

**Research and program evaluation in Illinois:
Studies on drug abuse and violent crime**

The DuPage County State's Attorney's
Drug Control Strategy Task Force:
A Process Evaluation

**The DuPage County State's Attorney's
Drug Control Strategy Task Force:
A Process Evaluation**

**Principal Investigator
Leonard P. Wojciechowicz**

May 1993

Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

**Peter B. Bensinger, Chairman
Dennis E. Nowicki, Executive Director**

Jim Edgar, Governor

**Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, Illinois 60606-3997**

**Printed by the authority of the State of Illinois
May 1993
Printing order number 93-22 (b)
700 copies**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority would like to thank DuPage County State's Attorney James E. Ryan and the members of the DuPage County State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force for their insight and assistance during this evaluation. Special thanks go to Gene Kennelly, Assistant State's Attorney and Task Force Coordinator, for his efforts. The Authority would also like to thank Nancy Post for the many hours she devoted to editing this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
Background	1
Process Description	2
Evaluation	3
PROCESS DESCRIPTION	5
Task Force Idea	8
Initial Discussions with the Authority	8
Steering Committee Meetings	9
Press Conference Announcing Task Force	15
Task Force Newsletter	15
Public Hearings	15
Subcommittee Goals	20
Chairpersons Meetings	20
Subcommittee Meetings	20
Surveys	22
Draft Report	23
Press Conference Announcing Draft Report	23
Public Hearing	24
Final Report	26
Interdisciplinary Council	26
Final Press Conference	27

EVALUATION 29

- Unification of Community Resources 30
- Community Awareness 30
- DuPage Drug Information 30
- On-going Oversight 31
- Timetable 31
- InTouch 31
- Steering Committee Involvement in Setting Goals 32
- Report Generation 32
- Communication 35
- Adherence to Initial Goals 35
- Subcommittee Leadership 36
- Survey Data 37
- Public Hearings 39

CONCLUSION 40

Figure

1. Task Force Process	7
---------------------------------	---

Tables

1. Initial Steering Committee Members	10
2. Task Force Timetable	11
3. Subcommittee Chairpersons	14
4. Panel Members at Public Hearings	16
5. Scheduled Testimony at Elmhurst Public Hearing	17
6. Scheduled Testimony at Downers Grove Public Hearing	18
7. Scheduled Testimony at Wheaton Public Hearing	19
8. Scheduled Testimony at March 24, 1992, Public Hearing	25
9. Initial Members of the Interdisciplinary Council	28

Appendices

1. Steering Committee Agenda, February 22, 1991
2. Goals, Objectives, Plan Outline, and Methodology
3. *Developing a Local Drug Strategy*, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
4. Press Release, March 28, 1991
5. Task Force Newsletter, April 1991
6. Press Release, April 1, 1991
7. Memo from James E. Ryan to Steering Committee and Subcommittee Chairpersons, April 24, 1991: Suggestions for Strategic Plan
8. Task Force Sources
9. Sample Subcommittee Agenda
10. Sample Subcommittee Meeting Notes
11. Business Survey
12. Township Survey
13. Municipality Survey
14. School Survey
15. Police Survey
16. Press Release, March 11, 1992
17. Comparison of Task Force Goals to Final Recommendations, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In early 1991, James E. Ryan, the DuPage County State's Attorney, formed a task force to develop a strategy for preventing and controlling substance abuse in DuPage County, Illinois. The task force consisted of more than 100 volunteers from both the public and private sectors. Over a 17-month period, the task force reviewed existing drug programs in DuPage County and produced recommendations for a coordinated drug control strategy. The effort was supported by the DuPage County State's Attorney's Office, the Office of the Governor, and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (the Authority).

Nearly 800,000 people live in DuPage County, which is located west of Cook County and Chicago. Expanding economic opportunities have made DuPage one of the fastest growing counties in the nation, and its residents have the highest per capita income in Illinois. However, increases in the county's wealth and population have been accompanied by an increase in the number of drug users and drug-related arrests. The Authority estimates that more than 16,000 DuPage County residents currently use illegal drugs on a regular basis. Between 1983 and 1990, the annual number of drug arrests increased by approximately 80 percent. Growth in the number of drug arrests in the county has increased workloads at the state's attorney's office and is contributing to overcrowded conditions at the county jail.

While drug abuse still is not as widespread in DuPage County as in many other communities, the county clearly needs a multi-faceted and coordinated strategy to prevent the problem from escalating further. The effort by the task force to develop such a strategy appears to be among the first of its kind nationwide. We believe other communities will want to develop similar strategies and can benefit from the experience gained in this pioneering effort in Illinois.

The Authority prepared this report to document and evaluate the strategy development process. The report discusses each step in the process, from initial planning, goal-setting, and selection of task force members, to the final release of the completed strategy. The

report also describes the time and resources required to complete the project. The task force's approaches to obtaining information, publicizing the effort, conducting productive meetings, facilitating communication, and generating a final report are also discussed. This information can assist other groups that wish to develop similar strategies, including nearly any anti-crime task force at either the state or local level.

Process Description

The Drug Control Strategy Task Force was formed in February of 1991. In addition to a steering committee, seven subcommittees were created to evaluate current drug programs and develop written recommendations for a unified drug control strategy. Each subcommittee focused on a specific facet of drug control. The seven subcommittees were as follows: Police/Courts/Corrections, School/Law Enforcement, Community Drug Prevention Councils, Drug Education for Parents, Drug-Free Workplace, Treatment, and Central Planning and Resource Center. Subcommittee members were volunteers from local government, schools, community groups, businesses, and treatment providers. Because these people volunteered their time, few financial resources were expended on the project.

The task force held three press conferences to publicize its efforts and two sets of public hearings to obtain information and feedback. In addition, the state's attorney's office surveyed businesses, towns, schools, and police departments in order to gather information on current drug control efforts in the county.

The task force released a report containing its final recommendations in June of 1992. The report, entitled *Confronting Substance Abuse: An Action Plan for Change*, was made available to the local media and sent to all mayors, police chiefs, local governments, school districts, and public libraries within DuPage County. The report was also made available to local business organizations and treatment providers. An on-going drug advisory council was also formed near the end of the project. The goal of the council is to make sure the strategy is successfully implemented.

The action plan issued by the task force culminated a 17-month process to develop recommendations for every level of community organization concerned with substance abuse. The completed plan is comprehensive and virtually self-executing, because it includes sample letters, policies, and procedures to assist community groups in implementing the strategy. The plan should enable organizations in DuPage County to focus and coordinate their efforts and resources more effectively and efficiently than when they were working independently. This should help the community to better manage and curtail drug abuse.

Evaluation

Based on an evaluation of the task force process, the Authority has a number of recommendations for others attempting a similar effort. These recommendations, listed below, reflect both highly successful approaches used by the task force and the Authority's suggestions for enhancing similar efforts in the future.

1. Allow adequate time for the entire process. The effort in DuPage County took approximately 17 months.
2. Involve and seek advice from existing organizations that have experience in consensus-building on similar issues.
3. Involve subcommittee leaders in defining task force goals and in developing surveys to identify existing community programs and problems. This will reinforce the leaders' commitment to achieving the goals, and enhance the scope and utilization of information gathered as the basis for strategy development.
4. Disseminate survey results and public hearing transcripts to subcommittees before the groups develop their recommendations. The subcommittees need this information to focus on problem areas and to provide a rationale for their final recommendations.
5. Determine the format of the final report before the subcommittees begin meeting. Provide subcommittee leaders with a typed outline to fill in or a computer disk with charts and the appropriate headings already in place. Enforce format standards so that the final report can be readily compiled into a consistent-looking document.

6. Hold periodic steering committee meetings throughout the process to resolve any problems or questions that may be blocking progress by the subcommittees. Throughout the process, have the steering committee review preliminary recommendations developed by the subcommittees to make sure the groups' efforts are on target.
7. Direct subcommittee leaders to prepare an agenda prior to each subcommittee meeting and distribute it to meeting participants. (A sample agenda is shown in Appendix 9.) Agendas make meetings more productive and clarify what needs to be accomplished.
8. Encourage all subcommittee members to participate actively in discussions. To produce the best strategy, all viewpoints, no matter how unconventional, should be considered.
9. Keep subcommittee members informed of their group's progress. Maintain subcommittee meeting notes and circulate them among subcommittees (see Appendix 10 for sample notes).
10. Involve all subcommittee members at each subcommittee meeting. Assignments, such as obtaining information or writing potential recommendations, should be divided among subcommittee members. This will keep everyone focused and involved.
11. Make sure that subcommittee members have the opportunity to arrive at a general consensus on their subcommittee's final written recommendations. Have subcommittee members write preliminary recommendations for review and discussion by the entire subcommittee. Within subcommittees, revise recommendations as often as necessary. Be open to full-scale changes if a majority of the members feel the changes are necessary, even if time is running short.

PROCESS DESCRIPTION

The Drug Control Strategy Task Force issued its final report on June 29, 1992, reflecting the combined efforts of more than 100 people. The idea for the task force originated a year and a half earlier with James E. Ryan, the DuPage County state's attorney. Under Ryan's direction and leadership, the task force developed a coordinated strategy to combat drug abuse.

Ryan initially formed a steering committee for the task force. Ryan and the steering committee then formed seven subcommittees to develop strategies for each segment of the community they deemed critical to drug control. The subcommittees were as follows: Police/Courts/Corrections, School/Law Enforcement, Community Drug Prevention Councils, Drug Education for Parents, Drug-Free Workplace, Treatment, and Central Planning and Resource Center.

Although each group was responsible for developing strategies for a particular sector of the community, they were free to offer suggestions to other subcommittees. Some groups had to coordinate their strategies because they needed to rely on the same community resources, such as police departments, or because they were targeting the same population group, such as teenagers.

To the knowledge of the Authority, this large-scale effort to develop a coordinated strategy to combat drug abuse was one of the first of its kind. Other communities have developed drug strategies, but the DuPage effort went a step further by bringing together representatives of nearly all of the county's public and private sector organizations that had an interest in the problem. By marshalling and coordinating the resources and efforts of all of these organizations, the strategy addresses the problem of drug abuse at many levels.

We hope that the efforts of the DuPage task force will serve as a model for similar groups throughout Illinois and other states. Community leaders in other areas may wish to adapt the ideas presented here and in the task force's report to meet their local needs.

The state's attorney's office provided guidance for the project and also assisted in the

compilation and editing of the final report. Additional support for the task force's efforts was provided by the project's steering committee, the Office of the Governor, and the Authority.

The project took approximately 17 months to complete. Figure 1 on page 7 shows the activities necessary to complete the project, from forming the task force to issuing the final report. During the course of the project, the subcommittees held more than 80 meetings. The subcommittee chairpersons and the steering committee each met six times. The task force held three press conferences and four public hearings. Surveys of current programs of businesses, towns, schools, and police agencies resulted in nearly 300 responses. Survey results were compiled and analyzed by the Authority, and included in the task force's final report.

Task Force Idea

The idea for the task force originated with James E. Ryan, the DuPage County state's attorney, in January of 1991 (Figure 1, Step 1). As chief prosecutor, Ryan was fully aware of the consequences of drug abuse within the county. Believing a coordinated strategy was needed, Ryan initiated an ambitious plan to bring together the many community organizations already working to combat substance abuse.

Before the task force was created, efforts to control substance abuse in DuPage County were somewhat disjointed. Several people interviewed for this report by the Authority said communication gaps existed among local community groups. For example, one treatment provider said that private, for-profit providers had never met with their not-for-profit counterparts to discuss common concerns and learn about one another's services. The provider went on to say that an open dialogue among treatment professionals in the community was initiated during Treatment Subcommittee meetings. The provider hoped this would lead to further discussion and progress in the future. Two other providers from the same subcommittee voiced similar opinions.

The task force process strengthened bonds between different types of agencies and institutions. For instance, while schools and police departments already had good working relationships, the recommendations developed by the task force should help them maintain strong relationships in the future as they combat substance abuse among students. The task force also brought together police departments and treatment providers and gave them an opportunity to discuss common concerns.

Many other groups represented on the task force found they had common concerns, as well. Together, they were able to develop recommendations that address substance abuse at many levels and provide a complete, coordinated, county-wide strategy.

Initial Discussions with the Authority

State's Attorney Ryan discussed his idea for the task force with officials at the Authority in early 1991 (Figure 1, Step 2). A state agency, the Authority gathers, analyzes,

and disseminates information relevant to the administration of criminal justice in Illinois. Ryan discussed his plans with J. David Coldren, executive director¹, and Candice Kane, associate director, Federal and State Grant Unit. After the task force was formed, two other members of the Authority provided research and analytical support: Roger K. Przybylski, director, Information Resource Center, and Leonard P. Wojciechowicz, senior research analyst.

Ryan, Coldren, and Kane agreed that a task force steering committee should be established, consisting of community leaders and others willing to assist with the effort.

Steering Committee Meetings

On February 22, March 8, and March 28, 1991, a steering committee formed by State's Attorney Ryan met to discuss plans for the task force (Figure 1, Step 3). The steering committee members represented a cross-section of community organizations concerned with substance abuse issues. Table 1 lists the people who attended at least one of these three meetings.

Table 1. Initial Steering Committee Members

Name	Title/Affiliation
J. David Coldren	Executive Director, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Berardo DeSimone	Regional Superintendent of Schools
Richard Doria	Sheriff of DuPage County
Herbert Herman	Regional Manager, Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse
William Kassal	Supervisor, Bloomingdale Township
Pat Larson	Director, Victim Services, Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists (AAIM)
Richard Larson	Administrator, Department of Human Resources, DuPage County
Steven W. List	Chief, Woodridge Police Department
Ed Merkle	County Board Member, Elmhurst
John Millner	Chief, Elmhurst Police Department
Larry Mulcrone	Director, DuPage Metropolitan Enforcement Group
William F. Murphy	Mayor, Village of Woodridge
Roger K. Przybylski	Director, Information Resource Center, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
James E. Ryan	DuPage County State's Attorney
Robert Spence	Supervisor, Major Crimes Unit, DuPage County State's Attorney's Office
Richard Stock	First Assistant, DuPage County State's Attorney's Office
Eva Tameling	Attorney at Law, Oak Brook
Daniel Tufo	Principal, Lace Elementary School
John Zaruba	Deputy Chief Administrative Assistant, DuPage County Sheriff's Office

At its first meeting, the steering committee discussed drug abuse prevention projects currently operating in the county. (The meeting agenda appears in Appendix 1.) The committee also approved goals and objectives developed by Ryan for the task force (see Appendix 2) and the following timetable:

Table 2. Task Force Timetable

Target Date	Goal
<u>1991</u>	
June 1	Task force to complete fact-finding and data collection
September 1	Subcommittees to complete respective strategies
September 15	Task force to complete second round of public hearings
October 1	Task force to adopt final plan
December 31	Mayors, managers, and others to adopt final plan
<u>1992</u>	
January 1	Plan to be implemented

Although the committee members felt this was an ambitious timetable, they believed the goals were achievable.

During the first meeting, the steering committee also made plans for an orientation session for task force members, a press conference, and three public hearings to be held in early April. Finally, it approved the formation of six subcommittees (Figure 1, Step 4) and began selecting subcommittee members.

At the steering committee's second meeting, State's Attorney Ryan announced that William F. Murphy, mayor of the Village of Woodridge, would serve as chairman of the task force. J. David Coldren, executive director of the Authority, suggested that the task force identify the current extent of substance abuse in DuPage County before developing recommendations. Coldren also agreed to provide steering committee members with several

relevant Authority publications: *Statewide Strategy to Control Drug and Violent Crime*; *Blueprint for the Future: Final Report of Trends and Issues for the 1990s*, *An Illinois Criminal Justice Forum*; and *Developing a Local Drug Strategy*, which provides guidelines for developing a system to battle drug abuse (see Appendix 3).²

State's Attorney Ryan also announced the names of the subcommittee chairpersons. Two more subcommittees were also added at this point to the six approved at the first meeting: the Central Planning and Resource Center subcommittee and the Fact-Finding subcommittee. The goal of the central planning and resource center subcommittee was to determine ways that the DuPage Prevention Partnership could assist local community prevention councils in developing and implementing local drug prevention plans. (The DuPage Prevention Partnership is an alliance of organizations whose goal is to develop and implement a primary prevention plan for substance abuse in DuPage County.) The purpose of the fact-finding subcommittee was to gather preliminary information needed by the other subcommittees. The fact-finding subcommittee disbanded before the first subcommittee chairpersons meeting in April. Table 3 lists the seven ongoing subcommittees and their chairpersons.

At the steering committee's third meeting and a press conference immediately afterward, Lieutenant Governor Robert Kustra was in attendance and voiced strong support for the task force. Steering committee members interviewed later by Authority staff said that the support of the Office of the Governor strengthened their resolve to accomplish the task force's objectives.

During this third meeting, the steering committee agreed that all recommendations developed by the subcommittees should be submitted to the steering committee for approval, then sent to a drafting committee to edit and combine into a report. The committee also made plans for three public hearings to be held in April of 1991. The committee specified the following guidelines for the hearings:

- Ten people would be invited to testify at each hearing. The committee felt this number would be sufficient to represent a broad range of viewpoints and that having more people testify might be confusing or too time-consuming.

- Following the testimony, time would be allowed for follow-up questions.
- After the scheduled testimony, citizens could testify. Written comments would be accepted from people who were not in attendance.
- A court reporter would transcribe the hearings.
- Notices of the hearings would be sent to media outlets, municipalities, mayors, council members, township supervisors, trustees, county board members, state representatives and senators, hospitals, police chiefs, educators, chambers of commerce, and others.

Table 3. Subcommittee Chairpersons

Subcommittee	Chairperson(s)
Police/Courts/Corrections	Richard Doria, DuPage County Sheriff Robert Spence, Supervisor, Major Crimes Unit, DuPage County State's Attorney's Office
School/Law Enforcement	John Millner, Chief, Elmhurst Police Department Daniel Tufo, Principal, Lace Elementary School
Community Drug Prevention Councils	Pat Larson, Director, Victim Services, Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists (AAIM) William F. Murphy, Mayor, Village of Woodridge
Drug Education for Parents	Eva Tamelung, Attorney at Law, Oak Brook
Drug-Free Workplace	William W. Hargreaves, Vice President for People, The ServiceMaster Company Geri Powell, Manager, Media Relations, Waste Management Corporation
Treatment	Dr. Richard Ready, Hinsdale Hospital Tony Atkin, Executive Director, DuPage Counseling and Referral Services, Inc.
Central Planning and Resource Center	Richard Larson, Administrator, Department of Human Resources, DuPage County

Press Conference Announcing Task Force

The task force was officially announced at a press conference held March 28 (Figure 1, Step 5). At the press conference, State's Attorney Ryan, Lieutenant Governor Kustra, and Mayor Murphy discussed current substance abuse problems in DuPage County and encouraged task force members to develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing them. The task force also issued a press release announcing its formation (see Appendix 4).

Task Force Newsletter

The task force published a newsletter to keep members informed of the project's status (Figure 1, Step 6). Task force members received the one-page newsletter each month from April through September 1991, and also in March 1992, as the project neared completion. (The April newsletter is included in Appendix 5.) The newsletter provided information on current task force activities, such as public hearings and surveys, subcommittee progress, and substance abuse statistics.

Public Hearings

Public hearings were held April 9 through 11, 1991, in three DuPage County communities: Elmhurst, Downers Grove, and Wheaton (Figure 1, Step 7). A press release announcing the hearings was issued the previous week (Appendix 6). At each hearing, a panel of task force members received testimony and questioned those testifying. Several panel members attended more than one hearing. Table 4 lists the panel members at each of the three hearings.

Table 4. Panel Members at Public Hearings

Task Force Member	Elmhurst	Downers Grove	Wheaton
Atkin		X	
Coldren	X	X	X
Doria			X
Hargreaves	X		X
R. Larson	X		X
Millner	X		X
Powell		X	
Ready			X
Ryan	X	X	X
Spence		X	
Tufo		X	

The steering committee invited a wide variety of people to testify. These included business leaders, police officials, government officials, educators, PTA members, and a recovering addict. Speakers were chosen based on their expertise in relevant areas and their ability to present ideas effectively. The steering committee asked the speakers to address specific points, but also gave them latitude to discuss other concerns in their areas of expertise.

The task force panel received testimony from the invited speakers and then gave members of the public an opportunity to testify. Each person who testified had about five minutes to present a statement. Panel members then had a chance to ask questions. The hearings generally lasted two to three hours.

At the first hearing, which was held on April 9 in Elmhurst, 13 people testified. Of these, 12 were people who had been specifically invited by the steering committee (see Table 5). At the second hearing, held April 10 in Downers Grove, 14 people testified. Of

these, 10 had been asked to testify by the committee (see Table 6). At the third hearing, held April 11 in Wheaton, 12 people testified. Of these, nine had been invited by the committee (see Table 7).

Table 5. Scheduled Testimony at Elmhurst Public Hearing

Name	Title/Affiliation
Aldo Botti	Chairman, DuPage County Board
Shirley Burnside	Fenton High School
"Cathy"	A recovering addict
Dennis Ferguson	DuPage County Health Department
Christine Gaylord	InTouch
Linda Lang	Illinois State Police, DARE Bureau
Pat Larson	Director, Victim Services, Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists (AAIM)
Ed Merkle	County Board Member, Elmhurst
John Millner	Chief, Elmhurst Police Department
Bill O'Sullivan	Captain, Illinois State Police, DARE Bureau
Eva Tameling	Attorney at Law, Oak Brook
Daniel Tufo	Principal, Lace Elementary School

Table 6. Scheduled Testimony at Downers Grove Public Hearing

Name	Title/Affiliation
Bob Bishop	AMOCO Corporation
Richard Doria	Sheriff of DuPage County
Sharon Freeman	Downers Grove Area PTA Council President
William W. Hargreaves	Vice President for People, The ServiceMaster Company
Bruce Hasher	Downers Grove Township
Herbert Herman	Illinois Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse
James Mullany	Chief, Glen Ellyn Police Department
William F. Murphy	Mayor, Village of Woodridge
Gretchen Sauer	Downers Grove South High School
Melvin Schabilion	United States Drug Enforcement Administration

Table 7. Scheduled Testimony at Wheaton Public Hearing

Name	Title/Affiliation
Shannon Burns	Parkside Lodge of DuPage
Ellen DeLordo	NALCO Chemical Company
Terry Mee	Commander, Wheaton Police Department
Rick Musil	Detective, Westmont Police Department
James O'Connor	Chairman, Commonwealth Edison Company
Geri Powell	Manager, Media Relations, Waste Management Corporation
Robert Spence	Supervisor, Major Crimes Unit, DuPage County State's Attorney's Office
Paul Teodo	Central DuPage Hospital
Frank Williams	Chief, Wood Dale Police Department

The panels also accepted written testimony from anyone who was unable to testify at the hearings or who wanted to submit additional information. The panels received about a dozen written comments. Both the verbal and written testimony were transcribed and later presented to the task force.

Subcommittee Goals

Defining the goals of each subcommittee was an important step that occurred early in the process (Figure 1, Step 8). State's Attorney Ryan wrote a memo defining the issues he believed each subcommittee should address and presented this memo to the steering committee and the subcommittee chairpersons on April 24, 1991 (see Appendix 7).

Although not all task force members were aware of the memo or its importance, the subcommittee chairpersons were guided by it as their subcommittees prepared recommendations. Without the memo, the subcommittees would have spent a considerable amount of time developing a list of issues to address.

Chairpersons Meetings

The subcommittee chairpersons met several times to update one another on their subcommittees' progress and to keep the project moving forward (Figure 1, Step 9). They typically discussed the recommendations their subcommittees had developed so far, the problems they had encountered, and any potential duplication of effort among subcommittees. These meetings usually lasted two to three hours and were chaired by the task force chairman, Mayor Murphy.

Subcommittee Meetings

The seven subcommittees had approximately 10 members each; all subcommittee members were volunteers. Each subcommittee was responsible for preparing recommendations on a specific topic for the drug control strategy report, which was the final product of the task force.

The subcommittee members developed recommendations based on their own experience, information gathered at the public hearings, and a wide variety of source materials from Illinois and elsewhere (see Appendix 8). Some subcommittee members spent considerable time obtaining and reviewing relevant materials.

The subcommittees began meeting in May of 1991. Most completed their recommendations within five months, by October 1991 (Figure 1, Step 10). However, the amount of time and effort invested by members of various subcommittees differed significantly.

Most subcommittees began meeting promptly after receiving instructions, and met at least once a month after that. However, as the deadline approached, some began meeting every other week. The meetings usually lasted two to three hours. One subcommittee took the novel approach of meeting *before* the regular workday, so that everyone would be fresh and eager to achieve the goals of the meeting. Examples of a subcommittee meeting agenda and meeting notes are provided in Appendices 9 and 10.

Subcommittee members were selected by State's Attorney Ryan and the subcommittee chairpersons. Members came from various age groups, educational backgrounds, and professions. For instance, the following people were members of the school/law enforcement subcommittee:

- An elementary school principal
- A local police chief who also leads a Metropolitan Enforcement Group (MEG)
- A regional school superintendent
- A criminal justice program coordinator from a local college
- A community resource coordinator for a local township
- A DARE officer
- A substance abuse and prevention education specialist for a local school district
- A police detective
- A prevention coordinator for a statewide drug prevention program

The wide range of experience and viewpoints represented by the subcommittee members helped contribute to the quality and community acceptance of their recommendations. According to subcommittee members interviewed by the Authority, most meetings provided an open forum for ideas on controlling substance abuse in DuPage County. Most subcommittees encouraged members to present and consider as many ideas as possible, even unconventional ones.

Surveys

In May of 1992, at about the same time that the subcommittees first convened, staff at the state's attorney's office developed four surveys to obtain information for use by the task force (Figure 1, Step 11). The surveys targeted businesses (see Appendix 11), townships and municipalities (Appendices 12 and 13), schools (Appendix 14), and police agencies (Appendix 15).

Approximately 300 surveys were returned to the state's attorney's office (24 from towns, 28 from police agencies, 106 from businesses, and 131 from schools). The results provided valuable information for the task force's final report.³ For example, the school surveys showed how many schools already had a formal substance abuse curriculum, as well as the types of programs they offered. The business surveys showed that a number of DuPage County businesses were testing employees for drugs. The municipality and police surveys showed that some of these groups were sponsoring activities to promote a drug-free community.

Unfortunately, delays in compiling and analyzing the survey results meant that this information was not available to the subcommittees until they had finished formulating most of their recommendations (Figure 1, Step 12). If the information had been available sooner, it would have expedited and enhanced the subcommittees' efforts.

Draft Report

The subcommittees provided their recommendations and supporting materials to the state's attorney's office in early November of 1991. Although this was two months behind the steering committee's original timetable, the discrepancy seemed to be a result of an overly ambitious schedule, rather than lack of efficiency or effort on the part of the subcommittees. Because the task force was a volunteer effort, failing to meet the original schedule did not have any funding consequences.

However, once the subcommittees submitted their reports, standardizing and organizing the materials into a draft took four months, because many of the reports had to be rewritten (Figure 1, Step 13). This was due to a lack of parallelism in the content and format of the recommendations and other materials submitted by the subcommittees.

Most of the work necessary to compile the draft report was performed by Gene Kennelly, Assistant State's Attorney and task force coordinator. Secretaries at Kennelly's office and technical analysts at the Authority provided additional assistance.

When the draft report was completed, copies were mailed to all task force members, the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, and all DuPage County mayors, police chiefs, local governments, school districts, and public libraries. Copies were also sent to treatment providers and some business groups, such as the East-West Corporate Corridor Association.

Press Conference Announcing Draft Report

On March 8, 1992, the task force held a press conference to announce the release of the draft report (Figure 1, Step 14). Copies of the report were available to everyone who attended.

At the press conference, State's Attorney Ryan described the substantial amount of effort that went into producing the report. He stressed the tremendous impact that the recommendations would have on the community if everyone worked together to implement them.

Ryan also announced that a public hearing would be held to obtain feedback on the

report at the end of the month. The purpose of the hearing was to provide an opportunity for members of the public and invited guests to respond to the report and offer suggestions for improvement. A press release announcing the public hearing was issued on March 11 (see Appendix 16).

Public Hearing

The public hearing was held in Wheaton on March 24, 1992 (Figure 1, Step 15). A panel representing the task force heard and responded to comments on the draft report. The following people were panel members at the hearing:

- Richard Ballinger, DuPage County Coroner
- Richard Larson, Administrator, Department of Human Resources, DuPage County
- James E. Ryan, DuPage County State's Attorney
- Robert Spence, Supervisor, Major Crimes Unit, DuPage County State's Attorney's Office
- Daniel Tufo, Principal, Lace Elementary School
- Leonard Wojciechowicz, Research Analyst, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

Twenty-two people testified at the hearing. Table 8 lists the people who were invited to testify. The task force also received 12 written comments, including eight from people who did not give oral testimony. The hearings provided task force members with valuable feedback on the draft report. Some recommendations in the final report were based on suggestions and information provided at this hearing.

After the hearing, Kennelly sent each steering committee member a transcript and a list of the issues raised that had direct bearing on the report.

Table 8. Scheduled Testimony at March 24, 1992, Public Hearing

Name	Title/Affiliation
Sister Andrea Chudzik	Principal, St. Mary's Catholic School
Jim Cichanski	Chairman, Human Resource Council, East-West Corporate Corridor Association; Director, Human Resources, HPD Company
Jack Donahue	President, DuPage County Bar Association
Paul Froelich	Executive Director, Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists
Gary Gates	Student System Program Coordinator, Wheaton-Warrenville School District 200
Helen Gorsuch	Breaking Free
Bob Heap	DuPage County Board
Sandra Hinely	DuPage County Health Department
Lou Oates	Chairman of Public Affairs, American Cancer Society, West DuPage Branch Office
Bob Porter	Officer, Downers Grove Police Department
Ted Schlake	Executive Director, American Lung Association, DuPage and McHenry Counties
Charles Schlicher	Addison Substance Responsibility Commission
John Thorson	Superintendent, Hinsdale District 86
Mike Tierney	Detective, Addison Police Department
Michael Toomey	Chief, Bensenville Police Department
John Turrubiarres	Illinois Department of Employment Security
Rich Veenstra	Addison Substance Responsibility Commission
Mike Willison	Officer, Downers Grove Police Department

Final Report

Following the public hearing, Kennelly revised the draft and began assembling the final report (Figure 1, Step 16). On May 7, the steering committee held a final meeting to discuss the final revisions and the comments received at the hearing. The committee met for most of the day and discussed each recommendation. While the committee made some editorial changes, they did not significantly alter the substance of any of the recommendations. The meeting adjourned after the committee reached a consensus on all of the recommendations.

After the committee's editorial changes were incorporated, the report was further enhanced by changing the title and converting the text into a more readable format. The working title of the draft, *Report of the State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force*, was changed to *Confronting Substance Abuse: An Action Plan for Change*. The text was reformatted into two columns, and shading that surrounded the recommendations in the draft was removed. Type fonts and styles were made consistent throughout the report, including the exhibits and public hearing testimony.

Interdisciplinary Council

Before the final report was issued in late June of 1992, the task force created an interdisciplinary council to ensure that the recommendations would be implemented (Figure 1, Step 17). The council included many of the original task force members, as well as some additional community leaders who could provide new ideas and target additional groups. The original council members are listed in Table 9. However, the council is an on-going entity, so its membership changes periodically.

Representatives of the council have met with the DuPage County Police Chiefs Association, the DuPage Mayors and Managers Conference, and several school districts. These groups have pledged to support implementation of the recommendations. These local organizations and others have formally endorsed the task force's report and encouraged other groups to do the same. Council representatives will continue to meet with community

organizations, town boards, additional school districts, and other groups that have the ability and authority to implement the task force's recommendations, such as the East-West Corporate Corridor Association. This support should further unite the community in its effort to control and prevent substance abuse.

Final Press Conference

The final report was released to the public at a press conference on June 29, 1992 (Figure 1, Step 18). State's Attorney Ryan, Lieutenant Governor Kustra, and Task Force Chairman Murphy praised the efforts of task force members and stressed the importance of implementing the recommendations. They said that the value of the report would depend on the acceptance and implementation of the recommendations throughout the community. Copies of the report were available to everyone attending the press conference and were mailed to all task force members, the Office of the Lieutenant Governor, and all DuPage County mayors, police chiefs, local governments, school districts, and public libraries. Copies were also sent to treatment providers and business associations. To date, over 500 copies of the report have been distributed.

Table 9. Initial Members of the Interdisciplinary Council

Name	Title/Affiliation
Tony Atkin	Executive Director, DuPage Counseling and Referral Services, Inc.
Richard Ballinger	DuPage County Coroner
Judith Brinkman	DuPage Prevention Partnership
Tim Cramer	Prevention Area Coordinator, InTouch
Berardo DeSimone	Regional Superintendent of Schools
Dean DiNicolo	Addison Elementary School District #4
Jack Donahue	President, DuPage County Bar Association
Beverly Fawell	State Senator
John Geils	President, Village of Bensenville
Bruce Hasher	Downers Grove Township
Herbert Herman	Regional Manager, Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse
Joel A. Kagan	Clerk of the 18th Circuit Court
Pat Larson	Director, Victim Services, Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorists (AAIM)
Richard Larson	Administrator, Department of Human Resources, DuPage County
Ed Merkle	County Board Member, Elmhurst
John Millner	Chief, Elmhurst Police Department
William F. Murphy	Mayor, Village of Woodridge
Rick Musil	Detective, Westmont Police Department
Geri Powell	Manager, Media Relations, Waste Management Corporation
Robert Spence	Supervisor, Major Crimes Unit, DuPage County State's Attorney's Office
Daniel Tufo	Principal, Lace Elementary School
Frank Williams	Chief, Wood Dale Police Department

EVALUATION

In addition to providing technical assistance to the task force, the Authority observed and analyzed the task force process. This section presents the results of this analysis for the benefit of task force participants and other groups planning similar efforts.

Authority staff attended nearly all of the steering committee meetings and public hearings held by the task force and also reviewed memos, meeting minutes, newspaper articles, and other information documenting the task force's work. Seventeen people associated with the project contributed their observations during interviews with Authority staff. Interviewees included Gene Kennelly, task force coordinator; William Murphy, task force chairman; eight subcommittee chairpersons; and seven subcommittee members. Three of the subcommittee members served on two subcommittees, enabling them to draw comparisons. At least one person from each subcommittee was interviewed. All but one of the subcommittee chairpersons were interviewed.

The success of the task force in achieving most of the original goals defined by State's Attorney Ryan and producing a coordinated drug strategy is impressive. This achievement is particularly noteworthy because, to the Authority's knowledge, the effort was among the first of its kind nationwide. The task force not only addressed the obvious drug control problems faced by law enforcement officials, but also those of businesses, schools, parents, communities, government bodies, and treatment providers. The effort brought together these groups and enabled them to produce a coordinated, multi-level strategy. The task force firmly believes that DuPage County will be well-served by implementing the strategy. We concur with this assessment.

The costs associated with developing the strategy were minimal because the task force consisted of volunteers. Yet, the task force leaders succeeded in motivating the group to develop a high-quality report in a relatively brief amount of time. State's Attorney Ryan provided knowledgeable and dedicated leadership, offering creative ideas, challenging task force members with ambitious goals, and providing staff resources. Ryan and the committee

chairpersons met throughout the project and tried to ensure that all ideas were addressed and that the best possible strategy was being developed.

Other groups would benefit from using a process similar to the one followed by the DuPage task force. Of course, as with any project of this size and scope, some obstacles were encountered. It is our hope that other communities or agencies planning a similar effort will benefit from the evaluation that follows of both the successes and challenges encountered by the task force.

Unification of Community Resources

The task force effectively brought together many community organizations already working to combat substance abuse. The task force process helped open up communications among these groups, enabling them to identify common concerns and put aside "turf battles." Both the formal strategy and the informal relationships established should facilitate improved coordination and understanding among these groups in the future.

Community Awareness

One of the most important achievements of the task force was an increase in community awareness of the need for an effective drug control strategy in DuPage County. The task force used an effective, multi-level approach for raising community awareness by issuing press releases, holding public hearings and press conferences, and widely distributing the final report. The task force disseminated information on its activities and recommendations to media outlets, municipalities, mayors, council members, township supervisors, trustees, county board members, state representatives and senators, hospitals, police chiefs, educators, chambers of commerce, and others.

DuPage Drug Information

Through the combined efforts of the task force, the DuPage County State's Attorney's Office, and the Authority, a significant amount of information on current substance abuse

levels and drug control programs in DuPage County was gathered, analyzed, and aggregated. This information is a useful new resource for the community at large and for the organizations responsible for implementing the drug control strategy.

On-going Oversight

The task force wisely chose to ensure that its impact on the community would not end with the release of the final report. By forming the on-going Interdisciplinary Council, the task force attempted to ensure that its recommendations would obtain broader support and full implementation within the county. The Council may also increase the useful life of the strategy by adapting it to meet changing community needs in future years.

Timetable

The task force did not meet the original timetable established by the steering committee, issuing the final report eight months later than planned. However, given the complexity of the project, the amount of time actually required was still within reason. Since the task force was made up of volunteers, there were no adverse funding consequences as a result of missing the original deadline. Overall, it appears that the original timetable was simply too ambitious. One benefit of the challenging schedule set by the steering committee was that the task force was probably motivated to complete the project more quickly than it would have otherwise.

InTouch

InTouch (the Illinois Network to Organize the Understanding of Community Health) is a substance abuse network developed six years ago by the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse (DASA), Lieutenant Governor George H. Ryan, and the State Board of Education. An InTouch representative served on one of the task force subcommittees. In retrospect, it might have been helpful if the InTouch representative had been on the steering committee, so this resource could have been utilized more fully throughout the project

by all subcommittees.

The InTouch representative noted that both InTouch and the task force's Community Drug Councils may be drawing volunteers from the same pool of concerned citizens. Coordination between the two groups could prevent duplication of effort.

Steering Committee Involvement in Setting Goals

State's Attorney Ryan defined the goals of the task force, and the steering committee approved them at its first meeting. The subcommittees were then asked to develop recommendations to support the goals. This approach enabled the task force to rapidly begin its work with a strong, focused, and coordinated set of goals for guidance.

However, some steering committee members and other members of the task force did not have a strong sense of ownership of the goals. Several interviewees said that, while the goals were well-conceived and relevant, task force members should have had an opportunity to assist in developing them. According to the interviewees, one advantage of the task force approach to developing a strategy was that the final recommendations were written by the same people who would be asked to put them into action. These included teachers, police officers, business leaders, and community and government representatives.

The task force's sense of ownership of the goals might have been stronger if the steering committee members had drafted the goals themselves, with the task force chairman serving as the facilitator. However, this approach admittedly would have been more time-consuming. Other groups may want to consider the trade-offs between efficiency and group consensus when planning their goal-setting processes.

Report Generation

The major delay that extended the project past its original deadline occurred when it was time to aggregate the recommendations and other materials from the subcommittees into the draft report. The four months necessary to complete this task was longer than anticipated. The project virtually came to a standstill and the enthusiasm and community support

generated during the subcommittee meetings wavered while everyone waited for the report to materialize. The time that elapsed while the report was being edited was equal to the time the subcommittees spent developing and reaching a consensus on their recommendations.

The draft report took an unusually long time to assemble because the recommendations and other materials submitted by the subcommittees were not consistent in content, organization, or format. If the subcommittees had submitted uniform reports, it is possible that the time required to generate the draft could have been reduced from four months to one. This would have allowed the project to be completed nearly on schedule.

The delay while the draft report was being assembled may have detracted from its appeal for some community groups. For example, one subcommittee member said he met with several superiors during this time and championed the value of the recommendations for his agency's substance abuse efforts. However, his point was weakened by the fact that the report was not available. He said that by the time the report was finally issued, it had less of an impact on his superiors than it might have had earlier, because their interest in the project had waned.

If some mechanism for reviewing and standardizing the subcommittee reports as they were being developed had been in place, a significant amount of time probably would have been saved. For example, the drafting committee envisioned by the steering committee potentially could have reviewed and revised the subcommittee reports, checked them for consistency and completeness, and compiled them into a uniform set of final recommendations. However, the task force did not form a drafting committee.

In November of 1991, seven totally different reports were submitted simultaneously to the state's attorney's office. The recommendations differed in focus, depth of analysis, and format. In addition, since the subcommittees' reports were typed, rather than on computer disks, the state's attorney's office had to retype or scan them to produce a single, consistently formatted document. Once the document was completed, duplication and distribution required additional time.

The issue of uniformity was not overlooked in the early planning stages of the

project. At a steering committee and subcommittee chairpersons meeting held April 24, 1991, J. David Coldren, director of the Authority, discussed the document *Developing a Local Drug Strategy*. Coldren commented that it was important for each subcommittee to follow a uniform approach in going about its work and drafting its portion of the plan.

A memo to all subcommittee chairpersons, dated May 30, 1991, stressed uniformity and the importance of maintaining a consistent and coherent style throughout the reports. The memo specified that the subcommittee reports should begin with a narrative discussion of the subject area, and that the recommendations should include the following:

- A specific statement of what was to be done
- A statement of how and when this was to be done
- A statement identifying who was to be involved in accomplishing the task
- A means for evaluating the eventual success or failure of the implemented recommendation

None of the reports submitted by the subcommittees followed the guidelines stated in the memo. The subcommittee chairpersons apparently did not communicate the guidelines to subcommittee members. Uniformity also was not a central issue during the five meetings held by the subcommittee chairpersons. One task force member said that, while the state's attorney's office encouraged uniformity, the guidelines should have been enforced more adamantly.

The steering committee reviewed the draft once it had been compiled. However, if the steering committee or some other overseeing group had also performed periodic reviews of the recommendations as they were being formulated, the lack of consistency and adherence to the guidelines could have been corrected earlier in the process. While the subcommittee chairpersons reviewed the draft recommendations throughout the development process, they understandably focused their attention on content rather than uniformity.

We suggest that other groups attempting to develop a similar document define content, organization, and format guidelines for subcommittee reports early in the develop-

ment process. Taking a tough stand on conforming to predetermined standards and guidelines is necessary on a project of this size. Both the steering committee and the subcommittee chairpersons need to be aware of the importance of producing consistent reports, and should go so far as to return reports that do not conform to the specified format and style. The subcommittees should be responsible for editing their own reports to conform to the guidelines.

Periodic reviews of subcommittee recommendations should be performed by a steering committee or other group responsible for overseeing the project. Once the subcommittees have completed their reports, the steering committee should be responsible for compiling the final report, checking for redundancy, and ensuring that the report covers all intended areas.

Communication

Communication within and among subcommittees was usually excellent.⁴ However, a few communications problems were mentioned by the task force members interviewed by the Authority. For example, a few subcommittee members said that they were initially unaware that baseline goals had been established. This was problematic because the goals defined by State's Attorney Ryan were the foundation for the subcommittees' recommendations.

One interviewee said he was unaware of the goals for his subcommittee until the group had almost completed its work. He went on to say that he would have taken a different approach if he had known about the goals earlier. He said that the subcommittee chairpersons should have communicated the goals from the outset and continued to mention them at subsequent meetings.

Adherence to Initial Goals

Appendix 17 of this report compares the final strategy developed by the task force to the goals initially defined by State's Attorney Ryan. The goals were listed in a memo Ryan sent to the subcommittee chairpersons, dated April 24, 1991. The memo listed approximately

six goals for each subcommittee to consider.

The final strategy satisfies most of Ryan's goals effectively. However, one important goal that was specified for most of the subcommittees, yet overlooked by several, was to develop an evaluation of the effectiveness of existing programs in the community. This evaluation was to be included in the subcommittees' final reports. Some of the subcommittees may have chosen to omit the evaluation section from their reports because their members already felt knowledgeable about existing programs. However, for readers who are not familiar with existing programs, the omission of this information may weaken the persuasiveness of the task force's final report. The reasoning behind the recommendations would be easier to understand if every subcommittee had provided a discussion of current programs and problems.

Subcommittee Leadership

For the most part, subcommittee members said their subcommittees were conducted professionally and were well-focused. The subcommittee members interviewed by the Authority were generally extremely complimentary regarding their subcommittees' chairpersons. The members said they were amazed at how much their subcommittees were able to accomplish in a short time. They praised their chairpersons' skills in leading the group, coordinating the efforts of members, and ensuring the quality of their subcommittees' reports.

Still, some subcommittees were more efficient or effective than others. A task force member who served on two subcommittees said that one of the groups was somewhat disorganized and did not accomplish much at its first two meetings. As the deadline for submitting recommendations approached, the chairperson, not the subcommittee members, wrote the report. The subcommittee members then reviewed and agreed to the recommendations. While this approach saved time and helped the subcommittee meet its deadline, it probably weakened the subcommittee members' ownership of the recommendations.

The interviewee said that, in retrospect, the subcommittee's chairpersons and

members shared responsibility for the group's last-minute approach to generating its recommendations. The subcommittee members had adequate time to offer their assistance and to make critical contributions to the report, but no one took the initiative.

The most effective and productive subcommittees had enthusiastic chairpersons and members who were eager to participate. They began working on their reports soon after receiving their initial instructions, and followed an agenda at each meeting.

In interviews with the Authority, subcommittee members believed their time was well-spent when their subcommittee chairpersons prepared an agenda prior to each meeting. Agendas helped subcommittee members understand what the chairpersons expected to accomplish at each meeting.

One subcommittee prepared a mission statement so that its members could agree on the purpose of their efforts. Members said that developing recommendations was significantly easier once they formulated their mission.

Effective subcommittees also had chairpersons who assigned tasks to each member. This kept subcommittee members involved and increased their stake in the final recommendations.

Survey Data

The state's attorney's office sent out surveys in May of 1991 to gather data on current community programs and policies relevant to the goals of the task force. The resulting data were analyzed by Authority staff and presented in the task force's final report.

The survey results included important information about programs and procedures followed by local businesses, schools, police departments, and townships. The subcommittees received this information in mid-September 1991; most had finished writing their draft recommendations by October. If the survey results had been available sooner, the subcommittees could have utilized them more effectively. The original goal of the surveys was to help the subcommittees determine what policies and procedures were already in place, so that they could develop appropriate recommendations for their target groups. Most of the task

force members interviewed by the Authority said the survey information would have been more useful if it had been available when they were beginning to develop their recommendations.

One reason why the results were delayed was that no cut-off date for returning the surveys was specified. This made it difficult to determine when to begin analyzing the results.

Almost 300 surveys were eventually returned. However, because no "master list" of survey recipients was maintained, there was no way to follow up with organizations that did not return their surveys or to track the number of surveys outstanding. It appears that a majority of the surveys were returned.

Aggregating and analyzing the data presented another problem. Administrative personnel at the state's attorney's office originally believed that they could use database software at their office for this purpose. However, designing a database and inputting and analyzing the data proved to be more difficult and time-consuming than originally expected. The project was eventually transferred to the Authority, where staff designed a Paradox database and then input and analyzed the survey information.

In retrospect, it would have been helpful if the steering committee or the subcommittees had assisted in developing the surveys as one of their first tasks. Early in the project, State's Attorney Ryan asked the subcommittees to evaluate current substance abuse control efforts. As part of this responsibility, it would have made sense for the subcommittees to help create the surveys. The quality of the surveys was good. However, given the opportunity, the subcommittee members probably would have provided some valuable suggestions. They might have changed or added some questions to obtain specific information important for developing their recommendations. Involving the subcommittees in developing the surveys also would have increased their commitment to using the results.

Public Hearings

The public hearings held by the task force served a dual purpose. First, they enabled the group to obtain current information on substance abuse problems and programs in DuPage County. Second, they served to promote the work of the task force and encourage active citizen participation in the task force effort.

In retrospect, it probably would have been a good idea for the steering committee to get more involved in selecting people to testify and in developing questions for them. Once the hearings were held, the subcommittees could have made more use of the information provided in the transcripts. Although transcripts were available upon request to all task force members, some were unaware of this resource until their subcommittees had nearly finished developing recommendations. The transcript of the March 1992 hearing would have been worthwhile reading for all of the subcommittee members, since it documented the community's reaction to the draft report.

CONCLUSION

The effort to develop a multi-faceted and coordinated drug control strategy for DuPage County was one of the first broad-based, multi-level efforts of its kind and can serve as a model for other communities. The project successfully marshalled the talents of people from different backgrounds and from a broad range of community organizations. All of the task force participants were volunteers, making the effort highly cost-effective.

The task force members worked together effectively to develop a coherent, comprehensive drug control strategy. The final strategy they developed is practical and virtually self-executing, because the report includes specific recommendations and sample policies, procedures, letters, and other documents needed to implement the recommendations.

Both the development and implementation of the strategy enhanced communication and coordination among community organizations concerned with substance abuse. As a result, these organizations should be able to combine their resources and avoid duplication of effort in the future, making DuPage County drug control efforts more efficient and effective.

Notes

1. Dennis E. Nowicki has succeeded J. David Coldren as executive director of the Authority.
2. Copies of the *Strategy* and *Blueprint* are available from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority upon request.
3. Complete survey results are listed in the final report by the task force, *Confronting Substance Abuse: An Action Plan for Change*, p. 9-13.
4. Although the DuPage County State's Attorney's Office requested meeting minutes, not all of the subcommittees submitted them. This made it difficult to assess subcommittee communication in some cases.

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 2

GOALS:

1. Reduce the demand for illegal drugs in DuPage County
2. Suppress drug trafficking in DuPage County

OBJECTIVES:

1. Draft and implement a comprehensive, integrated drug control plan that includes the elements of enforcement, prevention and treatment
2. Establish a multi-disciplinary drug control advisory board to monitor the plan
3. Obtain the endorsement of Mayors and Managers Conference, Townships, County Board, Police Chiefs' Association, School Districts, Labor and Business Groups
4. Establish an evaluation component

PLAN OUTLINE:

1. Police/ Courts/ Corrections Strategy
 2. School/law enforcement partnership
 - a) prevention, intervention and disciplinary policies
 - b) Law enforcement protocol
 3. Community Drug Prevention Councils
 - a) Multi-disciplinary membership
 - b) Community goals and objectives
 - c) Linkage with schools
 - d) Develop, execute and monitor community drug control action plan
-

4. Drug Education Program for Parents
5. Central Planning and Prevention Resource Center
6. Model Drug-Free Workplace Recommendations
7. Treatment
8. Drug Control Advisory Board
9. Evaluation Component

METHODOLOGY:

1. Appoint Steering Committee
 - a) Approve goals and objectives
 - b) Approve strategy outline
 - c) Approve methodology
 - d) Establish time line for strategy development and implementation
 - e) Select Task Force Membership
 - f) Review and Approve Preliminary Subcommittee Proposals
 - g) Review and evaluate public comments, suggestions and recommendations
2. Task Force
 - a) Task Force orientation
 - b) Fact-finding subcommittee conducts hearings
 - c) Subcommittee develop components of the plan
 - d) Steering Committee reviews and approves preliminary plan
 - e) Drafting Committee prepare preliminary plan
 - f) Task Force reviews and approves preliminary plan
 - g) Conduct hearings regarding the preliminary plan

- h) Steering Committee reviews and evaluates public comments, suggestions and recommendations
 - i) Drafting Committee prepares final plan
 - j) Task Force approves DuPage County Drug Control Strategy
3. Drug Control Strategy Plan Implementation
- a) Seek approval by Mayors and Managers Conference, Townships, County Board, Police Chiefs' Association, School Districts, Labor and Business Groups
 - b) Appoint DuPage County Drug Advisory Council
4. Plan Evaluation
- a) The Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority will evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies plan and report its findings to the council
-

APPENDIX 3

DEVELOPING A LOCAL DRUG STRATEGY

Development of a comprehensive strategy requires careful thought and planning. Though it may appear at times to be an overwhelming task, the implementation of a well-conceived strategy - and the results it brings about - are well worth the time and effort.

This paper has been written to give those charged with the development of a strategy some guidance on how to proceed. It suggests steps a local task force can take and offers some recommendations on the format of the strategy itself.

What is a strategy?

A strategy is a road map which identifies an end a community wishes to achieve and sets out a plan for getting there. Strategies can be open-ended-setting agenda and leaving the nuts-and-bolts implementation steps to those who are charged with each task - or very specific by anticipating and providing direction for handling most of the tasks which will be faced.

Why formulate a strategy?

A local drug strategy draws together the various and diverse components of a community to plan a coordinated anti-drug initiative. At the heart of an anti-drug strategy is a desire to disrupt, to dismantle and ultimately destroy the illegal market for drugs by attacking both the supply and demand sides of the problem. To accomplish these ends, an integrated, interdisciplinary effort, which involves the public and private sectors, is needed. Therefore, for a strategy to be effective, it needs to draw on the talents and resources of the criminal justice system, education, business, social services, government officials, the media, and citizens in both planning and implementing a strategy.

Where to start

Strategies are rarely the work of one or two people. Since their success generally lies in many people sharing responsibility for their implementation, it is best to form a task force to develop the strategy. A task force approach brings a range of expertise to the "planning task" and promotes development of a more comprehensive and workable product because of the number of issues a diverse group will consider.

Once a task force is formed it needs to be given a clear charge. For instance, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, in preparing the state's anti-drug abuse strategy, was charged by the Department of Justice "to develop a statewide strategy to improve the functioning of the criminal justice system, with an emphasis on drug trafficking, violent crime and serious offenders". A number of other requirements, including involving state and local officials responsible for enforcing Illinois' drug and criminal laws in formulating the strategy, were also delineated.

What's the problem?

Before it can propose a response to the drug problem, the task force needs to understand the nature and extent of that problem. While data provide some guidance in this area they are not all-encompassing. Therefore it is advisable to invite public testimony and to also ensure input is gathered from key actors in the community. Information to be collected includes:

- Perception of the problem and any supporting evidence; and
- Prioritized recommendations for action.

It is also useful to share impressions gleaned from data with appropriate people and to ask for future explanation or interpretation. For instance, if a police chief says drugs are a major problem in the community but Uniform Crime Reports entries indicate a relatively low number of arrests for drug offenses, it is reasonable to ask the chief why the number of arrests isn't higher. His answer may provide valuable insight into the nature of the problem in the community.

Identify objectives

Objectives describe outcomes the task force wishes to achieve. As such they measure the changes the task force expects to bring about by implementing the anti-drug strategy. The objectives of the Illinois Anti-Drug Strategy, which emphasizes the rules of law enforcement, education and treatment are:

- To reduce the number of people reporting overall drug use in statewide surveys;
- To reduce the number of emergency room mentions for cocaine, marijuana, heroin and dangerous drugs;
- To decrease the available supply of drugs as measured by an increase in price and a decrease in purity; and
- To decrease the estimated production of marijuana in Illinois.

Once the task force has reviewed data, hearing testimony and other information it has available to describe the problem, it can then set objectives for the strategy as a whole. If some of the work of the task force is to be done by committees, it is appropriate for each committee to review the information relevant to its charge and set its own objectives.

Needless to say, these should be consistent with any goals or objectives the task force sets as a whole.

Priorities

The priorities of the local anti-drug strategy should flow from the problem statement and objectives. They state what the strategy should do in general terms. The statewide criminal justice priorities for Illinois are to:

- Maintain the capability of local drug law enforcement, with an emphasis on supporting multi-jurisdictional efforts;
 - Maintain the capability to prosecute drug offenders, especially efforts to seize and forfeit assets and deprive traffickers of profits;
 - Fund alternative programs for non-violent drug offenders;
 - Target high intensity drug trafficking areas of the state;
-

- Monitor the drug enforcement and use patterns in the state and, if warranted, develop and implement an appropriate program response;
- Plan and implement creative approaches to stemming drug trafficking;
- Ensure a balanced approach to drug enforcement to avoid overloading any component of the system;
- Use drug testing as a means of holding known drug offenders accountable;
- Promote an interdisciplinary and collaborative approach to drug problems at the state and local level;
- Improve data collection and analysis;
- Build a strong infrastructure, including public information, to support the fight against drugs in Illinois;
- Continue drug treatment within the criminal justice system; and
- Evaluate the effectiveness of programs.

Examples of local priorities, which should be derived from the committee's deliberations, might be to:

- Identify users as early as possible and -link them with appropriate treatment programs;
- Hold users accountable;
- Establish drug-free workplaces;
- Ensure access to treatment for all users regardless of ability to pay;
- Make maximum use of community-based alternatives and sanctions including community service and restitution for non-violent offenders;
- Incorporate drug testing as part of a larger program to hold offenders accountable;
- Develop employment and education opportunities for drug abusers;
- Ensure young people who are at risk of drug use receive additional in-school or family support; or
- Provide more after-school activities for young people.

Action steps

The final step in developing the strategy is to match action steps with each of the priorities. Action steps say how the priority will be brought to life. For instance, if a priority is to hold users accountable, ways of doing this are to incorporate drug testing components into all treatment, probation and parole programs. Important too, would be to develop progressive sanctions within each type of program so a first violation does not result in expulsion from the program or automatic jail time.

Presentation of the strategy

Almost as important as the work of the task force is the way its work is communicated to the community. Clear, simple statements in a "reader-friendly" format is preferable. Use of bullets and margin notes should be considered as well as subheadings to highlight key points.

Key points to include in the strategy are:

I. Introduction

- Background
- Purpose/objectives
- Process followed by task force

II. Findings

- Data summary
- Hearing testimony summary

III. Strategy

- Task force priorities
- Priorities and action steps for each sub-committee

IV. List of witnesses/contributors

APPENDIX 4



OFFICE OF THE STATE'S ATTORNEY
DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

JAMES E. RYAN
STATE'S ATTORNEY

March 28, 1991

207 REBER STREET
WHEATON, ILLINOIS 60187
(708) 682-7050
(708) 682-6987 FAX (CRIMINAL)
(708) 682-7048 FAX (CIVIL)

PRESS RELEASE

DuPage County State's Attorney, JAMES E. RYAN, announced the formation of the **State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force**. Ryan, accompanied by Lt. Governor Bob Kustra, announced that the Task Force will be chaired by Mr. William F. Murphy, Mayor of Woodridge.

"Drug abuse remains the most serious crime problem in DuPage County. To win the war on drugs, we need a comprehensive, integrated strategic plan that includes elements of enforcement, prevention and treatment," Ryan said.

"The work of the DuPage County Task Force brings us closer to winning the battle against alcohol and other drug abuse," said Kustra, who is charged with coordinating Illinois' war on drugs. "This task force should be used as a model in other areas of the State."

In accepting his appointment to chair the Task Force, Mayor Murphy stated "This initiative of State's Attorney Ryan provides us a unique opportunity to formulate a comprehensive and coordinated plan. With the expertise of the Task Force, I am certain this will result in a plan that will place DuPage at the forefront of addressing one of our most difficult problems."

The goals of the plan are to reduce demand for illegal drugs and to suppress drug trafficking in DuPage County. To accomplish this, the Task Force will be organized into the following subcommittees:

- * Police/Courts/Corrections
- * School/Law Enforcement partnership
- * Community Drug Prevention Councils
- * Drug Education for Parents
- * Central Planning and Prevention Resource Center
- * Model Drug-Free Workplace Recommendations
- * Treatment
- * Drug Control Advisory Board
- * Evaluation Component

To develop and implement such a comprehensive plan, the membership of the Task Force was selected to be broad-based and inclusive. Educators, corporate executives, law enforcement personnel, social service providers, treatment specialists and community leaders are all involved.

A fact-finding subcommittee of the Task Force will begin its activities through three public hearings. Hearings will be held on April 9th in Downers Grove, April 10th in Wheaton, and April 11th in Elmhurst,

After securing public input, the Task Force will work to integrate the needs, resources and innovative prevention strategies identified into a comprehensive response to the substance abuse problem in DuPage County.

APPENDIX 5

The State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force

The Public Hearings...

On April 9th, 10th and 11th, the Fact-Finding Subcommittee of the Task Force will conduct public hearings chaired by State's Attorney Ryan and J. David Coldren, Executive Director of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Witnesses from the fields of education, law enforcement, treatment, prevention, business, social services, government, and the community have been scheduled to testify during the course of the hearings. Due to time constraints, further testimony and comments from the public must be limited to brief remarks only. The public is encouraged to submit written comments to the Task Force. All testimony, both oral remarks and written comments, will be made available to all members of the Task Force to assist in their work.

About the Task Force...

On March 28, 1991, James E. Ryan announced the formation of the State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force. "Drug abuse remains the most serious crime problem in DuPage County. To win the war on drugs, we need a comprehensive, integrated strategic plan that includes elements of enforcement, prevention and treatment," Ryan said.

The goals of the plan are to

reduce demand for illegal drugs and to suppress drug trafficking in DuPage County. To accomplish this, the Task Force will be organized into the following subcommittees:

- ◆ Police/Courts/Corrections
- ◆ School/Law Enforcement Partnership
- ◆ Community Drug Prevention Councils
- ◆ Drug Education for Parents
- ◆ Central Planning and Prevention Resource Center
- ◆ Model Drug-free Workplace Recommendations
- ◆ Treatment
- ◆ Drug Control Advisory Board
- ◆ Evaluation Component

To develop and implement such a comprehensive plan, the membership of the Task force was selected to be broad-based and inclusive. Education, corporate executives, law enforcement personnel, social service providers, treatment specialists and community leaders are all included.

Support from the Lt. Governor

"The work of the DuPage County Task Force brings us closer to winning the battle against alcohol and other drug abuse," said Lt. Governor Kustra, who is charged with coordinating Illinois' war on drugs. "This Task Force should be used as a model in other areas of the State."

About the Chairman...

An able leader has accepted the Chair of the State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force. He is William F. Murphy, the Mayor of Woodridge. Mayor Murphy is also the president of the Managers and Mayors of DuPage County. The Task Force is indeed fortunate to have someone of his ability in a leading role.

In accepting his appointment to chair the Task Force, Mayor Murphy stated "State's Attorney Ryan's initiative provides us a unique opportunity to formulate a comprehensive and coordinated plan. With the expertise of the Task Force, I am certain this will result in a plan that will place DuPage at the forefront of addressing one of our most difficult problems."

For More Information...

For any additional information on the work of the Task Force, or for information on submitting written comments for the Fact-Finding Subcommittee, please contact Gene Kennelly.

Mr. Kennelly is an Assistant State's Attorney who will be working with the activities of the Task Force. He may be reached at (708) 682-7594, or by writing to: Office of the State's Attorney, 207 Reber Street, Wheaton, Illinois 60187.

APPENDIX 6



OFFICE OF THE STATE'S ATTORNEY
DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

JAMES E. RYAN
STATE'S ATTORNEY

April 1, 1991

207 REBER STREET
WHEATON, ILLINOIS 60187
(708) 682-7050
(708) 682-6987 FAX (CRIMINAL)
(708) 682-7048 FAX (CIVIL)

For Immediate Release

Contact: Gene Kennelly
(708) 682-7050

PRESS RELEASE

DuPage County State's Attorney James E. Ryan announced that the State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force will be holding a series of three public fact-finding hearings. "To develop a comprehensive and integrated plan, it is vital to obtain the input of leaders from all facets of the community," Ryan stated. "These public hearings will provide the solid basis for the Task Force to build upon."

The hearings, which begin at 7:00 P.M., will be held on April 9th in the Elmhurst City Council Chambers, on April 10th in the Downers Grove Village Hall, and on April 11th in the Wheaton City Hall.

Witnesses from the fields of education, law enforcement, treatment, prevention, business and social services have been scheduled to appear at the public hearings. Members of the public are invited to attend and present brief oral testimony or written comments at the conclusion.

After securing public input through the fact-finding hearings, the State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force will begin development of a coordinated plan to address the problem of drug abuse in DuPage County.

###

APPENDIX 7



OFFICE OF THE STATE'S ATTORNEY
DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

JAMES E. RYAN
STATE'S ATTORNEY

207 REBER STREET
WHEATON, ILLINOIS 60187
(708) 682-7050
(708) 682-6987 FAX (CRIMINAL)
(708) 682-7048 FAX (CIVIL)

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Drug Control Strategy Task Force Steering Subcommittee,
Subcommittee Chairmen

FROM: James E. Ryan

DATE: April 24, 1991

Upon completion of the fact-finding process, Subcommittees should begin developing the preliminary strategic plan. Subcommittee chairmen should consider some of the suggestions listed below:

POLICE/COURTS/CORRECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE:

Tough, consistent enforcement of the law is an indispensable part of an effective drug control strategy. The Subcommittee should evaluate the effectiveness of law enforcement's response to the supply and demand for illegal drugs in DuPage County. Analysis and recommendations should address some or all of the following topics and issues.

1. Drug Interdiction;
2. Asset Forfeiture;
3. DuMeg Funding;
4. Criminal Justice Funding;
5. Multi-Jurisdictional Investigations;
6. Interagency Coordination and Cooperation;
7. User Accountability and Demand Reduction Programs
(See Maricopa County Plan and Elmhurst Police
Department Plan);

8. Drug Testing as a Condition of Pre-Trial Release, Probation, and for Juveniles entering the Youth Home;
9. Drunk Driving and Underage Drinking;
10. Substance Abuse Training for Police Officers and Prosecutors;
11. Jail Overcrowding and Sentencing Alternatives;
12. Crime Lab Analysis of Drug Cases;
13. Impact of Drug Cases on Court Calls.

The Subcommittee should consider developing a "drug enforcement protocol" to insure better coordination between law enforcement agencies.

SCHOOL/LAW ENFORCEMENT PARTNERSHIP SUBCOMMITTEE

The centerpiece of an effective drug control strategy is drug-free schools. The Subcommittee should evaluate the effectiveness of existing school policies, prevention programs and local enforcement of Illinois' drug-free school zone law. Recommendations should include the following:

1. A model drug-free school policy that includes education, prevention, intervention and student discipline;
2. A model "memorandum of understanding" between schools or school districts and local police departments. The Agreement should include law enforcement activities occurring on school grounds and reporting of suspected drug and alcohol offenses by school officials to law enforcement. A New Jersey plan covers the following issues:
 - a) Undercover school operations;
 - b) Planned narcotics surveillance;
 - c) Routine Patrols of drug-free school zone;
 - d) Police attending extra-curricular events;
 - e) Referrals to law enforcement and evidence pickup;
 - f) Arrest protocol;
 - g) School searches;

- h) Interrogations of students;
 - i) A drug abuse "Tip Line" to report suspicious activity on school property, buses or within the drug-free school zone, and
 - j) Joint School and Law Enforcement training.
3. Minimum standards for school drug education and prevention programs for grades K through 12. The Subcommittee may want to recommend specific programs like DARE that meet the standards established by the Task Force; and
 4. A model substance abuse training program for teachers and school administrators.

PARENT DRUG EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE:

Parental involvement is indispensable to winning the war on drugs in DuPage County.

The Subcommittee should find innovative ways to involve parents in the fight to keep schools and children drug free.

Prior to making its recommendations, the Subcommittee should evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and then either recommend specific model programs for county-wide implementation or develop a model program of its own. A program might include teaching parents about the legal consequences of alcohol and drug abuse, how to identify the symptoms of abuse and intervene effectively, and where to turn for help.

COMMUNITY DRUG PREVENTION COUNCIL SUBCOMMITTEE

Answers to DuPage County's drug problem will not come solely from Washington or Springfield. A coordinated grass-roots effort at the local level is needed. Each municipality must analyze its substance abuse problem and develop and implement a community response.

The Subcommittee should develop a community drug prevention council model that will assist municipalities in establishing and implementing a local action plan. The action plan should include the elements of enforcement, prevention and treatment. The plan may include a public awareness campaign, providing linkage between drug abusers and community resources, developing and initiating community based youth programs and supporting prevention methods like DARE in schools, and providing substance abuse training and education for police, parents, service providers and other members of the community.

Committee recommendations should include suggestions regarding size and composition of an interdisciplinary council, goals and objectives, and a methodology for establishing an action plan including how to do a "needs assessment" and "resource inventory" within the community.

TREATMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

A county wide action plan that ignores treatment will fail. The Treatment Subcommittee should conduct a "needs assessment" and "resource inventory" for DuPage County. The Subcommittee should identify gaps in the delivery of services to substance abusers and make recommendations on how to deal with the problem if it exists. The Subcommittee should look for innovative ways to integrate treatment with the other components of the strategic plan. Finally, the Subcommittee must determine whether adequate funding for treatment is available in DuPage County and identify potential sources of funding.

CENTRAL PLANNING AND PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER SUBCOMMITTEE

DuPage Prevention Partnership (DPP) was created to provide leadership and coordination in the development of drug education and prevention programs in DuPage County.

The Subcommittee shall provide recommendations on how the DuPage Prevention Partnership can assist community prevention councils in developing and implementing local action plans.

Additional recommendations may include ways to provide research and technical assistance to local councils, community groups and schools. The Subcommittee may also wish to consider creation of a drug-free workplace "hot line" and prevention resource center, giving employers access to drug education and treatment information.

The DPP can also assist employers in developing drug-free workplace policies and employee assistance programs.

MODEL DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE SUBCOMMITTEE

Surveys reveal that 10 to 20 percent of American workers use drugs on the job. Drugs in the workplace lower productivity and cost industry billions of dollars annually. A comprehensive drug control strategy must include drug-free workplaces.

The recommendations of the Subcommittee should include:

1. Model drug-free workplace policies for large and small businesses;

2. A model employee assistance program to treat and rehabilitate substance abusing employees; and
3. A model drug education program for employees and parents of school-aged children.

The Subcommittee should also consider taking a position on pre-employment drug screening, "for cause" drug testing, and random drug tests for employees in safety sensitive positions. Finally, the Subcommittee may wish to suggest initiating a drug-free workplace media campaign and forming a coalition of drug-free workplace businesses in DuPage County.

All Subcommittee Chairmen should work together to insure that the final plan integrates the elements of enforcement, prevention and treatment.

To be sure that the preliminary plan is completed in accordance with the timeline adopted by the Steering Committee, Committee Chairmen should schedule meetings on a regular basis.

Should you have any questions or comments, please contact Assistant State's Attorney Gene Kennelly at 682-7594.

ivf

APPENDIX 8

**Sources Used by the DuPage County
State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force**

The following sources were used by, or were made available to, the DuPage County State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force. Sources range from catalogs to proceedings of other "task forces" to scholarly articles and surveys. Addresses and phone numbers are included where they were available. Other agencies, especially Illinois agencies, attempting a similar project are strongly encouraged to examine relevant documents during the initial task force stages.

"Achieving Success in Drug Prevention:
Community-Law Enforcement Partnerships"
National Crime Prevention Council
Bureau of Justice Assistance
Department of Justice
1700 K Street NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202-466-6272)

"Active Parenting of Teens"
Parent's Guide
1990
Michael H. Popkin, PhD

Attorney General John K. Van de Kamp's
Commission on the Prevention of Drug and Alcohol Abuse
Final Report
May 1986
1515 K Street, Suite 511
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

The Attorney General's Crime Prevention Newsjournal
Summer 1988
Crime Prevention Center
California Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

"Attorney General's Statewide Action Plan for Narcotics Enforcement"
Implementation Program
New Jersey Department of Law and Public Safety
January 1988

"Biennial Survey of Drug and Alcohol Use Among California Students in Grades 7, 9, and 11"
Winter 1987-88
Office of the Attorney General
Crime Prevention Center
1515 K Street, Suite 100
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

"Blueprint for the Future: Final Report of Trends and Issues for the 1990s"
An Illinois Criminal Justice Forum
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
January 1991

"Building a Drug-Free Workplace"
An Office of National Drug Control Policy
Guide for State Legislation
November, 1990
For sale by:
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

"Communities Creating Change: Exemplary Alcohol
and Other Drug Prevention Programs, 1990."
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration
Office of Substance Abuse Prevention
in cooperation with the National Association of State Alcohol
and Drug Abuse Directors and the National Prevention Network

"Communities InTouch: A Practical, How-To Guide
for Community Prevention Task Forces"
Illinois Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse

"A Community Agenda to Combat Drug Abuse and Illegal
Use of Drugs"
October 30, 1987
The Regional Drug Initiative
Portland, OR

Community Partnership Training
Participant Manual
Prepared for the U.S. Office for Substance Abuse Prevention
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration
May, 1991

"Community Problem Solving Case Summaries"
Program for Community Problem Solving
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004
(202-626-3183)

"A Community Solution: Drug Abuse Treatment"
National Institute of Drug Abuse
Department of Health and Human Services
Public Health Service
Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration

"Confronting Tomorrow Today: A Comprehensive
Plan for Alcohol/Other Drug Services"
FY92 Update
Executive Summary
Illinois Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse (DASA)

"Developing a Local Drug Strategy"
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606
(312-793-855)

"Directory of Federal Anti-Drug Grants"
An Office of the National Drug Control Policy White Paper
April 1991
For sale by:
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

"Drug-Free Workplace"
A Guide from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
and the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606-3997
(312-793-8550)

Educational Materials Catalog 1991
Tools to Help Young People
Community Interventions, Inc.
529 South Seventh Street, Suite 570
Minneapolis, MN 55415

"An Employer's Guide to Dealing With Substance Abuse"
U.S. Department of Labor
October 1990
Available from:
The National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information
P.O. Box 2345
Rockville, MD 20852
(800-729-6686)

"Fightback Against Drugs: Fighting Illegal Drugs in the Workplace"
A Guidebook for Employers
September 1990
Oregon Business Council
1100 Southwest Sixth Avenue
Standard Plaza
Portland, OR 97204
(503-220-0691)

"Gang/Drug Policy"
Department of the Treasury
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
Glynco, Georgia 31524

Governor's Forum on Substance Abuse
1991
Governor Jim Edgar, Illinois

"Greater Ocean Opposes Drugs"
Office of the Ocean County Prosecutor
James W. Holzapfel
Ocean County Courthouse
C.N. 2191
Toms River, N.J. 08754
(201-929-2027)

"Growing Up Drug Free: A Parent's Guide to Prevention"
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, DC
(800-624-0100)

"How to Talk So Kids Will Listen"
Group Workshop Kit
1980
Adele Faber and Elaine Mazlish

"Model Sale of Tobacco Products to Minors Control Act:
A Model Law Recommended for Adoption by States and Localities
to Prevent the Sale of Tobacco Products to Minors"
May 1990

"Learning to Live Drug Free: A Curriculum Model for Prevention"
1990
U.S. Department of Education
Available from:
The National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information
Dept. CPI
P.O. Box 2345
Rockville, MD 20852

Library Audiovisual Resource List
Prevention Resource Center, Inc.
822 S. College Street
Springfield, IL 62704
(800-252-8951)

Materials from
Interventions
Professionals for Counseling and Education
1234 S. Michigan Avenue, Suite 200
Chicago, IL 60605

Materials from
InTouch (Illinois Network to Organize the Understanding
of Community Health)
Breaking Free
250 W. Downer
Aurora, IL 60506

Materials from
NIDA Drug Free Workplace Helpline
c/o Social and Scientific Systems, Inc.
12280 Wilkins Avenue (1st floor)
Rockville, MD 20852
(800-843-4971)

Materials from
State of New Jersey
Department of Law and Public Safety
Division of Criminal Justice
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
Trenton, NJ 08625-0085
(609-984-6500)

The Miami Coalition for a Drug-Free Community
Marilyn Wagner Culp, Executive Director
University of Miami/James L. Knight International Center
400 S.E. Second Avenue, 4th Floor
Miami, FL 33131
(305-375-8032)

"Model Plan for a Comprehensive Drug-Free Workplace Program"
1989

National Institute on Drug Abuse
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Division of Applied Research
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857

"A Model Substance Abuse Policy for Private Business"

Phoenix Police Department
Phoenix, AZ
January 1989

National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and
Drug Information (NCADI) Publications
Catalog, Fall/Winter 1991-92
P.O. Box 2345
Rockville, MD 20852
(800-729-6686)

National Directory of Drug Abuse and Alcoholism
Treatment and Prevention Programs
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20857

National Drug Control Strategy
September 1989
The White House
For sale by:
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

National Drug Control Strategy
January 1990
The White House
For sale by:
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

National Drug Control Strategy
February 1991
The White House
For sale by:
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

Office of the Inspector General Reports
Office of Evaluation and Inspections:

"Adolescents and Steroids: A User Perspective"
August 1990

"Adolescent Steroid Use"
February 1991

"Youth Access to Cigarettes"
May 1990

"Youth and Alcohol: Controlling Alcohol
Advertising that Appeals to Youth"
(Undated)

"Youth and Alcohol: A National Survey
Drinking Habits, Access, Attitudes, and Knowledge"
June 1991

"Youth and Alcohol: A National Survey
Do They Know What They're Drinking?"
(Undated)

"Youth and Alcohol: A Sample of Enforcement and Prevention Programs"
(Undated)

"Youth and Alcohol: Summary of Research
Alcohol Advertising's Effect on Youth"
(Undated)

"Youth Use of Smokeless Tobacco: More Than a Pinch of Trouble"
(Undated)

"Pre-filing Diversion in Maricopa County, Arizona:
(A Selective Alternative to Prosecution)"
Richard M. Romley
Maricopa County Attorney
Phoenix, AZ

"Preparing for the Drug Free Years"
A Family Activity Book
1988
Developmental Research and Programs Inc.
Roberts, Fitzmahan and Associates

"President's Drug Advisory Council Report
on National Community Coalition to Fight Drug Abuse"
January 1991
Executive Office of the President
Washington, DC 20503

Proceedings of Illinois Lieutenant Governor Bob Kustra's
Substance Abuse Meetings
Fall 1991

"Profile of the Nature and Extent of Drug Abuse in DuPage County"
March 1991
Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Drug Information and Analysis Center
120 South Riverside Plaza
Chicago, IL 60606
(312-793-8550)

"Profiles of Successful Drug Prevention Programs"
Drug Free School Recognition Program
1988-89
U.S. Department of Education
Recognition Division, Program for the Improvement of Practice
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
555 New Jersey Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20208-5645

"Regional Assessment of Maine's Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention, Education, Treatment,
Law Enforcement/Corrections and Dual Diagnosis Needs and Priorities"
August-September 1988
Alcohol and Drug Abuse Planning Committee
State House #11
Augusta, Maine 04333
(207-209-2595)

Regional Drug Initiative
Michael D. Schrunk
District Attorney for Multnomah County
600 County Courthouse
Portland, OR 97204
(503-248-3162)

"Report of the Attorney General: Crime in New Mexico"
December 1989
Office of the Attorney General
Hal Stratton, Attorney General
P.O. Box 1508
Santa Fe, NM 87504

"Rising Above Gangs and Drugs: How to Start a Community Reclamation Project"
August 1990
Funded by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
U.S. Department of Justice
Washington, DC

"Say No"
Youth Drug/Alcohol Information Guide
Lombard, Illinois Police Benevolent and Protection Association

**"Schools and Drugs: A Guide to Drug and Alcohol Abuse
Prevention Curricula and Programs"**

November 1987

Office of the Attorney General

Crime Prevention Center

1515 K Street, Suite 100

P.O. Box 944255

Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

"State Drug Control Status Report"

An Office of National Drug Control Policy White Paper

November 1990

For sale by:

Superintendent of Documents

U.S. Government Printing Office

Washington, DC 20402

"Substance Abuse in DuPage County"

Report from the Substance Abuse Subcommittee of the

Health and Human Services Committee of the DuPage County Board

May 1991

"Tell It Like It Is"

Alcohol and Substance Abuse Education for Grade School Students

1991

Richard Musil, Detective

Westmont Illinois Police Department

Tobacco Free Kit

DuPage County Health Education Consortium

DuPage County Health Department

111 North County Farm Road

Wheaton, IL 60187

**"Toward a Drug-Free America: A Nationwide Blueprint
for State and Local Drug Control Strategies"**

December 1988

The Executive Working Group for Federal-State-Local Prosecutorial Relations

"Toward a Drug-Free Generation: A Nation's Responsibility"
National Commission on Drug-Free Schools"
Final Report
September 1990
U.S. Department of Education

Training Resources Catalog 1990-91
Illinois Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse (DASA)
Prevention Resource Center
407 South Dearborn, Suite 1125
Chicago, IL 60605
(800-572-5385)

"What America's Users Spend on Illegal Drugs"
An Office of National Drug Control Policy Technical Paper
June 1991
Office of National Drug Control Policy
Executive Office of the President
Washington, DC 20500

"What Works: Schools Without Drugs"
1989
U.S. Department of Education
Available from:
National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and
Drug Information (NCADI)
P.O. Box 2345
Rockville, MD 20852
(800-624-0100)

"What Works: Workplaces Without Drugs"
August 1990
U.S. Department of Labor
Available from:
The National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information
P.O. Box 2345
Rockville, MD 20852
(800-729-6686)

"The White House Conference for a Drug Free America"
Final Report
June 1988

For sale by:
Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

"The Winnable War: A Community Guide to Eradicating
Street Drug Markets"
1991

Richard Conner and Patrick Burns
American Alliance for Rights and Responsibilities
1725 K Street NW, Suite 1112
Washington, DC 20006
(202-785-7844)

Wood Dale Community Task Force on Drug Abuse

Contact:

Frank E. Williams, Chief of Police
Wood Dale Police Department
404 North Wood Dale Road
Wood Dale, IL 60191
(708-766-2060)

"1990 Illinois Prevention Directory for Parents"
Illinois Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse

APPENDIX 9

To: Treatment Subcommittee Members,
Drug Control Strategy Task Force

From: Tony Atkin, Rich Ready M.D. ~~///~~

Re: Meeting Notice

Date: May 1, 1991

The first meeting will be on:

May 16, 1991

1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

DuPage Counseling and Referral Services
1156 S. Main Street
Lombard, Il. 60148
(708) 620-8130
(1 block N. of Roosevelt)

AGENDA

1. Introductions.
2. Purpose and Scope.
3. How the Subcommittee will function.
4. Future Action Steps.
5. Agenda for Next Meeting.
6. Date for Next Meeting.

APPENDIX 10

DuPAGE COUNTY STATE'S ATTORNEY'S
DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY TASK FORCE

Minutes of Police/Courts/Corrections
Subcommittee, June 7, 1991

The meeting was promptly called to order by Sheriff Doria at 9:00 a.m. Present were Sheriff Dick Doria, Chief Don Aleksy, Chief David Dial, Chief Bob LaDeur, DuMEG Director Larry Mulcrone, Chief Ed Musial, Mel Schabilion, Corrections Chief John Smith, Deputy Chief Bob Soucek and Assistant State's Attorney Bob Spence.

Interdiction and coordination. DuMEG Director Larry Mulcrone discussed problems of coordinating investigations with DuMEG, stating that local problems have subsided but that other agencies still fail to coordinate their investigations with DuMEG, including the State Police Task Forces from McHenry, Kane, and DeKalb Counties. Chicago Police Department narcotics units continue to conduct investigations and execute search warrants in DuPage County. Director Mulcrone stated that on one occasion within the past six months, Chicago PD executed a Cook County search warrant in Bensenville without notifying any DuPage agency. Several months later, Chicago PD came to the DuPage County State's Attorney's Office and obtained a search warrant to search a Bensenville residence. Assistant State's Attorney Spence notified DuMEG of this and two DuMEG agents met with the Chicago officers at the State's Attorney's Office, at which time the Chicago officers assured the agents that DuMEG would be called prior to executing the warrant. The warrant was executed that evening by Chicago PD and only after entry was made were DuMEG and Bensenville PD called. Director Mulcrone recommended that the subcommittee develop procedures for dealing with out-of-county agencies, as well as local departments that conduct investigations in other municipalities. It was generally agreed that out-of-county agencies coming to the State's Attorney's Office should be ordered by the assistant state's attorney to contact DuMEG prior to the execution of the warrant. Mulcrone mentioned that Assistant State's Attorney Spence had researched the issue of extraterritorial arrests by police departments. Spence indicated that the civil division of the State's Attorney's Office was researching the issue of civil liability for such officers and suggested that the research and findings be included and considered in such a policy.

Assistant State's Attorney Spence suggested that the subcommittee examine the program used by Elmhurst Police Department, where a two-man tactical team targets public areas of known drug use, such as night clubs. (see attached) Spence also suggested that the subcommittee consider recommending that street officers receive training on profiling traffic offenders and obtaining consents to search the vehicles of suspected drug offenders. The State Police has conducted this "Operation

Valkyrie" training only for troopers in the past and it would be effective for interdiction. Mel Schabillion stated that DEA has a 30 minute video on developing consent searches that would be available for training.

Asset Forfeiture. Assistant State's Attorney Spence stated that Ryan's office has requested an opinion from the Attorney General's office regarding the proper use of forfeited monies by local police departments and will send a copy of that with the minutes of the meeting. It may be 6 months to a year before an opinion is obtained from the Attorney General's office. Responding to a question concerning the sharing of assets by DuMEG, Director Mulcrone stated that if DuMEG renders technical assistance to a department, the department retains all assets forfeited. On DuMEG-initiated cases, DuMEG retains all assets.

Criminal Justice System. Mulcrone suggested that the subcommittee consider legislation requiring those incarcerated to pay the cost of their "room and board", similar to the payments mandated for those who are on work release. Assistant State's Attorney Spence stated that he would mail to all subcommittee members a copy of the Maricopa County diversion plan. Spence stated that of approximately 3300 felonies charged in DuPage County in 1990, roughly 580 were drug cases, or approximately 17-18%.

DuMEG Funding. All subcommittee members agreed that there is a need to find a permanent funding source for DuMEG, as funding from the State Police has been unreliable. One department has withdrawn from DuMEG for financial reasons. Mulcrone suggested that the subcommittee consider drafting legislation mandating that the cannabis and controlled substance taxes be used to fund MEG and Task Force units, with all tax monies levied and collected in any county used solely to fund the MEG in that county. It was also suggested that the subcommittee should investigate private funding sources, such as large corporations in DuPage County.

DUI/underage drinking. It was generally agreed that the present level of DUI enforcement in DuPage County was very good and that the pressure should be maintained by all departments. Sheriff Doria mentioned that Aurora PD has drafted a "mandatory parental involvement in lieu of arrest" policy and that the committee should examine it. (see attached) It was generally agreed that there should be a greater use of roadside sobriety checkpoints in the county. Liquor license violations were mentioned and it was agreed that more unified enforcement and penalties would be beneficial. Spence raised the question of the consistency of bar checks by local departments and Sheriff Doria requested that the State's Attorney's Office provide some guidance on procedures that should be followed and if possible, a protocol developed for conducting the bar checks that could be followed county-wide.

Substance abuse training. All present agreed that police officers could benefit from training sessions by DuMEG, conducted in

regional areas of the county. Chief Aleksy mentioned that the Cook County State's Attorney sends out a caselaw update monthly to Cook County departments and it is very informative. It was mentioned that federal monies for substance abuse training are available and that such monies should be obtained to reimburse departments for the cost of training.

Jail overcrowding. Sheriff Doria stated that the planned addition to the DuPage County Jail is approximately 400 beds at a cost of \$47 million, but there is no target date for breaking ground. The present jail is overcrowded and nonviolent inmates, primarily those charged with property crimes, are being released on their own recognizance, if necessary. There was much discussion concerning sentencing alternatives, ranging from electronic detention to the "boot-camp". It was generally agreed that the "boot-camp" alternative would be a benefit if used for those charged with property crimes who have a substance abuse problem. Possible suggestions were to implement the boot camp in conjunction with 1410 probation, in lieu of a prison sentence for repeat offenders, or as part of an intensive probation sentence. It was agreed that legislative changes would be necessary to institute such alternative sentences but that they would be effective and feasible and should be considered as part of the county-wide drug control strategy.

Crime lab analysis. Spence stated that new legislation has been passed which provides for a \$50 crime lab fee for anyone convicted of a drug offense which necessitated a lab analysis. At the present time, over \$10,000 has been ordered paid, however many of those defendants are on probation and the monies are collected over the period of probation. Mulcrone suggested that the crime lab send out statistics regarding submissions of drugs and it was agreed that could be done.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m. Subcommittee members will be notified of the next meeting.

[Attached are copies of the Maricopa County, Arizona deferred prosecution program, a description of the Elmhurst tacital program, the Aurora Police Department's program for minors in possession of alcohol, and the 1991-1992 Organizational Goals of the St. Charles Police Department pertaining to substance abuse.]

APPENDIX 11

**The State's Attorney's Drug Control
Strategy Task Force**

Organization: _____

This is a: public organization private sector organization

Contact (Person filling out this form): _____

Address and Phone: _____

1. How serious a problem do you consider alcohol and other drug abuse to be at your organization's location(s) in DuPage County?

- (a) a very significant problem
- (b) a significant problem
- (c) a minor problem
- (d) not a problem

2. Does your organization have a written drug-free workplace policy?

- (a) yes
- (b) no

3. If your organization does have a drug-free workplace policy, was it the result of collective bargaining?

- (a) yes
- (b) no

4. If your organization does have a drug-free workplace policy and programs, please specify:

What is the FTE equivalency directly dedicated to its support? _____

What dollar amount was expended last year to support these programs? _____

5. Does your company have an employee assistance program that includes help for substance abusers?

- (a) yes
- (b) no

6. Does your employee insurance coverage include treatment and rehabilitation for alcohol and other drug abusing employees?
 - (a) yes, both outpatient and inpatient
 - (b) inpatient only
 - (c) no

7. Does your organization use pre-employment drug testing?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no

8. Does your organization have "for cause" drug testing?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no

9. Does your organization utilize random employee drug testing for safety sensitive jobs?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no

10. Does your organization have a termination policy for employees caught using alcohol while on the job?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no

11. Does your organization have a termination policy for employees caught using illegal drugs while on the job?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no

12. Does your organization have mandatory alcohol and other drug abuse education for employees?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no

13. Does your organization have voluntary drug and substance abuse education for employees?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no

14. Does your organization provide alcohol and other drug abuse education for officers, managers, and department heads?
 - (a) yes
 - (b) no

15. Does your organization offer alcohol and other drug abuse education for the families of your employees?
- (a) yes
(b) no
16. How many persons are employed by your organization? _____
17. How many persons employed by your organization are at a job site in DuPage County? _____
18. Of those persons employed by your organization at a job site in DuPage County, what percentage of them also reside in DuPage County? _____

Please return to: DuPage County State's Attorney
Drug Control Strategy Task Force
207 Reber Street
Wheaton, IL 60187

APPENDIX 12

**The State's Attorney's Drug Control
Strategy Task Force**

Township: _____

Contact (Person filling out this form): _____

Address and Phone: _____

1. Does your township sponsor any specific alcohol and other drug abuse education programs for school aged children? (if so, please specify by program and target age group)

2. Does your township sponsor any specific alcohol and other drug abuse education programs for parents? (if so, please specify the program)

3. Does your township sponsor any type of alcohol and other drug abuse intervention programs which provide counseling and treatment? (if so, please specify)

4. Does your township have a Youth Commission?

(a) yes

(b) no

5. Does your township sponsor any community based youth programs to help them remain drug-free? (if so, please specify)

6. Do you have a mechanism in place (a committee, commission,

etc.) to coordinate anti-drug activities within the township?
(if so, please specify)

7. In the current fiscal year, what is the total budget allocation by your township toward alcohol and other drug abuse education and prevention? _____
8. How serious a problem do you consider alcohol and other drug abuse to be in your township, compared to other townships in DuPage County?
- (a) significantly more serious
 - (b) somewhat more serious
 - (c) somewhat less serious
 - (d) significantly less serious

Please return to: DuPage County State's Attorney
Drug Control Strategy Task Force
207 Reber Street
Wheaton, IL 60187

APPENDIX 13

The State's Attorney's Drug Control
Strategy Task Force

Municipality: _____

Contact (Person filling out this form): _____

Address and Phone: _____

1. Does your municipality sponsor any specific alcohol and other drug abuse education programs for school aged children? (if so, please specify by program and target age group)

2. Does your municipality sponsor any specific alcohol and other drug abuse education programs for parents? (if so, please specify the program)

3. Does your municipality sponsor any type of alcohol and other drug abuse intervention programs which provide counseling and treatment? (if so, please specify)

4. Does your municipality have a Youth Committee?

(a) yes

(b) no

5. Does your municipality sponsor any community based youth program to help them remain drug-free? (if so, please specify)

6. Do you have a mechanism in place (a committee, commission,

etc.) to coordinate anti-drug activities within your municipality? (if so, please specify)

7. In the current fiscal year, what is the total budget allocation by your municipality toward alcohol and other drug abuse education and prevention? _____
8. How serious a problem do you consider alcohol and other drug abuse to be in your municipality, compared to other municipalities in DuPage County?
- (a) significantly more serious
 - (b) somewhat more serious
 - (c) somewhat less serious
 - (d) significantly less serious

Please return to: DuPage County State's Attorney
Drug Control Strategy Task Force
207 Reber Street
Wheaton, IL 60187

APPENDIX 14

**The State's Attorney's Drug Control
Strategy Task Force**

Name of School _____

School District _____ This is a public private school.

Contact (Person filling out this form) _____

Address and Phone: _____

1. Please list the number of students in your school by grade:

K _____	4 _____	8 _____	12 _____
1 _____	5 _____	9 _____	
2 _____	6 _____	10 _____	
3 _____	7 _____	11 _____	

2. Total number of certified teachers: _____

3. How serious a problem do you consider alcohol and other drug abuse to be among students in your school, compared to other schools in DuPage county?

- (a) significantly more serious
- (b) somewhat more serious
- (c) somewhat less serious
- (d) significantly less serious

4. Is there a "Rainbow" program at your school?

- (a) yes
- (b) no

5. Is there a formal curriculum dealing with substance abuse?

- (a) yes
- (b) no
(if no, skip to #12)

6. For each substance abuse education and prevention program now

in use in your school, please indicate the grades where the respective program(s) is offered. List additional programs as necessary.

Program name	Grades (circle as appropriate)												
a. DARE	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
b. Snowball	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
c. Snowflake	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
d. Snowflurry	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
e. Clowning	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
f. Children are People	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
g. McGruff	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
h. Lifestyles	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
i. _____	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
j. _____	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
k. _____	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

7. For each grade, please indicate the total amount of time that each student is expected to participate in a substance abuse and prevention program during the normal school year.

Grade	Hours per school year (circle as appropriate)					
K	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
1	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
2	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
3	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
4	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
5	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
6	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
7	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
8	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
9	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
10	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
11	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80
12	0	1-20	21-40	41-60	61-80	> 80

8. The programs in place at your school deal with:

- (a) tobacco
- (b) alcohol
- (c) cannabis
- (d) controlled substances
- (e) all of the above

9. The programs in place at your school deal with:

- (a) the physical consequences
- (b) the social consequences
- (c) the legal consequences
- (d) other consequences (Please name) _____

10. It is taught in:
- (a) health class
 - (b) physical education class
 - (c) a science class
 - (d) home room
 - (e) a specific time period devoted to this subject
 - (f) other (Please specify) _____
11. If you do not have the DARE program in place at your school, do you utilize a program you believe is comparable to DARE?
- (a) yes (if so, please name) _____
 - (b) no (go to #12)
 - (c) no, DARE is not age-appropriate to grades at this school (go to #12)
12. What if any problems would be faced implementing such a program?
- _____
- _____
13. What if any informal prevention programs or classes are currently in place at your school?
- _____
- _____
14. Is there an INTOUCH program at your school?
- (a) yes
 - (b) no
15. Is any parent support or education concerning alcohol and other drug abuse available through your school?
- (a) yes (Please answer #16)
 - (b) no (Please skip to #17)
16. Please describe the type of support or education: _____
- _____
17. Is any parent support or education concerning alcohol and other drug abuse available in your community? (outside of this

school)

- (a) yes (Please answer #18)
- (b) no (Please skip to #19)

18. Please describe the type of support or education: _____

19. Do you currently have in place any in-service training for teachers concerning alcohol and other drug abuse?

- (a) yes (Please answer #20)
- (b) no (Please skip to #21)

20. By grade level, please name or describe the training which teachers receive: (Please use an additional sheet if necessary to describe the program)

Grade

K	_____
1	_____
2	_____
3	_____
4	_____
5	_____
6	_____
7	_____
8	_____
9	_____
10	_____
11	_____
12	_____

21. Is there any policy currently in place concerning students found using the following on school property? (check all that apply)

- (a) tobacco
- (b) alcohol
- (c) cannabis
- (d) controlled substances
- (e) no policy, taken on an individual basis

22. Is there any policy currently in place concerning students suspected or found using the following off of school property, while participating in school-related activities? (check all that apply)

- (a) tobacco
- (b) alcohol
- (c) cannabis
- (d) controlled substances
- (e) no policy, taken on an individual basis

23. Is there any policy currently in place concerning students suspected or found using the following off of school property, while not participating in school-related activities? (check all that apply)

- (a) tobacco
- (b) alcohol
- (c) cannabis
- (d) controlled substances
- (e) no policy, taken on an individual basis

24. Is there any policy currently in place concerning teachers or staff found to be using cannabis or controlled substances?

- (a) yes
- (b) no

25. Please attach any written policies concerning questions 21, 22, 23, and 24

26. Does your school have a policy concerning searching student lockers when prohibited substances might be involved?

- (a) yes, a written policy
- (b) yes, an unwritten policy
- (c) no
- (d) not applicable (no lockers, etc.)

27. Does your school have regular contact with your local police department?

- (a) an officer is on duty in the school
- (b) an officer is assigned to the school system
- (c) an officer is assigned as a liaison
- (d) a trained officer would be available when necessary
- (e) there is no special contact with the police department

28. Additional comments: _____

APPENDIX 15

**The State's Attorney's Drug Control
Strategy Task Force**

Police Department: _____

Contact (Person filling out this form): _____

Address and Phone: _____

1. Does your police department have any specific policies in place to enforce Illinois' Drug Free School Zone Law? (if so, please specify or attach a copy of your policy)

2. Does your police department sponsor a DARE program?

(a) yes

If yes, in how many schools? _____

and how many students served? _____

(b) no

3. Do officers from your department participate in a comprehensive substance abuse program other than DARE? (if so, please specify the program, the target grades, and the number of schools/students served)

4. Does your police department sponsor or participate in any drug or substance abuse programs for parents? (if so, please specify)

5. Does your police department sponsor or participate in any community-wide drug or substance abuse programs? (if so, please specify)

6. How serious a problem do you consider alcohol and drug abuse to be in your jurisdiction, compared to other jurisdictions in DuPage County?
- (a) significantly more serious
 - (b) somewhat more serious
 - (c) somewhat less serious
 - (d) significantly less serious
7. Does your department provide your police officers a curriculum of substance abuse training involving drug identification and symptoms of drug abuse?
- (a) yes
 - (b) no (please skip to #9)
8. Is this training mandated by your department, or is it voluntary on the part of officers?
- (a) mandatory
 - (b) voluntary
9. Excluding DuMeg contributions, how many officers are directly allocated by your department to alcohol and drug education/enforcement? _____
10. Excluding DuMeg contributions, what is the dollar allocation by your department toward alcohol and drug education/enforcement? _____

Please return to: **DuPage County State's Attorney**
Drug Control Strategy Task Force
207 Reber Street
Wheaton, IL 60187

APPENDIX 16



OFFICE OF THE STATE'S ATTORNEY
DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

JAMES E. RYAN
STATE'S ATTORNEY

505 N. COUNTY FARM ROAD
WHEATON, ILLINOIS 60187
(708) 682-7050
(708) 682-6987 FAX (CRIMINAL)
(708) 682-7048 FAX (CIVIL)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
March 11, 1992

Further Information
Gene Kennelly (708) 682-7089

PRESS RELEASE

The State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force will hold a Public Hearing on the newly released Draft Report of the Task Force on Tuesday, March 24, 1992. The hearing will be conducted in the Auditorium of the DuPage County Administration Building, 421 North County Farm Road, Wheaton. All comments from this hearing will be considered in formulating the Final Report of the Task Force.

Scheduled witnesses representing various groups and organizations will present their comments beginning at 2:00p.m.

The public is invited to present comments on the Draft Report of the Task Force beginning at 7:00p.m.

The Draft Report of the State's Attorney's Drug Control Strategy Task Force has been developed following a series of public hearings, countywide surveys, and months of work by more than one hundred Task Force Members.

The strategy which has been developed emphasizes parental involvement, grass roots community action, having drug free workplaces, treatment, drug free schools, and holding drug users, including underage drinkers more accountable for their actions.

To allow for public input, copies of the Draft Report have been sent to all local libraries throughout DuPage County. Interested persons may examine the Draft Report at their library, or at the Office of the State's Attorney. No advance registration is required to present comments during the evening session of the Public Hearing, however, those wishing to participate must be in attendance prior to 7:30p.m.

###

APPENDIX 17

COMPARISON OF TASK FORCE GOALS TO FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

This section compares the original goals defined for the task force subcommittees by State's Attorney Ryan to the subcommittees' final recommendations. Ryan listed the goals in a memo to the subcommittee chairpersons dated April 24th, 1991 (see Appendix 7). Each subcommittee's goals are reproduced here in italics, followed by an evaluation of how well the committee's final report addressed the goals.

Police/Courts/Corrections Subcommittee

Goals

Tough, consistent enforcement of the law is an indispensable part of an effective drug control strategy. The Subcommittee should evaluate the effectiveness of law enforcement's response to the supply and demand for illegal drugs in DuPage County. Analysis and recommendations should address some or all of the following topics and issues:

- 1. Drug interdiction,*
- 2. Asset forfeiture,*
- 3. DuMeg funding,*
- 4. Criminal justice funding,*
- 5. Multi-jurisdictional investigations,*
- 6. Interagency coordination and cooperation,*
- 7. User accountability and demand reduction programs (see Maricopa County Plan and Elmhurst Police Department Plan),*
- 8. Drug testing as a condition of pretrial release, probation, and for juveniles entering the youth home,*
- 9. Drunk driving and underage drinking,*
- 10. Substance abuse training for police officers and prosecutors,*
- 11. Jail overcrowding and sentencing alternatives,*
- 12. Crime lab analysis of drug cases,*
- 13. Impact of drug cases on court calls.*

The subcommittee should consider developing a "drug enforcement protocol" to insure better coordination between law enforcement agencies.

Evaluation

The report provides some information on law enforcement's response to drugs in DuPage County. Pages 6 through 8 present a detailed analysis of drug arrest statistics for the county over the last several years. Trend information is presented on arrests for driving under the influence of alcohol, quantity of illegal drugs seized, and arrests for possession of dangerous drugs such as LSD and "crack" cocaine. The effects of these trends on jails, prisons, and probation services are also discussed. Results of surveys of police agencies are analyzed on pages 10 and 11.

The report does not evaluate current problems and programs. An evaluation would have been useful, because it could have provided a rationale for the committee's recommendations.

The recommendations address many of the topics and issues listed in the goals. Drug interdiction is addressed by Recommendation 4, DUMEG funding by Recommendation 9, and asset forfeiture by Recommendations 11 and 14.

Criminal justice funding is addressed by Recommendations 9, 11, and 14. In addition, Recommendation 12 deals with County Board funding of vertical drug enforcement units. However, a general discussion of funding would have been helpful to give readers a better understanding of current funding mechanisms and the need to maintain or replace them in the future.

Recommendation 10 addresses multi-jurisdictional investigations. Apart from this recommendation, however, there are no others that specifically address interagency coordination. Another recommendation on this issue might have been useful. The report does say that extensive cooperation already exists among agencies, and that the task force encourages continued cooperation.

User accountability receives special emphasis in Recommendations 1 and 14 for juveniles, although it is a common theme throughout the recommendations. The recommendations do not discuss the Maricopa County Plan or the Elmhurst Police Department Plan for demand reduction.

Random drug testing of felons on probation is suggested by Recommendation 8. However, the recommendations do not address drug testing of juveniles entering the youth home or drug testing as a condition for pretrial release.

The issue of underage drinking is covered extensively. Recommendations 1, 3, 4, and 5 all target this problem. There is less emphasis on adult drinking and continued enforcement and prosecution of state laws. However, Recommendation 1 states that police departments should patrol areas with a high incidence of alcohol use.

Police officer training is covered in Recommendation 7. Prosecutor training is not addressed.

The report does not provide recommendations regarding jail overcrowding and sentencing alternatives. This is an important issue. Although the county is building an addition to the jail, overcrowding may still be a problem in the future if the number of substance abuse prosecutions continues to accelerate.

The recommendations do not address crime lab analysis of drug cases. They also do not provide any suggestions regarding the rising number of court calls that will result from increased enforcement efforts.

Recommendation 10 discusses developing a drug enforcement protocol to insure better coordination between law enforcement agencies.

Schools/Law Enforcement Subcommittee

Goals

The Subcommittee should evaluate the effectiveness of existing school policies, prevention programs and local enforcement of Illinois' drug-free school zone law. Recommendations should include the following:

1. *A model drug-free school policy that includes education, prevention, intervention and student discipline.*
2. *A model "memorandum of understanding" between schools or school districts and local police departments. The Agreement should include law enforcement activities occurring on school grounds and reporting of suspected drug and alcohol offenses by school officials to law enforcement. A New Jersey plan covers the following issues:*
 - a. *Undercover school operations,*
 - b. *Planned narcotics surveillance,*
 - c. *Routine patrols of drug-free school zones,*
 - d. *Police attending extra-curricular events,*
 - e. *Referrals to law enforcement and evidence pickup,*
 - f. *Arrest protocol,*
 - g. *School searches,*
 - h. *Interrogations of students,*
 - i. *A drug abuse "tip line" to report suspicious activity on school property, buses or within the drug-free school zone, and*
 - j. *Joint school and law enforcement training.*
3. *Minimum standards for school drug education and prevention programs for grades K through 12. The subcommittee may want to recommend specific programs like DARE that meet the standards established by the Task Force.*
4. *A model substance abuse training program for teachers and school administrators.*

Evaluation

The School/Law Enforcement section of the report does not include an evaluation of existing programs. No rationale is provided for the recommendations on this topic. However, an analysis of school survey results is provided on pages 12 and 13. This information is useful, but does not explain the committee's reasons for making particular recommendations.

No single recommendation or exhibit presents a complete model of a drug-free school policy. However, taken together, the recommendations adequately address the policy issues specified by the goals: education, prevention, intervention, and student discipline.

Recommendation 20 suggests that schools and police departments agree upon a memorandum of understanding. A sample is provided in School Exhibit 5.

Many of the topics included in the New Jersey Plan are addressed by the recommendations or School Exhibit 5. Recommendation 20 talks about undercover school operations, routine patrols of drug-free school zones, arrest protocol and school searches, and referrals to law enforcement and evidence pickup. Recommendation 17 also addresses referrals and evidence pickup. School Exhibit 5 refers to police attendance at extra-curricular events. However, this idea was not specifically included in Recommendation 20. Recommendation 17 suggests implementing policies and procedures for reporting suspicious student activities to parents and police.

Unlike the New Jersey plan, the recommendations do not cover planned narcotics surveillance or interrogations of students. Recommendation 24 addresses training of administrators, teachers, and staff, but does not specify that this training would be performed in conjunction with law enforcement personnel. However, the report does say that law enforcement efforts should be coordinated with parents and community members and should support drug prevention curriculum goals.

Recommendation 16 covers standards for school drug education and prevention programs. Recommendation 20 says that school districts should develop comprehensive substance abuse training programs for administrators and teachers. However, a model program is not provided within the report.

Parent Drug Education Subcommittee

Goals

Prior to making its recommendations, the Subcommittee should evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs and then either recommend specific model programs for county-wide implementation or develop a model program of its own. A program might include teaching parents about the legal consequences of alcohol and drug abuse, how to identify symptoms of abuse and intervene effectively, and where to turn for help.

Evaluation

The Parent Drug Education section of the report does not include an evaluation of current programs. Such an evaluation would have enabled the committee to suggest a strategy that built upon or enhanced existing programs.

All of the committee's recommendations work together to provide a model program. Recommendation 40 is especially pertinent.

Recommendations 35 through 39 and Recommendation 23 address the goal of teaching parents about drug abuse.

Community Drug Prevention Council Subcommittee

Goals

The Subcommittee should develop a community drug prevention council model that will assist municipalities in implementing a local action plan. The action plan should include the elements of enforcement, prevention and treatment. The plan may include a public awareness campaign, providing linkage between drug abusers and community resources, developing and initiating community based youth programs and supporting prevention methods like DARE in schools, and providing substance abuse training and education for police, parents, service providers and other members of the community.

Committee recommendations should include suggestions regarding size and composition of an interdisciplinary council, goals and objectives, and a methodology for establishing an action plan, including how to do a "needs assessment" and "resource inventory" within the community.

Evaluation

Recommendation 33 addresses the goal of developing a model for a community drug prevention council. Part A of the recommendation describes the size and composition of the council. Parts B and C suggest conducting "needs assessments" and "resource inventories," but do not provide guidelines for accomplishing these tasks. Part D discusses council goals and objectives.

Treatment Subcommittee

Goals

The Treatment Subcommittee should conduct a "needs assessment" and "re-source inventory" for DuPage County. The Subcommittee should identify gaps in the delivery of services to substance abusers and make recommendations on how to deal with the problem if it exists. The Subcommittee should look for innovative ways to integrate treatment with other components of the strategic plan. Finally, the Subcommittee must determine whether adequate funding is available in DuPage County and identify potential sources of funding.

Evaluation

Some needs and resource information is presented on pages 8 and 9 of the report and in Recommendation 29. The report shows DuPage County statistics such as the number of people without insurance, the number of detoxification beds, rehabilitation beds, and halfway house and publicly funded outpatient slots. However, additional needs information would have been useful for planning purposes. This could have included the ages, races, lengths of stay, treatments received, and types of substance abuse of people who have used drug-related services in recent years. Projections of the number of people requiring treatment facilities in the future would also have enhanced the report.

Recommendation 29 comprehensively addresses gaps in treatment services, providing an overview of what currently exists and what is needed. However, it is not clear how the committee determined the optimal service levels suggested in the report. In addition, there is no discussion of future needs and the resource levels necessary to meet them.

The report makes some attempt to integrate treatment with other components of the strategy. For example, Recommendation 28 suggests increasing treatment services for offenders who are incarcerated in the county jail or on probation. However, the implications of this suggestion for the jail and the probation department are not discussed. Coordination of efforts between treatment providers and parents and businesses should probably have been addressed here. However, these links are addressed to some extent in the Central Planning and Prevention Resource Center section (Recommendations 42 through 45).

Recommendation 29 addresses funding.

Central Planning and Prevention Resource Center Subcommittee

Goals

The Subcommittee shall provide recommendations on how the DuPage Prevention Partnership can assist community prevention councils in developing and implementing local action plans.

Additional recommendations may include ways to provide research and technical assistance to local councils, community groups, and schools.

The Subcommittee may also wish to consider creation of a drug-free workplace "hot line" and prevention resource center, giving employers access to drug education and treatment information.

The DPP can also assist employers in developing drug-free workplace policies and employee assistance programs.

Evaluation

Recommendations 42 and 43 suggest cooperation between the DuPage Prevention Partnership and community prevention councils in developing and implementing local action plans. These recommendations also suggest ways to provide research and technical assistance to local councils, community groups, and schools.

Recommendation 45 suggests creating a drug-free workplace hot line and a prevention resource center. The hot line would enable employers to obtain assistance in developing drug-free workplace policies and employee assistance programs.

Drug-Free Workplace Subcommittee

Goals

The recommendations of the Subcommittees should include:

- 1. Model drug-free workplace policies for large and small businesses,*
- 2. A model employee assistance program to treat and rehabilitate substance abusing employees, and*
- 3. A model drug education program for employees and parents of school-aged children.*

The Subcommittee should also consider taking a position on pre-employment drug screening, "for cause" drug testing, and random drug tests for employees in safety sensitive positions. Finally, the Subcommittee may wish to suggest initiating a drug-free workplace media campaign and forming a coalition of drug-free workplace businesses in DuPage County.

Evaluation

Parts A through K of Recommendation 41 comprehensively address drug-free workplace policies and models that businesses could employ. Several exhibits provide examples of policies developed by companies within DuPage County. The plan and the examples appear to be geared toward larger companies. However, small companies would probably benefit from similar programs.

Part G of the recommendation addresses the relationship of an Employee Assistance Program to employees' needs. A model EAP statement and a checklist are provided in Workplace Exhibit 4.

Part I addresses education by referring to Workplace Exhibit 7, a model employee training/education policy. The importance of educating parents of school-aged children is mentioned, but not discussed. This issue probably should have received more attention.

Part J mentions the importance of an awareness training program, but does not go into detail.

Parts D and F provide an excellent discussion of drug testing, without taking a specific position on what type of testing should be used. This seems appropriate, since the need to test some or all employees varies among employers.

The recommendations do not address a drug-free workplace media campaign or formation of a coalition of drug-free businesses.

All Committees

Goals

All Subcommittee Chairmen should work together to insure that the final plan integrates the elements of enforcement, prevention, and treatment. To be sure that the preliminary plan is completed in accordance with the timeline adopted by the Steering Committee, Committee Chairmen should schedule meetings on a regular basis.

Evaluation

Subcommittee leaders met about every other month for approximately 14 months. In addition, some of the committee chairpersons met in smaller groups. More communication among committees during the course of the project would have been valuable, enabling them to share information and deal with common problems. However, since this was a volunteer effort and the leaders were already spending a significant amount of time with their committees, it is not surprising that they were unable to schedule more frequent meetings.