ___ Receiving timely or appropriate technical assistance.
- ___ Placement of TSAV Office within organizational structure of the tribe(s).
- ___ Getting active support from Tribal Council on promoting TSAV goals community-wide.
- ___ Other: Please explain: _____

9. To what extent has each of the following individuals or groups been involved in the implementation of the local TSAV Initiative’s activities since your TSAV effort was funded by BJA? (For each group, circle one answer. Circle “Don’t Know” if you don’t know about that entity. Circle “NA” if you don’t have that type of individual or group in your community — for example, if you do not have a Tribal Corrections facility, you would circle “10” under the NA column.)

To what extent have the following groups been involved in local TSAV activities?	Not at All	Some	A Great Deal	Don’t Know	NA
a. Tribal police	1	2	3	9	10
b. BIA police	1	2	3	9	10
c. City police	1	2	3	9	10
d. County Sheriff’s office	1	2	3	9	10
e. State Highway Patrol	1	2	3	9	10
f. Tribal Courts	1	2	3	9	10
g. County Courts	1	2	3	9	10
h. State Courts	1	2	3	9	10
i. Federal Courts	1	2	3	9	10
j. FBI/U.S. Attorney’s Office	1	2	3	9	10
k. Federal Marshal’s Office	1	2	3	9	10
l. Tribal Health Services	1	2	3	9	10
m. Other Health Services	1	2	3	9	10
n. Tribal Social Services	1	2	3	9	10
o. Other Social Services	1	2	3	9	10
p. Tribal Schools	1	2	3	9	10
q. BIA Schools	1	2	3	9	10
r. Public Schools	1	2	3	9	10
s. Tribal Substance Abuse Prog.	1	2	3	9	10
t. Other Substance Abuse Prog.	1	2	3	9	10
u. Tribal Chair	1	2	3	9	10
v. Tribal Council	1	2	3	9	10
w. Tribal Emergency Shelter	1	2	3	9	10
x. County Emergency Shelter	1	2	3	9	10
y. Tribal Corrections	1	2	3	9	10
z. County Corrections	1	2	3	9	10
aa. State Corrections	1	2	3	9	10
bb. Tribal/BIA Juvenile Services	1	2	3	9	10
cc. County Juvenile Services	1	2	3	9	10
dd. Tribal/Indian Businesses	1	2	3	9	10
ee. Non-Indian Businesses	1	2	3	9	10
ff. Community in general	1	2	3	9	10
gg. Cultural Traditionalists	1	2	3	9	10

10. Of those groups that have not been involved in your local TSAV Initiative, why do you think they have not been involved? Listed below are some common reasons frequently given for non-involvement. (For each group not involved, circle the one main reason that you think they have not been involved. Circle "10" under NA if none of the given reasons applies and write across the numbers why they stopped being involved. Do not circle any response items if you don't have that type of individual or group in your community.)

Of groups not involved , why do you think they have not been involved in TSAV?	Turf issues	Not invited	Person- lity conflict	Under- staffing	No group interest	Tribal factions	Not a prior- ity	Policy conflict	N A
a. Tribal police	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
b. BIA police	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
c. City police	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
d. County Sheriff's office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
e. State Highway Patrol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
f. Tribal Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
g. County Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
h. State Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
i. Federal Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
j. FBI/U.S. Attorney's Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
k. Federal Marshal's Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
l. Tribal Health Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
m. Other Health Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
n. Tribal Social Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
o. Other Social Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
p. Tribal Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
q. BIA Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
r. Public Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
s. Tribal Substance Abuse Prog.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
t. Other Substance Abuse Prog.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
u. Tribal Chair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
v. Tribal Council	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
w. Tribal Emergency Shelter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
x. County Emergency Shelter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
y. Tribal Corrections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
z. County Corrections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
aa. State Corrections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
bb. Tribal/BIA Juvenile Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
cc. County Juvenile Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
dd. Tribal/Indian Businesses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
ee. Non-Indian Businesses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
ff. Cultural Traditionalists	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
gg. Community in general	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10

11. Which organizations or groups (which were involved at some point with the local TSAV Initiative) have stopped participating in the TSAV Initiative? Why? (For each group that stopped being involved, circle the one main reason that you think they stopped participating. Circle "10" under NA if none of the given reasons applies and write across the numbers why they stopped being involved.)

Of those groups that were involved in TSAV in the past, why do you think they stopped participating?	Turf issues	No longer invited	Personality conflict	Understaffing	No group interest	Tribal factions	Not a priority	Policy conflict	N A
a. Tribal police	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
b. BIA police	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
c. City police	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
d. County Sheriff's office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
e. State Highway Patrol	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
f. Tribal Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
g. County Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
h. State Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
i. Federal Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
j. FBI/U.S. Attorney's Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
k. Federal Marshal's Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
l. Tribal Health Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
m. Other Health Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
n. Tribal Social Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
o. Other Social Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
p. Tribal Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
q. BIA Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
r. Public Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
s. Tribal Substance Abuse Prog.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
t. Other Substance Abuse Prog.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
u. Tribal Chair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
v. Tribal Council	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
w. Tribal Emergency Shelter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
x. County Emergency Shelter	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
y. Tribal Corrections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
z. County Corrections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
aa. State Corrections	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
bb. Tribal/BIA Juvenile Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
cc. County Juvenile Services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
dd. Tribal/Indian Businesses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
ee. Non-Indian Businesses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
ff. Community in general	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10
gg. Cultural Traditionalists	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10

12. Which organizations or groups — only minimally involved or not involved at all with TSAV — do you think should be better represented in your TSAV process in the future? (Check as many groups as you think should be more involved. Do not check if that group does not exist in you community/reservation.)

Which organizations — now only minimally or not involved — should be in your TSAV process in the future?	Check Each Group That Should Be More Involved		Check Each Group That Should Be More Involved
a. TSAV Core Team			s. Tribal Schools
b. TSAV Workgroups			t. BIA Schools
c. Tribal police			u. Public Schools
d. BIA police			v. Tribal Substance Abuse Prog.
e. City police			w. Other Substance Abuse Prog.
f. County Sheriff's office			x. Tribal Chair
g. State Highway Patrol			y. Tribal Council
h. Tribal Courts			z. Tribal Emergency Shelter
I. County Courts			aa. County Emergency Shelter
j. State Courts			bb. Tribal Corrections
k. Federal Courts			cc. County Corrections
l. FBI/U.S. Attorney's Office			dd. State Corrections
m. Federal Marshal's Office			ee. Tribal/BIA Juvenile Services
n. Tribal Health Services			ff. County Juvenile Services
o. Other Health Services			gg. Tribal/Indian Businesses
p. Tribal/BIA Social Services			hh. Non-Indian Businesses
q. Other Social Services			ii. Cultural Traditionalists
r. Community in general			jj. Other: (specify)

13. All coalitions experience a certain amount of conflict when making decisions. Think about the various entities represented in your local TSAV partnership. Please rate below how much conflict that entity has had with the rest of the TSAV partners. (Circle one number to the right of each entity for how much conflict you think that entity has had with the rest of the group.)

	A lot of conflict that improved decision-making	Some conflict that improved decision-making	Little or No conflict	Some conflict that impeded decision-making	A lot of conflict that impeded decision-making	Don't know
a. Tribal Courts	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Tribal Prosecutor	1	2	3	4	5	9
c. Law Enforcement	1	2	3	4	5	9
d. Tribal Government	1	2	3	4	5	9
e. Schools	1	2	3	4	5	9
f. Child Victim Response	1	2	3	4	5	9
g. Adult Victim Response	1	2	3	4	5	9
h. Substance Abuse Prog.	1	2	3	4	5	9
i. TSAV Staff	1	2	3	4	5	9

14. How do/did conflicts within your TSAV partnerships **typically** get resolved? (Check all the responses that apply below. If none of those apply, please specify method of resolution under "Other.")

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> By consensus decision | <input type="checkbox"/> By TSAV Coord. | <input type="checkbox"/> By other TSAV leader's |
| <input type="checkbox"/> By majority vote | <input type="checkbox"/> By dissidents leaving | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> By Tribal Chair/Council | <input type="checkbox"/> By using Talking Circle | (specify) |

15. Given your TSAV experience, what would YOU do differently if you were just starting your TSAV Initiative? _____

16. Given your TSAV experience, what would you suggest that the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) do differently in assisting other American Indian nations implement TSAV Initiatives? _____

THANK YOU for your thought, time and effort in answering these questions.