187673

Proposal to Help Convene Three Policy Forums on Crime Issues for State Policy Makers

(Grant 98-IJ-CX-0054

Executive Policy Forum 1:

Combating School Violence

February 11-12, 1999
Sheraton Raleigh Capitol Center Hotel
Raleigh, North Carolina

November 24, 1998

The NGA Center for Best Practices, with support from the National Institute for Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, invites you to attend the first of three policy forums focusing on combating violent juvenile crime for governor's advisors and state officials. The first forum, to be held February 11-12 at the Sheraton Raleigh Capitol Center Hotel in Raleigh, North Carolina, will focus on *Combating School Violence*. The meeting is being co-hosted by Office of North Carolina Governor, Jim Hunt, and the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, located in Raleigh, North Carolina.

The attached agenda, which was prepared after consultation with an advisory group comprised of Governors' staff, outlines the one and one-half day meeting. The meeting will begin at 9:00 AM on Thursday, February 11, 1999 and end just after noon on Friday, February 12. The policy forum will include an overview of the topic, presentations by leading experts who will summarize the latest research on school safety issues, and discussions with cutting-edge practitioners and policymakers who will describe best practices being implemented at both the state and local levels. Participants will have the opportunity to share their ideas and outline the political, policy, administrative, and programmatic strategies they have found to be effective. Part of the forum also will be devoted to a discussion about how states and communities can prevent and respond to the types of tragic school shootings that occurred in several states in the last year and half.

Participation in each forum will be limited to about thirty-five people to promote interaction and a dynamic state-to-state exchange. Governor's offices are encouraged to send a two-person team to the forum with one person representing the governor on education policy and another on public safety policy. States may choose to send only person or a larger team. However, if the meeting is oversubscribed, preference will be given on a first-come basis to two-person state teams as described above.

The National Institute for Justice will arrange and pay for participant travel to Raleigh perdiem and lodging at the Sheraton Raleigh Capitol Center.

To register for the forum, please return the attached registration form to NGA by December 15, 1998. You will receive confirmation of your registration soon thereafter. In addition, please use the attached form to let us know about relevant and noteworthy initiatives underway in your state. We will use this information to promote state-to-state information exchange on best practices. Please fax the completed form to Jennifer Price at the NGA Center for Best Practices at 202/624-5313 by December 15.

The next two policy forums will be held in the spring and early summer of 1999. We tentatively plan to focus the next forum on handling violent youth in both the juvenile and criminal justice systems and improving outcomes for incarcerated youth. The third forum is likely to focus on the prevention of violent juvenile crime and teenage substance abuse and gang intervention strategies. States that were not represented at a previous forum will be given preference for participation in a latter forum.

If you have any questions, please call Evelyn Ganzglass at 202/624-5394.

Sincerely,

John Thomasian
Director
NGA Center for Best Practices

and

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director
Employment and Social Services
Policy Studies Division

CC: Governor's Policy Director
Governor's Education Policy Advisor
Governor's Public Safety Advisor
Washington Representative/NGA Staff Contact

NGA/NIJ Combating School Violence
Executive Policy Forum

AGENDA

February 11-12, 1999

Sheraton Capitol Center Hotel
Raleigh, North Carolina

Thursday, February 11, 1999

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Registration**

9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. **Welcome** *Hanover II-III*

Honorable James B. Hunt Jr.
Governor of North Carolina
Raleigh, North Carolina

9:30 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. **Overview**

Shay Bilchik
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

Christopher E. Stone
Director
Vera Institute of Justice
New York, New York

10:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Break**

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Framing State Concerns**

Pamela L. Riley
Director
Center for the Prevention of School Violence
Raleigh, North Carolina

12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. **Working Luncheon** *Governor's II*

"Linkages and Partnerships to Promote School Safety"

Linda Hayes
Chair of the Governor's Crime Commission
Office of the Governor
Raleigh, North Carolina

1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. **Identifying Violence-Prone Youth** *Hanover II-III*

Kevin P. Dwyer
President-Elect
National Association of School Psychologists
Bethesda, Maryland

2:00 p.m. – 2:15 p.m. **Break**

2:15 p.m. – 3:45 p.m. **Preventing School Violence: Dealing with Disruptive Youth – What Works/What's Promising?**

Paul Kingery
Director
Hamilton Fish National Institute on
School and Community Violence
Rosslyn, Virginia

Jeff Miller
Principal
G. Holmes Braddock High School
Miami-Dade County Public Schools
Miami, Florida

3:45 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. **Role of the Governor in Promoting School Safety**

Mark Garriga
Chief of Staff
Governor's Office
Jackson, Mississippi

Rita C. Meyer
Chief of Staff
Education Policy Advisor
Governor's Office
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Friday, February 12, 1999

8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Registration**

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **School Safety and Alternative Schools** *Hanover II-III*

William Modzeleski
Director
Safe and Drug Free Schools Program
U.S Department of Education
Washington, DC

Curtiss Little
Principal
Independence High School
Winston-Salem, North Carolina

10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. **Break**

10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. **Dealing with High Profile School Crime Incidents**

Jamon H. Kent
Superintendent
Springfield Public Schools
Springfield, Oregon

Olga Trujillo
Legal Counsel
Office for Victims of Crime
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

11:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Wrap Up and Next Steps**

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director
Employment and Social Services Policy Studies
NGA Center for Best Practices
Washington, DC

NGA/NIJ Combating School Violence Executive Policy Forum

American Samoa

Sili K. Sataua
Chief of Staff
Office of the Governor
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799
96799
684-633-4116
684-633-2269(Fax)

Illinois

Jamie Zembruski
Legislative Liaison
Illinois Governor's Washington Office
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 240
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-7760
202-724-0689(Fax)
email: jzembrus@gov284r1.state.il.us

Kentucky

Jake Hastleton
Superintendent
Oldham County Schools
P.O. Box 218
Buckner, KY 40010
502-222-8880
502-222-8885(Fax)

Pamela J. Murphy
Deputy Secretary
Kentucky Justice Cabinet
Bush Building
403 Wapping Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
502-564-7554
502-564-4840(Fax)
email: pamela.murphy@mail.state.ky.us

Maryland

Joanne L. Carter
Assistant State Superintendent
Compensatory Education and
Support Services
Maryland State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
410-767-0275
410-333-0880(Fax)

Kerry Whitacre
Policy Advisor
Office of the Lieutenant Governor
100 State Circle
Annapolis, MD 21401
410-974-2570
410-974-2077(Fax)
email: kwhitacre@gov.state.md.us

Michigan

Thomas A. Ginster
Criminal Justice Policy Advisor
State Government Affairs Division
Executive Office of the Governor
111 S. Capitol Avenue, 3rd Floor
Lansing, MI 48933
517-373-7949
517-335-0118(Fax)
email: ginstert@mail.state.mi.us

Mississippi

Mark Garriga
Chief of Staff
Governor's Office
P.O. Box 139
Jackson, MS 39205
601-359-3150
601-359-3022(Fax)
email: garriga@govoff.state.ms.us

Mark Henry
Chief Legal Counsel
Governor's Office
P.O. Box 139
Jackson, MS 39205-0139
601-359-3150
601-359-3022(Fax)
email: mhenry@govoff.state.ms.us

Missouri

Angela Heffner
Legal Counselor to the Governor
Governor's Office
206 W. High Street
Jefferson City, MO 65102
573-751-3222
573-751-1495(Fax)
email: aheffner@mail.state.mo.us

New Mexico

Paula Buchwald
Policy Analyst
Department of Public Safety
P.O. Box 1628
Santa Fe, NM 87504-1628
505-827-3370
505-827-3434(Fax)
email: pbuchwald@dps.state.nm.us

New York

Jill Dunn
Counsel
Lieutenant Governor's Office
Executive Chamber
New York State Capitol
Albany, NY 12224
518-474-4623
518-486-4170(Fax)
email: jill.dunn@chamber.state.ny.us

North Carolina

Lynda McCulloch
Governor's Senior Education Advisor
Special Advisor for Education
Office of the Governor
116 W. Jones Street
Raleigh, NC 27603
919-733-3921
919-715-3561(Fax)

Pamela L. Riley
Director
Center for the Prevention of School Violence
20 Enterprise Street, Suite 2
Raleigh, NC 27607
919-515-9397
919-515-9561(Fax)
email: www.ncsu.edu/cpsv/

Michael Ward
State Superintendent
Department of Public Instruction
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
919-715-1299
919-715-1278(Fax)

Carleen Wray
Special Projects Director
Center for the Prevention of School Violence
20 Enterprise Street, Suite 2
Raleigh, NC 27607
919-515-9397
919-515-9561(Fax)

Ohio

Maureen O'Connor
Lieutenant Governor
State of Ohio
77 S. High Street, 30th Floor
Columbus, OH 43215
614-466-3396
614-644-0575(Fax)

Pennsylvania

Lynn Cromley
Director
Center for Schools and Communities
1300 Market Street, Suite 12
Lemoyne, PA 17043
717-763-1661
717-763-2083(Fax)
email: lcrom@northstar.csiu.k12.pa.us

Clay Yeager
Executive Director
Governor's Community Partnership for Safe Children
P.O. Box 1167
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1167
717-705-0904
717-705-3698(Fax)
email: yeager@pccd.state.pa.us

Rhode Island

Kathy Dennard
Policy Advisor
Governor's Policy Office
State House, Room 128
Providence, RI 02903
401-222-2080
401-521-1665(Fax)
email: kdennard@gov.state.ri.us

Joseph DiPina, Jr.
Policy Analyst
Governor's Policy Office
State House, Room 128
Providence, RI 02903
401-222-2080
401-521-1665(Fax)

Tennessee

Mike Herrmann
Director
Safe and Drug Free Schools
Department of Education
710 James Robertson Parkway
Andrew Johnson Tower, 7th Floor
Nashville, TN 37243
615-741-3248
615-532-4899(Fax)

Vermont

Janet Ancel
:gal Counselor to the Governor
Governor's Office
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609
802-828-3333
802-828-3339(Fax)
email: jancel@gvr.state.vt.us

Kristina Pisanelli
Policy Analyst for Education
Governor's Office
109 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05609
802-828-3333
802-828-3339(Fax)
email: kpisanelli@gvr.state.vt.us

West Virginia

Otis G. Cox, Jr
Cabinet Secretary
Military Affairs and Public Safety
State Capitol Complex
1900 Kanawha Boulevard East
ilding 6, Room B-122
Charleston, WV 25305
304-558-2930
304-558-6221(Fax)

Wisconsin

Mark Grapentine
Policy Advisor for Corrections
Office of the Governor
115 E. State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702
608-267-3839
608-261-6804(Fax)

Bill Steiger
Policy Advisor for Education
Office of the Governor
115 E. State Capitol
Madison, WI 53702
608-266-0100
608-261-6804(Fax)

Wyoming

Matt Jones
Public Safety Policy
Governor's Office
State Capitol
200 W. 24th Street
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307-777-3604
307-632-3909(Fax)

Rita C. Meyer
Chief of Staff
Education Policy Advisor
Governor's Office
State Capitol
200 W. 24th Street
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307-777-3604
307-632-3909(Fax)
email: rmeyer1@missc.state.wy.us

National Governors' Association

Emily Cornell
Policy Analyst
Health Policy Studies Division
NGA Center for Best Practices
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-3629
202-624-5313(Fax)
email: ecornell@nga.org

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director
Employment and Social Services
Policy Studies
NGA Center for Best Practices
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-5394
202-624-5313(Fax)
email: eganzglass@nga.org

Noel Milan
Director
Office of Public Affairs
NGA Center for Best Practices
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-5352
202-624-8832(Fax)

Jennifer Price
Research Assistant
Employment and Social Services
Policy Studies
NGA Center for Best Practices
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-7857
202-624-5313(Fax)
email: jprice@nga.org

U.S. Department of Justice

Shay Bilchik
Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-5911
202-307-2093(Fax)

Betty M. Chemers
Director, Research and Program Development Division
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-3677
202-514-6382(Fax)
email: chemersb@ojp.usdoj.gov

Erin Dalton
Special Assistant to the Deputy Director
Office of Development and Communications
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-5752
202-307-6394(Fax)
email: daltona@ojp.usdoj.gov

Kevin Jackson
Program Manager
Office of Science and Technology
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-2956
202-307-9907(Fax)

Cindy Larson
Program Specialist
Office for Victims of Crime
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-305-2177
202-514-6383(Fax)
email: larsonc@ojp.usdoj.gov

Winifred L. Reed
Social Science Analyst
Office of Research and Evaluation
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-2952
202-307-6394(Fax)
email: winnie@ojp.usdoj.gov

John Schwarz
Deputy Director
National Institute of Justice
Office of Development and Communications
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-305-4893
202-307-6394(Fax)
email: schwarzj@ojp.usdoj.gov

Olga Trujillo
Legal Counsel
Office for Victims of Crime
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW, 8th Floor
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-3585
202-514-6383(Fax)

Presenters

Kevin P. Dwyer
President-Elect
National Association of School Psychologists
8524 Carlynn Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817
202-944-5400
301-657-0275(Fax)
email: kdwyer@naspweb.org

Linda Hayes
Chair of the Governor's Crime Commission
Office of the Governor
National Chair
National Coalition of Juvenile Justice Advisory Groups
2065 Chicora Road
Dunn, NC 28334
910-892-2269
910-891-1198(Fax)

James B. Hunt Jr.
Governor
State of North Carolina
State Capitol
Capitol Square
Raleigh, NC 27603-8001
919-733-4240

Jamon H. Kent
Superintendent
Springfield Public Schools
525 Mill Street
Springfield, OR 97477
541-726-3200
541-726-3312(Fax)

Paul Kingery
Director
Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence
1925 N. Lynn Street, Suite 305
Rosslyn, VA 22209
703-527-4217 ext. 104
703-527-8741(Fax)
email: kingery@gwu.edu

Curtiss Little
Principal
Independence High School
W. Clemmonsville Road
...ston-Salem, NC 27127
336-771-4580
336-771-5101(Fax)

Jeff Miller
Principal
G. Holmes Braddock High School
Miami-Dade County Public Schools
3601 147th Avenue, SW
Miami, FL 33185
305-225-9729
305-221-3312(Fax)

William Modzeleski
Director
Safe and Drug Free Schools Program
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, 3E314
Washington, DC 20202-6123
202-260-3954
202-260-7767(Fax)

...stopher E. Stone
Director
Vera Institute of Justice
377 Broadway, 11th Floor
New York, NY 10013
212-334-1300
212-941-9407(Fax)
email: cstone@vera.org

Other

Shaun Bernier
Program Assistant
National Criminal Justice Association
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 618
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-1455
202-508-3859(Fax)
email: sebncja@sso.org

Edward F. Connors
President
Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-684-5300
703-739-5533(Fax)
email: econnors@ilj.org

Ken Dover
Project Manager
Federal Property Programs
National Law Enforcement Corrections
Technical Center - Southeast
P.O. Box 1996
Newport, NC 28570
888-874-5854
888-874-5854(Fax)

David Osher
Director
Center for Effective Collaboration
and Practice
American Institutes for Research
1000 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20007
202-944-5373
202-944-5455(Fax)
email: dosher@air-dc.org

Melorra Sochet
Senior Planner
Vera Institute of Justice
377 Broadway, 11th Floor
New York, NY 1001-3
212-334-1300
212-941-9407(Fax)

Walk-In

William Capers
School Resource Officer
Forsyth County Sheriff's Department
Winston-Salem, NC

Ann Lichtner
Deputy Director
Inter Governmental Relations
Office of the Governor
Raleigh, NC

Robin Lubitz
Director
Governor's Crime Commission
3824 Barrett Drive
Raleigh, NC 27609
919-571-4736
919-571-4745(Fax)

Mary Phillips
High School Teacher
Independence High School
Winston-Salem, NC

Dennis Stacey
Section Chief
Safe Schools
Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC

Ed Taylor
Acting Administrator
Office of Juvenile Services
Administrative Offices of the Court
P.O. Box 2448
Raleigh, NC 27602
919-662-4300
919-662-4310(Fax)

Gina Wells
Teens, Crime, and the Community
Coordinator
Center for the Prevention of
School Violence
Raleigh, NC

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

Issue Brief

Employment and Social Services Policy Studies Division
Contact: Thomas M. MacLellan, 202/624-5427 or
Tmaclellan@nga.org
August 23, 1999

Making Schools Safe[1]

Summary

The ultimate goal of any school violence prevention program is to create safe and orderly schools. However, school violence is not and should not be viewed solely as a school-based problem, nor will any single intervention be effective in combating school violence. Rather, any strategy to combat school violence must be a multimodal, comprehensive, and coordinated effort that involves schools, communities, businesses, public and private agencies, parents, and elected officials.

Incidents of school violence and in-school weapon violations actually have decreased significantly during the last several years. Despite the occurrence of crime in schools, they remain one of the safest places for youth today. Linked to this decline are advances in understanding what works in planning and implementing school violence prevention strategies.

Although school violence is, in many respects, a local problem, Governors can significantly impact the preparedness of schools to combat school violence. Through leadership, the bully pulpit, legislative agendas, and the forging of interagency partnerships, Governors can develop a statewide capacity to effectively and proactively respond to this issue. Likewise, there are many strategies that schools can adopt, including incorporating codes of conduct, increasing student involvement, promoting positive adult interaction, using basic security measures, and developing crisis response plans.

However, some of the best advances in combating school violence come through the early identification of those youth most at risk of perpetrating it. While by no means definitive, researchers have identified risk factors and early and imminent warning signs for troubled youth. Understanding these signs within the proper context can help avoid further incidents of school violence. Although research is relatively new, within the last several years there has been a tremendous growth in research, information, and funding for school violence prevention efforts. As understanding increases about the causes of school violence, policymakers will be able to create and implement more effective policy.

Introduction

There is a paradox within America's schools today. Despite research indicating that incidences of school violence and in-school weapon violations have dropped, students, teachers, and administrators feel less safe within their own schools[2] and more worried about attacks.[3] One of the causes for this

heightened sense of fear is the high-profile cases of the last several years.[4] The tragedies of Jonesboro, Arkansas; Conyers, Georgia; West Paducah, Kentucky; Pearl, Mississippi; Springfield, Oregon; Edinboro, Pennsylvania; and, perhaps most striking, Littleton, Colorado, are grim reminders that, despite progress in reducing crime and violence within schools, this fear is not ungrounded.

Students and teachers are susceptible to violence and crime within a school. Recent data indicate, however, that students, while in school, are much less likely to be victims of violent crime—including rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault.[5] While any crime within schools is too much, such data challenge widely held notions about the safety of schools.

In February 1999, the National Governors' Association (NGA) Center for Best Practices and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), in conjunction with the Governor's Office of North Carolina and the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, cosponsored an executive policy forum in Raleigh, North Carolina, on combating school violence. The forum was the first of a series sponsored by NGA and NIJ. The second forum, held on May 1999 in Dearborn, Michigan, focused on dealing with violent juvenile offenders, and the third forum, which will be held Fall 1999, will focus on family violence. These forums are informing Governors' executive policymakers about issues related to juvenile and criminal justice. Representatives from twenty states, including North Carolina Governor James B. Hunt Jr. attended the Raleigh forum. Representatives from private and federal agencies also were in attendance, including representatives from NIJ, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, the Office of Victims of Crime, the Vera Institute of Justice, the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, the National Association of School Psychologists, and the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence. Also present were representatives from several education departments and school districts from across the nation.

The issues related to preventing school violence are complex. This *Issue Brief* highlights some of the more salient issues identified during the February forum, including an overview of the recent trends of school violence throughout the United States; an overview of early warning signs and potential risk factors; an examination of some of the best-practices and strategies that schools, states, and communities can adopt to address this crisis; and, finally, some areas where Governors can accomplish positive change.

Recent Trends

What is School Violence?

Because of the recent high-profile cases, school violence has become a widely discussed topic in the media, among policymakers, within communities, and in day-to-day discussion. But what does school violence mean? Is school violence a special type of violence? Dr. Pamela L. Riley, executive director of the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, argues that school violence is not a special genre of violence, rather "school violence is youth violence that happens at school"[6] and is a much wider-ranging issue than simply what goes on between 8:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m.

Clearly, any examination of the trends of school violence is inexplicably linked to how school violence is defined, how it is reported, and how that information is captured. Moreover, from a policymaker's perspective, *how* school violence is defined delimits *where* solutions are sought. For example, defining

school violence in narrow, limiting terms—focusing only on violence that occurs on school property—restricts the issue almost exclusively to schools and, ultimately, principals. By broadening the understanding of these issues, more comprehensive communitywide solutions can be sought.

This broader understanding of school violence is important to remember while reviewing the following statistics. Most of the included incidents occurred either in school, on the way to school, or at a school-sponsored event.

School Violence and Crime

Overall, while crime clearly is occurring within schools, the rates of violent crime and weapons violations within schools are declining. However, the impact of the recent high-profile incidents has increased levels of fear. Despite this increase, youth actually are much less likely to be victims of violent crime while in school than out.

Following are a few of the more notable trends of violence and crime within schools.

- **Fear**. The overall level of school violence is both low and stable, but fear of in-school violence has increased.[7] For example, one particular measure indicates that between 1989 and 1995, the percentage of students reported fearing attack in school rose from 6 percent to 9 percent, and students who reported fearing attack on the way to or from school rose from 4 percent to 7 percent.[8] Additionally, a recent survey of high school students found that fear of school violence kept 5 percent of students home at least once in the month prior to being surveyed.[9]

- **Threats and injuries**. Closely linked to this increase in fear, the percentage of students who have been threatened also has increased.[10] While not enough is known about threats of violence to students while in school,[11] in 1996, 13 percent of all twelfth-grade students reported that someone had threatened them with a weapon and 22 percent reported that they were threatened by someone without a weapon.[12]

- **Serious violent crime**. Youth are much less likely to be victims of nonfatal serious violent crime (rape, sexual assault, robbery, and aggravated assault) while in school than in their community. Despite this, for the 1996–97 school year, 10 percent of all public schools reported one or more incidents of rape, sexual assault, robbery, or aggravated assault.[13] There are, however, significant differences in the amount and seriousness of violence occurring in elementary, middle, and high schools. Forty-five percent of elementary schools reported one or more violent incident compared with 74 percent of middle schools and 77 percent of high schools during the 1996–97 school year.[14]

- **Theft**. The most common school-related crime is theft, which accounts for approximately 62 percent of all crimes against students. Students are more likely to be victims of theft while at school than while away from school.[15]

- **Weapons in schools**. During the 1997–98 school year, nearly a million students carried a gun to school.[16] Despite this, the number of youth bringing guns into schools has dropped. Between 1993 and 1996, male high school seniors who reported carrying a weapon to school within a four-week period dropped from 14 percent in 1993 to 9 percent in 1996. During the 1996–97 school year, 6,093 students were expelled for bringing firearms or explosives to school.[17] For females carrying guns, this percentage remained fairly consistent at 2 percent to 3 percent.

- **Violence and threats against teachers.** Teachers are victims of approximately 18,000 serious violent crimes per year. While these rates fluctuate with the race and sex of the teacher as well as the location of the school, male teachers are more often the target of crime and violence. Additionally, in terms of threats, during the 1993–94 school year, 12 percent of teachers, or 341,000, were threatened and 4 percent, or 120,000, were physically attacked by a student.[18]

Responses

This section highlights some of the different strategies available to states, localities, and schools. It also outlines several facets related to early identification of potential perpetrators of school violence and provides a framework of various programs and strategies for combating school violence.

State Responses

Efforts to combat school violence occur at many different levels. Although largely a local issue, states can play an important role in reducing school violence. Nevada, South Dakota, and Vermont have each been recognized by the National Education Goals Panel for making positive strides in three indicators—student victimization, physical fights, and teacher victimization. Nevada, the only state that has reduced the percentage of physical fights, attributes its success to a variety of statewide programs that are designed to reach the entire population of students in a school. The program models Nevada has adopted come from a variety of sources—some are commercial, some are locally developed, and some are general program models.[19]

South Dakota, a top performer in each of the three indicators, credits its success to fostering an environment where violence is not accepted and where there are very strong ties between communities and schools. State officials report that, although there's no special initiative within the state, there is a pervasive culture that violence is unacceptable and that accounts for its success.

Vermont credits much of its success in reducing student victimization and physical fights through its use of the Building Effective Supports for Teaching (BEST) program. BEST is designed to help schools develop effective strategies and interventions to anticipate, prevent, and respond to the challenging behaviors of students, benefiting the entire school community. The BEST strategy is designed to build regional and local school capacity to deal with students with a range of emotional and behavioral challenges. The program implements effective, early intervention practices to reduce the number of students with emotional and behavior issues.

The Role of the Governor

Governors can have a significant impact on preventing school violence. By providing leadership and guidance, they can set the standard of school violence prevention efforts by seizing the bully pulpit through town meetings, parent panels, press conferences, press releases, and speeches and by making school visits. Governors can use the legislative agenda to introduce violence prevention legislation and to establish an independent commission, including school representatives and criminal justice professionals, whose goal is criminal justice reform. Governors can forge partnerships within and between agencies to help develop comprehensive prevention plans and immediate response capabilities

to incidents of school violence. Finally, they can propose legislation on a variety of issues aimed at preventing school violence, including parental responsibility laws, mandated drug and weapon searches within schools, reform of youth court systems, mandated incident-reporting procedures for principals, and automatic expulsion laws.

State School Safety Centers

Currently, thirteen states have state school safety centers: California, Connecticut, Kentucky, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Washington. State school safety centers represent directed statewide efforts to deal specifically with school violence. These centers offer a wide range of services, including information dissemination, research, program development and support, grantmaking, training of teachers and administrators, capacity building, conferences, and crisis management and response. The administrative and organizational structures of these centers vary widely: some are private nonprofits, some are public/private ventures, some are associated with institutions of higher education, and others exist within state governmental organizations. More information about these programs can be found at <http://www.nssc1.org/home2.htm> and in the appendix of this *brief*.

School-Based Responses

The object of any school plan is to create and foster safe and orderly schools where youth can learn and grow in an environment free from fear. Since the causes of school violence are complex, no one strategy will be completely effective. Instead, prevention plans must be multimodal, incorporating different strategies.

During the last several years, there has been a tremendous growth in the number and availability of different strategies to address school violence. These strategies generally fall into several overlapping categories, including disciplinary codes of conduct, positive adult interaction, student-directed responses, and general school policies. Some of these strategies are briefly discussed below.

Disciplinary Codes of Conduct

Zero-tolerance policies. Zero-tolerance policies are designed to set the tone of conduct within schools towards weapons, fighting, gangs, drugs, alcohol, tobacco, and violence. Zero-tolerance policies have been widely implemented throughout the states, in part as a condition of the 1994 Gun-Free Schools Act. The act requires that all states receiving funding from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act implement a zero-tolerance policy towards weapons and expel students for one year if they bring a weapon to school.

Dress codes. Although sometimes controversial, dress codes offer another strategy that schools can employ to reduce violence. Although there has been little evaluation of their effectiveness, certain school administrators, policymakers, and parents believe these codes can help maintain order within schools. More research needs to be conducted to determine the effectiveness of this strategy.

Positive Adult Interaction

Positive adult interaction, while more a key quality of an effective school than a strategy, allows youth to have sustained relationships and positive experiences with adults and to replicate that behavior. Such

interactions help create the atmosphere of a safe and secure school where students can approach adults if they feel the need to.

Mentoring. Mentoring programs are effective. Students involved in mentoring programs are 46 percent less likely to experiment with drugs and alcohol, 33 percent less likely to act violently, and 50 percent less likely to skip school. However, despite a $30 million increase in funding for mentoring efforts across the country and a growth of mentoring programs to 160 sites in forty states, only 5 percent of youth who need mentors have them.[20]

School Resource Officers (SROs). School resource officers have become an extremely important feature in many schools' violence prevention plans; for many schools, the SRO is the cornerstone of their safety plan. Three main functions define the role of the SRO: law enforcement, law-related counselor, and law-related education teacher. SROs not only provide police visibility, they also provide a positive role model for youth.

Reduced teacher/counselor loads. The majority of school-related incidents are caused by a minority of students. Teachers and counselors, however, often are faced with classes and caseloads that make attention to or sustained relationships with high-need and/or troubled youth difficult. Strategies that address this issue allow teachers and counselors the necessary and crucial opportunity to work with troubled or at-risk students.

Student-Directed Responses

Conflict resolution training. As with any new approach, training and skill development is paramount. Training students and teachers in the specific skills and techniques of conflict resolution is crucial to any school violence prevention plan.

Peer mediation. Peer mediation programs allow students to actively participate in dispute resolution and use many of the skills learned in conflict resolution training. Peer mediation programs empower students by directly involving them in ensuring the safety of their own schools.

Law-related education. Law-related education is directed at teaching students to be successful citizens.[21] Students are educated on a variety of topics, including the legal process, the law, and concepts of justice.

Teen/student courts. Similar in some respects to peer mediation and conflict resolution, teen and student courts, in which youth assume the roles of prosecutors, defenders, judges, and jurors, provide a more formal setting in which youth can actively resolve disputes and apply their law-related education.

Alternative Schools

As the number of suspensions and expulsions have increased, so has the need for alternative schools. These schools provide educational opportunities for expelled youth in a much more tightly controlled environment and have become a necessity with zero-tolerance polices. There is concern, however, about the insufficient number of educational sites and the poor quality of some of the existing ones.

Environmental Design

Physical plant and technological improvements are important components to any school safety plan, and there have been significant advancements in this area. Metal detectors, security cameras, proper

lighting, and building design have significantly helped reduce crime and violence and create safe school environments. Staggering class schedules and dismissal times to avoid hallway congestion also can have a significant positive impact on a school's environment.

Crisis Response

Incidents can occur at any school and at any time. Crisis response plans should be readily available and comprehensive. They should detail the steps that can be taken prior to a crisis (i.e., staff training, action protocols, references, involvement of state and local officials); the steps that can be taken during a crisis (i.e., evacuation, communication, responsibilities of crisis team members); and the steps that can be taken immediately following a crisis (i.e., debriefing, counseling, followup with parents and officials).

State and Local Planning Processes

While there are many different strategies that states and schools can adopt to reduce school violence, any best-practice strategy begins with the planning process itself. A generic best-practice planning model was recently developed by the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence. This framework can be used as a guide to help ensure a planning process that is comprehensive, effective, and dynamic and that draws strength from many different resources. This planning process is designed to be both sequential and iterative in nature.

The steps are as follows.[22]

- **Unite schools with their communities in the effort to prevent violence**. Schools are not islands. They exist within a larger community and need strong links with community leaders, businesses, social service agencies, police, faith-based organizations, juvenile justice authorities, and parents to design an effective violence prevention plan. Such networking introduces additional resources, ideas, and supports. Examples of this type of networking include roundtable discussions, task-specific workgroups, and joint sponsorship of community events.
- **Identify and measure the problem**. As mentioned earlier in this *brief*, there are many definitions and understandings of what constitutes school violence. Prior to moving ahead with a plan, communities and schools must reach consensus on what exactly the problem is and how it is to be measured. Reliable information on victimization, perpetration, substance abuse, and related issues is key. Doing this early in the process builds cohesion and clarifies the issues under consideration.
- **Set goals and objectives**. Goals and objectives should reflect the broad aim of an effort and the specific steps to achieve results. Well-defined, specific goals and objectives provide a strategic blueprint and are crucial to the successful implementation of any plan.
- **Identify appropriate strategies**. Given the complexity of school violence, it is highly unlikely that any one solution will completely address the issue. Planners must recognize that no one solution will be sufficient. Strategies should be multimodal and use various approaches. Existing research on effectiveness, cultural and developmental appropriateness, and other factors must be considered to identify appropriate strategies.
- **Implement a comprehensive plan**. Successful implementation is tailored to each school and should occur through progressive stages. It is crucial that all participants be kept informed of

progress and planning stages. During this phase, issues of staff development, barriers, and budget goals should be considered and addressed.

- **Measure the success of the effort**. Evaluation is central to any successful program. Data collection and analysis should begin immediately to help determine the effectiveness of the strategy.
- **Revise strategies based on the evaluation**. Based on the evaluation's results, programs may need to be adjusted or even scrapped if the results are not promising.

Early Identification

Perhaps the best strategy for preventing school violence and crime is early identification. Three main subtopics are featured here: risk factors for delinquency and violence, early warning signs for violence, and imminent warning signs of violence.

Risk Factors for Delinquency and Violence

Identifying what factors place a youth at risk for violent behavior is difficult. Although research is relatively new and is not necessarily definitive, it can provide a guide for policymakers, school officials, and community leaders in understanding at-risk youth.

Delinquency and violence are closely associated. Identifying factors that place a youth at risk of delinquency will guide understanding in what places a youth at risk of violence. It is essential to note, however, that risk factors are not predictive in nature. They indicate an increase in risk, not a causal relationship.

In a multiyear, longitudinal study of recidivism rates among juvenile offenders in Oregon, the Oregon Social Learning Center (OSLC) found that youth with a combination of any three of the six risk factors listed below had an 80 percent chance of reoffending and being detained. Race and type of arrest were not related to future detainment. These factors are:

- arrest of father,
- arrest of mother,
- documented involvement with child protective services.
- major family transition (one parent within home either left or returned since birth),
- special education services received by child, and
- early history of delinquent/criminal activity (child arrested before the age of fourteen).

OSCL found that while individual indicators did not necessarily indicate risk of arrest, a combination of factors had a significant impact on risk. While these factors do not directly translate into risk factors for school violence, they do offer some guidance for identifying troubled youth.

More general research in identifying risk factors associated with youth violence also has been conducted and can be found in the resources listed in the appendix of this *brief*.

Early Warning Signs for Violence

Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools[23] highlights sixteen early warning signs that help to identify youth who may be prone to violence. Exceptional caution must be taken when considering these signs, however. The guide warns that "there is a real danger that early warning signs

will be misinterpreted."[24] Doing so risks stigmatizing youth. These signs need to be taken and interpreted in the larger context of each student's situation.

They are briefly outlined here.

- **Social withdrawal**. This occurs when youth withdraw partially or totally from social contacts.
- **Excessive feelings of isolation and being alone**. Although the majority of youth who appear isolated and friendless are not violent, research also shows that violent youth often exhibit these same characteristics.
- **Excessive feelings of rejection**. While rejection is often a painful part of growing up, troubled children may experience rejection in a way that may cause them to act out violently and to seek acceptance from other, more aggressive friends.
- **Being a victim of violence**. Victimization, either through sexual or physical abuse, is often a factor for a youth becoming violent.
- **Feelings of being picked on and persecuted**. Youth who feel they have been picked on and/or bullied may withdraw socially and act out inappropriately, including through violence.
- **Low interest and poor academic performance**. While many children do not perform well academically, troubled children's academic performance may undergo a dramatic change. It is crucial to assess the reasons for a student's poor academic performance. For violent youth, feelings of frustration and inadequacy may lead to violent acting-out behaviors.
- **Expression of violence in writing and drawings**. Although many children may make drawings or write stories that are violent in nature, this does not necessarily mean they are troubled. However, a child whose work shows a preponderance of violence over time and is specific in detail may be at risk. In such an instance, a qualified professional should be consulted.
- **Uncontrolled anger**. Anger is a natural emotion. However, youth whose anger is excessively disproportionate to the precipitating cause may be at risk.
- **Patterns of impulsive and chronic hitting, intimidating, and bullying behaviors**. These types of behavior, if allowed to continue unchecked, could pave the way for further violence.
- **History of discipline problems**. Consistently inappropriate behavior at school and within the home may be indicative that a youth's needs are not being met. Becoming accustomed to violating norms and standards of conduct may place these children at higher risk of further, more aggressive violence.
- **Past history of violent and aggressive behavior**. Youth with a history of violent and aggressive behavior, especially if left unaddressed, pose a higher risk. Age of onset is a crucial consideration.
- **Intolerance for differences and prejudicial attitudes**. Exceptional prejudice against certain groups by a youth should be viewed as an early warning sign for violence.
- **Drug use and alcohol use**. Drug and alcohol use increases the likelihood of becoming violent and of being victimized.
- **Affiliation with gangs**. Gang involvement fosters antisocial activities and should be viewed as an early warning sign.
- **Inappropriate access to, possession of, and use of firearms**. Youth with inappropriate access to firearms can have an increased risk for violence. Furthermore, research shows that these youth also have a higher probability of becoming victims of violence.

- **Serious threats of violence.** Unfortunately, threats of violence by students are not uncommon. They should not be treated lightly. Attention to the nature of such threats is crucial to properly reading the signals of potential aggressors.

Imminent Warning Signs of Violence

Related to these early warning signs are imminent warning signs—signs that a youth is decompensating and is moving toward violence. Violent youth typically will exhibit more than one of the preceding signs repeatedly and with increasing severity as they become more unstable and the risk of violence increases. Imminent warning signs are very clear indicators that a youth is in distress and needs immediate attention. They include:

- serious physical fighting with peers or family members;
- severe destruction of property;
- severe rage for seemingly minor reasons;
- detailed threats of lethal violence;
- possession and/or use of a firearm or weapon; and
- self-injurious behaviors or threats of suicide.

Sources for Information and Funding

The information listed here and in the appendix also can be found on NGA's web site at <http://www.nga.org>.

Federal Sources for Information

In light of the recent tragedies, preventing school violence has become a national cause. Efforts to compile information on trends and strategies have begun at many different levels. For example, the U.S. Department of Education (DOEd) and the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) have developed *Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools* to help schools, parents, and communities initiate comprehensive violence prevention plans.[25] The guide is available online at <http://www.ed.gov>. They also have prepared an annual report on school safety that provides parents, schools, and communities with an overview of the scope of school crime, and describes actions schools and communities can take to address this critical issue.[26] The annual report is available at <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SDFS>.

DOEd and DOJ also produced a report entitled *Indicators of School Crime and Safety, 1998*. Divided into five sections, the report uses seventeen indicators of school safety to provide an overall snapshot of school violence and crime across the nation. The sections are: Nonfatal Student Victimization—Student Reports; Violence and Crime at School—Public School Principal/Disciplinarian Reports; Violent Deaths at School; Nonfatal Teacher Victimization at School—Teacher Reports; and School Reports. This report is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo. asp?pubid=98251>.

Statewide Information

Information on school violence varies by state. As of February 1998, according to a research brief from the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, a review of state reporting standards found that eight states—Alabama, California, Delaware, Florida, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia—had either detailed reports of incidents of school violence or were in the process of creating

these reports. The emphasis of each of these reports varies by state, and the range of titles includes a focus on violence, crime, and differing concepts of school safety. Another eight states were creating less detailed reports and thirty-four states did not have reporting systems except those required by the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994.[27]

Any discussion on the availability of information on school violence should include the question of underreporting. While the definition of school violence is clearly important in understanding the issue, much of the available information on school crime statistics is based, in part, on reported incidents. Since these incidents are often used to indicate the overall quality of a school, the question of underreporting of incidents by schools also must be considered.

Federal Funding Sources

Safe and Drug-Free Schools (SDFS) Program. SDFS is funded through DOEd and is designed to reduce substance abuse and violence through education and prevention activities. States and localities are eligible to apply for SDFS funding, which includes state formula grants aimed at education and prevention and other funds with which states can carry out a variety of discretionary initiatives. SDSF's web site is: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SDFS/>.

Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative. The Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative is designed to help schools and communities with planning and implementing comprehensive communitywide strategies. This program is funded by DOJ's Offices of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) and Community Oriented Policing Services; DOEd's Office of Elementary and Secondary Education; and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Center of Mental Health Services. Eligible recipients must demonstrate a comprehensive communitywide strategy that has been developed by a partnership of schools, law officials, providers, families, and representatives of the juvenile justice system and must consist of six elements: school safety; drug and violence prevention and early intervention programs; school and community mental health prevention and intervention services; early childhood psychosocial and emotional development programs; education reform; and safe school policies. The initiative's web site is <http://165.224.220.66/inits/FY99/sdfshapp.html>.

21st Century Community Learning Centers. These centers fund programs in inner-city and rural schools and districts to reduce drug use and violence. While there are statutorily defined categories of services that must be provided under this program, there also is flexibility to fund a wide array of activities. This program is administered through DOEd's Office of Education Research and Improvement. Its web site is <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/21stCCLC/>.

Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIBG). While JAIBG is designed to promote greater accountability within the juvenile justice system, there are two areas where JAIBG funds may be expended on issues related to schools and school violence: one allows funds to be used for interagency information sharing and the others allow funds to be used to establish and maintain programs aimed at protecting students and teachers from drugs, gangs, and youth violence. Eligible recipients of JAIBG funds are state agencies. However, 75 percent of JAIBG funds must be passed through to local governments. Information on JAIBG can be found on OJJDP's web site at <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/95081.pdf>.

Title V Community Prevention Grants. Community prevention grants also are administered by OJJDP. Although these funds are more restrictive, with their main purpose being the support of community-based crime prevention planning efforts, these activities could include the issue of preventing school violence. State advisory groups (SAGs) are eligible to apply for Title V funds. In turn, SAGs fund, through a competitive process, local units of government. Their web site is <http://ojjdp.ncjrs.org/grants/grants.html>.

Project SERV. $12 million has been proposed to fund the School Emergency Response to Violence, or Project SERV. Similar to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Project SERV is designed to give states and local communities access to federal funds in the event of a school violence-related crisis. Project SERV focuses on:

- providing immediate assistance for emergency response,
- establishing coordinated federal response to school crises,
- strengthening the ability of states and communities to respond to school crises, and
- supporting research evaluation.[28]

Further information about these programs is available in the appendix of this *brief* as well as on NGA's web site at <http://www.nga.org/>.

Conclusion

While the overall decline in the number of incidents of school violence is heartening, the recent high-profile incidents are a wake-up call that more must be done to make schools safer. To promote safe and orderly schools, policymakers must adopt strategies that are multimodal, comprehensive, and coordinated with schools, communities, businesses, public and private agencies, parents, and elected officials. No one intervention will accomplish this, and schools cannot do this alone.

Appendix

Additional Reports on School Violence

Violence in America's Public Schools: Five Years Later. This document is a followup to a 1993 study of students' and teachers' incidents of school-related violence. The study surveyed 1,044 students (third through twelfth grades), 1,000 teachers, and 100 law enforcement officials. More information on this study is available by contacting MetLife, The American Teacher Survey, P.O. Box 807, Madison Square Station, New York, New York 10159-0807, or at <http://www.metlife.com>.

School Safety: The Efforts of States and School Programs to Make Schools Safe. Available by contacting the National Criminal Justice Association, 444 N. Capitol Street. N.W., Suite 618, Washington, D.C. 20001, 202/624-1440, or at <http://www.sso.org/ncja>.

Comprehensive Framework for School Violence Prevention and *Effective Programs and Strategies to Create Safe Schools.* Available through the Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence, George Washington University, 1925 North Lynn Street, Suite 305, Rosslyn, Virginia 22209, 703/527-4217.

Organizations

U.S. Department of Justice
Office for Victims of Crime
810 7th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531
Phone: 202/307-5983
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/ovc/>

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 7th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531
Phone: 202/307-5911
Fax: 202/307-2093
<http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org>
E-mail: askjj@ojp.usdoj.gov

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 6000
Rockville, Maryland 20849-6000
Phone: 800/638-8736
Fax: 301/519-5215
E-mail: askncjrs@ncjrs.org

Oregon Social Learning Center
160 E. 4th Ave.
Eugene, Oregon 97401
Phone: 541/485-2711
Fax: 541/485-7087
<http://www.oslc.org/>

Vera Institute of Justice
377 Broadway
New York, New York 10013
Phone: 212/334-1300
Fax: 212/941-9407
<http://www.vera.org/>

National Center for Education Statistics
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208-5574
Phone: 202/219-1828
<http://nces.ed.gov/>

The National Education Goals Panel
1255 22nd Street, N.W., Suite 502
Washington, D.C. 20037
Fax: 202/632-0957 or 202/632-1032
E-mail: NEGP@ed.gov
<http://www.negp.gov/>

National School Safety Center
Ronald D. Stephens, Executive Director
141 Duesenberg Drive, Suite 11
Westlake Village, California 91362
Phone: 805/373-9977
<http://www.nssc1.org>

Center for the Prevention of School Violence
Dr. Pamela L. Riley, Executive Director
20 Enterprise Street, Suite 2
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607-7375
Phone: 800/299-6054
<http://www.ncsu.edu/cpsv/>

National Resource Center for Safe Schools
Carlos Sundermann, Program Director
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: 800/547-6339 (ext.131)
E-mail: safeschools@nwrel.org

National Alliance for Safe Schools
Peter D. Blauvelt, President and CEO
P.O. Box 1068
College Park, Maryland 20741
Phone: 301/935-6063
<http://www.safeschools.org>

Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence
Delbert S. Elliott, Director
University of Colorado
Campus Box 442
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0442
Phone: 303/492-1032
<http://www.colorado.edu/UCB/Research/cspv>

Institute on Violence and Destructive Behavior
Hill M. Walker, Co-Director
Jeffrey Sprague, Co-Director
University of Oregon
1265 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-1265
Phone: 800/824-2714
<http://www.darkwing.uoregon.edu/~ivdb/>

National Association of School Psychologists
4340 East West Highway, Suite 402
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
Phone: 301/657-0270
Fax: 301/657-0275
TDD: 301/657-4155
<http://www.naspweb.org/>

Safe and Drug Free Schools Program
William Modzeleski, Director
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., 3E314
Washington, D.C. 20202-6123
Phone: 202/260-3654
<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SDFS/>

Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202-0498
Phone: 800/USA-LEARN (800/872-5327)
<http://165.224.220.66/inits/FY99/sdfshapp.html>

21st Century Community Learning Centers
U.S. Department of Education
OERI
555 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208
Phone: 202/219-2204
<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/21stCCLC/>

Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and
Community Violence
Paul Kingery, Director
1925 N. Lynn Street, Suite 305
Rosslyn, VA 22209
Phone: 703/527-4217 ext. 104
Fax:703/527-8741
E-mail: Kingery@gwu.edu

State School Safety Centers

State	Program Name/Address	Contact Person	Phone/Fax/E-mail
California	Safe Schools and Violence Prevention Office California Department of Education 560 J Street, Suite 260 Sacramento, CA 95814	Ms. Mary Weaver Program Administrator	Phone: 916/323-2183 Fax: 916/323-6061
Connecticut	Drugs Don't Work Connecticut Safe Schools Coalition 30 Harbor Street Hartford, CT 06106	Ms. Kathy Boone	Phone: 860/231-8311
Kentucky	Kentucky Center for School Safety Eastern Kentucky University 300 Stratton Building 521 Lancaster Avenue Richmond, KY 40475	Dr. Bruce Wolford Dr. Lois Adams-Rogers Co-Directors	Phone: 606/622-1498 Fax: 606/622-6264 E-mail: brucetrc@iclub.org <www.kysafeschools.org>
Missouri	Missouri Center for Safe Schools University of Missouri, Kansas City School of Education 340 Education Building 5100 Rockhill Road Kansas City, MO 64110	Dr. Pat Henley Director	Phone: 816/235-5657 Fax: 816/235-5270
New Hampshire	New Hampshire Department of Education State Office Park South 101 Pleasant Street Concord, NH 03301	Mr. Gerald P. Bourgeois Administrator for School Safety	Phone: 603/271-3828 Fax: 603/271-3830
New York	New York State School Safety Center New York State Education Department Comprehensive Health & Pupil Services 318 EB Albany, NY 12234	Ms. Arlene Sheffield Director	Phone: 518/486 6090

State	Program Name/Address	Contact Person	Phone/Fax/E-mail
North Carolina	Center for the Prevention of School Violence 20 Enterprise Street, Suite 2 Raleigh, NC 27609	Dr. Pamela Riley Director	Phone: 919/515-9397 Fax: 919/515-9561 E-mail: pamela_riley@ncsu.edu
Pennsylvania	Office for Safe Schools Pennsylvania Department of Education Bureau of Community & Student Services 333 Market Street, 5th Floor Harrisburg, PA 17126	Ms. Charles Spanno Director	Phone: 717/783-3755 Fax: 717/783-6617
South Carolina	Safe and Drug Free Schools South Carolina State Department of Education Room 1108 1429 Senate Street Columbia, SC 29201	Ms. Bunny Mack Coordinator	Phone: 803/734-8573 Fax: 803/734-2983 E-mail: bmack@sde.state.sc.us
Tennessee	Center for Safe and Drug Free Schools 3782 Jackson Avenue Memphis, TN 38108	Mr. Ken Strong Supervising Psychologist	Phone: 901/385-4240 Fax: 901/385-4221
Texas	Safe Schools, Chapter 37 1701 North Congress Avenue Austin, TX 78701-1494	Mr. Billy G. Jacobs Program Director	Phone: 512/463-9073 Fax: 512/475-3638
Virginia	State Department of Education Commonwealth of Virginia P. O. Box. 2120 Richmond, VA 23218	Ms. Marsha Hubbard Safe School Specialist	Phone: 804/225-2928 Fax: 804/371-8796
Washington	Washington State School Safety Center Drug-Free Schools and Communities Programs, OSPI P. O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200	Ms. Denise Fitch Director	Phone: 360/753-5595 Fax: 360/664-3028

Model Programs

The Blueprint Program. Colorado and Pennsylvania initiated funding for a project through the Center for Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV) to identify ten violence prevention programs "that met a very high scientific standard of program effectiveness—programs that could provide an initial nucleus for a national violence prevention initiative."[29] Blueprints were "designed to be very practical descriptions of effective programs that would allow states, communities, and individual agencies to: (1) determine the appropriateness of this intervention for their state or community; (2) provide a realistic cost estimate for this intervention; (3) provide an assessment of the organizational capacity needed to ensure its successful start-up and operation over time; and (4) give some indication of the potential barriers and obstacles that might be encountered when attempting to implement this type of intervention."[30]

The Blueprint Program identified ten model programs that met these rigorous standards and had been replicated at more than one site. They are:

Big Brothers Big Sisters
Bullying Prevention Programs
Functional Family Therapy
Life Skills Training
Midwestern Prevention Program
Multisystemic Therapy
Nurse Home Visitation
Quantum Opportunities
PATHS
Treatment Foster Care

More information on the Blueprint Program can be found at <http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/>.

---

[1] This project was supported by Grant No. 98-IJ-CX-0054 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

[2] U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice, *Annual Report on School Safety 1998* (Washington, D.C.: Authors), 1.

[3] Louis Harris and Associates, Inc. (Conducted for Metropolitan Life Insurance Company), *The American Teacher 1999* (Louis Harris and Associates, Inc., 1998), 66.

[4] This is supported both by the *Annual Report on School Safety 1998* and by comments made by Christopher Stone of the Vera Institute during the February 1999 Executive Forum on Combating School Violence.

[5] U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice, *Annual Report on School Safety 1998* (Washington, D.C.: Authors), 3.

[6] Comments from Dr. Pam Riley, *Washington Post* interactive chat interview, May 1999.

[7] Comments made by Christopher Stone during the February 1999 Executive Forum on Combating School Violence.

[8] Kaufman, P., Chen, X., Choy, S.P., Chandler, K.A. Chapman, C.D., Rand, M.R. and Ringel, C. *Indicators of School Crime and Safety, 1988.* (U.S. Departments of Education and Justice. NCES 98-251/NCJ-172215. Washington, D.C.: 1998), 30.

[9] U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence.* Cited in *National Safe Schools Week* (October 19–23, 1998), Center for the Prevention of School Violence, 1.

[10] Kaufman et al., vi.

[11] U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice, *Annual Report on School Safety 1998* (Washington, D.C.: Authors), 1.

[12] Kaufman et al, 8.

[13] National Center for Education Statistics, *Violence and Discipline Problems in U.S. Public Schools: 1996–1997*, 1998). Cited in *National Safe Schools Week: October 19–23, 1998*, Center for the Prevention of School Violence.

[14] Ibid.

[15] U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice, *Annual Report on School Safety 1998* (Washington, D.C.: Authors), 2.

[16] 1997–1998 PRIDE Survey, Parent Resource Institute for Drug Education (PRIDE), 1998.

[17] U.S. Department of Education, *Report on State Implementation of the Gun-Free Schools Act—School Year: 1996–1997*, (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1997). Cited in *National Safe Schools Week: October 19–23, 1998*, Center for the Prevention of School Violence, 1.

[18] Kaufman et al., 26.

[19] National Educational Goals Panel, *NEGP Weekly.* (Vol. 2, No. 3, April 28, 1999.)

[20] Comments made by Shay Bilchik at February 1999 Executive Forum on Combating School Violence.

[21] Information from the Center for the Prevention of School Violence, Internet document.

[22] Hamilton Fish Institute on School and Community Violence, *Comprehensive Framework for School Violence Prevention.* (Rosslyn, Virginia: Author, 2/8/99.)

[23] Dwyer, K., Osher, D., and Warger, C. *Early Warning, Timely Response: A Guide to Safe Schools.* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1998.)

[24] Dwyer et al., 7.

[25] Ibid.

[26] U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Justice, *Annual Report on School Safety 1998* (Washington, D.C.: Authors), i.

[27] Center for the Prevention of School Violence, *Center.Link Research, School Violence Incident Reporting in the United States*, Number 3, February 1998.

[28] White House Press Release, *Project SERV: School Emergency Response to Violence* (October 15, 1998).

[29] *About Blueprints*, Internet document.

[30] Ibid.

Executive Policy Forum 2:

Dealing with Violent Juveniles

May 17-18, 1999
Hyatt Regency Dearborn
Dearborn, Michigan

National Governors' Association
Center for Best Practices
444 North Capitol Street
Suite 267
Washington, D.C. 20001-1512

Telephone (202) 624-5300
http://www.nga.org/Center

NGA *Center for Best Practices*

March 26, 1999

To All Governors' Chiefs of Staff:

The NGA Center for Best Practices, with support from the National Institute for Justice, and the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, invites you to attend the second of three policy forums for governor's advisors and state officials focusing on combating violent juvenile crime. The forum, *Dealing with Violent Juvenile Offenders,* will be held May 17-18 at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Dearborn, Michigan. The meeting is being co-hosted by the Office of Michigan Governor, John Engler.

The attached agenda outlines the topics that will be covered in the one and one-half day meeting. The meeting will begin at 9:00 AM on Monday, May 17, and end just after noon on Tuesday, May 18. The policy forum will include presentations by leading experts who will summarize the latest research on juvenile crime, and discussions with cutting-edge practitioners and policymakers who will describe best practices being implemented at both the state and local levels. Participants will have the opportunity to share their ideas and outline the political, policy, administrative, and programmatic strategies they have found to be effective.

Participation in each forum will be limited to about thirty-five people to promote interaction and a dynamic state-to-state exchange. Registrations will be accepted on a first come, first serve basis with preference being given to states that did not participate in the first forum.

The National Institute for Justice will arrange and pay for participant travel to Dearborn, per diem and lodging at the Hyatt Regency Hotel.

To register for the forum, please return the attached registration form to NGA by no later than April 15, 1999. You will receive confirmation of your registration soon after it is received and a representative of the Institute for Law and Justice will contact you regarding travel arrangements.

If you have any questions, please call Evelyn Ganzglass at 202/624-5394.

Sincerely,

John Thomasian
Director
NGA Center for Best Practices

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director
Employment and Social Services
Policy Studies Division

CC: Governor's Policy Director
Governor's Public Safety Advisor
Washington Representative/NGA Staff Contact

NGA/NIJ
Dealing with Violent Juvenile Offenders
Executive Policy Forum

AGENDA

May 17-18, 1999

Hyatt Regency Dearborn
Dearborn, Michigan

Monday, May 17, 1999

8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. **Registration and Coffee Service** *Outside Regency A/B/C*

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Welcome and Opening Remarks** *Regency A/B/C*

The Honorable John Engler
Governor of Michigan
Lansing, Michigan

John Schwarz
Deputy Director
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

John J. Wilson
Deputy Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. **Painting a National Picture: How Juvenile Offenders are Affecting the Crime Rate**

Howard Snyder
Director of Systems Research
National Center for Juvenile Justice
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

9:30 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. **Framing State Issues**

* What are the dynamics in my state?
* How big is the juvenile crime problem?
* What's working and what can we do better?

Angela J. Davis
Associate Professor
Washington College of Law
The American University
Washington, DC

Nolan Jones
Director
Human Resources Group
National Governors' Association
Washington, DC

11:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m. **Break**

11:15 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Why Kids Offend? Risk Factors Associated with Violent Juvenile Offending**

Kimberly Kempf-Leonard
Associate Professor
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Missouri – St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. **Working Luncheon** *Regency D*

What We Know about Programs that Work

Patrick Tolan
Project Director
The Institute for Juvenile Research
Department of Psychiatry
University of Illinois at Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. **Strategies to Address Treatment and Sanctions of Violent Juvenile Offenders** *Regency A/B/C*

Moderator:

Nolan Jones
Director
Human Resources Group
National Governors' Association
Washington, DC

Presenters:

Craig Dearden
Commissioner
Utah Department of Public Safety
Salt Lake City, Utah

Gregory Pittman
Probate Court Judge
Juvenile Court
Meskegon, Michigan

Howard Snyder
Director of Systems Research
National Center for Juvenile Justice
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Invited Guest
Youth Crime Gun Interdiction Initiative
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms
Washington, DC

3:30 p.m. – 3:45 p.m. **Break**

3:45 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. **Breakout Tables**

Solutions for Troubled Youth

Thomas Webber
Executive Director
Edwin Gould Academy
New York, New York
and
Joanne Archontakis
Coordinator of Research and Public Relations
Edwin Gould Academy
New York, New York

Race and Gender Issues in Juvenile Case Processing

Kimberly Kempf-Leonard
Associate Professor
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Missouri – St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri

Alternatives to Incarceration – How to Create Accountability

Edwin W. Zedlewski
Assistant Director
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

The Role of Drug Testing in Screening and Assessment of Violent Youthful Offenders

Jerome Gallagher
Executive Director
Project Century
Court Testing and Treatment Clinic
Lansing, Michigan

7:30 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. **Continental Breakfast with Breakout Tables** *Regency A/B/C*

Confidentiality and Information Sharing

John J. Wilson
Deputy Administrator
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

A Restorative Approach

Dennis Maloney
Director
Deschutes County Department of Community Justice
Bend, Oregon

School Safety

Kenneth S. Trump
President/CEO
National School Safety and Security Services
Cleveland, Ohio

8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m. **Financing Juvenile Placement**

Mark W. Jasonowicz
Deputy Director
Michigan Family Independence Agency
Lansing, Michigan

Carol Rapp Zimmermann
Assistant Director
Department of Youth Services
Columbus, Ohio

9:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. **The Roles are Changing: A Discussion on Handling Juvenile Offenders in Juvenile and Criminal Justice Systems**

Gregory Pittman
Probate Court Judge
Juvenile Court
Meskegon, Michigan

Catherine M. Ryan
Chief
Juvenile Justice Bureau
Cook County State's Attorneys Office
Chicago, Illinois

10:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	**Break**

11:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **From Corrections to Community**

David M. Altschuler
Principal Research Scientist
Institute for Policy Studies
Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

Dennis Maloney
Director
Deschutes County Department of Community Justice
Bend, Oregon

12:30 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. **Wrap Up and Next Steps**

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director
Employment and Social Services Policy Studies
Center for Best Practices
National Governors' Association
Washington, DC

ATTENDEE LIST

NGA/NIJ Handling Violent Juvenile Offenders
Executive Policy Forum

February 11-12, 1999

Jennifer Adger
Policy Analyst
Office of the Governor
600 Dexter Avenue
Montgomery, AL 36130
334-353-1159
334-353-3012(Fax)
jadger@governor.state.al.us

Susan Alford
Deputy Director
Treatment Services
South Carolina Department of Juvenile Justice
P.O. Box 21069
Columbia, SC 29212
803-896-9797
803-896-9767(Fax)

Kim M. Allen
Executive Director
Criminal Justice Council
Kentucky Justice Cabinet
Bush Building, 2nd Floor
403 Wapping Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
502-564-3251
502-564-5244(Fax)
kim.allen@mail.state.ky.us

David M. Altschuler
Principal Research Scientist
Institute for Policy Studies
Johns Hopkins University
Wyman Park Building, 5th Floor
3400 N. Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218
410-516-7179
410-516-8233(Fax)
dma@jhunix@hcf.jhu.edu

Joanne Archontakis
Coordinator of Research and Public Relations
Edwin Gould Academy
23 Gramarcy Park, South
New York, NY 10003
212-982-5200
212-982-6886(Fax)

Shelley Borysiewicz
Staff Associate
Office of Public Affairs
National Governors' Association
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-5333
202-624-8832(Fax)
sborysiewicz@nga.org

Donna P. Bowman
Youth Safety Specialist
Criminal Justice Analyst
Department of Criminal
Crime Prevention Center
805 E. Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219
804-371-8981
804-371-6506(Fax)
dbowman@dcjs@state.va.us

Maritere Brignoni
Advisor to the Governor
Office of Public Safety
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 902-0082
San Juan, PR 00902
787-721-2840
787-721-8589(Fax)
mbrignoni@fortaleza_prstar.net

Edward F. Connors
President
Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703-684-5300
703-739-5533(Fax)
econnors@ilj.org

Erin Dalton
Special Assistant to the Deputy Director
Office of Development and Communications
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-5752
202-307-6394(Fax)
daltona@ojp.usdoj.gov

Angela J. Davis
Associate Professor
Washington College of Law
The American University
4801 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Room 388
Washington, DC 20016
202-274-4230
202-274-4130(Fax)

Craig Dearden
Commissioner
Utah Department of Public Safety
4501 S. 2700, West
Box 141775
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-1775
801-965-4463
801-965-4608(Fax)

John Engler
Governor of Michigan
P.O. Box 30013
Lansing, MI 48909
517-373-3400
517-241-2910(Fax)

Dianne Gadow
Superintendent
Department of Services for Children, Youth, and their Families
Division of Youth Rehabilition Services
Ferris School
959 Centre Road
Wilmington, DE 19805
302-993-3811
302-993-3820(Fax)

Jerome Gallagher
Executive Director
Project Century
Court Testing and Treatment Clinic
2301 E. Michigan Avenue
Lansing, MI 48912
517-372-7700
517-372-0054(Fax)

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director
Employment and Social Services Policy Studies
Center for Best Practices
National Governors' Association
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-5394
202-624-5313(Fax)
eganzglass@nga.org

Steve Gibson
Superintendent
Department of Corrections
Pine Hills Youth Facility
108 N. Haynes Avenue
Miles City, MT 59301
406-232-1377
406-232-7432(Fax)

Thomas A. Ginster
Criminal Justice Policy Advisor
State Government Affairs Division
Executive Office of the Governor
111 S. Capitol Avenue, 3rd Floor
Lansing, MI 48933
517-373-7949
517-335-0118(Fax)
ginstert@mail.state.mi.us

Deborah Hartz
Cabinet Secretary
Department of Children, Youth, and Families
P.O. Drawer 5160
Santa Fe, NM 87502-5160
505-827-7602
505-827-4053(Fax)

George L. Hinchliffe
Assistant Secretary
Department of Juvenile Justice
2737 Centerview Drive
Tallahassee, FL 32399-3100
850-921-4188
850-414-2264(Fax)
glhinchliffe@djj.state.fl.us

George Holden
Regional Consultant
Office of Juvenile Justice
Office of the Governor
225 Green Street, Suite 504
Fayetteville, NC 28301
910-486-1425
910-486-9472(Fax)

Manfred G. Holland
Deputy Commissioner
Division of Corrections
Department of Military Affairs and Public Safety
Capitol Complex
112 California Avenue
Charleston, WV 25305-0280
304-558-2036
304-558-5934(Fax)
mhollan1@mail.wvnet.edu

Leon Huff
Regional Director
Juvenile Justice
Kentucky Justice Cabinet
916 N. Mulberry Street
Elizabethtown, KY 42701
502-766-5201
502-766-5203(Fax)
dlhuff@mail.state.ky.us

Darnell Jackson
Director
Office of Drug Control Policy
Lewis Cass Building, 2nd Floor
320 S. Walnut Street
Lansing, MI 48913
517-373-4700
517-373-2963(Fax)

Silvia R. Jackson
Assistant Administrator
Division of Juvenile Corrections
Department of Corrections
149 E. Wilson Street
P.O. Box 8930
Madison, WI 53708-8930
608-267-3691
608-267-3693(Fax)
silvia.jackson@doc.state.wi.us

Mark W. Jasonowicz
Deputy Director
Michigan Family Independence Agency
235 S. Grand Avenue
Lansing, MI 48909
517-373-7500
517-335-6101(Fax)

Bob Jester
Area Coordinator
Oregon Youth Authority
2630 N. Pacific Highway
Woodburn, OR 97071
503-982-4438
503-982-4439(Fax)

Nolan E. Jones
Director
Human Resources Group
National Governors' Association
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-5360
202-624-5313(Fax)
njones@nga.org

Kimberly Kempf Leonard
Associate Professor
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice
University of Missouri - St. Louis
748 Yale Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63130
314-516-5035
kleonard@umsl.edu

Akiva Liberman
Social Science Analyst
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-4919
libermaa@ojp.usdoj.gov

Thomas M. MacLellan
Policy Analyst
Employment and Social Services Division
National Governors' Association
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001-1512
202-624-5427
202-624-5313(Fax)

Dennis Maloney
Director
Deschutes County Department of Community Justice
1128 N.W. Harriman
Bend, OR 97701
541-388-6673
541-383-1525(Fax)

Larry D. Miesner
Director
Office of Juvenile Justice
Michigan Family Independence Agency
235 S. Grand Avenue, Suite 401
Lansing, MI 48933
517-335-3489
517-373-2799(Fax)
miesnerl@state.mi.us

Mark Noel
Extradition/Clemency Coordinator
Office of the Governor's Legal Counsel
121 State Capitol
Denver, CO 80203
303-866-2880
303-866-6399(Fax)
mark.noel@state.co.us

Gregory Pittman
Probate Court Judge
Juvenile Court
Muskegon County
Muskegon County Building, 5th Floor
Muskegon, MI 49442
616-724-6241
616-724-6232(Fax)

Kristine D. Ragaglia
Commissioner
Department of Children and Families
505 Hudson Street, 10th Floor
Hartford, CT 06106-7107
860-550-6300
860-566-7947(Fax)

Carol Rapp Zimmermann
Assistant Director
Department of Youth Services
51 N. High Street
Columbus, OH 43215
614-466-8783
614-752-9078(Fax)

Catherine M. Ryan
Chief
Juvenile Justice Bureau
Cook County State's Attorneys Office
1100 S. Hamilton, 6th Floor
Chicago, IL 60612
312-433-7028
312-433-4832(Fax)

John Schwarz
Deputy Director
National Institute of Justice
Office of Development and Communications
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-305-4893
202-307-6394(Fax)
schwarzj@ojp.usdoj.gov

Stewart Simonson
Legal Counsel to the Governor
Office of the Governor
Room 125 South, State Capitol
P.O. Box 7863
Madison, WI 53707
608-266-1212
608-267-8983(Fax)
stewart.simonson@gov.state.wi.us

Lisa Skiles
Policy Analyst
Senior Staff to the Governor
Office of the Governor
State Capitol, Room 124
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307-777-7929
307-632-3909(Fax)
lskiles@missc.state.wy.us

Howard Snyder
Director of Systems Research
National Center for Juvenile Justice
710 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3000
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-3000
412-227-6950
412-227-6955(Fax)

Thomas Webber
Executive Director
Edwin Gould Academy
23 Gramarcy Park, South
New York, NY 10003
212-982-5200
212-982-6886(Fax)

Patrick Tolan
Project Director
The Institute for Juvenile Research
Department of Psychiatry
University of Illinois at Chicago
MC 747
907 S. Wolcott
Chicago, IL 60612-7347
312-413-1893
312-413-1703(Fax)

Dawn Wilson
Senior Advisor to the Lieutenant Governor
Policy Advisor to the Governor
Office of the Governor
State Capitol
Des Moines, IA 50319
515-281-0167
515-281-6611(Fax)
dawn.wilson@igov.state.ia.us

Kenneth S. Trump
President/CEO
National School Safety and
Security Services
P.O. Box 110123
Cleveland, OH 44111
216-251-3067
216-251-4417(Fax)
kentrump@aol.com

John J. Wilson
Deputy Director
Office of Juvenile Justice and
Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-3627
202-514-6382(Fax)

Debra Valentine
Director of Juvenile Institutions
Department of Children's Services and
Institutional Support
Cordell Hull Building, 9th Floor
436 Sixth Avenue, North
Nashville, TN 37243
615-741-9866
615-741-7322(Fax)
e108589@sd17.e10150

Edwin W. Zedlewski
Assistant Director
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-2953
202-307-6394(Fax)
edwin@ojp.usdoj.gov

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

Issue Brief

Employment and Social Services
Contact: Thomas M. MacLellan, 202/624-5427
February 14, 2000

Dealing with Violent Juvenile Offenders[1]

Executive Summary

Despite recent drops in juvenile crime, including violent juvenile crime, there is little dispute among experts, policymakers, and the general public that the rates of juvenile crime and violence remain too high. Juveniles are not just the perpetrators, however, they are also the victims. Juveniles are more than two-and-a-half times more likely to be the victims of violent crime than adults. While the recent decreases are encouraging, much remains to be done.

Rates of violent juvenile crime are declining.

The good news is that Governors and policymakers now have more information available to them as they strive to design more effective treatment and prevention strategies. Through rigorous evaluations, research has begun to identify which program models and strategies reduce crime and violence and which do not. This research can help policymakers make critical funding decisions. For example, understanding that the majority of juvenile crime—especially violent juvenile crime—is committed by a minority of youth suggests that there is a need for effective identification and differentiation strategies and targeted high-impact efforts. Targeted interventions aimed at this small group of juvenile offenders will conceivably have the greatest impact on crime reduction and maximization of resources. There is also a strong link between child abuse and neglect and later violent offenses. While not all abused or neglected youth become offenders, an overwhelming percentage of violent youth come from abusive backgrounds. Any comprehensive violence reduction strategy should also look at ways to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect.

The majority of juvenile crime is committed by a minority of youth. For example, the juvenile violent crime index for 1995 indicates that less than on half of one percent of juveniles were responsible for all indexed violent crimes that year.

Source: H. N. Synder, Juvenile Justice Bulletin: Juvenile Arrests 1995, *February 1997, 4.*

Understanding the factors that increase a youth's chance for becoming violent is important. It is equally important, however, to understand the factors that decrease the chances of a youth becoming violent. Regardless of risk, most youth do not commit violence. Rather, they are protected by a source of personal assets that keep them from offending. State strategies that recognize the role and influence of risk factors, yet build upon the characteristics of youth which protect them from risk, hold the key to a long-term, comprehensive violence reduction strategy.

States are at the forefront of establishing juvenile policy. Through executive branch agencies and leadership, governors can promote targeted intervention efforts, innovation, research, and inter- and intra-agency coordination. They can form independent commissions and use the legislative agenda to promote effective and comprehensive violence reduction strategies and programs that tap into current research.

Introduction: A Changing Environment

Beginning in the mid- to late 1980s and lasting until around 1994, juvenile crime rates in the United States rose precipitously in virtually all categories. However, the last few years have seen a significant lessening of this trend. Currently, the overall juvenile crime rate is comparable to what it was prior to 1985 and about average for the last thirty years. This decline has caused researchers to revise predictions downward of a major spike in youth violence early in the new millennium. With few exceptions, however, the juvenile crime rate remains unacceptably high.

Table 1
Principles of Effective Service Delivery

1. Delivered Early
2. Multicomponent, Multitargeted
3. Problemsolving, Focused
4. Family Focused, Support Development
5. Structured, Planned, Goal-Oriented, Consistent Methods
6. Bring Together/Work with all Relevant Systems
7. Focuses on the Ecology of the Problem and its Solutions
8. Strong Case Supervision with Adequate Caseloads
9. Regular Opportunity for Case Discussion, Skill Development, and Professional Satisfaction of Direct Service Providers
10. Service Intensity Based on Case Need, Not Service Provider or Agency Scheduling Conveniences

Source: Dr. Patrick Tolan, May 1999.

While dealing with violent juvenile offenders is not a new issue, there have been many significant changes policymakers should be aware of including a change in the pattern and nature of juvenile crime and violence. Research indicates that while individual juveniles do not commit more violent acts today than youth fifteen years ago, more juveniles are being arrested for committing violent crimes.[2] Given this, among other things, states will need more intermediate sanctions and other nontraditional options to incarceration to meet this increased need.

Despite these challenges, there have been positive developments in dealing with violent juvenile offenders. Scientific advances in understanding what works in treatment are allowing policymakers and providers to build on proven practices in designing effective treatment systems. While this body of research is still growing, its potential impact on improving the effectiveness of dealing with violent juvenile offenders is significant. Changes in the legal context surrounding violent juvenile offenders also has altered the landscape that policymakers work within. Whether policymakers welcome these changes or not, they need to understand their impact as they seek solutions for dealing with violent juvenile offenders

Trends of Juvenile Violence

In examining the trends of juvenile crime and violence, arrest rates are only one source of important information. A comprehensive examination of current trends also considers victimization data.

Violent Crime Index

The juvenile violent crime index is a composite of various violent crimes including murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault.[3] It provides an overview of the scope of juvenile violence. For example, in 1995, there were 147,700 indexed violent crimes committed by juveniles. This figure, when compared to 1986 data, indicates a 67 percent increase in juvenile arrest for violent crime.[4] Although more recent data indicate a lessening of this trend, this statistic is significant.

Juveniles are more than 2.7 times more likely than adults to be the victims of violent crime and be injured as a result. For example, in 1994, the victimization rates for juveniles as compared to adults was 116 per thousand versus 43 per thousand for adults.[5]

Homicide

Juvenile homicides rates began to rise in 1984 and peaked in 1994, when juveniles were implicated in 16 percent of all homicides. In 1995, despite a 17 percent decrease in the number of homicides committed by juveniles nationwide, 2,300, juveniles were implicated in 1,900 murders.[6]

Between 1985 and 1995, nearly 25,000 juveniles were murdered in the U.S. (2,600 in 1995 alone).[7] One third of these murders occurred in ten counties.[8] This represents a 66 percent increase in the number of juveniles murdered between 1985 and 1995. Nearly all of this increase was firearm-related.

Overrepresentation of Minorities

Homicide. In terms of total crime, white juveniles accounted for 69 percent of all arrests and black juveniles accounted for 28 percent. Prior to 1987, there were roughly equal numbers of white and black juvenile homicide offenders, but after 1987, the majority of juvenile homicide offenders were black. As of 1994, 61 percent of all juvenile homicide offenders were black.[9]

Custody Facilities. Despite attempts to curb the disproportionate representation of minorities in custody facilities, this number has actually increased. While 32 percent of the U.S. population ages ten to seventeen were classified as minorities in 1995, minorities made up 68 percent of the detention center population. Similarly, the minority proportion in public long-term facilities (such as training schools) rose from 56 percent in 1983 to 69 percent in 1991. In 1995 it was 68 percent.[10]

Child "Maltreatment"

An overwhelming percentage of violent juvenile offenders were abused or neglected as children. In many ways, abuse and neglect statistics provide an indicator of future risk. Youth with a history of maltreatment have a 25 percent greater risk for a variety of problems, including violence, substance abuse, teen pregnancy, poor school performance, and mental illness.[11]

Between 1980 and 1994 reports of child maltreatment rose 154 percent. "Maltreatment" is defined as physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, and educational neglect. In 1993, more than 2.8 million children were identified as maltreated, and in 1994 nearly 2 million reports of child abuse or neglect were filed with child protective service agencies. Some of this increase is linked to a greater willingness to report suspected abuses, but incidences of child abuse and neglect remain high.

Female Offenders

Although the numbers of female offenders is significantly less than males, rates of offenses by females continues to increase while similar offenses by males have decreased. For example, between 1992 and 1996, the number of juvenile females arrested for violent offenses increased 25 percent with no similar increase for males. Similarly, juvenile female arrests for property crime offenses (burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, arson) increased 21 percent, while juvenile male arrests in this category decreased 4 percent.[12]

Risk Factors for Predicting Youth Violence

Violent behavior is the result of a complex interaction of individual, contextual (family, school, and peers), situational, and community factors.[13] Recognizing what factors predict juvenile violence is essential since juveniles with the most risk factors are five times to twenty times more likely to engage in serious, violent, and chronic offending.[14]

Several key characteristics—family, peer and school factors, neighborhood, environment, and daily activities—play essential roles in determining the risk of a juvenile becoming violent.[15] However, the "most powerful" demographic predictors of individual violent criminality are gender, age, and race.[16] The majority of violent juvenile offenders are males who begin this behavior by age fifteen.

Table 2 orders risk factors, in conjunction with developmental sequencing of life experiences, associated with serious violent juvenile offending. This chart can be a guide to help gauge the risk of a youth becoming violent over the various stages of childhood and adolescence. For example, a practitioner who sees a male infant who has had a neurological trauma, who has a difficult temperament, and has a young mother who shows signs of depression and is a substance abuser, will know the child is at risk of becoming a violent offender later in life. With this understanding, preventative measures can be taken which may reduce the chances of the child becoming violent.

Table 2.

Approximate Order of Risk Factors Relevant to the Developments of Disruptive and Serious Delinquent Behavior[17]

	Prenatal/Infancy	Toddler/Preschool	Middle Childhood/ Early Adolescence	Mid-Adolescence/ Early Adulthood
Risk Factors Emerging During Pregnancy and From Infancy Onward				
Child	Difficult temperament			
	Hyperactivity/impulsiveness/attention problems			
	Low intelligence			
	Male gender			
	Neurotoxin/neurological insult			
	Pregnancy and delivery complications			
Family	Young mother			
	Maternal depression			
	Parental substance abuse/antisocial or criminal behavior			
	Poor parent-child communication			
	Poverty/low socioeconomic status			
	Serious marital discord			

(continued)

Prenatal/Infancy	Toddler/Preschool	Middle Childhood/ Early Adolescence	Mid-Adolescence/ Early Adulthood
Risk Factors Emerging From the Toddler Years Onward			
Child	Aggressive/disruptive behavior		
	Lying		
	Risk-taking and sensation seeking		
Family	Lack of guilt, lack of empathy		
	Harsh and erratic discipline practices		
Community	Maltreatment or neglect		
	Television violence		
	Risk Factors Emerging From Mid-Childhood Onward		
	Child	Stealing and general delinquency	
		Depression	
		Precocious behavior: sex and substance use	
		Positive attitude toward problem behavior	
		Victimization and exposure to victimization	
	Family	violence	
	School	Poor parental supervision	
		Poor academic achievement	
		Truancy	
		Negative attitude toward school	
	Peer	Delinquent peers/siblings	
		Peer rejection	
	Community	Residence in a poor neighborhood	
		Risk Factors Emerging From Mid-Adolescence Onward	
		Child	Gun ownership
			Drug dealing
			Unemployment
		Family	School dropout
		Peer	Gang membership

Source: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Juvenile Justice Bulletin: Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders*, May 1998.

Strategies to Reduce Youth Violence

Significant advances in the design and formation of effective crime prevention strategies have occurred during the last several years. Policymakers should be aware of these developments to understand what programs work in reducing crime and violence and what elements keep youth from becoming violent. This section highlights some of the recent research on effective programs, details the protective factors that seem to keep youth from becoming violent, and features some promising state practices.

Programs

Table 3 highlights what works and what does not in the provisional findings of a systematic review of 500 scientific evaluations of crime and drug abuse prevention practices. The list is considered "provisional" by the research's authors because most crime prevention programs have not undergone rigorous evaluation. As more research becomes available, this list will grow. Featured as models that work in reducing reoffending in juveniles are vocational training, family therapy, parent training programs, and programs that teach social and "thinking" skills. Practices shown not to be effective in reducing juvenile crime include arresting juveniles for minor offenses, boot camps, and "scared straight" programs. (For more information on what works, what doesn't, and what's promising go to the Preventing Crime Website.)

Table 3.

What Works	❖ **For Infants**: Frequent home visits by nurses and other professionals. ❖ **For Preschoolers**: Classes with weekly home visits by preschool teachers. ❖ **For delinquent and at-risk preadolescents**: Family therapy and parent training. ❖ **For Schools**: —Organizational development for innovation, including use of school teams. —Communication and reinforcement of clear, consistent norms. —Teaching of social competency skills. —Coaching of high-risk youth in "thinking skills." ❖ **For older male ex-offenders**: Vocational training reduces repeat offending. ❖ **For rental housing with drug dealing**: Nuisance abatement action on landlords reduces drug problems in privately-owned rental housing. ❖ **For high-crime spots**: Extra police patrols. ❖ **For high-risk repeat offenders**: —Monitoring by specialized police units. —Immediate incarceration upon reoffense reduces their crime. ❖ **For domestic abusers who are employed**: On-scene arrests reduce repeat offenses. ❖ **Incarceration of offenders who will continue to commit crimes**: Works with more active and serious offenders. Diminished returns with less serious/active offenders. ❖ **For convicted offenders**: Rehabilitation programs with risk-focused treatments. ❖ **For drug-using offenders in prison**: Therapeutic community treatment programs.
What Doesn't Work	❖ **Gun "buyback" programs**: Although reducing the number of guns on the street, programs operated without geographic limitations on eligibility of people selling guns back fail to reduce gun violence. ❖ **Community mobilization against crime in high-crime poverty areas**: Fails to reduce crime in those areas. ❖ **Police counseling visits to homes of couples days after domestic violence incidents**: Fails to reduce repeat violence after an arrest or warrant. ❖ **Counseling and peer counseling of students in schools**: Fails to reduce substance abuse or delinquency and can increase delinquency. ❖ **Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.)**: Fails to reduce drug abuse when the original DARE curriculum is used. ❖ **Drug prevention classes focused on fear and other emotional appeals, including self-esteem**: Fails to reduce substance abuse. ❖ **School-based leisure-time enrichment programs**: Includes supervised homework and self-esteem exercises; fails to reduce delinquency risk factors or drug abuse. ❖ **Summer jobs or subsidized work programs for at-risk youth**: Fails to reduce crime or arrests. ❖ **Short-term, nonresidential training programs (including Job Training Partnership Act and JOBSTART) for at-risk youth**: Fails to reduce crime. ❖ **Diversion from court to job training as a condition of case dismissal**: Fails to reduce adult offending, but increased offending in juvenile program. ❖ **Neighborhood watch programs organized with police**: Fails to reduce burglary or other target crimes, especially in higher crime areas where voluntary participation often fails. ❖ **Arrest of juveniles for minor offenses**: Causes them to become more delinquent in the future than in policy exercise discretion or use alternatives to formal charging. ❖ **Arrests of unemployed suspects for domestic assault**: Causes higher rates of repeat offending versus nonarrest alternatives. ❖ **Increased arrests or raids on drug market location**: Fails to reduce violent crime or disorder for more than a few days. ❖ **Storefront police offices**: Fails to prevent crime in surrounding area.

	❖ **Police newsletters with local crime information**: Fails to reduce victimization rates. ❖ **Correctional boot camps using traditional military basic training**: Fails to reduce repeat offending after release. ❖ **"Scared Straight" programs where minor juvenile offenders visit adult programs**: Fails to reduce participant reoffending and may increase crime. ❖ **Shock probation, shock parole, and split sentences adding jail time to probation or parole**: Fails to reduce repeat offending compared to similar offenders under community supervision. Increases crime rates for some groups. ❖ **Home detention with electric monitoring**: Fails to reduce offending for low-risk offenders in comparison to standard community supervision without electronic monitoring. ❖ **Intensive supervision on parole or probation (ISP)**: Does not reduce repeat offending compared to normal levels of community supervision; varies by site, with some exceptions. ❖ **Rehabilitation programs using vague, unstructured counseling that does not specifically focus on each offender's risk factors**: Fails to reduce repeat offending. ❖ **Residential programs for juvenile offenders using challenging experiences in rural settings**: Fails to reduce repeat offending as compared to standard training schools.

Adapted from The National Institute of Justice Research in Brief, "Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising" (July 1998).

Asset Development

Also known as protective factors, assets are personal characteristics that protect youth from a host of high-risk antisocial behaviors, including substance abuse, dropping out of school, delinquency, and violence. While risk factors are a key component in understanding and identifying potentially violent youth, it is just as important to recognize the factors that keep youth from becoming violent. It is these factors that keep the majority of youth, despite living in poor and high-crime areas, from becoming involved in serious delinquency.[18]

Research has begun to identify these assets. For example, the Search Institute has identified forty developmental assets considered as key factors in enhancing the health and well-being of young people. These assets are divided into two main categories, external and internal assets. External assets focus on the positive experiences that young people receive from people and institutions, including positive adult relationships, family support, and caring schools and neighborhoods. Internal assets are the internalized qualities that guide choices and create a sense of centeredness, purpose, and focus for youth. These include items such as doing homework, integrity, honesty, and planning and decisionmaking skills. A complete list of Search's assets are listed in Table 4.

Table 4.

Asset Type, Asset Name and Definition

EXTERNAL ASSETS

Support
Family support: Family life provides high levels of love and support.
Positive family communication: Young person and her/his parent(s) communicate positively, and young person is willing to seek advice and counsel from parent(s).
Other adult relationships: Young person receives support from three or more nonparent adults.
Caring neighborhood: Young person experiences caring neighbors.
Caring school climate: School provides a caring, encouraging environment.
Parent involvement in schooling: Parent(s) actively involved in helping young person succeed in school.

Empowerment
Community values youth: Young person perceives that adults in the community value youth.
Youth as resources: Young people are given useful roles in the community.
Service to others: Young person serves in the community one hour or more per week.
Safety: Young person feels safe at home, at school, and in the neighborhood.

Boundaries and Expectations
Family boundaries: Family has clear rules and consequences and monitors youth's whereabouts.
School boundaries: School provides clear rules and consequences.
Neighborhood boundaries: Neighbors take responsibility for monitoring youth's behavior.
Adult role models: Parent(s) and other adults model positive, responsible behavior.
Positive peer influence: Young person's best friends model responsible behavior.
High expectations: Both parent(s) and teachers encourage the young person to do well.

Constructive Use of Time
Creative activities: Young person spends three or more hours per week in lessons or practice in music, theater, or other arts.
Youth programs: Young person spends three or more hours per week in sports, clubs, school organizations, and/or community organizations.
Religious community: Young person spends one hour or more per week in activities in a religious institution.
Time at home: Young person is out with friends with nothing special to do two or fewer nights per week.

INTERNAL ASSETS

Commitment to Learning
Achievement motivation: Young person is motivated to do well in school.
School engagement: Young person is actively engaged in learning.
Homework: Young person reports doing at least one hour of homework every school day.
Bonding to school: Young person cares about her/his school.
Reading for pleasure: Young person reads for pleasure three or more hours per week.

Positive Values
Caring: Young person places high value on helping other people.
Equality and social justice: Young person places high value on promoting equality and reducing hunger and poverty.
Integrity: Young person acts on convictions and stands up for her/his beliefs.
Honesty: Young person tells the truth even when it is not easy.
Responsibility: Young person accepts and takes personal responsibility.
Restraint: Young person believes it is important not to be sexually active or to use alcohol or other drugs.

Social Competencies
Planning and decisionmaking: Young person knows how to plan ahead and make choices.
Interpersonal competence: Young person has empathy, sensitivity, and friendship skills.
Cultural competence: Young person has knowledge of and comfort with people of different cultural/racial/ethnic backgrounds.
Resistance skills: Young person can resist negative peer pressure and dangerous situations.
Peaceful conflict resolution: Young person seeks to resolve conflict nonviolently.

Positive Identity
Personal power: Young person feels he/she has control over things that happen to me.
Self-esteem: Young person reports having a high self-esteem.
Sense of purpose: Young person reports that my life has a purpose.
Positive view of personal future: Young person is optimistic about her or his personal future.

Source: The Search Institute, 1999.

Promising State Practices

In implementing policy to address juvenile violence, states have had success in taking what has been learned and applying it.

Targeted Crime Prevention Strategies. These strategies rely heavily on crime data, including mapping areas of high criminal activity and identification and surveillance of the most active criminals in an area. These efforts tend to take careful aim at the most active and violent criminals and high-crime areas and to use a zero-tolerance policy in the arrest and prosecution of offenders, both juveniles and adults. For these efforts to be successful, they require coordination among many entities, including law enforcement, prosecutors, corrections, and other state agencies. Examples include Maryland's HotSpot Communities Initiatives, Department of Justice, Office of Justice Program's Operation Weed and Seed, Delaware's Operation Safe Streets, Operation Cease Fire in Boston, and Operation Safe Neighborhoods in Baltimore. Although tailored for each area, these initiatives use similar approaches in their reliance on research and in targeting the most active criminals.

More information can be found on targeted efforts in the Appendix of this *brief.*

Lengthening the Stay of Juveniles in Institutions. Several states have lengthened the institutional commitment of juveniles to promote skills development and address other problems. For example, Florida extended the length of commitment after research indicated that youth who were committed for shorter stays were actually reoffending at a higher rate than youth who were in for more serious offenses but had a longer commitment. This difference in recidivism rates was attributed to the number and intensity of services received, such as education, socialization skills, mental health services, and substance abuse services.

Balanced and restorative justice. States also report success in promoting strategies that use a balanced and restorative approach for working with youth, including violent youth. This model aims to balance the needs of the community, the victim, and the offender. Components include a continuum of

graduated sanctions, restitution, community service, and competency development of offenders. The balanced and restorative approach allows serious and violent youth to be incarcerated and less involved youth to be treated in the community.

Research. Many states have initiated rigorous and directed scientific research projects with universities. Such collaborative research is extremely important since accurate information about juvenile crime is often difficult to piece together. Key information is often divided among different agencies and organizations and lead juvenile justice agencies may not have the capacity or resources to pull this information together. Collaborative research can help to bridge that gap.

Michigan's Trauma Project is an example of such and initiative. For the Trauma Project, Michigan's juvenile justice agency, in particular its training school, partnered with the University of Michigan to conduct several studies examining juvenile offenders, including violent juveniles and sexual offenders. In addition to providing more accurate information about their offender population, these studies have improved treatment capacity within the state facility in terms of professional staff development and improved treatment modalities.

Such efforts may not necessarily be unique, but they are essential for planning purposes and for improving treatment options. More information on joint and collaborative research is available in Viewing Crime and Justice in a Collaborative Process.

Improved State Planning Processes. States also are having success integrating specific needs of local areas in the state juvenile justice plan. This allows state and local needs to shape the state juvenile justice plan and can also be used to identify and obtain funding for services.

An example is Florida, where the state juvenile justice plan is initiated through a county and district planning process. Each county has a council dedicated to juvenile justice issues that creates a countywide juvenile justice plan and forwards it to a district board. Similar to the county councils, the district boards are dedicated to juvenile justice issues and are comprised of representatives from each of the county boards. The district boards create district plans that are forwarded to the state agency where they are modified and incorporated into the state plan.

In Oregon, public safety coordinating councils are legislatively mandated to produce local safety coordinating plans. These plans outline the coordination of services for juveniles within the counties. Although not statutorily mandated, Utah has a similar structure whereby local councils produce safety plans. These plans are then incorporated into the state juvenile justice planning process.

Making Policy in a Changing Legal Landscape

Policymakers should be aware that there have been many changes in the legal landscape in dealing with juveniles offenders. Policymakers may either welcome or oppose these changes, but they need to be aware of their impact as they strive to implement effective juvenile violence reduction strategies. Three changes are important to note: the laws governing jurisdiction of juvenile crime, the development and use of specialized courts for social problems, and the role of judges.

Laws Governing Jurisdiction of Juvenile Crime. In response to juvenile crime rates states have amended laws on juvenile offenders, making them tougher and making it easier to try juveniles as adults. States also have enacted laws strengthening parental responsibility for juvenile offenses and victims' rights law. Between 1992 and 1995, forty-one states passed laws making it easier for juveniles to be tried as adults in criminal courts.[19] While many of these changes are unique to individual states, table 5 provides an overview of the various transfer classifications that states have adopted in dealing with juvenile offenders.

Table 5.

Transfer Classification	Definition	State Use (as of December 1997)
Discretionary Waiver	A juvenile court judge may waive jurisdiction and transfer the case to criminal court typically based on factors outlined in the *Kent v. United States* [383 U.S. 541 (1996):566-67] decision.	All but five (Connecticut, Massachusetts, Nebraska, New Mexico, and New York)
Mandatory Waiver	A juvenile court judge must waive jurisdiction if probable cause exists that the juvenile committed the alleged offense.	Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia
Presumptive Waiver	The burden of proof concerning a transfer decision is shifted from the state to the juvenile. Requires that certain juveniles be waived to criminal court unless they can prove they are suited for juvenile rehabilitation.	Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, District of Columbia, Illinois, Kansas, Minnesota, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah
Direct File	The prosecutor decides which court will have jurisdiction over a case when both the juvenile and criminal courts have concurrent jurisdiction. Also known as prosecutor discretion or concurrent jurisdiction.	Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Vermont, Virginia, Wyoming
Statutory Exclusion	Certain juvenile offenders are automatically excluded from the juvenile court's original jurisdiction. Also known as legislative exclusion or automatic transfer.	Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Michigan, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, Washington, Wisconsin

Reverse Waiver	A criminal court judge is allowed to transfer "excluded" or "direct filed" cases from criminal court to juvenile court for adjudication.	Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Iowa, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming
Once an Adult, Always an Adult	Once a juvenile is convicted in criminal court, all subsequent cases involving that juvenile will be under criminal court jurisdiction.	Alaska, Arizona, California, Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin

Source: "State Legislative Responses to Violent Juvenile Crime: 1996–97 Update," *OJJDP Juvenile Justice Bulletin*, November 1998.

Development and Use of Specialized Courts for Social Problems. Many states also have formed special courts, such as family, handgun, and drug courts. While specialized courts are not a new to judicial systems or designed to deal exclusively with juveniles, these courts are being used more extensively to deal with social problems. Drug courts, for example, were originally designed "to relieve congestion in traditional criminal courts by placing nonviolent drug offenders in a cooperative, nonadversarial court setting where they take responsibility for both their crimes and their futures."[20] These courts have five basic elements: immediate intervention, nonadversarial adjudication, hands-on judicial involvement, treatment programs with clear rules and goals, and a team approach (judge, prosecutor, defense, treatment provider, corrections).[21]

Michigan's Muskegon County Juvenile Court's In-Home Intensive Treatment Program (IITP) is an example of effective integration of a court in a treatment program. IITP works with young offenders and their families to keep youth out of residential placements. IITP is an intensive outreach program that promotes accountability and competency development. The court is an integral part in this program model, working closely with probation officers, conducting regular reviews of youths' progress, and providing sanctions and rewards where appropriate. (More information on IITP can be found by contacting Michigan's Family Court Division, Fourteenth Judicial Circuit, Muskegon, Michigan 49442, 616/724-6530.)

Specialized courts may be limited by the location and nature of the issues they address, but they provide another option for states to consider.

Role of Judges. The changing role of judges is closely related to the development of specialized courts. While judges have always had an impact on shaping policy, they are now much more active in promoting policy change and program development. The impetus for this "therapeutic jurisprudence" is that judges have seen the same problems and offenders repeatedly and have been unable to restrict the flow into the courtroom, even though these problems impede effective (and beneficial) adjudication of cases.[22] As a result, judges have become active in promoting the development of traditional and alternative treatment programs and in the shaping of policy. Table 6 highlights some of the more salient changes in the role of judges.

Table 6.

A Comparison of Transformed and Traditional Court Processes	
Traditional Process	Transformed Process
• Dispute resolution	• Problem-solving dispute avoidance
• Legal outcome	• Therapeutic outcome
• Adversarial process	• Collaborative process
• Claim- or case-oriented	• People-oriented
• Rights-based	• Interest- or needs-based
• Emphasis placed on adjudication	• Emphasis on postadjudication and alternative dispute resolution
• Interpretation and application of law	• Interpretation and application of social science
• Judge as arbiter	• Judge as coach
• Backward looking	• Forward looking
• Precedent-based	• Planning-based
• Few participants and stakeholders	• Wide range of participants and stakeholders
• Individualistic	• Interdependent
• Legalistic	• Commonsensical
• Formal	• Informal
• Efficient	• Effective

Source: Warren, Roger K., "*Reengineering the Court Process*," Madison, Wisc., Presentation to Great Lakes Court Summit, September 24–25, 1998.

States' Challenges in Designing Effective Violence Reduction Strategies

While there clearly has been progress in dealing effectively with violent juvenile offenders, there are still areas that states continue to struggle with. These issues are divided into treatment issues and system issues.

Treatment Issues

Lack of Adequate Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services for Juveniles. Many states, have an inadequate supply of quality mental health and/or substance abuse services for incarcerated and nonincarcerated youth—especially for youth who cannot afford to pay for treatment. Consequently, states' juvenile justice systems become the treatment system of default. These youth may or may not receive adequate quality services and often the youth with the most need end up in more costly, less effective residential facilities where underlying issues remain unaddressed.

Expanded identification and assessment will help states to better differentiate between juveniles in need of residential treatment and those who could benefit from less costly community-based treatment. However, without adequate and viable nonresidential treatment options for youth who are not a threat to public safety, competing for bed space will remain an issue.

In addition to an appraisal of treatment capacity and need, implementing effective and ongoing quality assurance and evaluation processes will help to ensure that the standard of services provided remains high. Given the wide range in quality of treatment in and out of the juvenile justice system, this systemwide assessment is crucial as states form their strategic plan for dealing with violent juvenile offenders.

Sexually Abused/Abusing Youth. Whether the actual number of sex-related offenses has increased or there is better reporting, some states have seen a rise in the number of identified juvenile sexual assault offenders and victims. Unfortunately, many states do not have adequate treatment facilities to meet this growing need and expanding treatment is difficult. Sexual offenders are one of the most problematic populations to serve. Providers are wary of working with offenders or are not appropriately skilled, offenders are a risky population to work with in the community, the efficacy of treatment is difficult to assess, and offenders often require separate secure facilities in residential programs. Expanding treatment capability to meet needs and ensure that services provided are appropriate and effective can be a daunting task. Without appropriate, immediate, and early intervention, many young sexual offenders will continue this behavior into adulthood.

Identification/Assessment. The majority of juvenile crime is committed by a small minority of juveniles. It is these serious, chronic, and violent offenders that account for the largest percentage of juvenile crime, especially violent crime. Typically youth who commit lesser offenses are treated the same as offenders of more serious and chronic crimes. As a result, resources are drawn away from higher-need youth—including available residential treatment—meaning the younger, less serious offenders penetrate the system deeper than is necessary. Better identification, assessment techniques, and tools make it possible to target resources toward those who need services the most. By investing in strategies that promote this type of differentiation, states can maximize their dollars and achieve a more efficient and responsive system.

System Issues

Organizationally Fractured Juvenile Justice Systems. In many states, components of the juvenile justice system fall under the auspices of different agencies and organizations, including juvenile courts. This fragmentation raises numerous issues, including the use of detention and residential facilities, information sharing, and service gaps. Many young offenders are identified early in their criminal careers when interventions are more likely to have a positive impact and are typically less expensive. However, these youth often do not receive adequate services until after they have committed more serious offenses. A more unified juvenile justice and treatment system could better align services and responsibilities across agencies to provide more comprehensive and effective strategies.

Service Gaps. Service gaps often exist between institutionalization and aftercare and between early identification and treatment. For example, a youth who is identified as being at-risk a social service

organization, a school, or a community-based organization is not provided adequate services (or even no services at all) until that youth commits an offense serious enough to be noticed by the juvenile justice system.

Conclusion

The good news is that incidents of juvenile crime, including violent crime, are decreasing and that research has identified best practices and programs that work in preventing future crime. Research also emphasizes that it is never too late—nor too early—to implement these strategies. The bad news is that too many juveniles remain involved in criminal activities, including violent crime.

Policymakers can significantly impact the rates of violent juvenile crime by targeting the small minority of serious, chronic, and violent juvenile offenders responsible for most juvenile crime and by promoting strategies that build on the strengths which prevent youth from committing violence. Governors' leadership can promote effective treatment and prevention options, can tap into many nontraditional resources, and can promote efforts that portray youth in a positive light engaged in productive activities.

Note: This brief draws on presentations from an executive policy forum on dealing with violent juvenile offenders, hosted by Michigan Governor John Engler, and cosponsored by NGA's Center for Best Practices and the National Institute of Justice, May 1999. This forum was the second in a series of three executive policy forums on juvenile and criminal justice issues and state best practices. The first forum, on combating school violence, was hosted by Governor James B. Hunt Jr. of North Carolina. The third executive forum, will focus on integrated and cross-cutting strategies to address family violence.

End Notes

[1] This project was supported by Grant No. 98-IJ-CX-0054 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

[2] Melissa Sickmund, Howard N. Snyder, and Eileen Poe-Yamagata, *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1997), 24.

[3] Ibid, 17.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid, 4.

[6] Ibid, 12.

[7] Ibid, 1.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Howard N. Snyder, "Known Juvenile Homicide Offenders by Race, 1980–1995," adapted from Melissa Sickmund, Howard N. Snyder and Eileen Poe-Yamagata, *Juvenile Offenders and Victims: 1997 Update on Violence*, (Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 1997).

[10] Sickmund et al, 42.

[11] Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *OJJDP Research: Making a Difference for Juveniles* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, August 1999), 8.

[12] J. Budnick Kimberly, Ellen Shields-Fletcher, "What About Girls?" *OJJDP Fact Sheet,* no. 84 (September 1998).

[13] Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Juvenile Justice Bulletin: Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders* (Washington, D.C., May 1998), 3.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *Report to Congress on Juvenile Violence Research* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, July 1999), 5.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Department of Justice, *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*, 4.

[18] Ibid, iii.

[19] Sickmund, et al., 30.

[20] National Drug Court Institute, *Drug Courts: A Research Agenda* (Alexandria, Virginia: National Drug Court Institute), 1.

[21] David Rottmand, and Pamela Casey, *A New Role for Courts?* (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice Journal, July 1999), 15.

[22] Ibid, 13.

[23] Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, "Update on the Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders," *Fact Sheet No. 83* (September 1998).

Appendix

Resources

"National Evaluation of Weed and Seed"

This brief details NIJ's Weed and Seed Program, which aims to identify, arrest, and prosecute violent offenders, drug traffickers, and other criminals operating in target areas. It also features neighborhood revitalization efforts to prevent and deter further crime. National evaluation of eight Weed and Seed sites is included. For more information, contact DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 810 Seventh Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising

This report highlights the findings of 500 evaluations of crime prevention programs and identifies what works, what doesn't, and what's promising. Strengths and limitations of programs are closely examined as well as different research methods used to decide what works in the prevention of crime. More information is available at the DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 810 Seventh Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

"Therapeutic Jurisprudence and the Emergence of Problemsolving Courts"

This article discusses the emergence of therapeutic jurisprudence, where courts focus on, among other things, positive therapeutic outcomes for individuals. More information is available by contacting DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 810 Seventh Street N.W., Washington, D.C., 20531.

Viewing Crime and Justice from a Collaborative Perspective: Plenary Papers of the 1998 Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation

Papers include the changing role in community partnerships, relationship between science and practice, and research on the battering of women. For more information, contact DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 810 Seventh Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

The Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders

A bridge between treatment and legal remedies is the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) *Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders.* This strategy is "based on the establishment of a continuum of juvenile delinquency prevention, early intervention, and graduated sanctions, programs, that are built on research, driven by data, and focused on outcomes. The continuum starts with prenatal prevention and includes community-based prevention services based on a risk and resource assessment, immediate interventions, and a range of graduated sanctions that include institutional care and aftercare services. The prevention, early intervention, and graduated sanctions, services, and strategies are key points along the continuum and are designed to reduce and control the risk factors that contribute to delinquent behaviors and ensure public safety."[23]

Juvenile Justice at the Crossroads

This document's report is based on proceedings from 1996 OJJDP national conference. The conference featured presentations on effective approaches to reducing juvenile crime and violence, and findings of leading researchers.

Female Offenders in the Juvenile Justice System

This document analyzes increasing patterns in the arrest, management, and placement of violent female offenders. Between 1989–93, there was a 55 percent increase in arrests of females for violent offenses. This report presents various strategies to address this challenge. For more information contact the National Center for Juvenile Justice, 710 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219-3000.

Minorities and the Juvenile Justice System

This report reviews research on minorities in the juvenile justice system and identifies existing programs and policies. For more information, contact DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, OJJDP, 810 Seventh Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

OJJDP Research: Making a Difference for Juveniles

This report summarizes key initiatives undertaken by OJJDP's research division, from 1996 to 1998. Included is a review of critical findings, highlights of innovative research efforts, and information on emerging research, including that on very young offenders, school violence, and girls in the juvenile justice system. More information on this study is available by contacting DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, OJJDP, 810 Seventh Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

Recent Trends in Violence-Related Behaviors Among High School Students in the United States

This report in *The Journal of the American Medical Association* (JAMA) measures the trends in nonfatal violent behaviors among adolescents in the U.S. between 1991 and 1997. Research is presented that demonstrates apparent declines in fighting and weapon carrying among U.S. adolescents. The report is available through *JAMA* reference 1999; 282:440-446.

Report to Congress on Juvenile Violence Research

This report highlights the findings of studies funded by congressional directive. Among the findings is research that shows young African-American males are disproportionately involved as violent offenders and as victims of violence. This study also highlights four areas of intervention—gangs, guns, high-risk juveniles, and locations and times of highest risk for juvenile violence. More information on this report is available through the DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, OJJPD, 810 Seventh Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

State Legislative Responses to Violent Juvenile Crime: 1996–97 Update

This report is an update from a 1996 study of changes in jurisdictional authority, sentencing, corrections programming, confidentiality of records and court hearings, and victim involvement in juvenile proceedings undertaken by states from 1992 through 1995. This report details reforms passed

by additional states during the preceding two years. More information can be obtained by contacting the DOJ, Office of Justice Programs, OJJDP, 810 Seventh Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20531.

Organizations

Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence
Delbert S. Elliott, Director
University of Colorado
Campus Box 442
Boulder, CO 80309-0442
Phone: 303/492-1032

Hamilton Fish National Institute on School and Community Violence
Paul Kingery, Director
1925 North Lynn Street, Suite 305
Rosslyn, VA 22209
Phone: 703/527-4217 ext. 104
Fax:703/527-8741
E-mail: <Kingery@gwu.edu>

Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse
P.O. Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000
Phone: 800/638-8736
Fax: 301/519-5212

National Clearinghouse on Families and Youth
P.O. Box 13505
Silver Spring, MD 20911-3505
Phone: 301/608-8098
Fax: 301/608-8721
E-mail: <Info@ncfy.com>

Drug Courts Program Office
Office of Justice Programs
901 North Pitt Street
Suite 370
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 202/616-5001

U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
Phone: 202/514-2000

U.S. Department of Justice
Office for Victims of Crime
810 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531
Phone: 202/307-5983

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20531
Phone: 202/307-2942
Fax: 202/307-6394

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
810 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20531
Phone: 202/307-5911

The Search Institute
700 South Third Street,
Suite 210
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1138
Phone: 612/376-8955
Phone: 800/888-7828
E-mail: <si@search-institute.org>

Targeted Efforts

Operation Safe Streets
Anthony Farina
Press Secretary
Office of the Governor
Carvel State Office Building
820 North French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
Phone: 302/577-8711
Beeper: 302/575-6424

Beth Shelden
Chief of Media Relations
Administrative Offices
Department of Corrections
245 McKee Road
Dover, DE 19904
Phone: 302/739-5601, Ext. 232

Operation Cease Fire
Jim Jordan
Director of Strategic Planning
Office of Strategic Planning & Resource Development
Boston Police Department
154 Berkeley Street, Room 605
Boston, MA 02116
Phone: 617/343-4507
Fax: 617/343-5073

Executive Policy Forum 3:

Preventing Family Violence: Building Bridges Across Systems

January 13-14, 2000
The Hyatt Regency Phoenix at Civic Plaza
Phoenix, Arizona

National Governors' Association
Center for Best Practices
444 North Capitol Street
Suite 267
Washington, D.C. 20001-1512

Telephone (202) 624-5300
http://www.nga.org/Center

NGA *Center for Best Practices*

November 23, 1999

To All Governors' Chiefs of Staff:

The NGA Center for Best Practices, with support from the National Institute for Justice (NIJ), invites you or an appropriate member of your staff, to attend the third of three policy forums for governors' advisors and state officials. The forum, *Preventing Family Violence: Building Bridges Across Systems,* will be held January 13-14, 2000 at the Hyatt Regency at Civic Plaza in Phoenix, Arizona. The meeting is being co-hosted by the Office of Arizona Governor, Jane Dee Hull.

Although researchers have known for years that domestic violence and child maltreatment often coexist in families, it is only recently that they are being addressed together. The link between child abuse, neglect, and exposure to family violence, and increased risk of further violence for these youth is also being better understood. This forum will include presentations by leading experts who will summarize current research and will include discussions with cutting-edge practitioners and policymakers who will describe best practices being implemented at both the state and local levels. Selected sessions will include, coordinated responses to family violence; principles of best practices for family violence prevention programs and policies; judicial responses, including the development of family violence courts; the relationship between family violence, welfare receipt, and employment; and, federal resources committed to addressing family violence

The meeting, which will last one and one-half days, will begin at 9:00 AM on Thursday, January 13, and end just after noon on Friday, January 14. Participation in the forum will be limited to about thirty-five people and registrations will be accepted on a first come, first serve basis. Preference will be given to states that did not participate in the first two forums.

NIJ will arrange and pay for participant travel to Phoenix, and will cover per diem and lodging at the Hyatt Regency Hotel. To register, please return the attached registration form to NGA by no later than December 17, 1999. You will receive confirmation of your registration soon after it is received and a representative of the Institute for Law and Justice will contact you regarding travel arrangements.

If you have any questions, please call Thomas MacLellan via phone at 202/624-5427, email tmaclellan@nga.org, or fax at 202/624-5313.

Sincerely,

John Thomasian
Director
NGA Center for Best Practices

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director
Employment and Social Services
Policy Studies Division

CC: Governor's Public Safety Advisor
Washington Representative
NGA Center Contact

NGA/NIJ Preventing Family Violence: Building Bridges Across Systems Executive Policy Forum

AGENDA

January 13-14, 2000

Hyatt Regency Phoenix at Civic Plaza
Phoenix, Arizona

Thursday, January 13, 2000

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Registration**

9:00 a.m. – 9:45 a.m. **Welcome and Opening Remarks** *Remington*

John Thomasian
Director
Center for Best Practices
National Governors' Association
Washington, DC

Honorable Jane Dee Hull
Governor
State of Arizona
Phoenix, Arizona

Bonnie J. Campbell
Director
Violence Against Women Office
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

9:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. **Nature, Scope, and Impact: The Co-Occurrence of Domestic Violence and Child Abuse and Neglect**

Jacquelyn C. Campbell
Anna D. Wolf Endowed Professor
Associate Dean for Ph.D. Programs and Research
The Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing

Baltimore, Maryland

Diana J. English
Office Chief
Office of Children's Research
Department of Social and Health Services
Seattle, Washington

For Families: Building Bridges Between Domestic Violence and Child Abuse
12 minute videotape

11:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m. **Break**

11:15 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Framing State Issues**

Lonnie Weiss
Principal Consultant
Weiss Consulting
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

12:30 p.m. – 1:45 p.m. **Working Luncheon** *Curtis B*

Cultural Issues

Oliver J. Williams
Associate Professor of Social Work
University of Minnesota - St. Paul
Director
Institute on Domestic Violence in the African American Community
St. Paul, Minnesota

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. **Promising Principles for Addressing Family Violence** *Remington*

Meredith Hofford
Director
Family Violence Department
National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
Reno, Nevada

3:00 p.m. – 3:15 p.m. **Break**

3:15 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. **Promising Approaches: Cross-System Responses**

Judicial and Community Approaches to Preventing Family Violence

Harriett "Hank" Barnes
Director
Governor's Office for Domestic Violence Prevention
Phoenix, Arizona

New Haven Child Development-Community Policing Program

Miriam Berkman
Assistant Coordinator
Child Development-Community Policing Program
Yale University Child Study Center
New Haven, Connecticut

Kelly Dillon-Wardrop
Sergeant
New Haven Domestic Violence and Family Service Unit
New Haven, Connecticut

School Based Programming

Charlotte A. Watson
Executive Director
New York State Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence
Rensselaer, New York

Vermont's Rural Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Collaboration

Janine M. Allo
Director
Domestic Violence Unit
Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services
Waterbury, Vermont

8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Leveraging Federal Resources** *Remington*

Bernard Auchter
Acting Director
Criminal Justice and Criminal Behavior
Office of Research and Evaluation
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. **The Relationship Between Welfare and Family Violence**

Jody Raphael
Executive Director
Taylor Institute
Chicago, Illinois

10:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. **Break**

10:15 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. **Promising Approaches: Judicial Responses**

Ronald B. Adrine
Judge
Cleveland Municipal Court
Cleveland, Ohio

11:00 a.m. – 12:15 p.m. **Building Bridges at the State Level**

Facilitated Discussion

Lonnie Weiss
Principal Consultant
Weiss Consulting
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

12:15 p.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Wrap Up and Next Steps**

NGA/NIJ Preventing Family Violence: Building Bridges Across Systems Executive Policy Forum

Attendee List

January 13-14, 2000

Hyatt Regency Phoenix at Civic Plaza
Phoenix, Arizona

Ronald B. Adrine
Judge
Cleveland Municipal Court
1200 Ontario Street, Courtroom 15-A
Cleveland, OH 44113
216-664-4974
664-6737 (Fax)
longpencil@msn.com

Janine M. Allo
Director
Domestic Violence Unit
Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilition Services
103 S. Main Street
Waterbury, VT 05671
802-241-1206
802-241-2980 (Fax)
jma@srs.state.vt.us

Bernard Auchter
Acting Director
Criminal Justice and Criminal Behavior
Office of Research and Evaluation
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-0154
202-307-6394 (Fax)
auchter@ojp.usdoj.gov

L Baker
Project Coordinator
Children's Behavioral Health
Department for Children, Youth and Families
610 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Building 7
Providence, RI 02908
401-222-5252
401-222-5231 (Fax)

Harriett "Hank" Barnes
Director
Governor's Office for Domestic Violence Prevention
State Capitol, Suite 101
1700 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-542-1773
602-542-5522 (Fax)

Miriam Berkman
Assistant Coordinator
Child Development - Community Policing Program
Yale University Child Study Center
230 S. Frontage Road
New Haven, CT 06520
203-785-4610
203-785-4608 (Fax)
miriam.berkman@yale.edu

Rebecca Brown
Policy Analyst
Employment and Social Services Policy Studies Division
National Governors' Association
444 N. Capitol Street, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001-5427
202-624-5367
202-624-5313 (Fax)
rbrown@nga.org

Jacquelyn C. Campbell
Anna D. Wolf Endowed Professor
Associate Dean for Ph.D. Programs and Research
The Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing
522 N. Wolfe Street, Room 346
Baltimore, MD 21205-2110
410-955-2778
410-614-8285 (Fax)
jcampbel@son.jhmi.edu

Bonnie J. Campbell
Director
Violence Against Women Office
Office of Justice Programs
U.S. Department of Justice
Room 5302
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20530
202-616-8894
202-307-3911 (Fax)

Joseph B. Chandler, Jr.
Federal Legislative Counsel
North Carolina Washington Office
444 N. Capitol Street, Suite 332
Washington, DC
202-624-5861
202-624-5836 (Fax)
jchandle@gov.state.nc.us

Edward Connors
President
Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA
703-684-5300
703-739-5533 (Fax)
econnors@ilj.org

Erin Dalton
Special Assistant to the Deputy Director
Office of Development and Communications
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-514-5752
202-307-6394 (Fax)
daltona@ojp.usdoj.gov

Kelly Dillon-Wardrop
Sergeant
New Haven Domestic Violence and Family Service Unit
One Union Avenue
New Haven, CT 06519
203-946-6290
203-946-7375 (Fax)

Diana J. English
Office Chief
Office of Children's Research
Department of Social and Health Services
4045 Delridge Way, SW
P.O. Box 47986
Seattle, WA 98146-7986
206-933-3535
206-933-3547 (Fax)
endi300@dshs.wa.gov

Evelyn Ganzglass
Director
Employment and Social Services Policy Studies
Center for Best Practices
National Governors' Association
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001
202-624-5394
202-624-5313 (Fax)
cganzglass@nga.org

Jackie Garner
Senior Advisor
Health and Human Services
Office of the Governor
2 1/2 State House
Springfield, IL 62706
557-7507
217-557-9725 (Fax)

Lisa Gigliotti
Human Services Policy Coordinator
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 30013
Lansing, MI 48909
517-335-7824
517-335-0118 (Fax)
gigliottil@exec.state.mi.us

Gina Grappone
Aide to the Governor
Citizen Affairs
Office of the Governor
State House, Room 124
107 N. Main Street
Concord, NH 03301
603-271-2121
603-271-6998 (Fax)
ggrappo@gov.state.nh.us

Christine Hastie
Director of Policy
Executive Office of Public Safety
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
One Ashburton Place, Room 2133
Boston, MA 02108
617-727-7775
617-727-4764 (Fax)
christine.hastie@eps.state.ma.us

Jennifer Hatten
Assistant to Governor for Policy
Office of the Governor
State Capitol, G-10
Nashville, TN 37243-0001
615-532-4648
615-532-4644 (Fax)
jhatten@mail.state.tn.us

Richard B. Hillman
CPS- Policy Development
Office of the Director
Department for Children, Youth
and Families
610 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Building 7
Providence, RI 02908
401-222-5217
401-222-5231 (Fax)

Meredith Hofford
Director
Family Violence Department
National Council of Juvenile and Family
Court Judges
P.O. Box 8970
Reno, NV 89507
775-327-5329
775-784-6160 (Fax)

Jane Dee Hull
Governor
State of Arizona
Executive Tower
1700 W. Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-542-4331
602-542-1381 (Fax)

Shirley Iverson
Assistant Administrator
Adult and Family Services Division
Department of Human Services
500 Summer Street, NE, 2nd Floor
Salem, OR 97310-1013
503-945-6902
503-373-7492 (Fax)
shirley.iverson@state.or.us

Lynn A. Johnson
Senior Policy Analyst
Policy Initiatives
Office of the Governor
124 State Capitol
Denver, CO 80203
303-866-4609
303-866-6368 (Fax)
lynn.johnson@state.co.us

Sue Julian
Chair
Governor's Family Violence
Coordinating Council
4710 Chimney Drive, Suite A
Charleston, SC 25302
304-965-3552
304-965-3572 (Fax)
sjulian@wvwise.org

Patricia Kellar
Family Violence Program Director
Division of Family and Children Services
Department of Human Resources
Two Peachtree Street, 21st Floor
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-657-3476
404-657-3785 (Fax)
plkellar@dhr.state.ga.us

Marylouise Kelley
Program Specialist
Office for Victims of Crime
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-616-0530
202-514-6383 (Fax)
kelleym@ojp.usdoj.gov

Thomas M. MacLellan
Policy Analyst
Employment and Social Services
Policy Studies Division
National Governors' Association
444 N. Capitol Street, NW, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001-1512
202-624-5427
202-624-5313 (Fax)

Irene Masterson
Management Assistant
Idaho Council on Domestic Violence
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0036
208-334-6512
208-332-7353 (Fax)
imasterson@icdv.state.id.us

Derith McGann
Special Assistant to Bureau Chief
of Child Welfare
Department of Children and Families
505 Hudson Street
Hartford, CT 06106
860-349-8643
860-566-7947 (Fax)

Beth Morrison
Coordinator
Governor's Cabinet on Children
and Families
Capitol Complex, Building 5, Room 218
Charleston, WV 25305
304-727-1906
304-727-1906 (Fax)
bjm21456@aol.com

Trula Motta
Domestic Violence Administrator
Family Safety
Department of Children and Families
Building 8, Room 218
1317 Winewood Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700
850-922-0185
850-487-0688 (Fax)
trula_motta@dcf.state.fl.us

Jody Raphael
Executive Director
Taylor Institute
926 N. Wolcott
Chicago, IL 60622
773-342-0630
773-342-5918 (Fax)
jraphael@compuserve.com

John Schwarz
Deputy Director
National Institute of Justice
Office of Development
and Communications
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-305-4893
202-307-6394 (Fax)
schwarzj@ojp.usdoj.gov

Ed Seighman
Senior Associate
Violence Against Women Grants Office
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-305-2649
202-305-2589 (Fax)
seighman@ojp.usdoj.gov

John Thomasian
Director
Center for Best Practices
National Governors' Association
444 N. Capitol Street, Suite 267
Washington, DC 20001-1512
202-624-7881
202-624-5315 (Fax)
jthomasian@nga.org

Gloria Upshur
Deputy Director
Division of Social Services
Delaware Health and Social Services
Lewis Building
1901 N. DuPont Highway
New Castle, DE 19720
302-577-4408
302-577-4405 (Fax)
gupshur@state.de.us

Charlotte A. Watson
Executive Director
New York State Office for the
Prevention of Domestic Violence
Capitol View Office Park
52 Washington Street
Rensselaer, NY 12144
518-486-6262
518-486-7675 (Fax)
pattiel@nysnet.net

Lonnie Weiss
Principal Consultant
Weiss Consulting
505-H S. Tenth Street
Philadelphia, PA 19147
215-627-5454
215-627-2860 (Fax)
lonweiss@erols.com

Oliver J. Williams
Associate Professor of Social Work
University of Minnesota - St. Paul
Director
Institute on Domestic Violence in the
African American Community
Peters Hall, Room 290
1404 Gortner Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108
612-624-9217
612-624-9201 (Fax)
owilliams@maroon.tc.umn.edu

Doreen Y. Williams
Administrator
Division of Children, Youth and Families
Department of Human Services
3011 Golden Rock
Christiansted, St. Croix 00820-4355
340-773-4043
340-773-6121 (Fax)

Edwin W. Zedlewski
Assistant Director for Planning
and Management
National Institute of Justice
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20531
202-307-2953
202-307-6394 (Fax)
edwin@ojp.usdoj.gov

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

Issue Brief

Employment and Social Services Policy Studies Division
Contact: Thomas MacLellan, 202/624-5427
Rebecca Brown, 202/624-5367
October 17, 2000

Building Bridges Across Systems: State Innovations to Address and Prevent Family Violence[1]

Summary

Family violence costs the United States at least $1.7 billion annually.[2] In addition to these monetary costs, nonmonetary impacts of family violence on family and child well-being are far-reaching. In homes where domestic violence is occurring, there is a 30 percent to 60 percent likelihood that child maltreatment is also taking place. Victims and children (whether or not they are directly abused) each suffer short- and long-term negative consequences associated with family violence.

Research shows that children with a history of maltreatment are 25 percent more likely to engage in antisocial behaviors and to suffer from mental illness. There is a strong correlation between domestic violence and a family's involvement with the welfare system. Approximately 20 percent to 30 percent of women on welfare are current victims of domestic abuse and about 60 percent have experienced domestic abuse at some point in their lives.[3]

Given the intergenerational and cross-cutting impacts of family violence, effective family violence strategies are collaborative in their approach. Successful strategies involve law enforcement, the courts, human services, health agencies, community-based providers, employers, and schools, and they address multiple aspects of the problem simultaneously. Many Governors have made reducing the incidence of family violence a priority.[4]

Examples of cross-system state initiatives include the following.

- In addition to a statewide effort designed to link and train service providers, courts, and law enforcement personnel, **Arizona** developed a family violence resource guide for judges hearing family violence cases. The State also developed a response program model that allows for coordinated investigations and treatment of victims of domestic violence and sexual assault.
- The New Haven, **Connecticut**, Child Development-Community Policing Program forged a partnership between community police officers and mental health clinicians to provide immediate therapeutic attention to victims in the aftermath of abuse.
- **New York** developed a school-based program to increase awareness among educators about the nature of family violence. The State also developed guidelines for state agency employers to address family violence at the workplace and a cross-systems response model for counties.

- **Vermont** created a domestic violence unit within its state department of social and rehabilitation services, establishing a formal partnership between domestic violence and child welfare agencies.

Background

Family violence primarily refers to three categories of violence: domestic (or intimate partner) violence; child abuse and neglect; and elder abuse. (Elder abuse, however, is not a focus of this *Issue Brief*.) Dividing family violence into these three categories has resulted in the emergence of three distinct systems of care and protection and three distinct bodies of research.[5] However, recent research on the interrelationship of all forms of family violence, particularly among domestic violence, child maltreatment and negative outcomes for youth, is prompting innovation in developing cross-systems approaches to family violence.

Domestic (Intimate Partner) Violence. The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges defines domestic violence as patterns of assault and coercive behaviors, including physical, sexual, and psychological attacks, and economic, sexual, and emotional coercion.[6] Women are most often the victims of domestic violence. In fact, most violence against women is partner violence. There are many direct impacts of domestic violence.[7]

- It is the largest single cause of homelessness.
- Approximately 1.5 million women and 834,700 men are raped and/or physically assaulted by an intimate partner annually in the United States.[8]
- Of women who were raped and/or physically assaulted, 76 percent were assaulted by a current or former husband, cohabiting partner, or date.
- It is the primary contributor to alcoholism in women, accounting for more than half of all women alcoholics.
- Each day four women die in this country as the result of domestic violence.
- Family violence costs employers at least $13 billion every year since battered women use work time to arrange for legal, medical, and personal support relevant to their abuse. Almost all battered women report that their abusers caused problems at work. Each year, 13,000 incidents of family violence occur in the workplace.

Child Maltreatment. Child maltreatment includes physical abuse, sexual abuse, emotional abuse, physical neglect, educational neglect, and emotional neglect.[9] Some states, including **Arkansas**, **California**, **Minnesota**, **Oregon**, and **Utah**, have also made witnessing domestic violence a form of child abuse and maltreatment and have enhanced or enacted related criminal sanctions.[10]

Notable child maltreatment trends include the following.

- From 1992 through 1995, approximately 1 million children were victims of maltreatment each year.[11]
- Of the substantiated reports of child abuse and neglect (in general, about one-third of all reports of child maltreatment are confirmed), 54 percent involved neglect, 25 percent involved physical abuse, 11 percent involved sexual abuse, 3 percent involved emotional abuse, and the remainder involved other forms of maltreatment.[12]

- About 2,000 children each year or 5 children each day die from maltreatment.[13] Abuse is the most common cause of death (48 percent), followed by neglect (37 percent) and a combination of abuse and neglect (15 percent). The majority of victims (85 percent) are less than five years old.

Family Violence and Negative Outcomes for Youth

There is a significant overlap in domestic violence and child maltreatment. Although research is nascent, studies indicate that in families where either child maltreatment or domestic violence is identified, there is a 30 percent to 60 percent likelihood that both forms of abuse exist within the family.[14]

Child maltreatment is also an important predictor of antisocial behavior and mental illness. Youth with a history of maltreatment have a 25 percent greater risk for a variety of problems, including violence, substance abuse, teen pregnancy, poor school performance, and mental illness.[15] Among predictors of youth violence, family factors, such as child maltreatment, poor family management (e.g., failure to set clear expectations, inconsistent or aggressive discipline), low levels of parental involvement, poor family bonding and conflict, parental criminality, and parent-child separation, have a significant impact on the chances of a youth becoming violent or delinquent.[16]

Neglected children also are at a greater risk for negative outcomes than abused youth.[17] This is particularly significant since this cohort of youth, despite their high need for services, are not as easily identified by child protective services or other human services agencies.

Responses to Family Violence

The three public entities most involved in responding to family violence are law enforcement and the courts, human services, and health. The following examples provide a general overview of the current efforts within these fields to address family violence. Some of these examples illustrate cross-systems approaches while others describe ongoing initiatives within these fields. Specific state examples of cross-systems approaches to addressing family violence are included in Appendix A.

Legal Responses to Family Violence

The legal system, which includes courts, prosecutors, and law enforcement, is primarily concerned with issues of due process, bringing victims and offenders of family violence under the protection and control of legal and social institutions, and ensuring public safety in general. Recently, there have been efforts within the legal community to balance jurisprudence and due process concerns with the needs of individuals who have been victims of family violence. The goals of these efforts include making victims feel less intimidated; improving communication within the legal system; educating judges, prosecutors, court personnel, and law enforcement officers on the dynamics of family violence; and improving coordination among agencies that respond to family violence. There has also been a gradual expansion of those afforded protection under domestic violence laws. In addition to married couples, domestic violence laws offer protection to dating couples, same-sex couples, ex-spouses, cohabitating couples, and ex-boyfriends and girlfriends.[18]

The following highlight some current efforts within the legal system to address family violence.

- **Cross-Agency Trainings.** Many states have initiated training programs that either use similar curricula or bring judges, prosecutors, law enforcement officers, agency staff, and "first responders" (emergency medical technicians and fire professionals, teachers, child care workers, clergy, etc.) together for training on the dynamics of family violence. These efforts help establish a common language and understanding of family violence and educate participants on the availability of resources. Cross-training programs also help participants gain a better sense of the mandates, roles, and strengths of the various entities involved in responding to family violence.[19]

- **Dedicated and Specialized Courts.** Over the last several years, the number of courts with dedicated dockets and specialized courts has grown. Dedicated domestic violence courts or dockets specifically adjudicate domestic violence cases. A primary advantage of these courts is specialized judges and prosecutors. Another advantage of these courts is the impact that the court itself has on offenders as they watch cases similar to theirs get processed. More than 50 such courts exist today in cities including Denver, **Colorado**; Chicago, **Illinois**; Reno, **Nevada**; Brooklyn, **New York**; Seattle, **Washington**; and Washington, D.C. Specialized courts, also called unified or integrated courts, offer more holistic interventions and are structured similarly to the drug court model. In addition to criminal sanctions, these courts provide a host of support, treatment, and testing services. Integrated courts can feature specialized staff; support services for the victims of family violence; intake centers; and a range of offender sanctions, including mandating treatment for batterers. Examples include the South Bay Domestic Violence Courts in San Diego, **California**; **Hawaii**'s unified courts; and the Family Court Project, Jefferson County, **Kentucky**.

- **Batterer Interventions.** Batterer interventions are designed to change cognitive and behavioral patterns. These programs can provide an alternative to (or be a component of) incarceration. For example, judges in courts in Brooklyn, **New York**, mandate that offenders participate in a treatment program throughout the pending of their case. However, determining which offenders are amenable to treatment is difficult. Mandated treatment may be effective for certain types of batterers, but the research is inconclusive as to which offenders should be referred to treatment and which to more punitive sanctions.[20]

- **Automated Databases.** Integrating and sharing information across systems allows for real-time communication that is particularly crucial to judges, law enforcement, protective service workers, and for background investigations for weapons. Examples include arrest records, protective orders, and revocations of parole or probation.

- **Full Faith and Credit.** The full faith and credit provision of the 1994 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was enacted to establish nationwide enforcement of civil and criminal protection orders in state and tribal courts throughout the country. Its goal is to protect victims who have left the state of original jurisdiction of a protection order. Although they vary by state, more than 46 states have enacted some type of full faith and credit provision. More information on each state's provision is available at http://www.vaw.umn.edu/.[21]

- **Protective Orders.** Protective orders are victim-initiated civil injunctions that establish certain restraints against a person accused of threatening or harassing an individual. These restraints include assaulting the person being protected by the order, entering their home, approaching them, and communicating with them for a specified length of time. The effectiveness of protective orders depends on their enforcement. States have made efforts to make these orders more easily enforceable. For example, **Michigan's** personal protection orders (PPOs), which give victims immediate access to the courts by not requiring an attorney or charging a court fee to process the order, allow police to provide oral notification to the person restrained and to make a warrantless arrest for a violation of the order. In addition to criminal penalties, Michigan's law also provides additional penalties for violations of PPOs (93 days in jail or $500). Michigan's PPOs are enforceable throughout the state and are immediately accessible in the state's computerized Law Enforcement Information Network (L.I.E.N.).
- **Risk and Danger Assessments.** A variety of tools help practitioners determine if abuse is occurring and assess the danger of particular situations. Assessment tools and protocols have also been developed to identify other types of abuse beyond the original complaint. For example, a child protective service worker who is responding to a child abuse or neglect complaint could identify an adult victim of domestic violence during the investigation.
- **Animal Control Officers.** Although not traditionally considered part of the legal system, animal control officers can have an important role in identifying ongoing abuse within homes as the link between animal abuse and domestic violence or child abuse and neglect is becoming better understood. For example, some states and localities require child protective services to conduct investigations in instances of animal cruelty where there are children in the home. In **California,** animal control officers are trained to recognize indicators of family violence and file reports to child protective services (CPS). Given their access to homes, a high percentage of reports filed by these officers are likely to be substantiated.[22]

Human Services Responses to Family Violence

The human services system provides low-income families experiencing family violence with safety planning, treatment, and counseling; employment preparation; parent and life skills training; and referrals to other ancillary services (e.g., transitional housing, vocational rehabilitation, etc.). Entities comprising the human services system include public agencies administering Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), child care, child support enforcement, child welfare, Medicaid and Food Stamp programs; and public or private community-based and faith-based organizations.

There is a strong correlation between domestic violence and a family's involvement with the human services system, particularly public assistance. In 1997, 20 percent to 30 percent of women on welfare were current victims of domestic abuse and about 60 percent had experienced abuse at some point in their lives.[23] Since welfare caseloads have declined dramatically during the last few years, researchers estimate that domestic violence may now affect an even greater proportion of those left on the welfare rolls—perhaps as high as 50 percent. Welfare recipients are also about three times as likely as other low-income women to be victims of domestic abuse.[24] In some cases, abuse victims stay on welfare due to violent threats made and/or violence actually perpetrated by a partner who objects to her efforts to pursue employment and/or education and training. Welfare recipients who are abused also suffer

higher levels of health problems than other recipients (i.e., anxiety disorders, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder) and/or may abuse substances that make maintaining employment a challenge.

Welfare Reform Strategies and the Family Violence Option (FVO)

Domestic violence victims are also more likely than other recipients to cycle on and off welfare and to potentially reach the 60-month TANF time limit, particularly in cases where women experienced physical or sexual abuse during childhood.[25] The Wellstone/Murray Family Violence Amendment to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996, enables states to adopt the Family Violence Option (FVO) and grant temporary "good cause" waivers of TANF program requirements such as time limits, work participation, child support cooperation, and family cap provisions if complying with such requirements would make it more difficult for the woman to escape domestic violence. Waivers must be accompanied by a service plan developed by an individual trained in domestic violence and must be designed to lead to work. As of May 1999, 36 states had adopted the FVO. In most cases, states that have not formally adopted the option still provide family violence services and intervention to battered women.[26]

Some innovative strategies states are implementing either to explicitly meet FVO requirements or to address domestic violence even if they did not formally adopt the FVO follow.

- **Collocation of Specialists and/or Cross-Agency Training.** As of May 1999, 14 states that adopted the FVO involved private sector domestic violence specialists in the assessment or waiver determination process. Since then, more states are likely to have done so given FVO requirements. Several states either locate specialists on-site in human services offices or have on-call specialists to visit offices when services are needed. **Missouri** has conducted statewide training of human services staff in domestic violence. Its divisions of family services (DFS) and child support enforcement along with the state's Coalition Against Domestic Violence jointly trained DFS caseworkers, child support staff, and prosecuting attorneys.

- **Screening and Assessment.** States administer questionnaires and conduct interviews to identify potential victims of domestic abuse who come in contact with the human services system. However, a relatively small number of women actually disclose such abuse in government offices—only about 6 percent to 10 percent.[27] States may want to provide opportunities for disclosure at other sites, such as child care centers, health clinics, schools, and domestic violence shelters. Less intrusive questions may also make it easier for the victim to disclose. For example, **Nevada**'s screening process requires welfare caseworkers to ask questions about domestic violence more indirectly, such as, "Is there anyone who would interfere with a household member's efforts to maintain or keep a job?"

- **Employment Leave and Unemployment Insurance Laws.** Some states have laws that provide special employment leave for battered women and unemployment insurance for victims of domestic violence who leave work voluntarily because of abuse. For example, **Maine** permits leave that is "reasonable and necessary," with or without pay, to obtain necessary services (including legal and medical assistance) to remedy a crisis caused by domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking. Employers face a $200 civil penalty for violation.[28] **California**, **Florida**, and **New York** have similar laws. In **North Carolina**, a person's quitting work because of domestic violence committed upon her or her minor child constitutes "good cause" for leaving employment

voluntarily. An employer's reserve account will not be charged for unemployment insurance benefits paid to the victimized employee. **California**, **Connecticut**, **Maine**, **New Hampshire**, **New York**, and **Wyoming** have similar laws.

- **Emergency Payments and Address Confidentiality.** As of May 1999, twenty-seven states offered emergency payments to battered women to help them escape their violent households, partially subsidizing their housing or transportation costs.[29] Some states also help victims escape their abusers by providing them with a substitute mailing address so that they may keep their actual home address confidential. For example, through **Washington**'s Address Confidentiality Program, victims establish a substitute mailing address with the secretary of state's office and receive mail sent to that address at their home the following day. **California**, **Florida**, **Massachusetts**, **Nevada**, **New Jersey**, and **Vermont** have similar programs.
- **Child Support Enforcement Protections.** Some states are changing how they notify families about the availability of temporary waivers from paternity establishment, pursuance of child support payments or arrears, and other related child support requirements that might threaten the victim's safety. For example, **Rhode Island** provides TANF recipients with a notice that describes all situations in which the welfare department can grant a temporary exemption due to domestic violence, including from child support requirements. As mentioned earlier, some states train child support enforcement staff in domestic violence or collocate domestic violence specialists in child support offices.

Child Welfare and TANF Agency Collaboration. Some states are coordinating their child welfare and TANF agency policies and practices to more effectively address the interrelationship between domestic violence and child abuse and maltreatment. A child welfare agency's primary mission is to ensure a safe environment for children. This is a daunting task considering, that in 1995 alone, more than 3 million children were reported to child protective services as maltreated.[30] The responsibilities of child welfare agencies, which include investigating reports of child abuse and neglect, offering emergency and support services to families, making case recommendations to the juvenile court, and placing children in foster and adoptive care homes, make these agencies a logical venue for implementing approaches designed to assist adult and child victims of family violence.

However, child welfare agencies (particularly child protective services) and the adult welfare system have historically not worked together to address violence within the same families.[31] This can place each agency's efforts at odds with the other. For example, a mother required to work to receive TANF services may have difficulty complying with counseling or parent education requirements often mandated by the child welfare system. In other cases, the child welfare agency may recommend removal of an abused or neglected child because family violence is present even though the mother is not the perpetrator. Some states cross train agency staff, conduct joint case consultations to identify child maltreatment and domestic abuse and to plan for services, and work together to maintain family unity (for nonviolent family members) and to develop safety plans. For example, **Indiana** is cross-training child protection workers, public assistance staff, and domestic violence service providers to recognize and address the interrelationships between domestic violence and child maltreatment.

Health Care Responses to Family Violence

The entities that comprise the health care system include emergency medical services, medical transport services, hospitals, clinics, private practitioners (e.g., dentists, obstetricians), managed care organizations, local public health departments, home health care providers, visiting nurse associations, substance abuse and mental health treatment centers, veterans' health centers, family planning organizations, and other points of service. Health care interventions for family violence are not generally incorporated into standard medical care, health data reporting systems, or health care reimbursement practices. However, adult and child victims of family violence face a wide range of physical and mental health complications.[32] Some of these complications, besides injuries or abrasions, include migraines, insomnia, gastrointestinal disorders, chronic pain, anxiety, depression, and substance abuse. Research suggests that between 4 percent and 30 percent of women entering emergency departments suffer from a domestic violence injury.[33] Research also indicates that a majority of health care providers fail to identify patients as victims of family violence. This can lead to treating the symptoms of family violence without addressing the underlying cause.

Early identification, appropriate treatment, documentation, and referral of victims who seek health care can prevent repeated injury, pregnancy complications, and multiple medical and psychosocial consequences of ongoing family violence. Some of the ways the health care system is contributing to victim safety and violence prevention include the following.

- Develop identification, treatment/referral, and followup protocol for victims and perpetrators of family violence and train an array of health care providers to implement the protocol. [34]
- Inform families about domestic violence and related services through prevention and education activities, such as home visits, family support programs, and community health fairs.
- Educate and provide domestic violence services to women during prenatal and followup care. Estimates in public and private health care settings show that 4 percent to 17 percent of women experience domestic violence during pregnancy. Domestic violence is more common than such other pregnancy-related complications as placenta privia, preeclampsia, or gestational diabetes.[35]
- Address domestic violence as part of teen pregnancy prevention and parenting programs. A recent study of teen mothers on welfare indicated a relationship between domestic violence, birth control sabotage, and efforts by an intimate partner to prevent the woman's ability to complete school.[36]
- Maintain medical record documentation of a victim's statements, injuries, treatments, and referrals for use as evidence of assault in legal proceedings.
- Provide special advocacy and mental health services for mothers and their children who are victims of family violence.

Endnotes

[1] This project was supported by Grant No. 98-IJ-CX-0054 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

[2] Rosemary Chalk and Patricia King eds., *Violence In Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1998), 57. Cost estimates include direct costs related to treatment, protection, or other related services, as well as indirect costs, such as loss of productivity, related health issues, and increased rates of juvenile delinquency.

[3] Jody Raphael and Richard Tolman, *Trapped by Poverty, Trapped by Abuse* (Taylor Institute: Chicago, Illinois, 1997).

[4] An assessment of Governors' 2000 state-of-the-state addresses shows that eight governors made domestic violence/family violence reduction a priority: Alabama, Indiana, Maine, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Washington, and West Virginia. Additionally, many Governors have established state-level domestic violence coalitions and councils.

[5] Rosemary Chalk and Patricia King eds., *Violence In Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1998), 31.

[6] Susan Schechter and Jeffrey Edleson, *Effective Intervention In Domestic Violence &Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice* (Reno, Nev.: The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 1998), 9.

[7] This information comes from a literature review by Dr. Jean Peterson, Department of Human and Community Development, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign, July 1999.

[8] Patricia Tjaden and Nancy Thoennes, *Research in Brief*, "Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey" (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, November 1998), 2.

[9] Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, August 1997), 3; and Rosemary Chalk, and Patricia King eds., *Violence In Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press 1998), 32.

[10] There are concerns in the field that such laws may deter the victims of domestic violence from filing charges for a number of reasons including reluctance to exposing themselves to criminal charges and/or risk having their children removed from the home. No resources exist to date.

[11] Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, August 1997), 2.

[12] Ibid 2.

[13] Ibid 2 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, 1995, quoted in *In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment.*)

[14] Jeffrey Edleson, *The Overlap Between Child Maltreatment and Woman Abuse,* (National Resource Center on Domestic Violence, National Electronic Network on Violence Against Women, 1997, rev. April 1999), 2.

[15] Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *OJJDP Research: Making a Difference for Juveniles* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, August 1999), 8.

[16] Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, "Predictors of Youth Violence," *Juvenile Justice Bulletin* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, April 2000), 3.

[17] Dianna English, Department of Social and Health Services, Washington State (December 1999). This preliminary finding is from a not-yet-published report on childhood victimization and delinquency. The research is supported by the National Institute of Justice's Violence Against Women & Family Violence Project.

[18] Rosemary Chalk and Patricia King, eds., *Violence In Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs.* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1998), 33.

[19] Susan Schechter and Jeffrey Edleson, *Effective Intervention In Domestic Violence & Child Maltreatment Cases: Guidelines for Policy and Practice* (The National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 1998), 39.

[20] Rosemary Chalk and Patricia King, eds., *Violence In Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs.* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1998), 297.

[21] Full Faith and Credit Project, "Progress on Full Faith and Credit Enabling Legislation" (Washington, D.C.: October 1998)

[22] Interview with Dr. Frank Ascione, Utah State University, June 2000.

[23] Jody Raphael and Richard Tolman, *Trapped by Poverty, Trapped by Abuse*, (Chicago, Ill.: Taylor Institute, 1997).

[24] Jody Raphael, Center for Impact Research at National Governors' Association/National Institute for Justice Executive Policy Forum on Preventing Family Violence, Phoenix, Arizona, January 13-14, 2000.

[25] Ruth Brandwein, *The Use of Public Welfare by Family Violence Victims: Implications of New Federal Welfare Reform*, 1997.

[26] Jody Raphael and Sheila Haennicke, *Keeping Battered Women Safe Through the Welfare-to-Work Journey: How Are We Doing?* (Chicago, Ill.: Taylor Institute, September 1999).

[27] Jody Raphael, Center for Impact Research, at National Governors' Association/National Institute for Justice Executive Policy Forum on Preventing Family Violence, Phoenix, Arizona, January 13-14, 2000.

[28] 1999 Maine Laws 435 (to be codified at 26 Maine Revised Statutues § 850)

[29] Jody Raphael and Sheila Haennicke, *Keeping Battered Women Safe Through the Welfare-to-Work Journey: How Are We Doing?* (Chicago, Ill.: Taylor Institute, September 1999).

[30] Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, *In the Wake of Childhood Maltreatment* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Justice, August 1997), 2.

[31] National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, *Family Violence: Emerging Programs For Battered Mothers and Their Children* (Reno, Nev.: National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 1998), 13.

[32] Rosemary Chalk and Patricia King, eds., *Violence In Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs*, (Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1998).

[33] S. Wilt and S. Olson, "Prevalence of Domestic Violence in the United States," *Journal of the American Medical Womens' Association* (May/June 1996).

[34] Several associations have developed health care standards for domestic violence, including the American Medical Association, American Nurses Association, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Association of American Medical Colleges, and American College of Emergency Physicians.

[35] Julie A. Gazmararian, et al., *The Relationship Between Pregnancy Intendedness and Physical Violence in Mothers of Newborns*, (Atlanta, Ga.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, June 1995).

[36] Mary Ellen Konieczny, *Domestic Violence and Birth Control Sabotage: A Report from the Teen Parent Project* (Chicago, Ill.: Center for Impact Research, February 2000).

APPENDIX A: State Examples of Bridge Building

Arizona: Statewide Efforts to Coordinate Services and Develop Collaborations

Arizona has made a broad attempt to integrate the efforts of family violence service providers, courts, law enforcement, and employers. The Governor's Office for Domestic Violence Prevention is the lead agency. It coordinates the efforts of eight different agencies and $12.5 million in programs across the state that provide prevention, treatment, and enforcement services related to family violence. This office coordinates Arizona's domestic violence and sexual assault resources and administers the Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grant, the STOP (Services, Training, Officers and Prosecutors) Violence Against Women Grant, and the Governor's Innovative Prevention Grant. The office manages several coalitions, including the Governor's Commission on Violence Against Women, the State Interagency Task Force on Domestic Violence, the State Technical Assistance Response Team, and the Governor's Corporate Citizenship Initiative.

Examples of the efforts within the state to coordinate services include the following.

- **The Governor's Commission on Violence Against Women.** This interagency commission is comprised of representatives from various public agencies that respond to family violence. The commission's goals are information sharing and collaborative planning.
- **Arizona's Corporate Citizenship Initiative.** The Corporate Citizenship Initiative educates employers on family violence and helps implement violence prevention programs within the workplace. To support this effort, the Governor's Office for Domestic Violence Prevention published *A Workplace Guide* to help employers develop internal prevention and intervention programs. Included in this guide are sample policies and procedures, information for company newsletters, and sample paycheck inserts that inform victims where to turn to help. Companies involved in this effort include American Express, the Arizona Republic, Tosco Marketing, Phelps Dodge, the State of Arizona, and the City of Phoenix.
- **Coordinated Community Response Teams.** Arizona recently received $858,000 through the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention's (OJJDP) Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grant Program to develop coordinated community response teams (CCRTs). CCRTs are multidisciplinary teams that work at the county level in rural areas to plan and implement family violence services. In addition to CCRTs, Arizona also provides funds for family violence advocates/coordinators for each county.
- **Judges' Bench Book.** The Governor's Office on Domestic Violence Prevention has developed a resource guide for Arizona judges hearing family violence cases. The "bench book," which is designed to better inform judges on the impact of family violence and on available services within the state, was developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice.
- **Statewide Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault State Plan Task Force.** Arizona Governor Jane Dee Hull recently convened a Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault State Plan Task Force. Its goal is to develop a statewide plan to ensure a coordinated response to address domestic violence and sexual assault. The plan will address outcome goals, service and resource gaps, methods to ensure coordination and collaboration among state agencies and

between community-based organizations, the development of performance-based evaluation processes for service providers, and funding allocation methodology. The task force's final report is due December 1, 2000.

- **Centers Against Family Violence.** Arizona has also created Centers Against Family Violence (CAFVs) to work with victims of family violence and sexual assault. CAFVs provide a nonintimidating environment for recent victims of abuse while allowing for coordinated investigations and treatment interventions. Although CAFVs house police detectives and support staff, they are not located within police departments but in a less threatening environment. Other services, such as victim services, medical, and human services, are available onsite. CAFVs exist in Mesa, Phoenix, and Glendale.

Contact: Harriett "Hank" Barnes, Director, Governor's Office For Domestic Violence Prevention, 1700 W. Washington, Suite 101, Phoenix, AZ 85007; Phone: 602/542-1773, Fax: 602/542-5522, E-mail: hbarnes@az.gov

Connecticut: Community Policing and Mental Health Collaboration

The Child Development-Community Policing (CD-CP) Intervention Project in New Haven, Connecticut, brings together community police officers, domestic violence detectives, child mental health clinicians, and advocates for battered women to provide coordinated law enforcement and human services responses to abused women and their children. Created in 1992 by the Child Study Center at the Yale University School of Medicine and in partnership with the New Haven Police Department, the program has served over 350 families and more than 600 children.

Major program components follow.

- **Twenty-four-hour emergency response and interdisciplinary consultation.** City police officers may contact the CD-CP 24-hour on-call service for immediate response and consultation by mental health clinicians in the aftermath of a child witnessing and/or being involved in family violence. Therapeutic attention is provided immediately at the scene—which could include a home, police station, hospital or school—to address the child's needs, help law enforcement respond to a traumatized victim, and help the victim effectively navigate the legal process. At the trauma scene, victims may choose to receive followup services offered by an interdisciplinary consultation service team in such areas as safety planning, crisis intervention, clinical assessment, and treatment. The consultation service includes both law enforcement and advocacy/clinical followup services. The project also developed a confidentiality protocol for officers and clinicians to use as they work with abuse victims.
    - *Law enforcement followup.* Detectives and/or patrol officers make followup visits to the home of the victim and/or perpetrator, regardless of the victim's acceptance of the interdisciplinary consultation service. The unit assures physical safety and compliance with protective orders and helps complete case investigations. Assigned officers are responsible for developing and implementing a plan to increase victim and witness safety in the designated cases, and they work closely with advocates and clinicians who are involved with the family. A familiar beat officer can also increase the child's sense of security, provide an adult role model, and support the family in obtaining mental health and other human services.

- *Advocacy/clinical followup.* Advocacy and clinical followup includes such activities as assistance in obtaining court orders of protection; advocacy with prosecutors for increased bond and specific conditions of release; close coordination of information flow among police, prosecutors, probation officers, advocates, and victims; regular supportive contact and assistance with securing needed human services; and clinical assessments and ongoing psychotherapy.

- **Weekly police ride-alongs with a mental health clinician.** A mental health clinician rides with police officers weekly during evening hours to help respond to domestic violence calls. The clinician provides a resource for consultation and assistance on difficult domestic violence cases, particularly those involving children.

- **Data collection.** All cases referred to the project are tracked through an automated database that records identifying information, the nature of the incident, the immediate CD-CP response, and the number and nature of followup contacts. Domestic violence cases are also tracked by the police department to determine the existence of and compliance with court orders of protection, repeat calls for service, and level of violence perpetrated. Psychological responses of victims receiving clinical services following domestic violence incidents are also tracked. Case review allows for modification of the intervention plans for each case so coordinated interventions are effective.

With funding from the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and private sources, the CD-CP approach is being replicated at seven sites, including Buffalo, New York; Charlotte, North Carolina; Nashville, Tennessee; Portland, Oregon; Baltimore, Maryland; Framingham, Massachusetts; and Newark, New Jersey.

Contact: Miriam Berkman, Assistance Coordinator, Child Development-Community Policing Program, Yale University Child Study Center, 230 S. Frontage Road, New Haven, Connecticut 06520; Phone: 203/785-4610, Fax: 203/785-4608, E-mail: Miriam.berkman@yale.edu

New York: Using Schools and Employers to Prevent Family Violence

New York takes a multifaceted approach to ameliorating family violence by engaging the public, community organizations, schools, state and local agencies, and employers in family violence prevention and treatment efforts. To solicit citizen involvement in stemming family violence, Governor George Pataki launched a statewide public awareness campaign during Domestic Violence Awareness Month in April 1999. Using billboards, bus signs, and bumper stickers on police cars, the campaign's theme, "Domestic Violence: It's a ~~Shame~~ Crime," reinforced the message that domestic violence has legal as well as other consequences.

The governor's strong support for battling family violence has led to other statewide family violence initiatives. In early 1998, the state's Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence (OPDV) published recommendations developed by an interagency task force for locales interested in taking a cross-systems approach to family violence. The *Model Domestic Violence Policy for Counties* guidebook was disseminated statewide and presents strategies for employers, human services workers, mental health practitioners, health care professionals, substance abuse counselors, educators, child welfare workers, and the criminal justice system. OPDV also developed more comprehensive school and employer-based efforts to curb family violence.

- **School-Based Strategies.** Many researchers and policymakers attribute the intergenerational cycle of family violence to persistent social norms and peer group influences that consider family violence to be an acceptable way to resolve conflict and treat women and children. Schools offer an effective path to reaching children, young adults, and their parents who experience family violence. They provide an avenue for preventing family violence (through changing peer behavior) and identifying and referring families to community domestic violence services. New York's school-based initiatives include the following.

    - *Violence Prevention and Head Start.* The state Violence Prevention Project trains Head Start staff and parents of children in the Head Start program on the impact of domestic violence on preschool children. Part of the training involves techniques for identifying and dealing with the fears expressed by children who witness and/or are victims of family violence. The program also instructs staff and parents how to live lives free of domestic abuse and disempowerment.
    - *School-Based Programs and New York State Police.* The New York State Police (NYSP) and OPDV jointly developed a curriculum for the NYSP's Safe Schools Program on the relationship between domestic violence and school violence. This one-hour presentation is presented to schools upon request. OPDV also trained state troopers to help them develop a special awareness of the sensitivities surrounding domestic violence and youth.

- **Employer-Based Strategies.** New York also educates its state agencies on how to raise their employees' awareness of domestic violence and how to assist victims in the workplace. The model domestic violence employee awareness and assistance policy for state agencies provides effective practices, policies, and protocols for providing a safe and helpful work environment for employees who are victims of domestic violence and for coworkers who may be uninformed about the consequences of such violence. New York included business community representatives as well as employee organizations and other state agency leaders in the model's development. It disseminates the model policy to all agencies in the state. OPDV will soon release a similar policy for private-sector employers and plans to offer them technical assistance in using the protocol. In 2002, OPDV will survey businesses to determine the guide's usefulness and to identify strategies for improving the rate of its adoption by employers.

Contact: Charlotte Watson, Executive Director, New York Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence, 52 Washington Street, Rensselaer, New York 12144; Phone: 518/486-6262, Fax: 518/486-3583, E-mail: cwatson@nysnet.net

Vermont: Addressing Family Violence Through Child Welfare and Domestic Violence Coalition Program Partnerships

In its effort to address family violence, Vermont developed formal linkages between the child welfare system and nongovernmental domestic violence coalition programs. In 1997, as part of the Vermont Domestic Violence and Child Abuse Project, the Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) established a Domestic Violence Unit to enhance the safety, permanence, and well-being of abused children or youth in cases where their mothers are battered by an intimate partner.

Modeled after the Massachusetts Department of Social Services Domestic Violence Program (the first child welfare agency to establish a domestic violence unit) and the AWAKE program at Children's Hospital in Boston (one of the first hospital-based domestic violence advocacy programs for abused women and children) the Vermont SRS Domestic Violence Unit was designed to meet the needs of a more rural state. The unit jointly developed memoranda of understanding between child welfare agencies and domestic violence coalition programs to help reduce the barriers women face when accessing safety for themselves and their children. Vermont hired three domestic violence specialists statewide to serve four local SRS offices each. Some of the programs and responsibilities of the SRS Domestic Violence Units include the following.

- **Domestic Violence Consultation on Child Protective Services (CPS) and Juvenile Services (JS) Cases.** The unit offers consultation to CPS and JS caseworkers and various community partners on cases where there is adult intimate partner abuse. The consultation helps to develop innovative interventions in safety planning, service provision, and perpetrator accountability to enhance the safety of domestic violence victims. To date, more than 1,500 consultations have been provided on over 350 cases. The Domestic Violence Unit reviewed SRS intakes, open cases, and substantiated risk-of-harm cases to identify trends in child welfare practice in child abuse and juvenile services cases with domestic violence prior to the unit's creation. The unit also issued policy and practice recommendations to the child welfare agency and developed services for juveniles at risk of becoming domestic violence offenders.
- **Comprehensive Cross Training of CPS and Domestic Violence Program Staff.** Most of the state's child welfare and domestic violence program staff were cross-trained by 1997. As a result, most of the counties have developed memoranda of understanding between agencies to plan future collaborative efforts on behalf of battered women and their children. The unit's domestic violence specialists also partnered with the Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Coalition and designed and delivered basic and advanced training to child welfare workers on domestic violence; its impact on children; and the identification, assessment, and intervention strategies for child welfare cases involving domestic abuse.

Contact: Janine Allo, Jill Richard, Ellie Breitmaier, or Tori Russell, Domestic Violence Unit, Vermont Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services, 103 S. Main Street, Waterbury, Vermont 05671; Phone: 802/241-1206, Fax: 802/241-1253, E-mail: jallo@ccvs.state.vt.us (Janine Allo)

Other state examples of domestic violence and child welfare collaborations include: the Family Violence Outreach Program of the Coordinating Council for Children in Crisis, New Haven, Connecticut; Community Partnership for the Protection of Children: Domestic Violence and Child Protection Collaboration, Jacksonville, Florida; Department of Social Services Domestic Violence Unit, Massachusetts; Families First: Domestic Violence Collaboration Project, Lansing, Michigan; and Artemis Center for Alternatives to Domestic Violence: Integration Project, Dayton, Ohio.

APPENDIX B: Federal Funding Sources for Family Violence

STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grant Program

STOP (Services, Training, Officers and Prosecutors) is a grant program of the Violence Against Women Grant Office, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The program aims to develop and strengthen effective law enforcement and prosecution strategies to combat violence against women and to strengthen and develop victim services in cases involving violent crimes against women. For additional information, contact STOP, Phone: 800/256-5883 or 202/265-0967, Fax: 202/265-0579, or E-mail: STOPGrants_TA_Projects@csgi.com.

Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grant Program

This program focuses on the needs and unique characteristics of rural communities in addressing domestic violence and child victimization. The goals are to improve and increase the services in rural areas available to women and children and to enhance community involvement in developing a jurisdiction's response to domestic violence and child victimization. For more information, contact the Violence Against Women Office, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Phone: 202/307-6026, Fax: 202/305-2589, or via the Web:
http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/vawo/grants/rural/descrip.htm

U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs

In addition to the STOP and Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grants, the Office of Justice Programs operates other formula and block grant programs. Many of these initiatives provide funding to address family violence, including grants to encourage arrest policies, crime victim compensation, and reduction and prevention of children's exposure to violence. For more information, contact the Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, Phone: 202/307-0703. A comprehensive list of current funding programs and the grantees can be accessed at: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/00progplan/chap4.htm

State Grants for Child Abuse and Neglect

These formula grants are awarded to support and improve state child protective systems. Examples of projects include developing training opportunities for those working in child protective services; improving risk and safety assessment tools and protocols; and strengthening child abuse prevention, treatment, and research programs. For more information, contact the Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Phone: 202/401-5281, or via the Web at: http://www.cfda.gov/static/93669.asp

Social Services Block Grant (SSBG)

Many states allocate a substantial portion of their SSBG to fund family violence programs. Examples of programs funded by states using the SSBG are domestic violence counseling, comprehensive crisis intervention services, and emergency shelters. For more information, contact the Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Phone: 202/401-5281, or via the Web at: http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ocs/ssbg/index.htm

Title V (Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant)

Title V of the Social Security Act provides funds to states to address critical challenges in maternal and child health, including health-related services linked to child abuse and family violence. Funds can be used to prevent injury and violence; reduce infant mortality; reduce adolescent pregnancy; provide comprehensive care for women before, during, and after pregnancy and childbirth; meet the nutritional and developmental needs of mothers, children, and families; and for other purposes. For more information, contact the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Phone: 301/443-2170, or via the Web at: http://www.mchb.hrsa.gov/

Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Block Grant

In addition to cash assistance, job training, and employment retention and advancement services, the TANF block grant allows states to fund programs and services for welfare recipients and other low-income families who are victims of domestic violence. For example, funds can be used to help victims relocate and develop safety plans, to provide counseling, and to develop staff training. Activities funded with TANF must satisfy at least one of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996's stated four purposes. For more information, contact the Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Phone: 202/401-5281, or via the Web at: http://www.acf.dhhs.gov/programs/ofa/funds2.htm

Welfare to Work (WtW) Block Grant

WtW provides formula and competitive funding to states that may be allocated to family violence initiatives. Examples of programs eligible for funding include assistance for welfare recipients who are victims of family violence; projects that provide legal assistance, child care, transportation, and short-term housing for victims; and preventive programs for the children of domestic violence victims. For further information, contact the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, via the Web at: http://wtw.doleta.gov/. (Regional phone numbers are available at this site.)

APPENDIX C: Publications and Other Resources

Related Publications

"Advocacy in a Coordinated Community Response: Overview and Highlights of Three Programs." 2000. This paper discusses the importance of advocacy for victims of domestic violence, especially in the legal system and as part of a coordinated response. Appropriate roles for advocates are discussed. The paper profiles three coordinated community response models: Santa Barbara, California; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and Duluth, Minnesota. For more information, contact the Violence Against Women Office, 202/616-8894, or via the Web at: http://www.vaw.umn.edu/BWJP/communityV.htm.

"Coordinated Community Responses to Domestic Violence in Six Communities: Beyond the Justice System." October 1996. This paper examines the approaches six communities developed in response to domestic violence and highlights critical components of a comprehensive, coordinated response system. For more information, contact the Urban Institute, 202/833-7200, or via the Web at: http://www.urban.org/crime/ccr96.htm.

"Domestic Violence as a Barrier to Women's Economic Self-Sufficiency." December 1999. This paper discusses the frequency of domestic violence experienced by women on welfare and subsequent concerns of work requirements placed on welfare recipients. Policy issues regarding barriers facing victims, employer involvement, and human services office roles are presented. For more information, contact the Welfare Information Network, 202/628-5790, or via the Web at: http://www.welfareinfo.org/domesticviolence.htm.

Evaluation of the STOP Formula Grants to Combat Violence Against Women. July 1999. This report highlights the positive impact STOP grants have had on the experiences of female victims of violence in the criminal justice and other human services systems. Components of successful STOP projects are outlined. However, gaps in service, such as inadequate data systems, inconsistent enforcement of protective orders, and high up-front costs to victims, still remain. For more information, contact the Urban Institute, 202/833-7200, or via the Web at: http://www.urban.org/crime/vaw99.html.

Family Violence: Emerging Programs. 1998. This report highlights 29 innovative programs from 5 service areas affecting families from violent homes. Programs from child protection, community-based domestic violence services, the justice system, health care and community-based parent/child services, are described. For more information, contact the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, 702/784-6012, or via the Web at: http://www.dvlawsearch.com/pubs/.

Intimate Partner Violence. May 2000. This report highlights trends in domestic violence using data from the 1998 National Crime Victimization Survey. It details current statistics on such victim characteristics as age, race, and income. For more information, contact the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 202/307-0765, or via the web at: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/ipv.pdf.

Keeping Battered Women Safe Through the Welfare-to-Work Journey: How are We Doing? September 1999. This report monitors the implementation of policies for battered women under PRWORA of 1996. Discussion of the welfare reform law's Family Violence Option, temporary waivers available under the option, and the necessity of adequate domestic violence assessment and referral processes are included. For more information, contact the Center for Impact Research (formerly the Taylor Institute), 773/342-0630, or via the Web at: http://www.ssw.umich.edu/trapped/pubs_fvo1999.pdf.

"Legal Interventions in Family Violence: Research Findings and Policy Implications." July 1998. This document evaluates various legal interventions, such as civil orders, arrest, and prosecution in cases of family violence. For more information, contact the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice, 202/307-0703, or via the Web at: http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles/171666.pdf.

"Promising Practices: Assessing Justice System Response to Violence Against Women." 1998. This is a series of three papers written as a for the Promising Practices Initiative of the STOP Violence Against Women Formula Grants Technical Assistance (TA) Project. For more information, contact the Violence Against Women Office, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, 202/616-8894.

- **"A Tool for Law Enforcement, Prosecution and Courts."** February 1998. This paper presents a detailed checklist for assessing the roles of law enforcement, prosecution and the courts in responding to violence against women. It also features a review of selected innovative and replicable strategies from cities and counties around the country. http://www.vaw.umn.edu/Promise/pplaw.htm.
- **"A Tool for Community-Based Victim Service Providers."** April 1998.This is the second paper from the STOP-TA Project's Promising Practices Initiative. It profiles 17 nonprofit, community-based victim advocacy organizations around the nation. The profiles feature innovative outreach and service delivery strategies that assist victims of sexual assault, stalking, and domestic violence. http://www.vaw.umn.edu/Promise/Vicsvcs.htm.
- **"A Tool for Communities to Develop Coordinated Responses."** July 1998. The third paper features 13 communities that have undertaken efforts to reduce and prevent violence against women. These communities have developed a coordinated criminal justice response, including utilizing a variety of service providers while maintaining a focus on the safety of the victim and offender accountability. http://www.vaw.umn.edu/Promise/PP3.htm.

Violence in Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs. 1998. This collaborative publication of the Committee on the Assessment of Family Violence Interventions, National Research Council, and the Institute of Medicine evaluates health, social service, and legal approaches to family violence. For more information, contact 888/624-8373, or via the Web at: http://books.nap.edu/catalog/5285.html.

Organizations

The American Bar Association
Commission on Domestic Violence
740 15th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-1022
abacdv@abanet.org
http://www.abanet.org/domviol/home.html

Battered Women's Justice Project
c/o National Clearinghouse for the
Defense of Battered Women
125 South 9th Street, Suite 302
Philadelphia, PA 19107
215/351-0010
215/351-0779 (fax)
800/903-0111 ext. 3 (hotline)

Center for Impact Research (formerly the Taylor Institute)
926 North Wolcott
Chicago, IL 60622
773/342-0630
773/342-5918 (fax)
http://www.impactresearch.org

Family Violence Prevention Fund
383 Rhode Island Street, Suite 304
San Francisco, CA 94103-5133
415/252-8900
415/252-8991 (fax)
fund@fvpf.org
http://www.fvpf.org/

Institute for Law and Justice
1018 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
703/684-5300
703/739-5533 (fax)
ilj@ilj.org
http://www.ilj.org/dv/index.htm

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence
P.O. Box 18749
Denver, CO 80218

303/839-1852
303/831-9251 (fax)
http://www.ncadv.org/index.htm

National Council of Juvenile and
Family Court Judges—Family
Violence Department
P.O. Box 8970
Reno, Nevada 89507
800-527-3223
775-784-6160 (fax)
famvio@ncjfcj.unr.edu
http://www.ncjfcj.unr.edu/homepage/domvio.html

National Resource Center on Domestic Violence
Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence
6400 Flank Drive, Suite 1300
Harrisburg, PA 17112
800/537-2238
717/545-9546 (fax)

Violence Against Women Office
U.S. Deparment of Justice
810 7th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531
202/616-8894
202/307-3911 (fax)
http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/vawo/about.htm

OMB APPROVAL NO. 1121-0140 EXPIRES 1/31/96

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
Office of Justice Programs

CATEGORICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRESS REPORT

The information provided will be used by the grantor agency to monitor grantee cash flow to ensure proper use of Federal funds. No further monies or other benefits may be paid out under this program unless this report is completed and filed as required by existing law and regulations (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements — 28 CFR, Part 66, Common Rule, and OMB Circular A-110).

1. GRANTEE	2. AGENCY GRANT NUMBER	3. REPORT NO.
National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices	98-IJ_CX-0054	
4. IMPLEMENTING SUBGRANTEE	**5. REPORTING PERIOD** (Dates) FROM: 06/01/98 TO: 07/31/00	

6. SHORT TITLE OF PROJECT	7. GRANT AMOUNT	8. TYPE OF REPORT
State Executive Juvenile Crime Forums	$70,000.00	X REGULAR FINAL REPORT SPECIAL REQUEST

9. NAME AND TITLE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	10. SIGNATURE OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	11. DATE OF REPORT
Evelyn Ganzglass, Director	Evelyn Ganzglass	3/7/01

12. COMMENCE REPORT HERE (Continue on plain paper.)

Final Report

The NGA Center for Best Practices, in conjunction with the National Institute of Justice, convened a series of three executive policy forums to help address Governors' concerns about juvenile crime. The forums, "Combating School Violence," Dealing with Violent Juvenile Offenders," and "Preventing Family Violence," were designed to be highly interactive and to engage Governors' policy advisors and provide them with information on current research, best practices, and state examples. The forums were hosted by Governors' offices and attended by Governors' executive-level policymakers and advisors. For each of these forums, corresponding *Issue Briefs* were produced and disseminated to Governors' policy advisors, meeting participants, relevant state policymakers, and posted to NGA's website.

Each *Issue Brief* is attached.

13. CERTIFICATION BY GRANTEE (Official signature)	14. DATE
Evelyn Ganzglass	3/7/01

OJP FORM 4587/1 (REV. 2-90)