



Final report of the Go To 2040 Crime and Justice Planning Initiative



Final report of the Go to 2040 Crime and Justice Planning Initiative

May 2009

Prepared by

Mark Myrent, Associate Director

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

and

Dennis P. Rosenbaum, Professor and Director

Center for Research in Law and Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago

This project was supported by Subcontract #2009-00656-01-00 between the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, under grant #C2008-01409 from the Chicago Community Trust. Points of view or opinions contained within this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the Authority, the University of Illinois, or the Chicago Community Trust.

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
300 West Adams, Suite 700
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: 312.793.8550
Fax: 312.793.8422
www.icjia.state.il.us

Table of contents

Introduction	1
Refining our understanding of the causes of crime and delinquency	4
Addressing the needs of crime victims	11
Fairness and equity in law enforcement strategies	15
Community engagement and capacity-building for a holistic approach to crime prevention and intervention	20
Non-criminal justice solutions for drug offenders	24
Alternatives to incarceration and offender reentry	30
Bibliography	38
Notes	46

Acknowledgements

The Authority wishes to thank the Go to 2040 Planning Initiative Advisory Committee members for providing the assistance and guidance for this project:

Co-Chair: Mark Myrent, Associate Director, IL Criminal Justice Information Authority
Co-Chair: Dennis Rosenbaum, Director, Center for Research in Law and Justice, Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice, University of IL at Chicago
Dwight Baird, Chief, Oswego Police Department
Deanne Benos, Assistant Director, IL Department of Corrections
Dorothy Brown, Clerk of the Court, Cook County Circuit Court
Jeffrey Butts, Research Fellow, Chapin Hall at University of Chicago
Cynthia Cobbs, Director, Administrative Office of IL Courts
Joseph DeLopez, Chief, Winnetka Police Department
Barbara Engel, Victims Advocate
Hon. Timothy Evans, Chief Judge, Cook County Circuit Court
Cheryl Graves, Community Justice for Youth
Steven Guerra, Deputy Chief of Staff, Social Services, Governor's Office
Lori G. Levin, Executive Director, IL Criminal Justice Information Authority
James Lewis, Senior Program Officer, Chicago Community Trust
Theodore O'Keefe, Deputy Superintendent, Chicago Police Department
Kelly Childress Politte, Public Defender's Office, Lake County
Jennifer Ricker, Deputy Chief of Staff, Public Safety, IL Governor's Office
Brian Samuels, Chief of Staff, Chicago Public Schools
Wesley Skogan, Professor/Faculty Fellow, Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University
Gary Slutkin, Director, Chicago Project for Violence Prevention/CeaseFire, University of IL at Chicago, School of Public Health
Randolph Stone, Edwin F. Mandel Legal Aid Clinic, University of Chicago Law School
Hon. Michael J. Sullivan, Chief Judge, 22nd Judicial Circuit (McHenry)
Thomas Sullivan, Jenner & Block LLP
Rick Velazquez, Director, Youth Outreach Services
Asheley Van Ness, Mayor's Office, City of Chicago
Michael Waller, Lake County State's Attorney
B. Diane Williams, President, Safer Foundation
Paula Wolff, Senior Executive, Metropolis 2020

The agency would like to acknowledge the following Go to 2040 Planning Initiative primary work staff for their assistance:

Mark Myrent, Associate Director, IL Criminal Justice Information Authority
Dennis Rosenbaum, Director, Center for Research in Law and Justice, Department of Criminology, Law, and Justice, University of IL at Chicago
Christine Devitt, Senior Research Analyst, IL Criminal Justice Information Authority
Jessica Ashley, Senior Research Analyst, IL Criminal Justice Information Authority
Sal Perri, Research Analyst, IL Criminal Justice Information Authority
Ebony Evans, Research Analyst, IL Criminal Justice Information Authority
Idetta Phillips, Research Analyst, IL Criminal Justice Information Authority
Sylwia Piwoni, UIC research intern
John Roiniotis, UIC research intern

Introduction

The Chicago Community Trust and the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP) jointly initiated a comprehensive, long-range planning project for the Chicago region (Cook, DuPage, Kane, Will, Kendall, Lake and McHenry counties) entitled *Go To 2040*. This planning process encompasses multiple domains of public life including land use, transportation, housing and environmental issues, education, health, workforce development, arts and culture, food security, human relations and public safety. The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, along with the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) Center for Research in Law and Justice, was selected to provide leadership in the area of crime and justice within the public safety sphere.

As lead agency for this effort, Authority staff was expected to identify indicators, report on existing conditions, make recommendations for action in the area of crime and justice, and with guidance from an Advisory Committee, produce a report that:

- States the present condition of the issue examined.
- Identifies challenges and opportunities.
- Sets targets for 2040.
- Identifies strategies and their impact for the region.
- Identifies federal, state, and local policies and resources critical to the success of the Region.
- Identifies all organizations working on the issue and other resources relevant to the issue.

A vision statement was created by CMAP and the Trust to guide the work of the Crime and Justice Advisory Committee and staff, and provide an overview for identifying relevant themes for discussion, research, and development of action strategies:

"In 2040, the Northeastern Illinois region will be among the SAFEST urban areas in the nation. Our communities will be safer due to:

- *Crime prevention strategies*
- *Effective law enforcement*
- *Improved access to opportunity*
- *Individual social responsibility*
- *Increased civic involvement"*

The advisory committee met on October 3, 2008, and January 30, 2009, to review information, data, and reports compiled by staff to inform discussions centered on crime and justice issues in the seven-county Northeast Illinois region that will warrant attention and resources in the year 2040. Between those two meetings, advisory committee members were asked to complete an on-line survey regarding the current conditions in their field of criminal justice and in their communities and the anticipated effects of projected changes in demographics on criminal justice goals and objectives for reaching a safe, equitable, efficient region by Year 2040. The survey also asked members to assess the nature and magnitude of specific crime and justice issues raised

at the first advisory committee meeting. Although a multitude of issues were raised by the committee, they were distilled into the following six major themes:

- Refining our understanding of the causes of crime and delinquency.
- Addressing the needs of crime victims.
- Fairness and equity in law enforcement strategies.
- Community engagement and capacity building for a holistic approach to crime prevention and intervention.
- Non-criminal justice solutions for drug offenders.
- Alternatives to incarceration and offender reentry.

For each theme, this report contains a description of the issue and the challenges and opportunities in the area, as well as an action plan that describes recommendations and strategies for addressing the issue.

Public safety is a defining feature of life in many communities of Northeast Illinois and across America. The criminal justice system attempts to enhance public safety by responding when victimization occurs, maintaining order, and preventing crime via the threat of punishment. Unfortunately, the criminal justice system in the United States has been heavily criticized for not meeting the “Big Three Es” -- Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Equity. Too often the system is slow in administering justice and expensive to maintain. Too often the system that is supposed to rehabilitate offenders is unable to prevent them from returning to crime. And too often the system that is supposed to dispense justice is accused of enforcing laws in a manner that discriminates against persons of color and the poor. Indeed, research has documented that our criminal justice system is slow, ineffective at times, and does not dispense justice equally. Racial bias has been documented in decisions regarding arrests, searches, prosecutions, and sentencing, thus yielding today’s problem of disproportionate minority contact. Furthermore, research has documented some abusive encounters between the police and the public. This has resulted in reduced public confidence in the legitimacy of the criminal justice system.

Furthermore, American society has become heavily reliant on punitive, zero-tolerance strategies in an attempt to enhance safety in our communities. This has resulted in the rapid growth of prison populations over the past two decades, mostly affecting persons of color and limited means, and often involving non-violent offenders. The result is that the United States now has the highest rate of imprisonment per capita in the world.

This 2040 report on public safety addresses these concerns in a strategic manner as we develop a 30-year plan. In addition to enhancing the existing system (e.g., new training for law enforcement), this report suggests a need to seriously consider alternative models of justice, such as the balanced and restorative approach – which seeks to restore communities, victims, and offenders rather than removing and isolating offenders. This report also suggests the need to create an independent system of measurement to monitor the fairness of the criminal justice system and measure public safety outcomes that are important to the community, but are not captured in current indicators. Besides crime rates, the public cares about the quality of life in their neighborhood as measured by levels of physical and social disorder, fear of crime, and their freedom to use the local environment without concern for safety. The community also cares

deeply about equity and fairness during encounters with the police and other agents of the criminal justice system. These outcomes can be monitored with community surveys administered by an independent organization.

A fundamental problem with our current approach to public safety is our heavy reliance on reactive rather than preventative strategies. Research has identified dozens of individual and community factors that place youth at risk of delinquency and criminality. As a society, we have not adequately addressed the causes of crime including the role of poverty, health care, housing, education, family support, and neighborhood social networks. This report begins to document our current status on some of these dimensions in Illinois. To recommend changes in specific government policies and service delivery systems that contribute to crime would be beyond the scope of this report and would overlap with the contribution of other 2040 committees. However, this report does restore attention to the importance of the community in working with the police and others to maintain order on a daily basis and establish norms regarding acceptable behavior.

By relying so heavily on the police for public safety, there is a lack of recognition that public order is maintained largely by the social structure of the community itself, not by the police. Neighborhoods with high levels of collective efficacy (i.e., ability to look out for one another) and cohesion are less prone to violence and disorder than neighborhoods where social disorder is prevalent. Therefore, we must think more creatively about ways to mobilize the community and get them more involved in setting norms and standards of appropriate behavior.

On a related note, there is a glaring need for public education to gain support for alternative approaches. For example, critics have argued that the United States is more violent than most countries because of high levels of exposure to violence and trauma experienced by youth in certain primarily urban neighborhoods. This concern also extends to the prevalence of violence in the media, in entertainment, in sports and other aspects of our culture. Therefore, more persuasive public education campaigns are needed in order to change norms about the acceptability of violence as a means of human interaction. Also, public education campaigns may help to change norms about the relative merit of punitive criminal justice solutions to public safety and public health problems. The resources currently devoted to the non-violent drug offenses represent a powerful example of the failure of public policy. While new drug courts serve as important and encouraging incremental improvement in the system, the larger issues of drug enforcement remain. The costs of these enforcement efforts far outweigh any benefits and do not acknowledge the complexity of the drug problem in America.

In general, we encourage the pursuit of evidence-based, rational approaches that have a high probability of achieving justice and enhancing public safety. Too often our choice of public safety strategies is driven by fear or by myths about the effectiveness of criminal justice rather than by evidence of “what works.” Both incremental and major changes to our criminal justice system are needed based on scientific evidence. Also, given the complexity of the public safety issue, we recommend the development of multi-agency partnerships that require agencies outside the criminal justice system to accept responsibility for policies and practices that contribute to deviance, delinquency and criminality.

Refining our understanding of the causes of crime and delinquency

Description of the issues, challenges, and opportunities in the area

Inevitably the risk factor often cited as a precursor to crime is poverty. One fact is well established -- there is more violent and property crime in economically depressed communities than in affluent communities. In looking ahead to 2040, then, the state of the economy could have an impact on levels of crime. That fact leads naturally to the assumption that if a community becomes more prosperous, crime rates will go down, and if income levels decline, crime rates go up. Economists who have studied this view have discovered that it is often true, but not always.¹ For example, in the 1960s, the national homicide rate rose by 43 percent even though the country was in a period of great prosperity and low unemployment. The homicide rate fell in the 1980s, even as the economy was wobbling, with high interest rates and a steep rise in business bankruptcies. Although national trends do not always show covariation between the economy and crime, the link between poverty and crime at the community level is well established. Therefore, the 2040 plan should pay attention to economic issues in the region. But a wider range of potential causal factors must be addressed.

This report begins with a look at recent crime trends in the region as well as trends in existing data on family, school and community risk factors -- factors that have been identified in prior research as causes of crime and delinquency.

Crime trends in the seven-county region

- Statewide, there was a slight decrease in Part I crimes between 2001 and 2006. The overall decrease was comparable for violent (homicide, rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) and property crimes (burglary, larceny, motor vehicle theft, and arson), 2.5 percent and 2.1 percent, respectively.
- For the seven-county region, the overall decrease for violent crime was sharper (3.9 percent) than the decrease for property crime (2.5 percent).

Table 1
UCR Part I Crime in Chicago, seven-county region, and state by crime type and average annual percent change between 2001 and 2006

	2001			2006			Average annual percent change		
	Illinois	Chicago	7-County Region	Illinois	Chicago	7-County Region	Illinois	Chicago	7-County Region
Part I total	524,386	198,694	365,205	467,372	165,474	315,426	- 2.2%	- 3.3%	- 2.7%
Violent	81,327	46,534	60,713	71,226	35,292	48,927	- 2.5%	- 4.8%	- 3.9
Property	443,059	152,160	304,492	396,146	130,182	266,499	- 2.1%	- 2.7%	- 2.5

Source: Illinois Uniform Crime Reports available at the Illinois State Police web site

Risk factors

Data on risk factors in the areas of family, school, and community for the Northeast Illinois region are provided below.²

Family risk factors

Domestic violence

- Exposure to domestic and community violence are significant risk factors for delinquency, and they increase the likelihood that youth will experience school disruption and poor academic performance, which are also risk factors for delinquency.³

Table 2
Reported domestic violence incidents
in the Northeast IL region, 2007

County	Number	Rate per 100,000 population	Percent change in rate 2002- 2007
Cook	68,332	1,293	-22%
DuPage	2,731	294	+1%
Kane	1,912	382	+10%
Lake	2,518	355	-27%
McHenry	569	180	-9%
Will	2,360	350	-15%
Kendall	395	408	-28%
Region total	78,817	926	-23%
State total	115,006	895	-14%

Source: Illinois State Police, Uniform Crime Reports

- From 2002 to 2007, the rate of reported domestic violence incidences decreased 23 percent in the Northeast Illinois region.
- In 2007, the region’s rate of reported domestic violence incidents per 100,000 in the population was 3 percent higher than the state rate.

Child abuse and neglect

- Research has found that abused and neglected children have delinquency rates 47 percent higher than children who are not abused or neglected.⁴

Table 3
Indicated child abuse and neglect investigations
in the Northeast IL region, Fiscal Year 2008

County	Number	Rate per 100,000 children	% change in rate FY03- FY08
Cook	7,770	589	-7%
DuPage	787	339	+50%
Kane	1,050	708	+42%
Lake	1,567	790	+39%
McHenry	652	758	+34%
Will	924	478	+30%
Kendall	106	379	+6%
Region total	12,856	583	+6%
State total	27,947	874	+11%

Source: Illinois Department of Child and Family Services.
 FY08 rates were calculated using U.S. Census Bureau data 2007 estimates, the most recent data available.

- Indicated investigations are the unique number of children for which the Illinois Department of Child and Family Services (DCFS) found credible evidence of abuse and neglect.
- From state fiscal year (FY) 2003 to FY08, the rate of indicated child abuse and neglect investigations increased 6 percent in the Northeast IL region.
- In FY08, the region’s rate of indicated child abuse and neglect investigations per 100,000 in the population was 33 percent less than the state rate.

School risk factors

- A meta-analysis of risk factors for delinquency found that academic failure and low school attachment were significant predictors of juvenile delinquency.⁵

Truancy

- Truancy data is available on all youth enrolled in Illinois public schools. Students are considered truant if they have been absent from school without valid cause for one or more days during the academic year.

Table 4
School truancy in the Northeast Illinois region,
academic year 2008

County	Number	Rate per 100,000 students	% change in rate AY03- AY08
Cook	176,815	23,158	+121%
DuPage	18,806	11,932	+50%
Kane	35,171	30,106	+114%
Lake	21,776	15,824	-29%
McHenry	6,044	11,454	+1%
Will	29,868	26,418	+216%
Kendall	3,670	17,992	-4%
Region total	292,150	21,454	+85%
State total	458,946	22,553	+69%

Source: IL State Board of Education. Data include youth enrolled in public high schools in Illinois.

- From Academic Year (AY) 2003 to AY08, the rate of school truanancies increased 85 percent in the Northeast Illinois region.
- From AY03 to AY08, the rate of school truanancies more than tripled in Will County, from 8,364 to 26,418.
- In AY08, the region’s rate of school truanancies per 100,000 students in the population was 5 percent less than the state rate.

School dropouts

Table 5
High school dropouts in the Northeast Illinois region,
academic year 2008

County	Number	Rate per 100,000 high school students	% change in rate AY03- AY08
Cook	17,229	7,276	-7%
DuPage	730	1,395	-28%
Kane	990	2,938	-27%
Lake	925	2,142	-68%
McHenry	208	1,255	+236%
Will	844	2,533	+11%
Kendall	112	1,973	-48%
Region total	21,038	4,990	-16%
State total	27,860	4,354	-25%

Source: Illinois State Board of Education. Data include youth enrolled in public high schools in Illinois.

- From Academic Year (AY) 2003 to AY08, the rate of high school dropouts decreased 16 percent in the Northeast Illinois region.
- From AY03 to AY08, the rate of high school dropouts more than tripled in McHenry County, from 374 to 1,255.
- In AY08, the region’s rate of high school dropouts per 100,000 students was 15 percent more than the state rate.

Community risk factors

Research has found delinquency is correlated with drug availability, high levels of adult criminality, exposure to violence, and exposure to racial prejudice in the community.⁶ Studies have found that communities with higher levels of poverty or social disorganization tend to have higher levels of juvenile delinquency.

Poverty

- Annually, the U.S. Census Bureau defines poverty by a monetary income threshold for families according to family size.

Table 6
Children living in poverty in Northeast Illinois region, 2007

County	Number	Rate per 100,000 children	% change in rate CY02- 2007
Cook	281,408	21,323	+3%
DuPage	13,181	5,671	+3%
Kane	16,234	10,944	+20%
Lake	16,488	8,316	+11%
McHenry	5,418	6,295	+44%
Will	13,829	7,159	-5%
Kendall	1,343	4,805	+9%
Region total	347,901	15,771	+2%
State total	524,318	16,389	+8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau

- From 2003 to 2008, the rate of children living in poverty increased 2 percent in the Northeast region.
- In 2008, the Northeast region’s rate of children living in poverty per 100,000 children was 4 percent less than the state rate.

Overall, the data on causes of crime in the Northeast region found that in the past five years:

- The rate of domestic violence incidents in the region was slightly higher than the state rate.
- The rate of indicated child abuse and neglect investigations in the region increased slightly.
- The rate of school truancies in the region increased 85 percent.
- The region’s rate of high school dropouts was 15 percent more than the state rate.
- The rate of children living in poverty in the region increased slightly, but less than the rate of increase for the state.

Target for Year 2040 in Northeast Illinois region

The rate of domestic violence, child abuse and other health risks to minors will be greatly reduced through a comprehensive best-practices approach to delinquency prevention that includes public education and government/community partnerships, and that prioritizes competency building for at-risk youth.

Action plan/strategies

The regional data provided indicate the following programming directions:

Increasing protective factors for youth

Resiliency or protective factors encourage positive attitudes and behaviors and can act as protective assets against risk factors. Studies have suggested youth who are involved in their communities, have a non-parental positive adult role model, and a peer group that engages in constructive activities are less likely to be involved in criminal behaviors.⁷ Studies have shown that the younger an individual is when s/he begins to engage in delinquent acts the more likely s/he is to continue such behaviors into adulthood.⁸ Therefore, it is important to address risk and protective factors early in a youth's life and encourage the inclusion of the family, school, and community. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) offered promising interventions that focus on preventing and reducing risk factors for youth. They include:

- Classroom and behavior management programs.
- Multi-component classroom-based programs.
- Social competence promotion curricula.
- Conflict resolution and violence prevention curricula.
- Bullying prevention.
- Afterschool recreation, mentoring, and school organization programs.
- Comprehensive community interventions.

Lead agencies: Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission in conjunction with local juvenile justice planning councils in the Northeast Illinois counties

Reducing domestic violence

(See Section B for recommendations to address domestic violence)

Reducing child abuse and neglect

Prevent Child Abuse America has designed a comprehensive strategy comprised of a variety of community-based programs to prevent child abuse. The strategy recommends:

- Support programs and education for new parents.

- Early and regular child and family screening and treatment.
- Child care and day care opportunities for parents.
- Therapeutic treatment for abused children.
- Family support networks and crisis assistance.
- Life skills training for children and young adults to aid in adulthood, parenting, and to prevent personal abuse.
- Public information and education on child abuse.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Children and Family Services should assemble an implementation plan including recommended program approaches in conjunction with Child Protection Court Program Administrators and service providers in Northeast Illinois counties.

Researchers have found many benefits for children and youth, women, men, and communities who are raised by parents in healthy families, compared to unhealthy families. The Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families promotes the following programs:

- The *Healthy Marriage Initiative*, which helps couples gain greater access to marriage education services, on a voluntary basis, where they can acquire the skills and knowledge necessary to form and sustain a healthy marriage.
- The *Promoting Responsible Fatherhood Initiative* is to promote responsible fatherhood by funding programs that support healthy marriage activities, promote responsible parenting, and foster economic stability; and enable fathers to improve their relationships and reconnect with their children.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Human Services in conjunction with service providers and school administrators in Northeast Illinois counties.

Addressing the needs of crime victims

Description of issues, challenges, and opportunities in the area

Crime victimization produces a wide range of harm to individuals and communities. Many offenders are former crime victims (and vice-versa), creating a general culture of harm in certain urban areas. Victims often lose property or have it damaged and sustain substantial physical injury.⁹ Criminal violence is also associated with considerable psychological trauma.¹⁰ The range of costs include those caused directly by the offender, those incurred by individuals and society in an effort to deter or prevent criminal victimization, those incurred by the offender, and those associated with the criminal justice response.¹¹

The personal costs alone of criminal violence to victims are substantial and can be viewed as falling into four categories.¹² First, out-of-pocket expenses include property damage and loss and the cost of medical care. Although insurance often covers partial or full restitution for such costs, victims can still be required to pay insurance deductibles and often face higher premiums when renewing their insurance. Particularly in the case of violent crimes, victimization often results in physical injury.¹³ Some data indicate that almost one-quarter of all victims of violent crime sustain some physical injury, of which almost 7 percent incur some form of medical expense and almost 5 percent received hospital care.¹⁴ Contributing to these expenses, almost one-third of these victims have no health care insurance.¹⁵

A second type of cost stems from lost wages and productivity. Approximately 12 percent of all victims of criminal violence experience some loss of time from work.¹⁶ Of this group, more than 50 percent lose between 1 and 5 days, and almost 15 percent lose 11 or more.¹⁷

A third category of costs is associated with psychological trauma. Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and its symptoms are well recognized as consequences of criminal violence. One study found that one-quarter of all crime victims experienced a related PTSD, including nervous breakdowns, suicide ideation, and suicide attempts. Furthermore, recent research indicates that almost 50 percent of all victims of sexual assault and approximately 5 percent of victims of assault and robbery incur costs for mental health services.¹⁸

The final category of costs to victims of crime is less tangible, stemming from pain, suffering, and reduced quality of life. The established market value for these intangible costs is difficult to determine. One strategy, however, is to base estimates on jury awards to crime and burn victims.¹⁹ Typically, these estimates are based on the portion of the jury verdict designed to compensate the victim for pain, suffering, and diminished quality of life.

The cost estimates associated with the first three categories range between \$1,800 and \$6,800, depending on the particular crime type. A more recent study suggests that these estimates may significantly underestimate the personal costs of crime, and that previous estimates did not properly consider long-term socioeconomic detriments stemming from violent victimization.²⁰ This life-course model developed by Macmillan suggests that long-term costs of criminal victimization stem from the psychological consequences of victimization that disrupt processes

of education and occupational attainment, ultimately resulting in diminished income in later life. When viewed in this more comprehensive fashion, the costs of criminal violence for individuals victimized in adolescence are considerably steeper than earlier estimates. Based on this expanded paradigm, Macmillan estimates losses in income from violent victimization in adolescence to be well over \$200,000.

Domestic violence, also referred to as spouse abuse, woman battering, intimate partner violence, domestic abuse, and family violence, is a problem of epidemic proportions. According to a recent report,²¹ nearly 25 percent of women surveyed indicated that they were physically assaulted and/or raped by a current or former spouse, cohabitating partner, or date at some time in their lives. In 2003, 10 percent of violent crimes reported to law enforcement were committed by an intimate partner, and from 1998 to 2002, 11 percent of all violent crimes were committed by a family member.²² Intimate partner crimes are committed much more frequently against women than against men. The Bureau of Justice Statistics found that 85 percent of the victims of intimate partner violence were women.²³

These are the most recent domestic violence figures for the Northeast Illinois region:

Table 7
Domestic violence offenses in 2007

Cook – 68,332
DuPage – 2,731
Kane – 1,912
Kendall – 395
Lake – 2,518
McHenry – 569
Will – 2,360
Northeast Illinois regional total – 78,817

Source: Illinois State Police, Uniform Crime Reports

Looking ahead to 2040 the population is expected to be older, which indicates a need to plan for possible increases in elder abuse and other crimes against the elderly, such as financial exploitation. As seen below, a substantial number of elder abuse cases have taken place within the Northeast Illinois region.

Table 8
Elder abuse cases in 2006

Cook – 2,784
DuPage – 225
Kane – 233
Kendall – 17
Lake – 168
McHenry – 122
Will – 193
Northeast Illinois regional total – 3,742

Source: Illinois Department on Aging

Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) advocates that the adult and juvenile justice systems give balanced attention to public safety, individual accountability to victims and the community,

and development of skills to help offenders live law abiding and productive lives. Illinois had adopted the BARJ model in the language of the Illinois Juvenile Court Act,²⁴ but has still had limited implementation in many jurisdictions, and is rarely considered in the adult system.

Target for year 2040 in Northeast Illinois region

Services will be specifically targeted to vulnerable populations – including minorities, women, youth, and elderly persons – through the principles of Balanced and Restorative Justice, thereby balancing the needs of crime victims with those of the community and the offender.

Action plan/strategies

Based on testimony from leading experts in victim services in the state of Illinois, the following recommendations are offered for the improvement of services to victims of crime:

- Greater support for community-based implementations of Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) for juveniles in both prevention and diversion including best practices such as family conferencing and peacemaking circles. Ensure that BARJ programs do outreach to victims and communities, not just to the juvenile offender.
- Increased training and technical assistance for community members, police, prosecutors, and faith-based organizations in creating and implementing neighborhood BARJ programs. Evaluate community empowerment and investment to gauge the success of BARJ.

Lead agencies: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority in conjunction with the Illinois Balanced and Restorative Justice Initiative and Northeast Illinois county BARJ program administrators.

- Funding and support for capacity building in communities focused on community mobilization against sexual, domestic and gang violence, with a focus on counseling and advocacy services for sexual assault and domestic violence victims in every community, including immigrant and special needs populations.
- Development of best practice treatment programs for adolescent and adult sex offenders both in prison and community based aftercare; network of accountability and treatment centers for men who batter, with services available in appropriate languages; sexual assault and dating violence/domestic violence education appropriately focused at life stage and age at every level of schooling; evaluation of program efficacy and recidivism.
- Comprehensive 24-hour emergency medical, forensic, advocacy and counseling response for sexual assault survivors in regionalized sexual assault treatment centers located in hospital emergency rooms; better consolidation of the medical and forensic response to sexual assault victims with skilled, trained sexual assault nurse examiners and forensic personnel; ensure that evidence is analyzed in all cases and reduce backlogs of rape kit evidence at crime labs.

Lead agencies: Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault in conjunction with the Illinois Department of Corrections, and with sexual assault service providers, hospital and school administrators, police, and prosecutors in Northeast Illinois counties.

- Expanded and extensive network of supervised visitation centers for families where domestic violence threatens the safety of family members utilizing standards developed by federal Safe Havens Project; development of affordable housing for domestic violence victims after or in addition to emergency shelter. Targeted job development, job readiness, training, placement and ongoing support for battered women to enable economic self-sufficiency.

Lead agencies: Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence in conjunction with Chicago Mayor's Office on Domestic Violence, federal Office of Victims of Crime, and service providers in Northeast Illinois counties.

- Support comprehensive regional child advocacy centers for physically and sexually abused children that offer coordinated criminal justice and therapeutic response to the children and their families.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Children and Family Services and federal Office of Victims of Crime in conjunction with child advocacy centers in Northeast Illinois counties.

- Services should be expanded to investigate abuse, neglect, and financial exploitation of seniors. Law enforcement must develop partnerships with social services for anticipated increases in elder abuse as the population of the 7-county region gets older.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Aging in conjunction with service providers in Northeast Illinois counties.

Fairness and equity in law enforcement strategies

Description of issues, challenges, and opportunities in the area

Too often, municipal police organizations have not responded appropriately and professionally to citizens as victims, witnesses, suspects, complainants, and concerned citizens. One “neighborhood problem” that needs to be addressed in urban areas is the troubled relationship that exists between police and local residents, especially persons of color who live in high-crime neighborhoods.

Research conducted by Rosenbaum suggests that the introduction of police strategies and tactics without the consultation with the community may result in inequitable policing (e.g., racial profiling), aggressive and insensitive policing (e.g., verbal abuse, excessive force).²⁵ The price to the police organization may be a loss of the community’s trust and confidence. The cost to the individual officers may be alienation from the community, compromised safety, and lower morale.²⁶

Traditionally, police accountability has been an internal and legal process, focusing on the control of officers through punitive enforcement of rules, regulations, and laws. Today, police organizations are under pressure to be responsive to the public both for crime control and police conduct. The apparent success of New York’s technology-driven COMPSTAT model has made “accountability” the new buzzword in policing. But the questions are: (1) To whom are police accountable? And (2) For what are they accountable? Unfortunately, the COMPSTAT model requires the beat officers and their supervisors to be accountable primarily to central management in the traditional police hierarchy. As for the “what”, despite new technology systems, police organizations continue to rely on the traditional “big four” to measure their performance: reported crime rates, overall arrests, clearance rates, and response times.²⁷ Too many law enforcement agencies have blindly followed the narrow application of COMPSTAT technology to hold police officers and managers accountable for jurisdictional crime rates.

In the future, policy makers must give greater attention to measuring what matters to the public. In addition to crime, the public will undoubtedly be concerned about the overall quality of life and level of disorder in their neighborhood (e.g., loud music, public drunkenness, youth hanging out). Fear of crime and their ability to use their own neighborhood (e.g., walk to the store or use the park without harassment) are also important indicators of public safety. In the public safety domain, treatment of citizens by police is also of paramount importance. There is widespread concern about equitable treatment by race, gender, class, sexual orientation, and religion. In the future, the region should develop new and standardized indicators of these components of public safety as a means of monitoring progress by law enforcement agencies in a multicultural society. An annual public safety survey, managed by an independent agency, would be a worthwhile investment. Many of the appropriate measures have been developed in previous research.²⁸

At the same time, community-oriented approaches have been adopted by some law enforcement agencies to address these concerns. The most visible partnership between the police and the community is arguably seen in the adoption of community policing strategies. A working definition of this model offered by researchers includes: (1) organizational changes that encourage a closer relationship between police officers and the neighborhoods they service, such as decentralization of authority, attendance at community meetings, and foot and bike patrols; (2) serious problem solving that considers the concerns and problems expressed by neighborhood residents; and (3) community engagement designed to stimulate and empower community residents in the prevention of crime and disorder.²⁹ Police executives report that their organizations have changed substantially in structure and function since the early 1990s in response to the community policing agenda. These national surveys indicate that self-reported implementation of police-community partnerships, collaborative problem solving, and organizational change more than doubled in the mid-1990s.³⁰

On the other hand, police observers and researchers have argued that findings from national studies offer an inflated view of the level of support for community policing.³¹ Some researchers have noted that community policing has not been widely and deeply institutionalized because of internal resistance and a lack of organizational readiness (e.g., training and policies).³² This suggests the need to establish measurement systems that are able to monitor progress with these types of reforms. The Office of Community-Oriented Policing has initiated work in this area. Also, the National Institute of Justice has funded the development of a National Police Research Platform that will begin to develop new metrics to capture organizational change over time. Chicago and other jurisdictions in the region will have opportunities to participate in this initiative.

For community policing to be successful in practice, the relationship with the public must be strengthened. Community policing in the future will require a new level of information sharing.³³ If policing organizations wish to decentralize their authority, for example, beat officers must be empowered with up-to-date information about neighborhood characteristics. If data-driven problem solving is a priority, then police officers and supervisors need timely geo-based information. Especially important are data about the concerns and priorities of local residents and community organizations. If community engagement is a priority, then police officers need reliable information on local resources that can be leveraged to help prevent crime and disorder.

Without data systems that collect relevant community-based information about police performance and local community issues, and without new channels of communication, behavior on both sides is unlikely to change.

Target for year 2040 in Northeast Illinois region

Law enforcement agencies will be guided by a comprehensive community-oriented approach to policing that encourages problem solving, information sharing, community engagement, and performance measurement. State-of-the-art information sharing technologies will be used to enhance communication and trust between police and community members. Feedback will be sought from citizens to gauge satisfaction with police performance regarding effectiveness and equity concerns and progress on the implementation of community policing reforms. This will also provide a foundational index for measuring progress on a wide range of public safety dimensions, including victimization.

Action plan/strategies

The traditional measures of police accountability are inadequate for satisfying the new information requirements of community policing and for promoting a higher level of police performance.³⁴ These indicators of performance do not address the key factors that contribute to public safety and do not gauge in a meaningful way the level of satisfaction of the community with the quality of police service.

This problem can be remedied with internal and external strategies. Externally, we would recommend the establishment of independent community surveys that would monitor public safety issues in the region on a biannual basis, including levels of victimization, fear of crime, quality of neighborhood life, and satisfaction with the services provided by the police and other criminal justice agents. Measuring victimization also generates an independent estimate of the level of crime and the public's willingness to report crime.

Internally, there is much that law enforcement agencies can do to stimulate citizen participation in public safety. It has been argued by criminal justice policy analysts that because law enforcement agencies are assumed to be the experts on crime and public safety, and because they receive the lion's share of funding for these issues, that they carry the biggest responsibility for educating and involving the community in prevention activities.³⁵

Some cities, like Chicago, have taken this responsibility seriously by institutionalizing community beat meetings and other activities.³⁶ Unfortunately, when the community becomes involved in problem solving, traditional police data systems are not capable of incorporating the new data that is generated. As Skogan notes, the community's assessment of neighborhood problems that are viewed as precursors to crime (e.g., gang members loitering on street corners) often does not fit neatly into existing police data fields, and consequently, does not get recorded in any systematic and representative way.³⁷ This suggests that new data systems are needed to capture the kinds of information that is important to community residents.

As we move toward the year 2040, it is important for justice agencies to leverage the available technologies. Police organizations can make better use of the internet as a vehicle to satisfy the information needs of community policing and problem-solving models, and as a vehicle for improved responsiveness and sensitivity to the community.

A viable model has been proposed by Rosenbaum for a web-based initiative:

Incident reporting

- Using the internet for taking minor crime reports will allow police officers to devote less time to filling out reports, thus freeing them to address more pressing issues. It will also allow police departments to build a more representative database quickly and move toward the goal of a “paperless” agency. By providing citizens with the ability to report criminal activity confidentially, an avenue will be opened that has previously been denied to those residents who fear retaliation. Online reporting and anonymous tips may lead to improved clearance rates for violent crime, notably in neighborhoods where visible cooperation with police is problematic.

Citizen monitoring

- Web survey data could be collected from a sample of households that are randomly selected from each block or each police beat. This mechanism would allow police to measure perceptions of fear and safety, preventive behavior, and levels of citizen involvement; to gauge citizens’ perceptions of police effectiveness, equity and efficiency; to evaluate police anti-crime interventions; and to present opportunities for field new ideas and suggestions from citizens. The Chicago Internet Project tested this concept in 50 neighborhoods and found it to be viable.³⁸

Neighborhood profile report

- Creating a two-way flow of information is critical. If citizens take the time to participate in a Web reporting system, the police should provide some analysis and feedback on the information supplied. Neighborhood profile reports might include crime information and citizen monitoring results, including summary reports of the data collected from citizens’ Web surveys. This feedback might include neighborhood or beat profiles and performance summaries for both police and citizens. Sharing information via neighborhood profile reports should increase “organizational transparency,” thereby fostering greater trust among local residents and increasing their desire to collaborate. CLEAR-Path --a joint web-based initiative between the Chicago Police Department and Chicago residents, illustrates the potential for this type of virtual communication.³⁹

Enhanced police-community program

- For departments that have institutionalized community policing programs (e.g., community beat meetings, neighborhood watch, police citizen academies, school programs), the department can use the internet to improve the efficiency of communication with participants and extend the program’s reach. Beyond maintaining pertinent information about citizen meetings (e.g., times, locations, agendas, guest speakers), the website might serve as a communication center for beat officers and residents, providing a virtual community to complement the physical community fostered through beat meetings. Chat rooms could also be created to allow for synchronous communication, and would provide the opportunity for police officials to hold “virtual meetings” at the neighborhood or city

level. Listservs could be used to alert citizens about immediate threats to their community, acting as an initial means of notification in emergency situations.

Public service links

- Criminologists have clearly documented that public safety is not achieved by anti-crime measures alone, but rather is the product of a larger array of personal, social, environmental, economic, and political forces that impinge on neighborhoods.⁴⁰ Given this reality, police agencies should consider using the internet to link residents with a wide range of resources to assist them in solving personal problems and thereby reduce their risk of offending or being victimized. The public services of the Web page would extend beyond the boundaries of traditional policing efforts, providing links to websites that offer information on social, educational, health, and public safety services.

Lead agencies: Illinois State Police in conjunction with federal Office of Community Oriented Policing (COPS), academic advisors, and law enforcement agencies in Northeast Illinois counties.

Community engagement and capacity-building for a holistic approach to crime prevention and intervention

Description of issues, challenges, and opportunities in the area

Increasingly, those who study the criminal justice system have argued that the system cannot, by itself, solve the complex problems of crime, drugs, and disorder in our society – at least in the long run.⁴¹ Given the multiple and complex causes of crime and drug use, a growing chorus of scholars argue that a new approach is needed, one that tackles these problems from multiple angles, applying a multitude of strategies. This reasoning has been used, in turn, to justify the creation of anti-crime and anti-drug partnerships or coalitions – a group of organizations that can bring distinctive but complementary skills and resources to the table and can produce coordinated and targeted responses to public safety concerns.⁴²

Research indicates, for example, that delinquency and youth violence are caused by a wide range of factors, including poor parenting and childhood maltreatment,⁴³ personality deficits,⁴⁴ peer group influences,⁴⁵ community social disorganization and structural characteristics,⁴⁶ and environmental opportunities.⁴⁷ While much of this research has focused on specific risk factors, some have called for an integrated perspective on human development, recognizing that different systems interact and have differential effects on individuals at various stages in the life cycle.⁴⁸ So, for example, the adverse effects of child abuse can be compounded by inferior education, lack of economic opportunities, inadequate health and public services, the absence of positive role models, weak collective efficacy among neighborhood residents, peer pressure to join youth gangs, and easy opportunities for criminality. A compounding of such factors can lower one's probability of living a productive, healthy, and crime-free life. Recognizing these complexities, some researchers and policy analysts have proposed comprehensive, multi-level interventions as a strategic approach to increasing public safety, especially in urban settings.

Public safety has seen a few important examples utilizing this type of comprehensive model. The classic Chicago Area Project was established in 1931 to encourage community self-help and prevent juvenile delinquency.⁴⁹ The Boston Mid-City Project in the 1950s and the Mobilization for Youth Program in Manhattan in the 1960s attempted to replicate the basic idea behind the Chicago Area Project,⁵⁰ as they sought to mobilize community involvement across grassroots, social service, faith-based, and government organizations.

Involvement in partnerships by law enforcement agencies appears to be on the rise. National survey data⁵¹ indicate that the number of U.S. law enforcement agencies who report participating in “partnership-building activities” has grown substantially since the mid-1990s. The five most common partnership activities were: joint crime prevention programs (e.g., Neighborhood Watch), regular community meetings, joint projects with businesses, projects with residents to reduce disorder, and citizen surveys.

The promise of partnerships has led to several government-sponsored national demonstration programs. The U.S. Department of Justice has funded several key initiatives to demonstrate the value of collaboration for addressing public safety issues. The Community Responses to Drug Abuse Program (CRDA) in nine cities encouraged police departments and community organizations to join forces, along with other social service agencies, to combat local drug markets and to provide services to high-risk youth. A national evaluation of CRDA found that the partnerships were productive and educational to all parties. Some conflict between group members did arise because of the mixture of professional and community representatives who generally advocated divergent approaches to program planning and implementation.⁵²

The partnership concept was expanded further in the 1990s when the Department of Justice funded initiatives that were more comprehensive in nature, while retaining law enforcement in a central role. The Comprehensive Communities Program (CCP) was initiated in 1994 “to demonstrate an innovative, comprehensive, and integrated multi-agency approach to a comprehensive violent crime/community mobilization program.”⁵³ Cities were encouraged to engage in strategic planning that involved partnership building, data-driven problem identification and problem solving, and documentation of results. The national process evaluation found that most CCP sites were able to create new partnerships or broaden existing partnerships to include representation from the community, private sector, and many levels of government.⁵⁴ In terms of crime outcomes, many of the sites reported substantial reductions in target neighborhoods during the 2-year demonstration period⁵⁵, but a rigorous impact evaluation was not conducted, and crime rates were on the decline nationally during this period.

The most visible Department of Justice partnership initiative involving law enforcement has been the Weed and Seed Program, with more than 200 communities involved today, including East Aurora in Kane County. It is a comprehensive multi-faceted anti-crime program started in 1991 to achieve the following objectives⁵⁶:

1. To develop a comprehensive, multi-agency strategy to control and prevent violent crime, drug trafficking, and drug-related crime in targeted high-crime neighborhoods.
2. To coordinate and integrate existing as well as federal, State, local, and private-sector initiatives, criminal justice efforts, and human services to concentrate those resources in the project sites to maximize their impact.
3. To mobilize residents in the targeted sites to assist law enforcement in identifying and removing violent offenders and drug traffickers from their neighborhoods and to assist other human service agencies in identifying and responding to service needs in the target area.

The agriculturally-derived program title suggests a two-prong strategy of “weeding” out violent criminals in the target neighborhood through law enforcement and prosecution efforts, and “seeding” the area with prevention, intervention, treatment, and revitalization services.

Both process and impact evaluations of Weed and Seed were conducted. Law enforcement agencies were heavily represented on the steering committees, and therefore, for the purposes of developing and implementing weeding strategies, was relatively successful across the sites. In

Community engagement and capacity-building for a holistic approach to crime prevention and intervention

contrast, interagency cooperation among federal, state, and local prosecutors was not as successful. Too often, the local district attorney's office, which handled 92 percent of all Weed and Seed cases, felt excluded by the "feds" from the planning and decision-making process, and received no federal grant funds for their efforts. The most innovative component of Weed and Seed – the seeding of preventive social services – was also the biggest disappointment during the initial demonstration period. The reasons for this were numerous, ranging from insufficient funds for seeding activities (less than one-fourth of the total funds on average) to inadequate attention from program leaders. From a multi-agency partnership perspective, the composition of the seeding committees was also problematic. Local agencies (e.g., police, mayor's office, city services, non-profit organizations) were overrepresented on many seeding committees. The evaluation findings underscored the importance of bringing the right people to the table from the beginning, including representatives from the district attorney's office and from the target neighborhoods. It was also seen that community representation is also critical to prevent neighborhood residents from becoming angry and resentful of weeding activities.

Target for year 2040 in Northeast Illinois region

Reciprocal partnerships will be formed that involve criminal justice agencies, public health agencies, schools, businesses, community organizations, and other stakeholders to develop comprehensive strategic approaches to public safety. These partnerships will reach across jurisdictional boundaries and work with community leaders and community stakeholders to maximize resources in the implementation of crime prevention and intervention strategies.

Action plan/strategies

A subsequent cross-site analysis identified a range of factors that seemed to contribute to successful implementation and impact of the Weed and Seed initiative.⁵⁷ These findings should be viewed as useful guidelines for implementation of a wide range of future community capacity/coalition building efforts in the seven-county Northeast Illinois region.

In terms of community setting variables, successful sites were those with:

1. A pre-existing network of community organizations and community leaders.
2. A limited presence of deep-seated, intractable crime problems, such as gangs.
3. Proximity to commercial areas with potential for economic development.
4. More stable, less transient neighborhood populations.

In terms of program design, the evaluation concluded that the proper mix and sequencing of weeding and seeding activities are important predictors of success. Specifically, successful sites were more likely than their counterparts to:

1. Build community trust by implementing seeding activities at the same time as weeding.
2. Sustain weeding activities to prevent the resumption of criminal activity.
3. Combine high-level interagency task forces with street-level police presence as an anti-drug trafficking strategy.

Community engagement and capacity-building for a holistic approach to crime prevention and intervention

4. Maintain an active prosecutorial role at both the local and federal levels.

The main lesson here is that, contrary to the widespread belief that weeding activity is a one-shot event that must precede seeding activity, successful sites appreciate the need for simultaneous and sustained activity on both fronts.

The efficient use of limited resources to produce maximum impact is another important design consideration. The Weed and Seed findings suggest that greater success is achieved when the funds are concentrated on a narrowly defined (smaller) target population, and when administrators are able to channel and leverage other funds for the initiative. Thus, programs that are able to increase the dosage or intensity of the intervention are likely to have greater success than programs that focus on large target areas with no supplemental funds or resources applied to the initiative.

Finally, the Weed and Seed evaluation suggests that leadership styles and partnership dynamics are important for success. Weed and Seed, like many other public safety partnerships and coalitions, is a coalition of separate organizations with different objectives and constituents, and therefore, being able to work together smoothly toward a common goal is essential. The results suggest successful sites were characterized by:

1. Leadership that encouraged cooperation rather than confrontation.
2. A “bottom-up approach to identifying problems and solutions.
3. Extra efforts to build capacity among local organizations. Giving community organizations and leader an equal role in developing and implementing the Weed and Seed initiative can be very difficult for law enforcement agencies, but appears to be a sound long-term strategy for building healthy partnerships and creating self-regulating communities.

Lead agencies: Sheriffs’ departments and state’s attorneys’ offices in Northeast Illinois counties should seek assistance from the federal Weed and Seed Office to form partnerships with service providers and develop a comprehensive strategy for crime prevention and intervention. Additional endorsement should be obtained from the Illinois Sheriffs Association and Illinois Prosecutors Association.

Non-criminal justice solutions for drug offenders

Description of issues, challenges, and opportunities in the area

Since 2001, Lake and McHenry were the only counties within the Northeast Illinois Region to see increases in drug related arrests, at 1.2 percent and 3.9 percent, respectively. The other counties saw total drug arrest totals decrease. The most substantial reduction was in Kendall County (-7.4 percent). Less dramatic decreases were found in DuPage (-2.0 percent), Kane (-2.4 percent), Will (-2.2 percent), and Cook (-0.8 percent) counties. Chicago drug arrests dropped by 0.6 percent, which was similar to the overall state trend (-0.5 percent). We should note, however, that since the 1980s, drug-related arrests have increased dramatically, and have leveled off in recent years.

Table 9
Drug arrest rates per 100,000 population for Northeast Illinois region and Chicago in 2001 and 2007

Total drug arrests	2001	2007	Annual average percent change between 2001 and 2006
Cook	1,342.3	1,214.2	- 0.8%
Du Page	464.6	458.6	- 2.0%
Kane	525.0	411.4	- 2.4%
Kendall	640.5	378.0	- 7.4%
Lake	508.8	573.9	+1.2%
McHenry	358.0	396.0	+3.9%
Will	537.3	508.5	- 2.2%
Chicago	2,002.4	1,904.6	- 0.6%
Illinois (all counties without Chicago)	899.2	856.0	- 0.5%

Source: Illinois State Police, Uniform Crime Reports

Between 1983 and 2005, the number of drug offenders in Illinois prisons rose from 547 to 11,179, a 20-fold increase.⁵⁸ National estimates confirm that more than half of all non-violent felony offenders meet the diagnostic criteria for substance abuse or dependence – about 15,000 in Illinois.⁵⁹ The public dollars spent annually to incarcerate drug offenders in Illinois is estimated at just over \$240 million.⁶⁰

IDOC data on the recidivism rate of offenders released after serving time for drug offenses shows that, of the 13,067 drug offense exits in 2001, 54.5 percent returned to prison within three years.⁶¹ (The data does not reflect the recidivism of substance abusers who were incarcerated for non-drug offenses.) The data establishes that, without treatment, more than half of the inmates with substance abuse issues will be repeatedly recycled through the system. Treatment and

supervision of drug offenders in lieu of incarceration results in cost savings: \$5,925 per year for probation, case management, and drug treatment⁶² versus \$22,278 for one year of prison followed by one year on parole at a cost of approximately \$1,000 per year. The objective of increasing public safety is better met through effective treatment because treated addicts re-offend far less than those who are incarcerated without treatment, with some studies documenting a 30 percent reduction.⁶³

The drug treatment infrastructure currently in place in Illinois reaches offenders at many stages of contact with the criminal justice system. From drug schools, which divert entirely from the system, to parole-based program, Illinois has the mechanisms to divert non-violent offenders into treatment alternatives through pre-dispositional programs, specialized problem-solving courts, or general docket courtrooms that have access to specialized probationary programs.

Drug school is a voluntary treatment option. It is designed to divert those who are minimally involved with drugs and the criminal justice system, and prevent them from going deeper into either realm. Drug schools do not provide treatment; however, referrals are provided for those who exhibit dependence. The program provides educational classes addressing the negative aspects of using drugs and the impact of having a drug conviction on one's record. Charges are dismissed upon successful completion of drug school, and offenders may apply for immediate expungement.

Within the Controlled Substances Act, the Cannabis Control Act, and the Methamphetamine Control and Community Protection Act, the legislature included options for treatment for first offenders. This "first offender probation"⁶⁴ is generally available to offenders who have not been previously convicted of any drug law violations and for whom the current charge is the lowest level of simple possession.⁶⁵ Upon successful completion of probation, the person is discharged and the proceedings are dismissed.

The 2002 Drug Court Treatment Act enables the Chief Judge of any circuit in the state to establish a drug court program and provides for the structure for operating the court.⁶⁶ Within the seven-county Northeast Illinois region, drug courts exist in both the criminal and juvenile divisions in Cook and Kane counties, the criminal divisions of DuPage and Lake counties, and the juvenile division of Will County. Generally, those that go through drug court are more drug-involved and have lengthier criminal records than drug school participants;⁶⁷ therefore more intensive treatment and monitoring are required. Before entry into a drug court program in Illinois, an offender must be screened and evaluated by a treatment professional. The program itself must include a regimen of graduated incentives, rewards, and sanctions.⁶⁸ Procedurally, an offender enters into a contract, or written agreement, regarding the terms of his or her participation in the program. Failure to follow those conditions may result in the imposition of sanctions, or ultimately, discharge from the program. Upon successful completion of the program, the court may dismiss the original charges against the defendant or successfully terminate the defendant's sentence or otherwise discharge him or her from further proceedings in the original prosecution.⁶⁹

In general, evaluation results pertaining to drug courts have been positive. According to a study released in 2003 by the National Institute of Justice from a sample of 17,000 drug court

graduates nationwide, within one year of program graduation only 16.4 percent had been rearrested and charged with a felony offense.⁷⁰ Positive results have been realized in the Cook County drug court program, where graduates from 1999 through 2005 demonstrated a reduction in felony arrests by 84 percent and a 73 percent reduction in total arrests. Drug court cost estimates range from \$2,500 to \$5,000 per participant per year, which is substantially less than incarceration costs.⁷¹

Illinois has also had statutory diversion alternatives available for drug-involved offenders for decades. The statutes describe eligibility and process for criminal justice treatment interventions and mandate the availability of treatment alternatives to drug-involved offenders under the supervision of a “designated program.”⁷² That program in Illinois is Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities (TASC), and it is the only agency designated the Secretary of the Department of Human Services to provide substance abuse assessments and recommendations for the Illinois courts. For each client, TASC conducts a comprehensive, strengths-based assessment, develops an individualized service plan, and monitors progress back to the court. TASC also employs drug use screening as needed to aid in assessment, treatment matching, and monitoring of client’s compliance with court mandates. Most drug-involved persons charged with or convicted of a probationable crime may elect treatment under the supervision of TASC, although there are eligibility exceptions including crimes of violence, limits on the amount of drugs involved, and multiple previous attempts at treatment.

Table 10
Drug treatment admissions in Northeastern Illinois region
1995 - 2006

County	Year			% change 1995-2006
	1995	2000	2006	
Cook	35,651	44,769	65,556	+ 84%
DuPage	778	1,337	2,169	+ 179%
Kane	1,040	1,292	2,478	+ 138%
Kendall	52	84	258	+ 396%
Lake	1,502	2,317	3,001	+ 100%
McHenry	325	530	1,106	+ 240%
Will	1,122	1,570	2,508	+ 123%

Source: Illinois Department of Human Services, Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse

Counties across the state, including Cook, also operate successful intensive drug probation programs. These are post-dispositional and use intensive supervision, drug testing and treatment, as well as other requirements such as curfew, community service, employment or school to curb drug use and offending behavior. Probation officers assigned to monitor these probationers have special training and expertise which enables them to work effectively with addicted offenders. Placement on intensive probation often substitutes for jail or prison sentences.

Finally, when diversion alternatives earlier in the justice process have been exhausted, drug prisons provide a treatment option for high-risk offenders. In January 2004, the Illinois Department of Corrections reopened the Sheridan prison facility as a drug prison.⁷³ Sheridan moves drug-involved offenders through an intensive drug treatment, cognitive skills

development, vocational and job preparation program. The program begins in the prison setting and follows through reentry and back into communities under an extensive case management program with heightened supervision. The cost per Sheridan inmate of \$46,012 in FY07 is more than twice the average inmate cost of \$21,278; however, the expectation is for long-term savings in terms of reduced recidivism.⁷⁴ After two years of operation, the results are promising. Sheridan graduates have been found to be 21 percent less likely to be rearrested and 44 percent less likely to return to prison. In SFY 2007, the Meth Prison and Reentry Program was established at the Southwestern Illinois Correctional Center (SWICC) in East St. Louis to address the crisis posed by methamphetamine abuse in many communities. The southwestern facility is scheduled to become a fully-dedicated drug prison and reentry program in the model of Sheridan.

Target for year 2040 in Northeast Illinois region

Drug abuse and addiction will be reduced through legislation, policies, and programs which reformulate the response through a public health rather as a criminal justice lens.

Action plan/strategies

Although drug treatment alternatives exist at various stages of the justice process, a number of states have enacted more sweeping reform of their sentencing structure to provide stronger mandates for drug treatment and promote alternatives to incarceration, including complete diversion from prison to treatment. The Illinois Consortium on Drug Policy recently laid the blueprint for such reform in Illinois and presented the following policy recommendations for diversion program codification:

Create a statewide alternative to incarceration plan to treat non-violent drug offenders

- Build upon existing codified infrastructure to construct a larger capacity for a statewide diversion from incarceration program. Continue to utilize TASC for offender assessment, case management, and communication between treatment providers and the criminal justice system. Expand use of the drug school model.
- Mandate clinical assessment, that is, all individuals entering the criminal justice system for non-violent drug offenses should be individually and professionally assessed for substance abuse and mental health disorders by an independent entity, prior to sentence. Screening for co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders is a priority.
- Transportation and childcare needs should be evaluated as these are shown to be barriers towards successful program completion.

Lead agencies: Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities (TASC) in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, and probation program managers in Northeast Illinois counties.

Illinois community needs must be assessed to develop the most effective and appropriate large-scale implementation

- All systems, including criminal justice and treatment, need to be evaluated to understand the current capacity and level of needed expansion. This evaluation will guide the development of the diversion program and will help all systems to be brought to scale in Illinois.

Lead agencies: The Illinois Department of Human Services in conjunction with the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Create new revenues to establish the statewide alternatives to incarceration

- Increase resources for the criminal justice system, such as probation and parole officers. Expanded resources would allow for increased training, smaller caseloads, individualized interventions and sanctions, and more contact with drug offense probationers. Increase fiscal resources for expansion of treatment centers reflecting the needs demonstrated by the community assessment.
- All participating individuals should be given a monetary assessment. Individuals who have money to pay for the treatment should do so, and this money should be diverted into the diversion fund.
- Monies that are not spent directly on treatment services should be allocated to prevention and drug education.

Lead agencies: The Illinois Probation and Court Services Association in conjunction with the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority should monitor availability of federal grant funds from U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Illinois must follow research-based interventions for the drug offending population

- Continue to use an independent entity that is responsible for individual assessment, creating individual treatment plans and any alterations during diversion process, court recommendation, and case management.
- The treatment plan should be based on the assessment outcomes. The plan should address the individual's needs, including type of services to be received and the length of program involvement.

Lead agencies: Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities (TASC) in conjunction with the Illinois Department of Human Services, Office of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse.

The alternative to incarceration program must have sanctions for program violations and accountability measures

- The court should intervene when an individual has no contact with the treatment center within 30 days of the first appointment date.

- Individuals who actively participate in a diversion program should not be sent to prison or jail for a single drug possession violation involving small drug quantities that occurs while undergoing treatment.
- Individuals who actively participate in a diversion program should not be sent to prison or jail for a single positive urine analysis; rather clinical intervention and treatment plan alteration should occur.

Lead agency: The Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts in conjunction with the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association members in Northeast Illinois.

After successful completion of the treatment plan, and all other court and/or probation requirements, individuals should receive consideration for expungement of the case

Lead agencies: Illinois Circuit Court Clerks Association in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

Illinois should evaluate the effectiveness of the diversion program

- The diversion program should be evaluated by an independent agency, such as a public university, to track program implementation, cost savings, and the number of people served under the new legislation.

Lead agency: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

Re-examine Illinois drug sentencing guidelines

- Review the impact of particular sentencing enhancements like Drug Free Zones, as these laws effectively include the majority of the city of Chicago and other large urban areas in the seven-county region. Consider lowering the number of feet to reflect urban populations, or limiting these provisions to areas directly adjacent to the affected areas (schools, public housing)
- Review the impact of lowered drug weight and equivalent felony penalty class for both possession and sales offenses.
- Broaden probation eligibility for drug offenses.

Lead agencies: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, Metropolis 2020, and the CLEAR Commission.

Alternatives to incarceration and offender reentry

Description of issues, challenges, and opportunities in the area

Over the past 40 years, violent crime in Illinois has decreased while the prison population has increased dramatically. The number of people entering and leaving Illinois prisons is nearly 40,000 annually, including a growing number of low-level, nonviolent, drug-addicted offenders. More than half (51.8 percent) of those released from Illinois prisons return within three years; of those returned to prison in 2005, 60.7 percent were for technical violations of parole.⁷⁵ The Illinois prison population has grown by more than 500 percent since 1970, driving up the costs to taxpayers of operating the state's prison system. From 1970 to 2005, the budget for IDOC, which is in charge of the state's 27 adult prisons and the parole system, has increased from \$65 million to \$1.3 billion. Even when these numbers are adjusted for inflation, the IDOC budget more than quadrupled over this period.

History shows, however, that states that increase their funding for prisons do not necessarily see crime rates drop any more than states that do not. More specifically, we now know that increasing prison and jail populations does not produce lower crime rates.⁷⁶ Research has shown that the increasing rates of incarceration in the United States have been subject to diminishing returns in effectiveness.⁷⁷

Reasons for the rising prison and jail populations are multi-layered and complex. The Justice Policy Institute refers to the notion of a prison industrial complex (PIC) as a “complicated system situated at the intersection of governmental and private interests that uses imprisonment, policing, and surveillance as a solution to social, political, and economic problems.”⁷⁸ Under this critical criminology view, the PIC “manifests all the inequities that still exist in the United States.” This is evidenced by the disproportionate involvement in the prisons (and the justice system overall) of young black males, as well as those with mental illness and substance abuse disorders; the use of the criminal justice system to enforce immigration laws, and skyrocketing imprisonment rates for women.⁷⁹

African American and Latinos bear the brunt of the increased use of prisons and jails. One recent report indicates that one out of every 100 adults in the U.S. is behind bars, but one out of every nine African American men between the ages of 20 and 34 and one out of every 36 Hispanic adults is imprisoned.⁸⁰ According to numbers from the Department of Justice, African Americans are now more than five times as likely and Latinos are more than twice as likely as whites to be housed in a prison or a jail.⁸¹ Although African Americans and Latinos combined make up only a third of the U.S. population, they constitute almost two-thirds of the prison and jail populations. Disproportionality is especially profound for drug offenses. The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration's (SAMSHA) National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH) found that in 2002, 8.5 percent of whites were current users of illicit drugs, compared to 9.7 percent of African Americans.⁸² However, a recent report by the Justice Police

Institute determined that African Americans are admitted to prison disproportionately for drug offenses at 10 times the rate of whites.⁸³

Government entities struggling to address homelessness, mental illness, and immigration have turned to the PIC with mixed results. For example, policies that criminalize homelessness have their origin in the “broken windows” theory.⁸⁴ This theory suggests that unkempt neighborhoods attract a criminal element, so crime can be controlled by a rigorous enforcement of quality of life ordinances that regulate panhandling, sleeping in public, and other public order offenses.

Nationally, approximately 15 percent of prison inmates and 24 percent of jail inmates have psychotic disorders. The estimated numbers of seriously mentally ill people in Illinois prisons and jails is more than 12,500.⁸⁵ Sixty percent of the jail population lives with a mental health disorder, compared to 10.6 percent of the general population.⁸⁶ People living with mental illness are swept into the criminal justice system because of the failures of the public mental health system and the lack of adequate treatment in most poor communities. As a result, prisons and jails alike function as the largest psychiatric facilities in the country. In many ways, prisons and jails are ill-equipped to meet the complex needs of people living with mental illness.

Incarceration itself can contribute to the destabilization of people with mental illness. From 1993 to 1998, public mental health spending increased 4.1 percent per year nationally, and from 1998 to 2003 spending increased 8.3 percent per year – a sign that people may be increasingly aware of the benefits of increased spending on mental health. Still, spending on mental health lags behind spending on police and corrections (\$100 million on mental health versus \$143.8 million on police and corrections).⁸⁷

Despite the self-perpetuating nature of the PIC, evidence suggests that in some instances policymakers and the general public are beginning to question the efficacy and fairness of our reliance on prisons and jails. A poll revealed that in 1994 only 48 percent of the public supported interventions that addressed the underlying causes of crime such as poverty and lack of education, whereas in 2002, 65 percent of the public supported these sorts of interventions over stricter sentencing.⁸⁸

Offender reentry

For some reason, many Americans believe that prison is a final destination for persons convicted of serious crime, but reality is much different. Almost all – between 95 and 97 percent of those who are incarcerated or detained in Illinois and nationally will serve their time and come home. The average prison stay in Illinois is just slightly more than one year. More than 54 percent are locked up again within three years. The City of Chicago absorbs more than 50 percent of those released prisoners. There is a tremendous need for support services for this group of releases:

- 75 percent have been in prison before.
- Less than half had a high school education before entering prison.
- Two-thirds reported drug use prior to prison.
- Only 14 percent have a job lined up after release.
- Only 19 percent have any sort of health coverage.

There is a need to address education, job readiness, healthcare, mental health, and family ties in offender reentry planning:

- The more education a prisoner receives while incarcerated, the more likely he or she is to succeed upon release. One national study found that prisoners who participated in any educational programming in state prison had a 29 percent reduction in reincarceration rates compared to those who did not participate in such programs.⁸⁹
- Formerly incarcerated individuals with jobs – and with the associated economic resources, structure and self-esteem that stable employment provides – are three times less likely to return to prison than those without jobs.⁹⁰
- Seamless and continuous health services are effective for long-term, lasting outcomes, including decreased drug use, lower recidivism rates and reduced hospital stays.⁹¹
- Creative collaborations between mental health systems and criminal justice systems not only reduce crime and prevent unnecessary incarcerations but also save public dollars. One Chicago study documented substantial cost savings, more than \$18,000 per person, from funding community mental health care and housing for released prisoners.⁹²
- Research confirms the important role that families play in the success of people returning home from prison or jail, especially those coping with addiction. A New York Study found that involving families during the first six months of an individual’s release and treatment process helped to reduce drug use, decrease arrest rates and increase overall family well-being.⁹³

Target for year 2040 in Northeast Illinois region

The number of persons under correctional supervision will be sharply reduced through an integrated strategy of sentencing reform, a shift in funding toward community-level, treatment-based correctional alternatives, effective risk assessment, and removal of barriers to successful offender reentry. Public attitudes about drug enforcement will be changed to reflect a greater interest in harm reduction rather than drug enforcement.

Action plan/strategies

Reducing prison populations

First, in response to the growing number of offenders with mental disorders, additional resources should be invested in mental health courts in Northeast Illinois counties, and should follow best practices established by the Council of State Governments Justice Center:⁹⁴

- Eligibility criteria address public safety and consider a community’s treatment capacity, in addition to the availability of alternatives to pretrial detention for defendants with mental illness.

- Participants are identified, referred, and accepted into mental health courts, and linked to services as quickly as possible.
- Terms of participation are clear, promote public safety, facilitate the defendant's engagement in treatment, are individualized, and provide positive legal outcomes for those who complete the program successfully.
- Defendants fully understand program requirements before agreeing to participate or, if they are not capable, allowing consultation with an advocate.
- Mental health courts use treatment and services in the community that are evidence-based.
- Health and legal information should be shared in a way that protects participants' confidentiality.
- All criminal justice and mental health staff receive specialized ongoing training.
- Criminal justice and mental health staff collaboratively monitor participants' adherence to court conditions, offer graduated incentives and sanctions, and modify treatment as necessary.
- Data is collected and analyzed to demonstrate the impact of the court.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Mental Health and Illinois Mental Health Court Association, in conjunction with the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts and treatment providers in Northeast Illinois counties.

The PEW Center on the States, in its report *One in 100: Behind Bars in America*, describes the factors associated with prison growth, and provides recommendations for controlling crime and prison populations that serve as a template for an Illinois action plan for the seven-county Northeast Illinois region.⁹⁵ PEW policy analysts stress that states that want to protect public safety while slowing the growth of their prison populations have two general options: they can divert a greater number of low-risk offenders from prison or they can reduce the length of time that the lowest risk offenders stay behind bars. They also make the point that both options require strong community corrections programs to ensure that offenders in the community remain crime and drug-free.

To reduce prison admissions on the front end, three strategies are recommended:

- Drug courts that break the cycle of crime and addiction with frequent drug tests, a continuum of treatment services and increasing penalties for violations.
- Targeted penalty changes that steer selected low-risk offenders to community corrections programs or modify mandatory minimum sentences.
- Sentencing guidelines that allow states to decide as a matter of policy which types of offenders should go to prison and which are appropriate for community corrections.

Lead agencies: Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, in conjunction with the Illinois Drug Court Association, the CLEAR Commission, and Metropolis 2020.

To reduce prison *readmissions*, three strategies are recommended:

- Intermediate sanctions such as day reporting centers for offenders who break the rules of their release, to ensure that each violation receives a swift, certain and proportionate response.
- Short-term residential facilities for persistent rule violators with substance abuse problems.
- Performance incentives that shorten terms of supervision for offenders who comply with their conditions and fulfill obligations such as victim restitution and child support.

Lead agencies: The Illinois Department of Corrections, in conjunction with the Illinois Parole Board, and the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association members in Northeast Illinois.

To reduce length of stay, three strategies are recommended:

- Risk reduction credits that allow slightly earlier release for inmates who complete treatment and education programs designed to reduce recidivism.
- Risk-based release instruments that use analysis of actual recidivism patterns to help releasing authorities decide who should remain behind bars and who is ready for release.
- Sufficient program availability in prisons and the community so release isn't delayed because inmates cannot complete requirements.

Lead agency: Illinois Department of Corrections

Offender Reentry

In April 2007, the Illinois report *Inside Out: A Plan to Reduce Recidivism and Improve Public Safety* was released by the 22-member Community Safety & Reentry Commission. The Commission's Report is a blueprint for a statewide system that has four phases of implementation to ensure that the reentry process begins from the day that an offender is admitted to prison, that every day spent in prison is focused on preparing for a crime-free and drug-free reentry, that all parolees have a well-supervised and supported reentry that moves them away from drugs and crime and toward honest work and citizenship, and that community capacity is developed to sustain success.

The Commission's recommendations

The Commission consolidated the recommendations of several working groups, which had exhaustively researched the needs of inmates, identified best practices and model programs, and conducted numerous public hearings throughout the state to gain a wide range of citizen input.

The recommendations suggested a continuum so that a new reentry initiative would span four stages:

1. Reception, Assessment, and Classification process at IDOC.
2. Prison-Based Reentry Preparation.
3. Post-Release Reentry Management.
4. Community Capacity and Sustainability.

From the perspective of defining the role of communities within the 7-county Northeast Illinois Region, this report will offer endorsement to recommendations within the fourth stage, Community Capacity and Sustainability.

Because most prison inmates typically come from (and return to) neighborhoods in the top 10 high-impact regions, which are plagued by high poverty, poor performing schools, low employment rates and high rates of drug crime, the Commission has recommended prioritizing resources to these areas. Within the Northeast Illinois Region, Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, and Will counties are among the 10.

At this stage, enhanced or better coordination of existing resources is needed across the board in these regions to provide job and educational opportunities, accessible treatment programs, stable housing and viable alternatives to crime and drugs. Without them, even the most compliant parolees will return home lacking opportunities and become vulnerable to old, dangerous patterns. In addition to programs and services, staff in existing programs must be trained to identify and support the needs of the formerly incarcerated.

At this stage, it is not only important to bolster community resources, but to ensure that long-term social stigmas and legal barriers be addressed. Despite even the most successful efforts to reform, complete their education, and become responsible members of their communities, many of the formerly incarcerated are blocked from many jobs, and if not barred outright, they face serious hurdles in the form of employer suspicion, lack of accurate information, and other social stigma. Regardless of the nature of their crime or proven track record of success, checking “yes” to the question on the job application, “Have you ever been convicted...?” is today’s scarlet letter. Not only are there stigma and legal restrictions on job applications, but on applications to subsidized housing, applications for federal education assistance, and in many other arenas.

Although many programs serve the formerly incarcerated, they often lack sufficient funding, they are not coordinated in any meaningful way, and their ongoing sustainability is at constant risk. The state must therefore foster partnerships among various government agencies and the community and faith-based organizations by creating legislation that supports reentry, eliminating legislation that imposes barriers to reentry, and by reinvesting funds currently used to incarcerate individuals into reentry programs and supports at the community level.

Other recommendations:

Remove legal and structural barriers faced by formerly incarcerated persons to employment

- Expand the use of existing tools for rehabilitated ex-offenders; establish “best practice” standards for employers to appropriately interpret criminal records; develop equitable legal standards for background checks; change public agencies’ administrative policies to allow some level of employment of individuals with criminal records.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Corrections, Illinois State Police, and Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

Remove legal and structural barriers faced by formerly incarcerated persons to housing

- Remove public housing bans for drug offenders in treatment; increase affordable housing stock with various incentives, and increase access to affordable housing for the formerly incarcerated; provide temporary rental stipends and increase housing vouchers for the formerly incarcerated.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Corrections, Illinois Parole Board, and Illinois Department of Human Services in conjunction with Illinois Legislature.

Remove legal and structural barriers faced by formerly incarcerated persons to health and behavioral health services

- Better coordinate support services for those with mental health diagnoses. Acknowledge the risk of relapse in substance abuse treatment and expand good conduct credit provisions for those incarcerated more than once and who are in substance abuse treatment. Establish the formerly incarcerated as priority populations in Medicaid, especially those with mental health issues.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Corrections, Illinois Parole Board, and Illinois Department of Mental Health in conjunction with Illinois Legislature.

Build capacity in the community by creating a seamless and coordinated system of supports

- Provide training to service providers in effectively addressing this population’s needs. Develop a coordinated and uniform system of supports and reporting standards among service providers to help build community capacity to help this population of formerly incarcerated.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Corrections, Illinois Parole Board.

Implement community-based service networks in high-impact regions

- Community-based networks should help foster long-term community buy-in, community support, and sustained change. Coordinate community groups, faith-based organizations, and others working independently to maximize efforts, impact, and support for the formerly incarcerated.

Lead agencies: Illinois Department of Human Services.

Increase access to employment-related training grants for smaller organizations

- Smaller organizations should have access to training grants and training through the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) and TIF-Works for community-based organizations working with the formerly incarcerated.

Lead agency: Illinois Department of Human Services.

Develop coordinated strategies for enhancing investments in reentry support services

- Such strategies should further leverage existing federal, state, and local investments and aggressively develop new funding sources to expand reentry support services, including funds from social service programs (such as WIA, Medicaid, and food stamps).

Lead agency: Illinois Department of Corrections.

Partner with private companies to develop employment opportunities

- Develop partnerships that help secure community reinvestment and that support specific reentry initiatives, particularly employment-related initiatives.

Lead agency: Illinois Department of Human Services.

Address the social stigmas attached to a criminal record

- Launch community-based public awareness campaigns about the importance of providing a second chance to formerly incarcerated persons who are seeking support to move away from crime and drugs and toward honest work and citizenship. This should include stories about the contributions of those formerly incarcerated individuals who have met with success.

Lead agency: Illinois Department of Corrections

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

20 ILCS 301/40

20 ILCS 570/410, 550/710 and 646/70

720 ILCS 570/410,

720 ILCS 550/710,

720 ILCS 646/70,

730 ILCS 166/1 et seq.

730 ILCS 166/35

730 ILCS 166/20

705 ILCS 405/5-101

A

Alpert, Geoffrey P., Moore, Mark H. 1998. "Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing". In *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings*, ed. Geoffrey P. Alpert and Alex Piquero. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Office of Justice Programs. National Criminal Justice Reference Service. NCJ 181382.

Alpert, G. P., and Moore, M.H. 1993. "Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing". In *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings* ed. Alpert, G.P., and A.R. Piquero. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc. 215-232.

American Psychological Association. 1984. *Victims of Crime and Violence*. Final Report of the American Psychological Association Task Force on the Victims of Crime and Violence.

Aspy, Cheryl B., Oman Roy F., Vesely Sara K., McLeroy Kenneth, Rodine Sharon, Marshall LaDonna. 2004. "Adolescent Violence: The protective effects of youth assets". *Journal of Counseling & Development*. 82: 268-276.

B

Bronfenbrenner, U. 1988. "Interacting Systems in Human Development: Research Paradigms Present and Future". In *Persons in Context: Developmental Processes*, ed. N. Bolger, A. Caspi, G. Downey, & M. Moorehouse, 25-49. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bureau of Justice Assistance. 2008. *Improving Responses to People with Mental Illnesses. The Essential Elements of a Mental Health Court*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Bureau of Justice Assistance. 2001. *Comprehensive Communities Program: Program Account*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. NCJ 184955

Bureau of Justice Assistance. 2001. *Comprehensive Communities Program: Program Account*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. NCJ 184955.

Bureau of Justice Assistance. 1996. *Comprehensive Communities Program: Update*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Burke, Kimberly. 2008. *Study Measures Impact Government Services on Juvenile Community Re-entry*. Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. Research in Brief, 3: 1.

Bostwick, L., “Juvenile Justice System and Risk Factor Data: 2007”, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (forthcoming).

Bursik, R.J., and Grasmick, H.G. 1993. *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. New York: Lexington.

C

City of Chicago. 2006. *Rebuilding Lives, Restoring Hope, Strengthening Communities: Breaking the Cycle of Incarceration and Building Brighter Futures in Chicago*. Final Report of the Mayoral Policy Caucus on Prisoner Reentry, January.

Chicago Metropolitan 2020. 2006. *2006 Crime and Justice Index*. Chicago: Chicago Metropolitan 2020.

Chicago Metropolitan 2020. 2006. *2006 Crime and Justice Index*. Chicago: Chicago Metropolitan 2020.

Clarke, R.V. 1995. “Situational Crime Prevention”. In *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, ed. M. Tonry & D.P. Farrington, 19. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, Mark, Miller, Ted, and Rossman, Shelli. 1994. “The costs and consequences of violent behavior in the United States”. In *Understanding and Preventing Violence*, ed. Albert Reiss and Jeffrey Roth. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

D

Drake, E. 2006. *Washington’s Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative: An Update on Recidivism Findings*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Dunsworth, T., Cordner, G., Greene, J., Bynum, T., Decker, S., Rich, T., Ward, S., and Webb, V. 2000. *Police Department Information Systems Technology Enhancement Project ISTEP*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Dunsworth, T., Cordner, G. and Greene, J. 1999. *National Evaluation of Weed and Seed: Cross-Site Analysis*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. NCJ 176358.

Durose, Matthew R., Wolf Harlow, Caroline, Langan, Patrick A., Motivans, Mark, Rantala, Ramona R., Smith, Erica L. 2005. *Family Violence Statistics Including Statistics on Strangers and Acquaintances*. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, NCJ 207846.

E

Eitle, D., Turner, R. J. 2002. "Exposure of Community Violence and Young Adult Crime: The Effects of Witnessing Violence, Traumatic Victimization, and Other Stressful Life Events". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39: 214.

F

Farrington, D.P., Sampson, R.J. and Wikstrom, P. H. 1993. *Integrating Individual and Ecological Aspects of Crime*. Sweden: National Council for Crime Prevention.

Felson, M. 1998. *Crime and Everyday Life*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

G

Gornik, M. 2001. *Moving from Correctional Program to Correctional Strategy: Using Proven Practices to Change Criminal Behavior*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections, Federal Bureau of Prisons. U.S. Department of Justice.

H

Hart, Peter D. and research associates. 2002. *Changing Public Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System, Summary of Findings*. The Open Society Institute.

Hawkins, J. D., Herrenkohl T., Farrington, D. P., Brewer, D., Catalano, R. E., Hirachi, T.W. 1998. "A Review of Predictors of Youth Violence". In *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and successful interventions*, ed. D.P. Farrington, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 144.

I

Illinois Department of Corrections. 2007. *Annual Report – Fiscal Year 2007*.

Illinois Department of Corrections. Statistical Presentation 2004. Springfield: Illinois Department of Corrections. October, 2005.
[http://www.idoc.state.il.us/subsections/reports/statistical_presentation_2004/part2.shtml#28.](http://www.idoc.state.il.us/subsections/reports/statistical_presentation_2004/part2.shtml#28))

J

James, Doris.J. and Glaze, Lauren. E. 2006. *Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. NCJ 213600.

Jencks, C. and Mayers S. 1990. "The Social Consequences of Growing Up in a Poor Neighborhood". In *Inner-City Poverty in the United States*, ed. L.E. Lynn & M.F.H. McGeary. 111-186. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

K

Kelling, G.L., Hochberg, M.R., Kaminska, S.L., Rocheleau, A.M., Rosenbaum, D.P., Roth, J.A. and Skogan W.G. 1998. *The Bureau of Justice Assistance Comprehensive Communities Program: A Preliminary Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Kelling, G.L., Rocheleau, A.M., Rosenbaum, D.P., Roth, J.A., Skogan, W.G. and Walsh, N. 1997. *Preliminary Cross-Site Analysis of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Comprehensive Communities Program*. Final Report to the National Institute of Justice. Cambridge, MA: BOTEC Analysis Corporation.

Kilpatrick, Dean, Saunders, Benjamin, Veronen, Lois, Best, Connie, Von, John. 1987 "Criminal Victimization: Lifetime Prevalence, Reporting to Police, and Psychological Impact". *Crime and Delinquency*. 33:479-489.

L

Lavrakas, P.J. 1985. "Citizen Self-Help and Neighborhood Crime Prevention Policy". In *American Violence and Public Policy*, ed. L.A. Curtis. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

Leventhal, T. and Brooks-Gunn, J. 2000. "The Neighborhoods They Live In: The Effects of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes". *Psychology Bulletin*, 126: 309-337.

Lipsey, M. W., Derzon, J.H. 1998. "Predictors of Violent or Serious Delinquency in Adolescence and Early Adulthood". In *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*, ed. Rolf Loeber and David P. Farrington, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 140-141.

Loeber, Rolf, Farrington, David P., Petechuk David. 2003. "Child Delinquency: Early Intervention and Prevention". *Child Delinquency Bulletin Series*, Washington DC: U.S.

Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, May 2003: 1.

Loeber, R. and LeBlanc, M. 1990. "Toward a Developmental Criminology". In *Crime and Justice: A Review of the Research*, ed. M. Tonry & N. Morris, 12: 375-473. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

M

Macmillan, R. 2002. "Adolescent Victimization and Income Deficits in Adulthood: Rethinking the Costs in Criminal Violence From a Life-Course Perspective". *Criminology*, 38: 2: 553 – 588.

Marris, P., and Rein, M. 1967. *Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States*. New York Atherton Press.

Miller, Ted, Cohen, Mark, Wiersema, Brian. 1996. *Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1996.

Miller, W.B. 1962. "The Impact of a 'Total Community' Delinquency Control Project". *Social Problems*, 10:168-191.

Moore, Mark, Prothrow-Stith, Debra, Bernard Geyer, Spivak, Howard. 1994. "Violence and intentional injuries: Criminal justice and public health perspectives on an urgent national problem". In *Understanding and Preventing Violence*, ed. Albert Reiss and Jeffrey Roth. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

N

National estimates of cost to implement and maintain a comprehensive drug court program are \$2,500 per participant according to the Office of National Drug Control Police, March 2003. Using figures supplied to Metropolis 2020 by TASC and the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, Illinois drug court costs can be estimated at \$4,250 per participant (\$3,500 for treatment and \$750 for prosecution costs).

P

Perkins, Craig, Klaus, Patsy, Bastian, Lisa, and Cohen, Robyn. 1996. *Criminal Victimization in the United States*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Petterutti, A., Walsh, N. 2008. *Moving Target. A Decade of Resistance to the Prison Industrial Complex*. Report. Justice Policy Institute.
www.justicepolicy.org.

Pew Center on the State. 2009. *One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Pew Center on the States. 2008. *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*. Washington, DC: Pew Center on the States.

Phillip, Beatty, Peterutti, Amanda and Ziedenberg Jason. 2007. *The Vortex: The Concentrated Racial Impact of Drug Imprisonment and the Characteristics of Punitive Counties*. Washington, DC: Justice Police Institute.

R

Rennison, C. M., Welchans, S. 2000. *Intimate Partner Violence*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. NCJ 178247.

Roehl, J. A., Huitt, R., Wycoff, M.A., Pate, A.M., Rebovich, D.J. and Koyle, K. R. 1996. *National Process Evaluation of the Weed and Seed Initiative*. Research in Brief series, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Roma, J., Townsend, W. and Bhati, A. 2003. *National estimates of drug court recidivism*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

Rosenbaum, Dennis; “Community policing and web-based communication: Addressing the new information imperative”. In *Future of Community Policing*, ed. Fridell, Lorie A. and Mary Ann Wycoff. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum. (forthcoming)

Rosenbaum, D. P. 2007. "Police Innovation Post 1980: Assessing Effectiveness and Equity Concerns in the Information Technology Era". *Institute for the Prevention of Crime Review*, 1: 11-44.

Rosenbaum, Dennis. P., Schuck, A. M., Graziano, L. M., and Stephens, C. D. 2007. *Measuring Police and Community Performance Using Web-based Surveys: Findings from the Chicago Internet Project. Final report to the National Institute of Justice*. Chicago, IL: Center for Research in Law and Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Rosenbaum, Dennis. 2002. “Evaluating Multi-Agency Anti-Crime Partnerships: Theory, Design, and Measurement Issues”. *Crime Prevention Studies*, 14:171-225.

Rosenbaum, D.P., Lurigio, A.J., and Davis, R. C. 1998. *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA Wadsworth.

Rosenbaum, D.P., Lurigio, A.J., and Davis, R. C. 1998. *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA Wadsworth.

Rosenbaum, D.P., Lurigio, A.J. and Davis, R. C. 1998. *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA Wadsworth.

Rosenbaum, D.P. 1994. *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rosenbaum, D.P. 1988. "Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature". *Justice Quarterly*, 5: 323-395.

Roth, J.A., Ryan, J.F., Gaffigan, S.J., Koper, C.S., Moore, H., Roehl, A., Johnson, C.C., Moore, G.E., White, R.M., Buerger, M.E., Langston, E.A. and Thatcher, D. 2000. *National Evaluation of the COPS Program: Title I of the 1994 Crime Act*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 183643.

Ryan, J. P., Testa, M. F. 2005. "Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Delinquency: Investing the Role of Placement and Placement Instability". *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27: 227-249.

S

Sabol, William J. and Couture, Heather. 2008. *Prison Inmates at Midyear 2007*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Sampson, Robert J. 1998. "What Community Supplies". In *Urban Problems and Community Development*, ed. Ferguson, R.F., and W.T. Dickens. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press.

Sampson, R.J. 1997. "Collective Regulation of Adolescent Misbehavior: Validation Results from Eight Chicago Neighborhoods". *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 12(2): 227-244.

Schuck, A. M., and Rosenbaum, D. P. 2008. *Building trust and a police-community website: An assessment of the CLEARPath planning and community engagement process*. Final report to the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

Shaw, C.R., and McKay, H. D. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Skogan, Wesley. G. 2002. Luncheon address at PERF conference on Information Technology. Chicago, IL.

Skogan, Wesley G., Hartnett, Susan M., DuBois, Jill, Comey, J., Twedt-Ball, K. and Gudell, J. E. 2000. *Public Involvement: Community Policing in Chicago*. National Institute of Justice, NCJ 179557.

Skogan, Wesley G., and Hartnett, Susan M. 1997. *Community Policing, Chicago Style*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Spergel, I.A. 1990. "Youth Gangs: Continuity and Change". In *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* ed. N. Morris & M. Tonry, 12: 171-275. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stemen, D. 2007. *Reconsidering Incarceration: New Directions for Reducing Crime*. New York City: Vera Institute.

www.vera.org/reconsideringincarceration.

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Results from the 2002 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed Tables. Prevalence Estimates, Standard Errors and Sample Sizes, 2005.

T

Tami, Mark. 2007. National Expenditures for Mental Health Services and Substance Abuse Treatment 1993-2003. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Thompson, Michael, Osher, Fred and Tomasini-Joshi, Denise. 2007. *Improving Responses to People with Mental Illnesses: The Essential Elements of a Mental Health Court*. The Council of State Governments Justice Center for the Bureau of Justice Assistance, cooperative agreement 2005-MU-BX-K007.

Thornberry, T.B., Krohn, M.D., Lizotte, A.J. and Chard-Wierschem, D. 1993. "The Role of Juvenile Gangs in Facilitating Delinquent Behavior". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30: 1: 55-87.

Tjaden, P. and Thoennes, N. 2000. *Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence*. Research Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

U

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2005. *Family Violence Statistics: Including Statistics on Strangers and Acquaintances*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. www.ojp.usdoj.gov.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. 2001. *Intimate Partner Violence: Special report*. Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. www.ojp.usdoj.gov.

W

Wilson, James Q. 2009. Crime and Economy don't tell the whole story. *New York Times*, January 8. <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/editorials/la-oe-wilson8-2009jan08,0,7541431.story>

Wilson, J.Q., Herrnstein R.J. 1985. *Crime and Human Nature*. New York: Simon and Shuster.

Wilson, James Q. and Kelling, George L. 1982. *Broken Windows*. The Atlantic Online. <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/198203/broken-windows>

Notes

¹ Wilson, James Q., “Crime and Economy Don’t Tell Whole Story,” *Los Angeles Times* (January 8, 2009).

² Much of this section on causes of crime was taken from Bostwick, Lindsay, “Juvenile Justice System and Risk Factor Data: 2007,” *Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority* (forthcoming).

³ Eitle, David, and R. Jay Turner, “Exposure to Community Violence and Young Adult Crime: The Effects of Witnessing Violence, Traumatic Victimization, and Other Stressful Life Events.” *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39(2) (May 2002): 229.

⁴ Ryan, Joseph and Mark Testa, “Child Maltreatment and Juvenile Delinquency: Investigating the Roles of Placement and Placement Instability,” *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27 (2005): 227.

⁵ Hawkins, J. David, Todd Herrenkohl, David P. Farrington, Devon Brewer, Richard E. Catalano, and Tracy W. Hirachi, “A Review of Predictors of Youth Violence,” in Loeber, R., and D.P. Farrington (eds) *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1998: 144.

⁶ Lipsey, Mark W., and James H. Derzon, “Predictors of Violent or Serious Delinquency in Adolescence and Early Adulthood,” in *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*, ed. Rolf Loeber and David P. Farrington (eds.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1998: 140-141.;

Hawkins, J. David, Todd Herrenkohl, David P. Farrington, Devon Brewer, Richard E. Catalano, and Tracy W. Hirachi, “A Review of Predictors of Youth Violence,” in Loeber, Rolf., and D.P. Farrington (eds) *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offenders: Risk Factors and successful interventions*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 1998: 144.

⁷ Aspy, Cheryl B., Roy F. Oman, Sara K. Vesely, Kenneth McLeroy, Sharon Rodine, and LaDonna Marshall, “Adolescent Violence: The Protective Effects of Youth Assets,” *Journal of Counseling & Development* 82 (Summer 2004): 268-276.

⁸ Loeber, Rolf, David P. Farrington, and David Petechuk, “Child Delinquency: Early Intervention and Prevention”. *Child Delinquency Bulletin Series*, Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (May 2003): 1.

⁹ Miller, Ted, Mark Cohen, and Brian Wierseman, “Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look,” Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1996.;

Moore, Mark, Debra Prothrow-Stith, Bernard Geyer, and Howard Spivak, “Violence and Intentional Injuries: Criminal justice and Public Health Perspectives on an Urgent National Problem,” in Reiss, A. and J. Roth (eds.) *Understanding and Preventing Violence*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1994.

¹⁰ American Psychological Association Task Force, “Victims of Crime and Violence: Final Report of the American Psychological Association Task Force on the Victims of Crime and Violence,” *American Psychological Association Task Force* (1984).;

Kilpatrick, Dean, Benjamin Saunders, Lois Veronen, Connie Best, and John Von, “Criminal Victimization: Lifetime Prevalence, Reporting to Police, and Psychological Impact,” *Crime and Delinquency* 33 (4) (1987):479-489.

¹¹ Cohen, Mark, Ted Miller, and Shelli Rossman, “The Costs and Consequences of Violent Behavior in the United States,” in Reiss, A. and J. Roth (eds.) *Understanding and Preventing Violence*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press. 1994.

¹² Ibid;

Miller, Ted, Mark Cohen, and Brian Wierseman, “Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look,” Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1996.

¹³ Kilpatrick, Dean, Benjamin Saunders, Lois Veronen, Connie Best, and John Von, “Criminal Victimization: Lifetime Prevalence, Reporting to Police, and Psychological Impact,” *Crime and Delinquency* 33 4 (1987): 479-489.;

Moore, Mark, Debra Prothrow-Stith, Bernard Geyer, and Howard Spivak, “Violence and Intentional Injuries: Criminal justice and Public Health Perspectives on an Urgent National Problem,” in Reiss, A. and J. Roth (eds.) *Understanding and Preventing Violence*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1994.

¹⁴ Perkins, Craig, Patsy Klaus, Lisa Bastian, and Robyn Cohen, “Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1993,” Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1996.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid.

- ¹⁸ Miller, Ted, Mark Cohen, and Brian Wierseman, "Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look," Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1996.
- ¹⁹ Cohen, Mark, Ted Miller, and Shelli Rossman, "The Costs and Consequences of Violent Behavior in the United States," in Reiss, A. and J. Roth (eds.) *Understanding and Preventing Violence*, Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press. 1994.;
- Miller, Ted, Mark Cohen, and Brian Wierseman, "Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look," Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1996.
- ²⁰ MacMillan, Ross, "Adolescent Victimization and Income Deficits in Adulthood: Rethinking the Costs of Criminal Violence from a Life-Course Perspective," *Criminology*, 38 (2) (2000): 553-588.
- ²¹ Tjaden, P. and N. Thoennes. "Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence," Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2000.
- ²² Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Family Violence Statistics: Including Statistics on Strangers and Acquaintances. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2005.
- ²³ Bureau of Justice Statistics, "Intimate Partner Violence: Special Report," Washington, DC: Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2001.
- ²⁴ 705 ILCS 405/5-101
- ²⁵ Rosenbaum, Dennis, "Community Policing and Web-based Communication: Addressing the New Information Imperative," in Fridell, L. A. and M. A. Wycoff (Eds.) *Future of Community Policing*; Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum. (forthcoming)
- ²⁶ Ibid.
- ²⁷ Alpert, G. P., and M.H. Moore. "Measuring Police Performance in the New Paradigm of Policing," in Alpert, G.P., and A.R. Piquero (eds.) *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings..* Prospect Heights: Waveland Press, Inc., 1993: 215-232.
- ²⁸ Rosenbaum, Dennis P., Schuck, A. M., Graziano, L. M., & Stephens, C. D., "Measuring Police and Community Performance Using Web-based Surveys: Findings from the Chicago Internet Project. Final report to the National Institute of Justice." *Center for Research in Law and Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago* (2007).
- ²⁹ Rosenbaum, Dennis, "Community Policing and Web-based Communication: Addressing the New Information Imperative," in Fridell, L. A. and M. A. Wycoff (Eds.) *Future of Community Policing*; Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum. (forthcoming)
- ³⁰ Ibid
- ³¹ Ibid.
- ³² Rosenbaum, Dennis P., "Police Innovation Post 1980: Assessing Effectiveness and Equity Concerns in the Information Technology Era," *Institute for the Prevention of Crime Review*, (2007) 1: 11-44.
- ³³ Rosenbaum, Dennis, "Community Policing and Web-based Communication: Addressing the New Information Imperative," in Fridell, L. A. and M. A. Wycoff (Eds.) *Future of Community Policing*; Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum. (forthcoming)
- ³⁴ Dunworth, T., G. Corder, J. Greene, T. Bynum, S. Decker, T. Rich, S. Ward, and V. Webb, "Police Department Information Systems Technology Enhancement Project ISTEP," Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2001.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis, "Evaluating Multi-Agency Anti-crime Partnerships: Theory, Design, and Measurement Issues," *Crime Prevention Studies*, 14 (2002):171-225.
- ³⁵ Rosenbaum, Dennis.P., Art J. Lurigio, and R.C. Davis, *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA Wadsworth, 1998.
- ³⁶ Skogan, Wesley G. and Susan M. Hartnett, *Community Policing, Chicago Style*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Skogan, Wesley G., Susan M. Hartnett, Jill DuBois, J. Comey, K. Twedt-Ball, and J.E. Gudell, "Public Involvement: Community Policing in Chicago," *National Institute of Justice* (NCJ 179557), 2000.
- ³⁷ Skogan, Wesley G. Luncheon address at PERF conference on Information Technology. Chicago, IL. July 2002.
- ³⁸ Rosenbaum, D. P., Schuck, A. M., Graziano, L. M., & Stephens, C. D. (2007). *Measuring Police and Community Performance Using Web-based Surveys: Findings from the Chicago Internet Project*. Final report to the National Institute of Justice. Chicago, IL: Center for Research in Law and Justice, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- ³⁹ Schuck, A. M., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (2008). *Building trust and a police-community website: An assessment of the CLEARPath planning and community engagement process*. Final report to the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.

- ⁴⁰ Rosenbaum, Dennis.P., Art J. Lurigio, & R.C. Davis, *The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA Wadsworth, 1998.
- Sampson, Robert J., "What Community Supplies," in Ferguson, R.F., and W.T. Dickens. (eds.) *Urban Problems and Community Development*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institute Press, 1998, 241-292
- ⁴¹ Lavrakas, P.J., "Citizen Self-Help and Neighborhood Crime Prevention Policy," in L.A. Curtis (ed.), *American Violence and Public Policy*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1985: 94-113.:
- Rosenbaum, Dennis.P., "Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature," *Justice Quarterly*, 5 (1988): 323-395.
- ⁴² Rosenbaum, Dennis; "Evaluating Multi-Agency Anti-Crime Partnerships: Theory, Design, and Measurement Issues." *Crime Prevention Studies*, 14 (2002):171-225.
- ⁴³ Hawkins, D.J., T. Herrenkohl, D.P. Farrington, D. Brewer, R.F. Catalano, & T.W. Harachi, "A Review of Predictors of Youth Violence.," in R. Loeber and D.P. Farrington (eds.), *Serious and Violent Juvenile Offending: Risk Factors and Successful Interventions*, Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1998:106-146
- Loeber, Rolph & M. LeBlanc "Toward a Developmental Criminology" in M. Tonry & N. Morris (eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of the Research*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1990: 375-473.
- ⁴⁴ Wilson, James Q., R.J. Herrnstein, *Crime and Human Nature*. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1985.
- ⁴⁵ Spergel, Irving A. "Youth Gangs: Continuity and Change," In N. Morris & M. Tonry (eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990: 171-275..
- Thornberry, T.B., M.D. Krohn, A.J. Lizotte, & D. Chard-Wierschem, "The Role of Juvenile Gangs in Facilitating Delinquent Behavior," *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 30(1) 1993: 55-87.
- ⁴⁶ Bursik, R.J., & Grasmick, H.G. (1993) *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. New York: Lexington.;
- Jencks, C. & S. Mayers "The Social Consequences of Growing Up in a Poor Neighborhood" in L.E. Lynn & M.F.H. McGeary (eds.), *Inner-City Poverty in the United States*, Washington, DC: National Academy Press. (1990) 111-186.;
- Leventhal, T. and J. Brooks-Gunn, "The Neighborhoods They Live In: The Effects of Neighborhood Residence on Child and Adolescent Outcomes," *Psychology Bulletin*, 126 (2000): 309-337.;
- Sampson, R.J. (1997). "Collective Regulation of Adolescent Misbehavior: Validation Results from Eight Chicago Neighborhoods." *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 12(2): 227-244.
- ⁴⁷ Clarke, R.V., "Situational Crime Prevention," in M. Tonry & D.P. Farrington (eds.) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.;
- Felson, M.. *Crime and Everyday Life*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press,1998.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis P., Art J. Lurigio, and R.C. Davis.,*The Prevention of Crime: Social and Situational Strategies*. Belmont, CA Wadsworth, 1998.
- ⁴⁸ Bronfenbrenner, U., "Interacting Systems in Human Development: Research Paradigms Present and Future," in N. Bolger, A. Caspi, G. Downey, & M. Moorehouse (eds.) *Persons in Context: Developmental Processes*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 25-49.
- Farrington, D.P., R.J. Sampson, & P.H. Wikstrom, *Integrating Individual and Ecological Aspects of Crime*. Sweden: National Council for Crime Prevention, 1993.
- ⁴⁹ Shaw, C.R., & H.D. McKay., *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- ⁵⁰ Marris, P., and M. Rein, *Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States*, New York Atherton Press, 1967.;
- Miller, W.B., "The Impact of a 'Total Community' Delinquency Control Project," *Social Problems*, 10 (1962):168-191.
- ⁵¹ Roth, J.A., J.F. Ryan, S.J. Gaffigan, C.S. Koper, M.H. Moore, J.A. Roehl, C.C. Johnson, G.E. Moore, R.M. White, M.E. Buerger, E.A. Langston, & D. Thatcher, *National Evaluation of the COPS Program: Title I of the 1994 Crime Act*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. NCJ 183643 (2000).
- ⁵² Rosenbaum, Dennis P. (ed.). *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1994.
- ⁵³ Bureau of Justice Assistance, "Comprehensive Communities Program: Update," *U.S. Department of Justice* (1996).
- ⁵⁴ Kelling, G.L., M.R. Hochberg, S.L. Kaminska, A.M. Rocheleau. D.P. Rosenbaum, J.A. Roth, & W.G. Skogan. *The Bureau of Justice Assistance Comprehensive Communities Program: A Preliminary Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice (1998).;

Kelling, G.L., A.M. Rocheleau, D.P. Rosenbaum, J.A. Roth, W.G. Skogan, and N. Walsh, "Preliminary Cross-Site Analysis of the Bureau of Justice Assistance Comprehensive Communities Program: Final Report to the National Institute of Justice.," *BOTEC Analysis Corporation* (1997).

⁵⁵ Bureau of Justice Assistance, "Comprehensive Communities Program: Program Account," *U.S. Department of Justice*, NCJ 184955 (2001).

⁵⁶ Roehl, J.A., R. Huitt, M.A. Wycoff, A.M. Pate, D.J. Rebovich, & K.R. Koyle, "National Process Evaluation of the Weed and Seed Initiative," Research in Brief series, *U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice* (1996).

⁵⁷ Dunsworth, T., G. Cordner, & J. Greene, "*National Evaluation of Weed and Seed: Cross-Site Analysis*," *U.S. Department of Justice*, NCJ 176358 (1999).

⁵⁸ Chicago Metropolis 2020, "2006 Crime and Justice Index," *Chicago Metropolis 2020* (2006).

⁵⁹ Treatment Alternatives for Safe Communities, personal communication, February 15, 2007.

⁶⁰ Chicago Metropolis 2020, "2006 Crime and Justice Index," *Chicago Metropolis 2020* (2006).

⁶¹ Illinois Department of Corrections, "Statistical Presentation 2004," *Illinois Department of Corrections*, (2005):47.

⁶² Using figures supplied by TASC to Metropolis 2020, the cost of TASC probation is estimated at \$5,925 (\$1,500 for probation supervision and monitoring, \$3,500 for treatment and approximately \$925 for TASC case management services).

⁶³ Gornik, M., "Moving from Correctional Program to Correctional Strategy: Using Proven Practices to Change Criminal Behavior," *National Institute of Corrections, Federal Bureau of Prisons. U.S. Department of Justice* (2001).;

Drake, E., "Washington's Drug Offender Sentencing Alternative: An Update on Recidivism Findings," *Washington State Institute for Public Policy* (2006).

⁶⁴ 720 ILCS 570/410, 550/710 and 646/70

⁶⁵ 720 ILCS 570/410; 720 ILCS 550/710; 720 ILCS 646/70.

⁶⁶ 730 ILCS 166/1 et seq.

⁶⁷ 730 ILCS 166/35

⁶⁸ 730 ILCS 166/20

⁶⁹ 730 ILCS 166/35

⁷⁰ Roma, J., W. Townsend, and A. Bhati, "*National Estimates of Drug Court Recidivism*," *National Institute of Justice*, (2003).

⁷¹ National estimates of cost to implement and maintain a comprehensive drug court program are \$2,500 per participant according to the Office of National Drug Control Police, March 2003. Using figures supplied to Metropolis 2020 by TASC and the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, Illinois drug court costs can be estimated at \$4,250 per participant (\$3,500 for treatment and \$750 for prosecution costs).

⁷² 20 ILCS 301/40

⁷³ www.idoc.state.il.us

⁷⁴ Illinois Department of Corrections, "Annual Report – Fiscal Year 2007," *Illinois Department of Corrections*, (2007).

⁷⁵ Illinois Department of Corrections, personal communication, February 15, 2007.

⁷⁶ Petteruti, Amanda and Nastassia Walsh, "Jailing Communities: The Impact of Jail Expansion and Effective Public Safety Strategies," *Justice Police Institute* (2008).

⁷⁷ Stemen, D., "Reconsidering Incarceration: New Directions for Reducing Crime," *Vera Institute* (2007).

⁷⁸ Pew Center on the State, "One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections," *The Pew Charitable Trusts* (March 2009).

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Pew Center on the States, "One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008," *Pew Center on the States* (2008).

⁸¹ Sabol, William J. and Heather Couture, "Prison Inmates at Midyear 2007," *Bureau of Justice Statistics* (2008).

⁸² Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, "Results from the 2002 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed Tables. Prevalence Estimates, Standard Errors. And Sample Sizes," (2005).

⁸³ Beatty, Phillip, Amanda Peterutti, and Jason Ziedenberg, "The Vortex: The Concentrated Racial Impact of Drug Imprisonment and the Characteristics of Punitive Counties," *Justice Police Institute* (2007).

⁸⁴ Wilson, James Q. and George L. Kelling, "Broken Windows," *The Atlantic Online* (March 1982).

⁸⁵ James, Doris J. and Lauren E. Glaze, "Mental Health Problems of Prison and Jail Inmates," NCJ 213600, *Bureau of Justice Statistics* (2006).

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Mark, Tami, “National Expenditures for Mental Health Services and Substance Abuse Treatment 1993-2003,” *Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration* (2007).

⁸⁸ Peter D. Hart Research Associates, “Changing Public Attitudes toward the Criminal Justice System, Summary of Findings,” *The Open Society Institute* (2002).

⁸⁹ City of Chicago, “Rebuilding Lives, Restoring Hope, Strengthening Communities: Breaking the Cycle of Incarceration and Building Brighter Futures in Chicago, Final Report of the Mayoral Policy Caucus on Prisoner Reentry,” *City of Chicago* (January 2006).

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Thompson, Michael, Fred Osher, and Denise Tomasini-Joshi, “Improving Responses to People with Mental Illnesses: The Essential Elements of a Mental Health Court,” *The Council of State Governments Justice Center* (2007).

⁹⁵ Pew Center on the States, “One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008,” *Pew Center on the States* (2008).