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LEAA’s “Pilot Cities”-- A Model for Criminal Justice Research and Demonstration

ROBERT C. CUSHMAN*

INTRODUCTION

The United States Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) has now designated seven demonstration sites throughout the nation to participate in an intensive, scientific program to test and to demonstrate new methods for reducing crime in America.

An action-oriented team of professionals experienced in criminal justice research has been located in each demonstration area. These teams are first assisting local officials to identify and assess the dimensions of local criminal justice problems and then, by application of the most current knowledge and technology, are


1. The seven Pilots, along with the date of grant award are: San Jose and Santa Clara County, California, May 1970; Dayton and Montgomery County, Ohio, July 1970; Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, December 1970; Albuquerque and Bernalillo County, New Mexico, February 1971; Norfolk, Metropolitan Area, Virginia, September 1971; Omaha and Douglas County, Nebraska, September 1971; Des Moines and Polk County, Iowa, September 1971.
helping officials to develop innovative programs for our police, courts and correctional system with the assistance of federal funds.

The Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program was the first of the seven “Pilots” to begin operations. It is located in San Jose and Santa Clara County, California and administered by the American Justice Institute, a nonprofit agency in Sacramento, California, which has conducted research and developed numerous demonstration projects in the criminal justice field over the past thirteen years. In May 1970, the American Justice Institute was awarded a grant by LEAA’s research arm, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice,\(^2\) to finance the first 18 months of this five-year program.

In this article, I will attempt to describe what we have learned from our 18 months of experience in San Jose and Santa Clara County; and since we have regular contact with personnel in the other six pilots and with LEAA officials in Washington, I shall attempt to also draw from their experience. Though the focus is on one of these Pilot Cities, there is no evidence that there is one “right” approach or that anything like a “cookbook” recipe can be prescribed for the development of a Pilot City Program. In fact, the evidence points in the opposite direction, that a successful approach will be highly flexible; one that reflects the uniqueness of each community, its leadership and the staff resources of the project. Nevertheless, if the approach of the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program can be viewed as a “case example”, there are principles which should be transferable.

The Formulation of a National Strategy

The idea for a national Pilot Cities program evolved from a project application prepared by the American Justice Institute proposing that San Jose and Santa Clara County be designated as a “laboratory” to develop, test, demonstrate and disseminate new methods for reducing crime in America. Upon receiving and reviewing the project application, LEAA decided to establish a special Center within the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice which would be responsible for program management, not only of the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program but for at least six other Pilots which would be established in other parts of the nation following the same basic program design.

The new program had some unique features from the very beginning:

The American Justice Institute recommended a national strategy based in large part on the principles of implementation advanced by the Organization for Social and Technical Innovation (OSTI). These principles are set forth in their report to the President's Crime Commission 3 entitled *Implementation*. 4 That report focuses on the need to develop a comprehensive federal implementation strategy based upon the recognition that major developments will occur primarily in those agencies identified as “front runners” or “champions for change”. The requirements for an effective federal strategy, then, would point to a developmental strategy for change which has the following properties:

a. Start small and build competence.

b. Introduce first pilot projects in strategic areas.

c. Choose first projects on the basis of the readiness of individuals associated with them to go to work, local initiative and competence, existing champions for change, and a favorable local climate.

d. A nurturing process should take place.

e. The early instances are used then, for learning about the change process intended; as a showplace of demonstrated accomplishment, in order to generate enthusiasm in others whose support or involvement is desired; as a training ground for additional competences . . . they provide people with the ability to say “another”, as it now possible to talk about “another” CYA Community Treatment Project 5 or “another” Provo experiment. 6


5. Palmer, California’s Community Treatment Program for Delinquent Adolescents, 8 JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN CRIME AND DELINQUENCY (Jan. 1971).

f. Avoid political confrontations, insofar as possible. There are issues of power and resistance to change based on power which this strategy does not confront.

At the outset then, these issues formed the strategic underpinnings for (a) proposing to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in October 1968, that a Pilot Program be initiated, (b) proposing Santa Clara County and San Jose, California as the initial program demonstration site, and (c) framing the initial "style" of the approach of the Pilot Program staff.

The American Justice Institute approached the development of the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program on the basis of substantial past experience. This experience taught us how really difficult it is to implement change in the criminal justice system and led to a conscious decision to seek out a "front runner" as a demonstration site for the new program.

Traditionally, the criminal justice system and its agencies concentrate the bulk of their resources on the offender who is most difficult to treat or in jurisdictions where crime reduction is often the most difficult. The design of the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program was a departure from this tradition. It deliberately concentrated resources in a "front runner" jurisdiction and then with the most capable and progressive leaders within that jurisdiction.

Given the difficulty of introducing change, we decided that if the Pilot demonstration area was to do the pioneering to "show the way" for the rest of the country, then it was necessary to locate in the best possible environment.

The criteria used to select San Jose and Santa Clara County also formed the basis for selection of the other six "Pilots" by LEAA.

We looked first for a county of about one million people with a core city of from 250,000 to 500,000 in population. The idea was to find a jurisdiction with most of the common urban problems, yet small enough for a modest amount of money and effort to make some impact. It was important to find a well managed jurisdiction, political stability, a tolerance for research and evaluation, and some sophistication in data processing. We looked for a community with demonstrated leadership and some success in addressing contemporary urban problems. We also looked for a

---

*graph No. 4*, California State Board of Corrections, Sacramento, 29-38 (1964).
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jurisdiction with fairly well developed criminal justice agency services across the board so system improvement would not be forced to “start from scratch.” We wanted to avoid having to spend a lot of time and resources helping a community establish the “basics”; i.e., to bring services up to standard.

This concern also set the Pilot Program apart from the other LEAA programs. The Pilot Program was to concentrate on research and pioneering, whereas the need to upgrade criminal justice services was to be accomplished through LEAA’s “block grant” and “discretionary grant” programs.

These criteria dictated the selection of “front runners” as opposed to those jurisdictions where a pilot program might be “badly needed”.

For this reason the program design carries some risk—if after the five-year program period has been completed, if after placing handpicked specially trained staff in the community, if after receiving specially earmarked funds, these “pilots” do not prove out, the prospects for improvement of the criminal justice system in less fortunate jurisdictions will be slim indeed.

**Organization, Functional and Funding Relationships**

While the philosophy and strategy of the program represents a departure from more traditional approaches, the organization, funding and functional relationships are also unique and to understand what a pilot city is, and how it functions, it may help to describe these features of the program. (See illustration)

First, a Pilot City is not really a pilot “city” at all. In all seven instances both a city and a county have been jointly designated as the demonstration site. I believe they were originally called “Pilot Cities” because of the Washington perception of crime as an urban problem; however, the only criminal justice agencies functioning in cities in California are the municipal police departments—the courts and most of the correctional functions of the

---

7. “Block Grant” funds refers to “blocks” of LEAA funds provided to each State as provided for in Part C of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, Pub. L. No. 90-351, as amended by the Omnibus Crime Control Act of 1970. “Discretionary Grants” refers to LEAA funds which may be allocated to States or units of local government at the discretion of the LEAA administration.
criminal justice system are operated by the county level of government. The joint city-county designation reflects the fact that the county is probably the basic planning unit for approaching the job
of improving the effectiveness of the criminal justice system and for reducing crime.

The second important tactical feature of Pilot Program organization attempts to compensate for the absence of adequate action-oriented mechanisms at the community level. The grantee—the agency receiving research funds from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice—is always a non-governmental agency. In San Jose and Dayton, the first two pilots to be established, the grantee is a private non-profit Institute; in the others, a college or university. It is too early to tell which arrangement is best. The reasons for not making either the city or county the grantee will appear more obvious throughout the remainder of this article; however, the key factors are: (a) to insure an apolitical and objective, though temporary, administrator or trustee for the project, (b) to avoid city-county or police, court, corrections conflict, (c) to provide needed flexibility to bring in highly specialized staff, and (d) to insure stability within the pilot over the five-year program period and throughout changing administrations at the local level.

In each pilot, key personnel represent police, court and corrections disciplines to tie the “system” together. These men and women generally have practical operating experience in the system as well as research skills.

In another respect this grantee arrangement provides a mechanism to compensate for the fact that criminal justice system planning and coordination mechanisms are underdeveloped at the local government level.

Even at the county level, the fragmented organization of the criminal justice system has not made criminal justice planning and coordination easy to accomplish. The criminal justice system is fragmented along city-county lines and among police, court and corrections agencies. There is no one group or organization which by consensus has assumed responsibility for overall improvement of the “bureaucratically provincial” segments of the criminal justice system.

With the program strategy and some major tactical considerations established, what are the characteristics of the Pilot Program staff team?
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THE SANTA CLARA CRIMINAL JUSTICE PILOT PROGRAM AS A
UNIQUE CRIMINAL JUSTICE INNOVATION

A “static” table of organization is presented in the illustration on the preceding page. Staff resources presented in the organizational boxes and surrounded by a dotted line are assigned out to provide staff support for work groups led by a member of the Pilot Program “core” staff.

The most glaring omission of the “static” table of organization is that it does not reflect the fact that these work groups often include members of the community and local agency personnel. The activities of the Pilot Program are embedded in a community development process.

The Pilot Program represents a highly flexible organizational model which is unique in the field of criminal justice. It is a highly adaptable, temporary organization, apolitical in nature and independent of local government. It is shielded from the day-to-day operating demands agency personnel must face. This provides the opportunity for thoughtful and often time consuming analysis of law enforcement problems, but this function is performed in a local setting not apart from it. It is an action-oriented organization designed to serve the criminal justice community, but it is advisory in nature, and relies solely on the authority of competence and performance. It has no formal jurisdictional authority. It is a guest in the community and is totally dependent upon the cooperation of local government and local law enforcement agencies.

It is a “low profile” organization which functions in a staff capacity to local agencies with a perspective that serves to link jurisdictional segments of the system. It links police, court, corrections and community segments of the system, and it links city and county jurisdictions through a person-to-person technical assistance effort by practical problem-solving professionals in criminal justice with specialized skills normally not present in a local criminal justice system. It is a “starter”, an organizer, an initiator. It deliberately seeks out “movers” in the community—agencies and individuals who are “front runners” and leaders. It attempts to find out where they are headed, then help them get there.
The Pilot Program is organized to react quickly to opportunities to improve the criminal justice system. A change in agency leadership, a local government crisis, a shift in community sentiment may provide these opportunities. Timing is often a crucial ingredient in this process.

The Pilot Program is the antithesis of a huge bureaucratic organization. The large government organization is helpful because it can build up tremendous momentum and apply its huge manpower and financial resources. In this sense, the Pilot Program is designed to complement the LEAA effort and the efforts of units of local government.

**MAJOR TASKS AND ACTIVITIES OF THE PILOT PROGRAM**

As depicted in the illustration showing program and staff organization, there are three major thrusts to the Pilot Program effort: Pilot Research, Demonstration Projects and Technical Assistance.8

*Pilot Research*

During the first 18 months of the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program, 15 pilot research projects were conducted and project reports were prepared and mailed to LEAA for dissemination. Most of these pilot research efforts were designed to develop tools, not just for Santa Clara County, but tools which could be useful throughout the country. For example:

*Victimization Survey*—In January, 1970, a countywide victimization survey was conducted in an attempt to assess the extent of crime by measures which were independent of police reporting systems. This involved going directly to citizens and to businesses and asking them what their experiences had been during 1970. This research project was conducted by the Bureau of the Census under contract from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. When research results become available in early 1972, we expect to use them to formulate intervention strategies. The victimization survey will be repeated again and thereby serve as a measure of performance of the Pilot Program.

---

8. The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, LEAA's research arm, provided $312,000 over 18 months to support the staff and other resources depicted in the illustration. They are providing slightly more than $400,000 over the next 20 months and the total for the five-year program will exceed one million dollars.

9. For a complete listing see: **AMERICAN JUSTICE INSTITUTE, FINAL REPORT, PHASE I, Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program.**
Baseline Offense Report Data System—A baseline offense report data system has been developed which provides the capability for crime analysis by geographic area. Offense reports completed by police officers provide the source documentation for this system. The data system is transferable to any police jurisdiction. Coding manuals have been distributed and a “how-to-do-it” manual is now being written. This system has proven to be of immense value in helping us diagnose the crime problem in specific geographic target areas and will be a useful tool in helping us evaluate the performance of specific crime reduction action programs.

Jail and Court Studies—The Pilot Program has conducted a detailed study and analysis of the processing of arrested persons from booking through disposition. A sample methodology for conducting such diagnostic work in other jurisdictions has been produced. In addition, a relatively simple tool has been developed which will allow a jail administrator to anticipate overcrowding, indicate the potential sources of the overcrowding and suggest possible solutions.

A Base Expectancy Score For Adult Probationers—This research is an attempt to identify client characteristics which are predictive of probationer success. It is expected that high risk, medium risk and low risk groups can be identified. These results will provide probation departments with a tool that can be used in three ways: (1) as a guide to caseload assignment (2) to establish the number of cases in a caseload, and (3) as a research tool. The base expectancy score provides a means for interpreting any difference in the probationer outcome of experimental versus control groups made up of persons with identical base expectancy scores. This will allow a probation department to embark on a strategy of search for more effective programs and allow it to cease random trial and error program development.

Demonstration Projects—The second major thrust of the Pilot Program is to help the community design and carry out pioneering new programs to reduce crime and to improve the effectiveness of the criminal justice system. The idea here is to take advantage of the willingness of the “front runner” agency’s ability and willingness to really do some pioneering and then to research and evaluate the results. Successful demonstrations will not only serve to test new crime reduction strategies but serve as living
examples so people from other jurisdictions can visit, feel, touch and see the results rather than read about "what should be done" in a text book. The emphasis here is on encouraging technology transfer and the content of the material to be learned is as much the process of how the project was started as the operational aspects of the project themselves. LEAA discretionary grant funds have been specifically earmarked for San Jose and Santa Clara County to financially support these demonstration projects. These funds come directly from Washington to the host agency, not the American Justice Institute. These funds are not available to other jurisdictions and are set aside specifically to support Pilot Cities demonstration programs. In fiscal year 1971, $500,000 has been made available for this purpose. This year we hope to have a similar amount but we do not yet know if the money will actually be available.

Like the pilot research support received from LEAA, these monies are to be used to support pioneering new programs to reduce crime. They are not provided to Santa Clara County and San Jose to merely augment State block grant monies and should not be used for "upgrading" or merely bringing the criminal justice system up to standard. Realistically, the funds are being used, and we hope will continue to be used, to reduce crime in Santa Clara County so that both the local interests and the national interests can be served.

**Methadone Treatment and Rehabilitation Program**

A Methadone Treatment and Rehabilitation Program was the first of these pilot demonstration efforts. The basic research-demonstration question revolves around the assessment of the impact of the program on the reduction of crime, particularly property crime. Five decentralized clinics throughout the county will eventually provide methadone maintenance services to approximately 1,000 heroin addicts, thus saturating the county with a program carefully focused on reducing the need and desire of addicts to commit crime. In addition to the social impact research being conducted by the American Justice Institute, medical research is being carried out through Stanford University. The strong research and evaluation component of this program, as well as its countywide focus, sets this program apart from other methadone maintenance programs throughout the country.

11. The Methadone Treatment and Rehabilitation Program is supported by LEAA Discretionary Grant # 71-DF-679.
Pretrial Release Project

The second pilot demonstration program initiated in Santa Clara County was a Pretrial Release Project.\(^{12}\) This demonstration project was a direct outgrowth of a pilot test conducted with pilot program funds. It is administered by the county with policy direction provided by a judicial executive committee composed of members of the Superior and Municipal Courts.

Persons booked into the County Jail are interviewed and the information is verified. Program eligibles are then cited (if they have misdemeanor charges) within two hours, or are released on their "own recognizance", or promise to appear, in the event of felony charges. The program is designed to increase the fairness and improve the effectiveness of adjudication. The American Justice Institute is evaluating the impact of this project.

Neither of these programs, methadone or pretrial release, are new pioneering programs, though they do represent excellent program models with strong evaluation components and serve as examples for other jurisdictions to emulate.

Beginning the demonstration program effort with these two projects frankly represents an attempt to establish credibility for action, competence and performance while the longer term research effort was gaining independent momentum. The research effort is now beginning to pay off in the form of more sophisticated and pioneering efforts based upon a close analysis of community criminal justice problems. Realistically, neither LEAA nor the community could wait 18 months for the research effort to bear fruit and this first series of demonstration projects was initiated after a rather intuitive early diagnosis. Fortunately, they have been successful programs and the demonstration area has been prepared to "risk" undertaking some more sophisticated programs.

Guided by information from the Offense Report Data System, we are assisting the San Jose Police Department to design a series of specific tactical intervention programs to reduce burglary in high crime areas. These will be specifically aimed at known high risk targets of crime.

\(^{12}\) The Pretrial Release Program is supportd by LEAA Discretionary Grant # 71-DF-701.
We are also working with the City and County Planning Departments to develop a method for community assessment which will identify variables associated with high crime areas. Since crime has its roots in the community, we think many of the solutions may also rest with specific intervention programs which are community-based. If this approach proves successful, it should lead to a shift from "tinkering" with the criminal justice system—police, courts, corrections—which are geared to react to crime as a symptom. It may be that a more direct and community-based intervention strategy will have more payoff in reducing crime. These efforts will need to be heavily funded by Model Cities, HEW and other funding sources, since the LEAA money is to be centered on improving the criminal justice system. In this sense, we do not know yet if the dual LEAA objectives of "reducing crime" and "improving the criminal justice system" are necessarily compatible.

It is not possible to list or describe here each of the 42 LEAA funded projects which have been funded or submitted for funding by San Jose or Santa Clara County so far. Most of these are not supported by Pilot Demonstration Grant funds but by "block grant" funds or other discretionary grant programs. A great number have been developed with some degree of Pilot Program assistance ranging from providing advice and review to complete design for perhaps half a dozen major projects. The demands for assistance in this area have been overwhelming and it has been difficult to convince some individuals that grant proposal preparation should not be a primary function of the Pilot Program staff.

Technical Assistance—In addition to pilot research and demonstration project development, the third major thrust of the Pilot Program has been to provide technical assistance. This thrust of the Pilot Program is more difficult to describe; the pilot research thrust and the demonstration project thrusts both wind up in a "product", something visible and tangible. This is not always the case with the technical assistance effort. Certainly the impact of the effort is of a more long term nature.

The technical assistance effort is designed to accomplish three basic purposes:

1) improve criminal justice planning skills at all organizational levels of the community-police-courts-corrections system.

2) improve criminal justice agency management capabilities, especially at the middle and top management levels; also to

13. Supra note 9.
improve inter- and intra-agency management and coordination of the system across city-county lines and across police-court-corrections jurisdictional lines.

3) improve the research and evaluation capabilities of people working in the criminal justice system. The emphasis here is on sharpening their diagnostic abilities, on instilling an interest for feedback of program results. This will guide disciplined progress toward programs that work and encourage abandonment of practices that are ineffective; in other words, to execute a strategy of search for programs that will improve the effectiveness of the criminal justice system.

In developing these three capabilities, we are talking more about a “process” than we are a “project”. Our hope is that at the end of the five-year program when we withdraw from the Pilot site, there will exist in Santa Clara County and within the City of San Jose, planning, management, research and evaluation capabilities far superior to what they are today. We hope to develop a model planning organization and the mechanisms to make the system work better.

Synthesis

The interaction of the three major thrusts of the Pilot Program—pilot research, demonstration programs and technical assistance can be described as a “strategy of approach” which is being implemented within the framework of the broad purposes set forth in the act.14

This federal legislation provided the boundaries for establishing the five-year objectives of the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program.

Goal: Reduce the Incidence of Crime in Santa Clara County.

Three broad objectives can be presented which are patterned after those in the Act:

Objective #1—Prepare, adopt and carry out a comprehensive law enforcement plan in Santa Clara County.

**SANTA CLARA CRIMINAL JUSTICE PILOT PROGRAM - PRIMARY METHOD**

Objective: Research, Develop, Test, Evaluate and Disseminate Methods for Reducing Crime in America.

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION PROCESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS</th>
<th>1. DIAGNOSIS</th>
<th>2. DEVELOPMENT/DEMONSTRATION</th>
<th>3. EVALUATION</th>
<th>4. DISSEMINATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Ident.</td>
<td>Problem Definition</td>
<td>Select Alternatives</td>
<td>Design Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop Countywide Comprehensive Criminal Justice Planning Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Develop Planning Capability at Criminal Justice System Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Develop Planning Capability at Agency Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improve Operational Performance of Criminal Justice System Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective #2—Improve the crime reduction performance of the criminal justice system.

Objective #3—Research, develop, test, evaluate and disseminate methods for reducing crime in America.

These three broad objectives can be placed in a matrix which conceptually illustrates what has become the central or primary method of the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program.

Primary Method:

Provide research, development testing evaluation and technical assistance to develop county-wide criminal justice planning capabilities which will improve the crime reduction performance of the criminal justice system.

The Primary Method involves the interaction of two broad processes—

a) a community development process.

b) a research, development, test, evaluation process. This matrix is presented on page 768.

All Pilot Program tasks and activities can be located within this matrix. Technical assistance is provided by the Pilot Program across the horizontal spectrum of the matrix and it is also provided along the vertical axis of the matrix.

The need for technical assistance with the research, development, test and evaluation process was anticipated, but it soon became obvious that the need for technical assistance with the Community Development Process had been underestimated in the program design. It has been necessary to concentrate the technical assistance effort on what OSTI\textsuperscript{15} advised should be the initial step—“the first stages should have the effect of building competence which does not currently exist to carry on the program.”

This assistance has taken many forms and probably absorbed a majority of the staff man-hours devoted to the Pilot Program. Some examples follow:

\textsuperscript{15} OSTI, \textit{Implementation} (1967).
at the Comprehensive Criminal Justice Planning Level

- The development of a countywide Criminal Justice Planning Board has been a significant achievement in building a mechanism which has responsibility for coordination, priority setting and policy determination. The Board has received LEAA Planning monies to carry out its work. This Board includes law enforcement officials, City and County officials and citizens. It now has a staff which can help the Board develop a countywide criminal justice planning capability. During the last 18 months, Pilot Program staff provided many of the staff services that are properly the function of staff working for such a Board.

- A drug abuse prevention program\(^\text{16}\) has been developed to coordinate the services of over 95 public and private agencies throughout the County.

- Meetings with numerous citizen groups and private agencies have taken place. They are interested in improving the crime reduction performance of the system and new methods need to be developed to harness this interest.

at the Criminal Justice System Level

A great amount of effort has been required to build relationships and problem-solving mechanisms across agency and jurisdictional gaps: For example,

- the City and County have identified police records, data processing and communications as areas for law enforcement cooperation.

- the contract cities have pulled together and with Pilot Program assistance, have designed a project to identify their law enforcement requirements.

- a Countywide Narcotic Enforcement Bureau\(^\text{17}\) has been created to systematically coordinate an attempt to reduce the supply of illicit drugs.

at the Operating Unit and Agency Level

The Pilot Program has organized and staffed task forces in a number of agencies to help re-define and articulate agency goals,


\(^{17}\) Santa Clara County Narcotics Bureau, Discretionary Grant # 71-DF-678.
objectives, needs and priorities. Over time, this has resulted in an appreciation for planning and fostered a re-thinking of what functions are being performed by the agency; why, and how these might be improved.

When a law enforcement problem has been identified, Pilot Program staff have frequently been called upon to participate in problem solution. Basic problem-solving skills are underdeveloped in some agencies. Agency personnel require assistance in developing completed staff work—a well thoughtout plan which can be presented for consideration by the City Manager and Council or the County Board of Supervisors. Often, basic planning data has not been available or agency personnel have required assistance in collecting and using it.

Often task groups again needed to be developed. Many times they involved people who had been employed by local government for years, but who were from different agencies and had to be introduced to one another.

A constant sorting process has taken place to find “front runners” and “movers” of developing task force groups cutting across agency lines, jurisdiction lines and criminal justice system functions.

Agency people had to be trained to write a fundable application. Many agencies had never completed a grant application. They had particular difficulty with the budget sections; for example, agency personnel had little experience at determining the cost of personnel fringe benefits. Many people relied heavily on the Pilot Program staff to show them how to build “soft match”.

The Pilot Program has assisted local law enforcement, at all levels, to reconsider the allocation of their time and resources. In many agencies, there is only an underdeveloped awareness of what performing various functions cost. They do not have any method for assessing where their money is going nor do they have the management information they need to assess the allocation of their manpower resources.

Because of their almost total past reliance on the County or City local property tax base for financing, many agencies do not know how to make use of the leverage they can get from LEAA, Model Cities, HEW and other sources of funds.
In many agencies, the Pilot Program staff has functioned as management consultants to help agencies overcome these problems and to begin to build capability within the agency by training personnel.

In other cases, the Pilot Program has arranged for management surveys such as the Peace Officers Standards and Training Survey now being conducted in the San Jose Police Department.

In still other cases, it has been necessary to bring people who have special skills into these agencies, rather than attempt to develop these skills in people now employed by the agency. The discretionary grant application to provide the San Jose Police Department with a Business Manager, a Personnel Development Specialist and an Operations Research Specialist is a good example. These skills are badly needed and should have high impact in the department. On the other hand, requests for funds of this type now receive low priority. It is difficult to categorize this kind of grant as a crime reduction program, and it can be argued that providing these kinds of skills within a police department is more a local responsibility than a federal responsibility.

In an experimental arrangement with the Department of Labor, the Pilot Program is training three former aerospace employees to prepare them for criminal justice careers. Their analytical skills should be valuable to local law enforcement.

There are still other circumstances in which "tooling up" has been necessary. Because of rapid growth and years of under-funding, the record systems of all county police agencies are in serious disarray. Research, just like management, relies on timely and accurate information and records. Though it is another project which is difficult to view as a specific and direct program to reduce crime, local law enforcement view improvement of their record systems as their number one priority. The reality is that if these are not improved, the workload over the next few years will inundate these systems and geometrically complicate their operational problems in the field.

**THE NEED FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS**

The required investment of staff time in helping criminal justice agencies develop these new organizational mechanisms has been problematic but it has provided an important lesson.

It has been problematic because of the time involved in helping local law enforcement agencies "tool up" to engage in a research program or to prepare to conduct a demonstration program.
The original perception was that if a “front runner” jurisdiction such as San Jose and Santa Clara County were selected as a demonstration site, the very fact that they are well managed jurisdictions with better than average criminal justice services across the board, would allow significant research and demonstration projects to be designed and implemented rather quickly. This has not been the case. With all due respect to San Jose and Santa Clara County, because indeed they are well managed units of local government, the Pilot Program has expended an enormous amount of time in developing criminal justice planning skills. Developing these skills, of course, has been a prerequisite for the successful design and development of pilot research and demonstration projects. Agency personnel and executives in City and County management have had to participate in this process. They have been very generous with their time and many have learned these skills very quickly.

The lesson of this experience is an important one for other jurisdictions and for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. It underscores the need for the improvement of management skills in criminal justice agencies, for the development of improved criminal justice planning capabilities and for building the competence to design and carry out well conceived crime reduction programs. It is clear that well designed crime reduction programs will emanate from well managed jurisdictions which have developed criminal justice planning skills and the new organizational mechanisms that are needed. Even in the nation’s most well managed units of local government, and Santa Clara County can properly be considered as one of these, these skills are underdeveloped. Reliance on the transfer of technological solutions, whether equipment or successful “projects” in cookbook recipe form, will not succeed unless they are supported by attention to the need for this community development process.

The Pilot Program has reviewed the progress of a number of other communities that have been heavily involved in the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration program. Where effective planning mechanisms have not been developed, or where planning skills are absent, there is often no sense of continuity in the use of LEAA funds. Program development appears to be random, without a strategy, without a plan. The Pilot Program has been
of some influence in advocating a more rational development pro-
gram in Santa Clara County; however, it has taken almost 18
months to develop the community organization and official plan-
ning mechanisms required to channel LEAA funds into a logical,
coordinated series of programs to reduce crime.

On the basis of our experience so far, it is our belief that
good “projects” will grow out of well managed agencies—agencies
that know where they are going, that know how to get there,
that can diagnose and evaluate what they are presently doing
and experiment with new approaches. In other words, “good
projects” will grow out of well managed jurisdictions with plan-
ning capabilities and research and evaluation capabilities, not vice
versa. The history of the field is replete with “good projects”
which have demonstrated worth but have not “caught on” and
been replicated in any significant number of jurisdictions through-
out the nation.

We lament our seeming need to “re-invent the wheel” in each
jurisdiction. Obviously, passing out cookbook recipes of “good
projects” has not worked. People newly recruited into the crim-
inal justice system “business” from the aerospace and defense in-
dustry where technology is heavily involved with the physical
sciences have been slow to recognize the difficulties inherent in
the technology transfer process in criminal justice.

The truth may be that the need to “re-invent the wheel” speaks
not to technology or technique but to the process. As planning,
management and research capabilities are improved, growth oc-
curs. People “re-invent the wheel” as they grow. For this reason,
perhaps we should not be so concerned with the need to “re-invent
the wheel” as this process may be the vehicle through which growth
will occur. The LEAA experience is already riddled with poorly
planned, poorly executed projects. Evaluation and research has
been neglected in too many projects. The cookbook recipe ap-
proach probably is not the answer for the majority of the jurisdic-
tions in the United States.

It is for these reasons that the Santa Clara Criminal Justice
Pilot Program is interested in research of the process of commu-
nity development and implementation, and concerned with the de-
velopment of improved planning, management and research capa-
bilities.

Implications—A Classification Of Strategies Of Approach To
Criminal Justice Planning

A number of the people who have visited the seven “Pilot Cities”
have commented about how differently each of them is operating.
They are referring to the “style” of operation as much as they are to differences in organization, the techniques of problem solution, and the kinds of projects for which funds are being requested.

This is an interesting observation since all of the Pilot Cities’ programs have as their basis, a grant application which is nearly identical to ours in San Jose-Santa Clara County. All of the Pilot Cities have been funded by the same organization—LEAA’s research arm, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. They are closely supervised by that agency. They all have essentially the same staffing patterns and financial resources.

Because of these similarities, we have a unique opportunity to conduct comparative research among the Pilot Cities. This might take the form of comparative or cross-cultural studies traditionally conducted by anthropologists.

Of course, the environment and the problems of these jurisdictions may in some cases vary enough to account for these differences in operation. We suspect, however, that some significant portion of the differences may also be traced to the fact that a community’s approach to crime control is an expression of, and is determined by, the striking of some sort of homeostatic balance among the perceptions or beliefs among a number of individuals, organizations and subcommunities about what causes crime and what should be done about it.

Agreement on a comprehensive criminal justice plan requires some degree of consensus among the viewpoints of participants of the local Criminal Justice Planning Board. They are charged

18. In California, as in a number of other states, the State Planning Agency which receives a block grant of LEAA monies, has developed a number of subregions throughout the state for law enforcement planning purposes. Smaller counties may be grouped into one law enforcement planning region but the larger counties are eligible to form planning regions which are consistent with their own boundaries. Each of these regions must have a Regional Planning Board and a great deal of their time is involved in establishing funding priorities for projects in their region. These recommendations are forwarded to the State Planning Agency, which in California is known as the California Council on Criminal Justice. The regional recommendations have a great influence on grants made by the California Council on Criminal Justice.

The current costs of the police-court-corrections system in Santa Clara County is 50 million dollars per year and these costs are increasing at a
with the responsibility for submission of plans to the state and federal governments. When brought to a vote at a conference table, this homeostatic resolution of differences in perceptions results in a “position” or stance that represents that community's unique synthesis of these viewpoints about the causes of crime and the means to be employed in crime reduction efforts. It is the synthesis of these viewpoints, developed slowly and after a great deal of necessary debate and deliberation which will provide the basis for a community's approach to crime control. This is a complex process and one we know very little about, yet it is the key determinant to how the problem will be approached. We all approach a problem from the viewpoint of our own individual training, experience and value system.

If given the same problem, a minister may take one problem-solving approach, a lawyer another, a policeman another, and so on.

Characteristic strategies can be identified with the major components of the criminal justice system. Police rely heavily on enforcement; the legal profession relies heavily on legislation, precedent and conciliation, and corrections with its casework orientation, emphasizes counselling and individual or group therapy. In other words, there are different, often competing theories of “deviance” and these lead to different strategies for conceptualizing and implementing crime control programs. The perspective of the problem solvers—local officials, citizens and in particular, members of the local Criminal Justice Planning Board—determine the “nuts and bolts” of how the problem will be approached. It determines the methods which will be used in the diagnosis and analysis of the problem—in fact, in the very definition of what the problem is. This clearly provides the environment in which cer-

rate of about ten percent per year. Since the total annual amount of LEAA dollars for projects in the county will probably be less than two million dollars, the LEAA monies will not even match this annual increase in system costs. It is clear therefore that the two million dollars must be allocated wisely if it is to have any impact on crime.

19. Craig Broadus, our Associate Director, has observed that even the “labels” used to describe offenders vary depending upon one's orientation: “suspect”, “detainee”, “defendant”, “inmate”, “client”, “probationer”, “parolee”, “ex-con” are all words which may describe the same individual at different stages of his “passage” through the system. The reason we need so many different labels to describe this individual is because the “parts” of the system dealing with him view him with different perspectives. This is evidence of a fragmented “nonsystem” which we erroneously refer to as a Criminal Justice System.

American Justice Institute President, Richard A. McGee has commented that “the Criminal Justice System is analogous to a plumbing system wherein the only thing holding the various parts together is the material flowing through it.”
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tain projects will be recommended for funding and others will not. This process will result in a "strategy of approach" for each community which we think can be identified and described. Further, it may be possible to classify these approaches and then to evaluate them in terms of their success.

Looking throughout California, we see Regional Criminal Justice Planning Boards operating with a number of characteristic styles.

The Body Count Style

One of the easiest to identify is the style Craig Broadus, our Associate Director, has nicknamed the "body count" style. The "body count" style emanates from a belief in one basic solution: more money and more manpower will solve the problem. There is a high value placed on the number of grants and the dollar amounts received. With new money and manpower, there are few attempts at new programs but a great emphasis on expanding existing criminal justice agency operations.

Normally, these efforts are aimed toward enforcement, deterrence and apprehension program areas with the idea that if at first you don't succeed, you get a bigger hammer.

There is normally little evaluation of these programs, but where it does occur it consists of counting activity, that is, number of arrests, number of clients served, etc. rather than an assessment of the program's impact on crime.

The underlying assumption is that the existing criminal justice system approach is effective but undermanned and underfunded. This perspective quite naturally leads to a criminal justice planning approach with certain recognizable characteristics.

The Accreditation Style

The second strategic approach to criminal justice planning we have nicknamed the "accreditation style". The "accreditation style" relies heavily on improving standards. The underlying perspective represents a slightly higher stage of development over the "body count style". It still maintains that existing practices involve the "right approach" but it stresses the need for improving the quality of personnel through credential programs, for establishing caseload size standards, for setting minimum standards for
accreditation for the care of inmates, etc. Projects are likely to involve a great deal of training (vis-a-vis education), construction or remodeling of facilities, tougher requirements for entrance exams, and higher salaries.

... there may also be attempts to develop a better class of inmate.

Success is usually evaluated in terms of "certification"; that is, better buildings, better trained personnel, lower client-to-supervisor ratios, etc. This approach is expensive but these improvements can be quite visible and are therefore politically attractive to pursue. Evaluation may or may not extend to measures of changes in the crime reduction performance of the improved system.

The "War Against Crime" Style

The emphasis of this third approach reflects the considerable influence of displaced aerospace and defense industry people who have found their way into the criminal justice "business". Projects likely to emanate from this approach include: crime labs, computer-assisted command and control systems, sophisticated police equipment for night vision, communications systems, helicopters, video equipment, etc. The approach recognizes shortcomings in the criminal justice system's effectiveness and finds quick answers in mechanical solutions. There is a preoccupation with deployment, quick police response and mobility. It is "hardware" oriented and seeks to "modernize" the criminal justice system with technological superiority. The human factors involved may be neglected, particularly the need to also train managers. This style is likely to surface in communities with police-community relations problems where there is a danger of reaction to "pacification" programs.

Research and evaluation schemes often use sophisticated techniques involving operations research and systems analysis. These approaches represent a great step forward; however in those instances where the target of the project is on the means to an end; i.e., a record system, a communications system, etc., it is difficult to carry the evaluation to a conclusion where one can assess whether the improved record or communications system actually reduces crime. (The end result desired.)

The Efficiency Style

The emphasis of this fourth strategy of approach is in "processing" offenders faster and less expensively. It has been criti-
cized as an approach that involves “tinkering” with the criminal justice system and it is also criticized because it often responds more to bureaucratic needs of organizations while sacrificing the fair and just prosecution of suspects.

Nevertheless, it is a development stage that recognizes the need for some basic changes in the way the system operates. Unlike the earlier styles, it does not overlook the need to train managers as well as improve equipment, and it introduces the evaluation concept of “feedback” to determine results. It focuses squarely on “improving the criminal justice system” though it often falls short of whether these “improvements” also meet the test of increased effectiveness in crime reduction. Instead, effectiveness is interpreted as clearing court dockets faster, diverting minor offenders from expensive criminal justice agency services, reducing jail overcrowding, clearing more offenses with arrests, increasing prosecution effectiveness, reallocating police patrol beats, etc.

**The Public Administration Style**

The efficiency style tends to blend into a higher level of development which seeks to reallocate criminal justice resources through improved management techniques. This approach recognizes that more information is needed to control crime but approaches the problem from the viewpoint that resources are poorly managed.

A criminal justice information system will be one project which receives acceptance at this level. There is also preoccupation with reworking administrative and organizational structures and with management surveys. Cost trade-offs are identified. This may lead to improved budgeting and reporting systems and criminal justice information systems with some real diagnostic and evaluation capability.

Research processes may be introduced; for example, to follow up a cohort of offenders to determine their probation performance. Use of the scientific method is strongly in evidence.

Even at this level, however, the focus as in the preceding strategies is still on achieving technological proficiency within the system itself. All of these strategies appear to stem from a perspective that crime control can be achieved by improving the police-courts-corrections system basically as they exist today.
The Pilot Cities, even with their individual differences, represent some sophisticated styles which may have more promise than the ones which have already been mentioned.

First, there is an emphasis on research, on problem identification and problem definition. In other words, there is a diagnosis. Then there are baselines established against which performance can and will be measured. This forces some attention on goals and objectives, on performance and on program impact.

Second, there is an inductive method—a strategy of search, rather than random trial and error activity. When combined with research, its underpinnings are empirical rather than mystical. There is every attempt to include a well-designed evaluation plan in each project proposal designed in each Pilot City.

Third, the Pilot Cities are part of a national strategy that stresses the interchange of research so we can determine which projects and approaches work and which do not. Some leverage is gained by having several Pilot Cities tied together through this national program.

Fourth, all the Pilot Cities are looking at the whole criminal justice system; they are describing it, studying it and attempting to improve it across the board. This perspective is a broad one, which leads to the next point.

Fifth, we think it is significant that in all the Pilot Cities, there is a strong interest in looking at the community itself as both the source of crime and the area in which many of the solutions will take place. The Pilot Cities are not limiting their attention to the police-courts-corrections system. They view the community as part of the criminal justice system. Each Pilot Program is making a community assessment with the view that the more we learn about the socio-cultural environment, about which business establishments are robbed and which are not, about victim-offender relationships, etc., the better the possibility for developing successful intervention strategies in the community rather than in the police, courts and corrections system. They are attempting to identify those factors which exist in the community and to learn more about how the interaction of key factors generates crime and delinquency. The more we learn, the greater the chance for successful intervention.

We have already commented on the strong thrust into a community development process in San Jose which is required to

strengthen that community’s ability to plan and carry out successful crime control programs.

The approach recognizes that public health, schools, churches and other organizations have important crime control functions. LEAA grants are flowing to these organizations in the Pilot Cities.  

This is not to say that work does not also need to be done at the other developmental stages which have first been described, but where training, command control or lower caseloads are the subject of a project application, they are clearly attempted as a means to an end rather than ends in themselves. The program may be necessary to get participants of the system organized and trained to this broader perspective of crime control; also even in the Pilot Cities, the criminal justice system has been in need of funds and manpower to upgrade areas that have not been funded adequately in the past.

Finally, it is characteristic of the Pilot Cities that citizens are represented on the Regional Criminal Justice Planning Boards. This is a sign that these communities, if they were well chosen, and I think they were, view crime as the problem of the whole community. They do not use the phrase “war on crime”, for only fools make war on themselves.

In conclusion, it is probably quite proper that different localities are approaching the crime control problem with different strategies. The techniques to be employed should come from an assessment of the community and its problems, and consistent with its stage of development, should reflect the political and cultural perspectives of the community. Frankly, no one knows which of these strategies is “right” but with a number of different approaches being tried, we may be able to find out; that is, we can learn if we pay attention to the need to research the process as well as the projects.

**Conclusion**

Through the Pilot Program much is being learned about the need to re-evaluate the traditional approaches of the social scientist

---

21. The Methadone Treatment and Rehabilitation Program, for example, is administered by the County Public Health Department.
to criminal justice research, demonstration program development and criminal justice planning.

Traditionally, the social scientist begins with research. But the criminal justice system has, just as traditionally, proved to be somewhat intolerant of research and largely unresponsive to research findings as a stimulus for change.

Social scientists characteristically require a long period of analysis and detachment during which an overall plan for improvement is developed. This delays action, however, and action is what local law enforcement and the funding agencies want; therefore, it is action that establishes credibility.

Any research plan is normally dependent upon a consensus of all parties. Whether the plan is developed in a vacuum or with local participation, the researchers' dependence upon consensus may ignore the reality that change in the criminal justice system is largely a political process in an ever-shifting, dynamic environment. No one person is steering. Any number of elected or appointed officials and community groups have separate, sometimes competing power bases—and criminal justice is an adversary system. The social scientist research plan—however conceived—often consists of a set series of steps, as in a blue print, with one step dependent upon another. It is linear and rather fixed; therefore, it cannot adapt, take advantage of crises or opportunity or change direction.

As the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program has gained experience, it is in these areas that the traditional approaches of social scientists have been re-evaluated.

The immediate reality is the mandate for action. Congress, LEAA and the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice require action programs and demonstrable crime reduction. The community expects it. Law enforcement expects it. How can this process legitimately move forward where organizational apparatus and planning skills are underdeveloped? How can it proceed in lieu of consensus?

The answers to these questions will depend in large part on the stage of development of the host community. In San Jose-Santa Clara County, the initial thrust of the Pilot Program has been to develop a flexible "strategy of approach" rather than a fixed, detailed plan, and to move forward on three broad fronts:

1. Pilot Research:

   Pilot research projects have been conducted to help diagnose and give needed definition to criminal justice
problems. Where possible the emphasis has been on developing tools, measurement techniques and methodology which will be easily transferable to other jurisdictions. In this effort, the Pilot Program serves as a laboratory site to develop and test new methods for reducing crime in America.

2. The Immediate Development of Demonstration Programs To Reduce Crime:

   There has been an early attempt to choose these projects carefully—to select demonstrations hosted by strong agencies, projects with a good deal of community support and momentum, projects which appear to have a better than average chance of making a measurable impact on crime. In the development of these projects, Pilot Program staff have been working with criminal justice agency staff on a task-oriented basis. This has been a visible and productive process. It has inspired mutual confidence and trust and a sense of accomplishment.

3. Deliver Technical Assistance:

   a) Develop Criminal Justice Agency Management Skills.

   There has been an attempt to assist with immediate law enforcement crises or problems. As these opportunities surface, the Pilot Program has attempted to be of immediate and practical value. This has involved the Pilot Program in the beginnings of a process of middle management and top executive staff development. It has stimulated a process of re-thinking of agency objectives. It has stimulated the search for new ways of approaching old problems.

   Many of the current problems facing the criminal justice system which have their roots in current management practices, the need for assisting police, court and corrections agencies in these areas, even in these relatively well managed jurisdictions have been under-estimated.
This raises a question of priority of emphasis. At present, "projects" receive emphasis and therefore funding, while money for management development is more difficult to develop. It is possible that a significant number of "action projects" in any one agency might not improve performance if the real need is to develop management skills. If management development were to be given emphasis first, however, an increased capacity to conceive and carry out well designed crime reduction programs should come about naturally.

b) Develop Criminal Justice Planning Capabilities

By involving agency heads, or sub-systems of criminal justice in planning activities, the Pilot Program is attempting to stimulate an awareness and an aptitude for criminal justice planning. The pilot research efforts described earlier in this report have been part of this process.

It is through these three general approaches that the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program is seeking to engage Santa Clara County and the City of San Jose in a process of community development. It is through the application of this hopefully flexible and responsive strategy that the Pilot Program hopes to end up where the traditional social scientist begins—with a plan, with more of a political consensus, and with the mechanisms needed to carry that plan on into the future.

In conclusion, after 18 months of operation, the Santa Clara Criminal Justice Pilot Program appears to be a promising innovation. Additional experience is needed to determine if the efforts that have been described here will significantly help the community reduce crime, and then to determine if what has been learned can be transferred to other jurisdictions.