

Final Report

Research Seminar on Community, Crime and Justice

David R. Karp, Ph.D.

presented by

**The George Washington University Center for Communitarian Policy Studies
and
The National Institute of Justice**

March 31, 1997

Table of Contents

I. Summary of Project

II. Stated Goals and Outcomes

III. The Seminar Discussion

IV. Participant List

V. Participant Biographies

VI. Discussion Papers

I. Summary of Project

Recently, criminal justice scholars and practitioners have turned their attention to the various ways in which the community may become a partner with the criminal justice system. The police have embraced various models of community policing, some prosecutors and public defenders are turning to neighborhoods rather than the courts for problem-solving and prevention, several major cities are creating community courts with community corrections. At the same time, community theorists are re-examining the role of the community in fostering personal and civic responsibility and rebuilding social institutions.

Common to both of these emerging trends is an emphasis on the essential role of the community in providing social order. There is a common recognition that, among other factors, crime flourishes when the social institutions of a community weaken. Families, schools, churches, and community groups help define and enforce local standards of acceptable behavior. All communities send a message to criminals indicating their level of vulnerability to crime. Communities with weak social institutions are, of course, not tolerant of crime, but they are insufficiently organized to resist the forces of disorder. The police alone cannot hope to fill such a vacuum. Therefore, it is essential to understand how communities create social order and how the

criminal justice system may work with communities to prevent crime and promote justice.

In order to further our understanding of crime, justice, and the community, the National Institute of Justice and The George Washington University Center for Communitarian Policy Studies co-hosted The Research Seminar on Community, Crime, and Justice. Support for the seminar was based on award # 96-IJ-CX-K005 (S-1).

In a series of collaborative meetings between June 1996 and the date of the seminar, March 7, 1997, The Center for Communitarian Policy Studies (CCPS) and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) met to plan and establish the format for the seminar. The seminar would be based upon a paper written by David Karp of CCPS, and held on The George Washington University campus. Amitai Etzioni, director of CCPS, and Jeremy Travis, director of NIJ, would chair the seminar. Seven seminar participants were asked to write responses to David Karp's paper, each from a different perspective on crime. Robert Sampson, Professor of Sociology at The University of Chicago was invited to write from an *ecological* perspective; Ronald Clarke, Dean of the School of Criminology at Rutgers University, from a *situational* perspective; Kent Portney, Professor of Political Science at Tufts University, from a *governance* perspective; Kay Pranis, Restorative Justice Planner at The Minnesota Department of Corrections, from a *community practitioner* perspective; Philip Selznick, Professor of Law at the University of California at Berkeley, from a *normative* perspective; John Hagan, Professor of

Sociology and Faculty of Law, University of Toronto, from a *stratification* perspective; and David Chavis, President of the Association for the Study and Development of Community, for the *prevention* perspective. Twelve other scholars in the field would be asked to participate in the seminar. Later that month, invitations were mailed out and responses received for the seven selected respondents.

In December, David Karp completed his paper. The list of twelve participants was finalized, and those invitations were mailed out. An "outer circle" of observers of the seminar was approved by NIJ and CCPS. This would consist of foundation executives, other interested practitioners, and NIJ and CCPS staff. It was decided that Professor Mark Moore, from the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, would be invited to the seminar to provide a synthesis of the day's discussion.

In January 1997, David Karp's paper was reviewed by NIJ and was adjusted per their recommendations and comments. The final copy was received by the seven respondents at the end of the month. Invitations to the outer circle were mailed out.

In February, CCPS received papers from all the respondents. These seven papers, in addition to David Karp's paper, a letter covering details of the seminar, and map of the George Washington University campus, were sent from CCPS to all the participants and outer circle observers. All those at the seminar would be expected to have read the papers prior to it.

The Research Seminar on Community, Crime, and Justice was held at The George Washington University on March 7, 1997. Unfortunately, Carl Klockars and Elijah Anderson missed the conference due to illness.

II. Stated Goals and Outcomes

There were four overarching goals of the seminar:

(1) The seminar will examine various criminal justice practices in light of community studies in order to generate new insights and *identify new lines of inquiry* for studying the relationship between community, crime, and justice.

(2) The seminar will study how communities can play a contributing role in the justice system. This evaluation will include the actions of community members and groups as well as partnerships between government, businesses, and communities.

(3) The seminar will identify new trends and practices in the criminal justice system that call for specific involvement of the community.

(4) The seminar will identify how disorganized communities can be organized and how inactive communities can be mobilized.

Achieving these goals depended a great deal on the selection of participants and paper respondents from several different disciplines. Thus, a selection criteria was adopted to foster high-level discussion as well as achieve the stated goals of the seminar. First, participants were to be composed primarily of academics with a strong minority of practitioners. In order to bring fresh ideas and different perspectives to the table, both NIJ and CCPS sought rising stars and leaders in the field as well as a diverse group of participants as a whole. Of the academics, criminologists would be complemented by an interdisciplinary group of social scientists. Both quantitative and qualitative, and theoretical or applied/evaluative perspectives were considered.

In order to ensure a productive exchange of ideas, only 21 people were invited as participants. This was to promote discussion from a broad range of perspectives, yet not allow so many voices so as to hinder overall productivity. As previously mentioned, seven people were asked to write response papers that highlighted their particular perspective. No single perspective was given more prominence than another, as the purpose of the seminar was not to debate and propel individual perspectives and agendas but to contribute to the collective goals of the seminar.

As each respondent, participant, and outer circle member was to have read David Karp's as well as each response paper, it was possible for discussion questions to be developed from them without bringing up issues already discussed in the papers. Questions directed toward respondents were thus for clarification purposes only. Prior to

the seminar, CCPS developed a set of discussion questions based on David Karp's as well as the seven response papers, which would serve as a framework for discussion.

III. The Seminar Discussion

Jeremy Travis opened the meeting, challenging the group to define community and community justice. Many new programs now include the term “community” in their titles but it is unclear whether this represents a fundamental change in addressing problems or simply “public relations.” What would a justice system built on a foundation of community justice look like, he asked. With increased emphasis on community-based responses to crime and social problems, NIJ seeks a clearer and broader understanding of the core concept. Travis said he hoped the group would begin a discussion and help formulate questions that could guide future research.

Thanking the group for coming from all parts of the country, Etzioni cautioned them not to approach the subject as an “ism.” While there were diverse perspectives, he hoped deliberations would reveal important areas of commonality and a subset of areas in which research was needed. He reminded the group that the focus was not policy development but research.

The day’s format called for Karp to summarize his paper followed by summaries of the respondents’ papers. Following the presentations, a general discussion of issues was planned. All participants then introduced themselves.

David Karp. Noting that the day's discussion was likely to focus on the forest rather than the trees, Karp urged participants to identify the trees. Rather than summarize his lengthy background paper, he posed a series of questions:

Why is community capturing our attention?

Can a society be strong on rights and strong on community? Can we ensure fair treatment and protect individual rights?

What distinguishing features separate community justice from other approaches?

Sometimes people equate community justice with volunteer efforts. To what extent does that undermine community justice?

While community justice is a new concept, it draws on many perspectives. Which perspectives?

What do we mean by community?

What is the relationship between community and the formal justice system? Between formal and informal controls and standards? Is community vigilantism a possible result of ignoring standards?

How can communities be held accountable?

How can this affect linkages between shared standards?

How can the criminal justice system address cultural and structural issues?

Where is the locus of responsibility for addressing change?

How can ties between rich and poor be increased?

How can citizens be mobilized and how can we ensure that those mobilized represent the people?

Robert Sampson. Speaking from an *ecological* perspective, Sampson identified three major themes: (1) spatial definitions of community; (2) structural differentiation of key social characteristics in physical space; and (3) consequences for community-level social organization. Despite the fuzziness of notions about local community and multiple definitions of neighborhood, the concept of neighborhood is still vital as a “nested structure.” It is not the mythical urban village some envision but an arena in which there are established patterns of behavior. What are the consequences of structural discrepancies? What is the ability of communities to engage in collective action and how do we maximize their strength? What factors are actually involved when communities act? How does social class influence interactions? How do social controls operate?

John Hagan. Speaking from a *stratification* perspective, Hagan asserted that Karp’s background paper argued that the community justice movement must incorporate reclamation and reinvestment efforts to be successful in disadvantaged communities. Reclamation involves establishing legal order and could include such actions as shutting down drug markets and “widening the net” by so-called “quality of life” arrests,

ultimately removing more young minority males from the community and discouraging investment. Reinvestment involves capital investment in the community and a corresponding increase in employment opportunities. Reclamation without reinvestment engenders a sense of injustice. In emphasizing reclamation, one of the biggest problems is the abstractness of the issues; we don't look at impacts on real people. If *justice in community justice* is to be a reality, we must make it a priority to find the appropriate balance between reclamation and reinvestment.

Kay Pranis. As a *practitioner* addressing community justice, it seems extremely dangerous to discuss the issue without attention to values. The feminist perspective of justice articulated by Kay Harris could inform this discussion—respect for the human dignity of each individual, belief that relationships are more important than power, emphasis on harmony and mutual accountability. (Copies of an article by M. Kay Harris, “Moving into the New Millennium: Toward a Feminist Vision of Justice,” *Modes of Moral Reasoning*, were later distributed.) Karp's paper is formulated from an academic rather than a community perspective. We need to re-examine how we think about informal social controls. Social controls must be based on caring, not fear as in the 50s--our cultural memory is of repressive social controls. Issues of substance, process and values are involved in designing social controls. Attention to values is critical. The way we intervene should reflect our values.

Kent Portney. From the perspective of *governance* rather than criminal justice, a key question is whether community justice can be practiced so that communities can govern themselves. Neighborhood-based systems of citizen participation seem to offer superior opportunities for balancing demands on local government and contributing toward or maintaining a social fabric that allows citizens to govern themselves. They appear to be successful to the extent they embody democratic governance—activities termed “moral dialogue” by Amitai Etzioni, also referred to as “democratic talk.” When moral dialogue is practiced, the chances for achieving community justice (to which citizen participation is integral) are improved.

David Chavis. The *prevention* perspective is based on substantial evidence that communities are essential for well being and must be capable of providing a healthy, just environment. A community development process can be used as a sustainable prevention strategy by building capacity through coalitions and collaborative structures. Chavis likened differences among systems approaches to the tension between people “downstream” who reach into a river to save passing victims from drowning and people who go “upstream” to stop the person or circumstance causing people to be thrown in. In thinking about community development, the emphasis on collaboration has changed to an emphasis on the community as a means of control. Chavis said we have reached a glass

ceiling. What are the barriers? What factors are necessary for a resilient, capable community? What role do institutions play? How do we make it happen everywhere? What are the best practices?

Ronald Clarke. From a *situational* perspective, where does crime prevention—a set of techniques for reducing the likelihood of crime—fit into the overall concept of community justice? Situational crime prevention does not currently fit into the ways we measure crime or informal social controls. Social control which attempts to build common thinking is, in fact, different from crime prevention. Individuals and organizations alike practice routine precautions in multitudes of settings—a vast amount of social control ignored by measurement. How do “bubbles of governance”—the morays of each institution we move into and out of each day—fit into community justice? These bubbles of governance include our homes, businesses, transportation systems, offices, etc., each arena in which we modify our behavior based on our understanding of the “bubble’s” implicit rules.

Philip Selznick. Speaking from a *normative* perspective, Selznick remarked that NIJ is to be commended for its interest in exploring the theory of community justice and how it can direct research and policy. We are still trying to understand theory, and it seems less important to define community than to define elements of community, relationships,

risks, values, informal and formal controls. What contingencies affect values would be within the *normative* and descriptive perspectives? Looking at community justice, two examples of what it is not would be: (1) locking our doors; (2) locking up people and throwing away the key. Practical issues involved in assessment are complicated by blurred boundaries whenever we look at criminal justice—blurring of values, blurring of work/home/school/family/friend influences. Each has significance yet the boundary of influence between each is blurred. Focus on community is based on the premise of inclusion: we will be more effective (and discipline and motivation will emerge) if everybody participates. The challenge to make government more responsive is reflected in the popularity of community policing and discussions about transforming or re-inventing government. Volunteerism as a means of mobilizing people is important, though Karp's concerns about substituting volunteers for government are valid. The goal has become *government in society*, not *government and society*.

Moving to the general discussion, Etzioni asked what the implications of these issues and analyses were for practitioners versus theoreticians.

Aspects of Community Justice

Throughout the day, participants struggled with terminology and attempts to distinguish among different aspects of community justice:

Prevention

Crime Control

Dispensing Justice

“Union,” “Public,” “Syndics”—all representing small geographical areas

Embedded structure

Moral arena

Process of building economic capital

Community as co-investigator/ role of informed consent

How do we recognize community?

Is it coexistent with others?

Can you build one?

Is it interaction of function?

Are there varying degrees of “community?”

“Shared joy”

Dependent on political boundaries?

On a common task or initiating incident?

On attitudes—is cohesiveness a perception existing in the mind only?

On a “sense of community?”

On a charismatic individual?

What about “gated communities” embodying the principle of defensible space and linked to exclusion? Applies to wealthy and poor neighborhoods for similar purposes.

Major issues affecting discussion of the topic included:

Racial segregation

Concentration of poverty

Confusion over goals—i.e., is the objective to make communities feel good or crime reduction?

Lack of common definition for justice.

“Right Relationships?”

Lack of knowledge on how to make jobs accessible to unemployed

Great imbalance between reclamation and reinvestment efforts

Caring, Values and Dialogue

How do we incorporate caring? Government cannot legislate caring but can create parameters. One route offered to a more responsive and community-based justice system is through dialogue that crosses classes, neighborhoods and ages. Communities are isolated and the criminal justice system, though often adversarial, is the frequently the most cross-cutting agency in the city, said Joan Moore. Behavior is not controlled by law but by family and community values, said Ronald Earle who credited the University of

Texas with initiating the notion of moral dialogue in Austin. Moral dialogue brings citizens to a common understanding of goals, Earle said, citing numerous successful community building efforts.

Invariably, when citizens of different backgrounds are brought together around a specific issue, particularly public safety, they discover shared beliefs and come to common recommendations. Their conclusions consistently match on causes of crime: dysfunctional families, domestic violence and child abuse, substance abuse, deteriorating neighborhoods, ethics abuses by “higher-ups.” Problem solving, several participants agreed, is best carried out by those experiencing the problem. Reinvestment in poor communities occurs when the wealthy are brought into disenfranchised communities and come to understand they have a stake in the overall prosperity of the city. “Success is bottom-up,” said Earle. Todd Clear noted similar findings in Florida citizen attitudes about keeping prisoners close to home.

David Chavis pointed out that communities exist to meet needs and engaging in dialogue itself met a common need. Sense of community is borne from feelings of membership/belonging, shared values and emotional connections, and the ability to influence and be influenced by others.

Kay Pranis spoke of the importance of shared values built on consensus. People hunger for a vision of what they could do to improve conditions and respond positively when they can build on human connections. Successful community justice processes are

built on direct participation in cases with victims and offenders. In “sentencing circles” used in Minnesota and Canada, people gather to deal with a specific case but ultimately they address a much broader social issue.

Felton Earles said the Chicago project illustrated the importance of providing opportunity for citizens of all ages to express their vision. Effort must be increased to bring children and adolescents into dialogues. Most of what we know is based on studies limited to over-18-year-olds. What we could learn from dialogue is barely touched.

Research Issues Related to Dialogue

Professionalism has alienated policy-makers from solutions, participants observed, agreeing that citizens should be asked about their perceptions of justice and fairness—order vs. autonomy. What do citizens want from community justice professionals? What do citizens believe are the requirements for a safe community? Would emphasis on safety mean less justice? How much variety do we allow? Who is *we*?

There was disagreement on the difficulty of engaging citizens in dialogue that could give direction to policy. David Chavis said the process *can* be easy and pointed out that people tend to accept control by those environments over which they have the most control. Kent Portney noted that dialogue polling is misused more often than not.

Amitai Etzioni said the purpose of moral dialogue must be considered; it makes a difference if it is used as a basis for policy (which can be good or bad).

The refusal of some community members to engage in dialogue poses another research challenge. Is the media an alternative arena for shaping policy? It has certainly had negative effects in glorifying crime and violence.

John Hagan emphasized when we discuss dialogue, we have to learn more about who is imprisoned and what the effects of imprisonment are. Why, asked Todd Clear, do we expect neighborhoods to be healthy when we remove large numbers of their citizens, damage them, and return them to the same environment?

We lack information that might be gleaned from studies on community justice perceptions of Asian-born minorities in the US such as Koreans, Chinese, Vietnamese, Cambodians, etc., despite the fact there are large immigrant populations.

Additional Issues

Jeremy Travis asked the group to consider the following questions:

What do we know about applying the concepts of community justice to disadvantaged and crime-producing neighborhoods?

What are the limits of applying the community justice concept?

How do we achieve reformation without economic development? Do we make jobs accessible by moving families or whole neighborhoods closer to employment. Ensuring

transportation is available between residences and job sites? Creating more employment opportunities in job-starved areas?

What are the ingredients of a resilient community?

Issues voiced by other participants included:

How can advantaged citizens be motivated to become part of the larger community in which they reside?

What can the criminal justice system do to relinquish control? The reason we are here, said Ronald Earle, is to figure out how to turn functions of behavior control back to the community. Lisbeth Schorr, a seminar guest with long experience as a child health and welfare researcher, noted that the child protection and school systems had also concluded that their effectiveness depended on sharing control with communities.

What about the educational system as a transforming agent of the community? The focus should be on children. It was noted that no representative of the school system was present at the seminar.

At what point do we raise questions of fundamental values in the justice system? At what point are we seeking the public good? What are the healthy and unhealthy dynamics of government? What kind of government support would sustain national initiatives such as the President and First Lady's reading-to-kids campaign?

How is accountability managed? In a community justice approach, is failure acceptable?

Asked by Amitai Etzioni to identify what questions the group should ask, Kay Pranis suggested research that would define critical features that maximize positive contributions of community members. The use of ritual appears to be an important factor—breaking bread together, an inclusive prayer expressing support for each participant, passing of a ritual object around a circle, etc. How can we learn from the restorative justice model? What are the common denominators of groups that interact at a highly successful level? Earle had previously cited the great cohesiveness of and level of caring seen in victims' groups.

Accepting community leadership might mean that traditional notions of professional standards and degrees would be revised. This is a two-way street. How much are we willing to work with an empowered, engaged citizenry?

Synthesis by Mark Moore

Given the task of analyzing the day's discussion, Moore made a 40-minute presentation from the perspective of a mayor of a mid-size city. This summary touches only a few points of the presentation which Moore may formalize in an article later.

The issues of community, crime reduction and justice are each means to an end. Which are ends and which are means depends on dialogue in this forum and elsewhere.

The ecology of communities show wide differences in competence, mostly related to choices made outside the community. Diverse groups within communities should be

brought together in moral dialogue. The common view of society as consisting of government and the good people ignores the natural ethics infrastructure existing within communities. (As mayor, I should reconsider the practice of removing males from the community. My job is to remind citizens they must move beyond tolerance to caring and connection.)

In defining communities, is triage the optimum approach? In the tension between reclamation and reinvestment, the level of reinvestment depends on success at the macro-level. If we can only do reclamation, why not move ahead with it as a first step.

Are we asking citizens or policy-makers to change their behavior? Why do we think community groups would be effective enforcers of behavior? Is it because love is the answer (referring to a comment by Earle that “to create a normal person, it is necessary to have another person who is irrationally crazy about that person”). If so, government can’t change behavior. We are now punishing community members at a higher rate that we can replenish with love.

We cannot depend on shared objectives for partnerships but it is possible to achieve a common goal with differing interests. My favorite example is the nursery rhyme: “Jack Spratt could eat no fat / his wife could no lean / and so between the two of them / they licked the platter clean.”

What is prevention vs. reaction? What looks like reaction may offer opportunity for prevention.

Research Needs

Although one participant (Felton Earles) suggested we may be at a “pre-scientific” stage in addressing community justice, others counseled to focus on what is known to sustain existing resources. Ronald Clarke suggested the reason we may “know so little may be because the topic hasn’t been important to us.” Participants were reminded that the core issue is poverty. Four final questions were put forward for NIJ’s consideration:

Is there a form of research—i.e., action research—that incorporates ethical concepts?

Working through normative theories, should we reach out to ethicists, philosophers and/or lawyers?

How can existing groups be used to mobilize communities?

To what extent is community justice an addition to existing conditions/practices or a fundamentally new approach?

Concluding the meeting, Jeremy Travis thanked participants. He said that although NIJ does not have a plan of action to implement recommendations, the seminar would inform agency deliberations on future efforts. The seminar was brought to a close by Amitai Etzioni.

Conclusion

Although the discussion what intensive and raised a number of pertinent issues, our conclusion suggests that three issues gained the most attention and may guide future work in this area. First, the relationship between economic factors, quality of community life, and crime and disorder need to be examined in detail. In particular, what is the effect of economic disadvantage and racial segregation on community and crime? Second, the relationship between the formal criminal justice system and communities needs clarification. This includes such issues as the transfer of power from formal to informal systems, the potential of the system to support and assist communities, and the working collaboration between criminal justice agencies and community organizations. Third, the meaning and definition of community need to be explored to better understand its role in criminal justice.

IV. Participant List

David Chavis
Association for the Study and Development of Community
12522 Hialeah Way
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
tele: 301-926-1889
fax: 301-519-0724
FPRG77A@prodigy.com

Ronald Clarke
Department of Criminal Justice
Rutgers University-Newark Campus
15 Washington Street
Newark, NJ 07102
tele: 201-648-5870
fax: 201-648-5896
rclarke@andromeda.rutgers.edu

Todd R. Clear
Associate Dean
School of Criminology & Criminal Justice
R-85
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306
tele: 904-644-0016/7656
email: tclear@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Ronald Earle
District Attorney
Travis County District Attorney's Office
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, TX 78767
(512) 473-9400
(512) 473-9695 (Fax)

Felton Earles
Harvard School of the Public Health
SPH3-310
677 Huntington Ave.
Boston, MA 02115
tele: 617-432-1227 (or -3892 for secretary)
fax: 617-432-3448

John Hagan
University of Toronto
Faculty of Law
Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
CANADA
tele; 416-978-6795
fax: 416-978-2648
email: hagan@chass.utoronto.ca

Sally Hillsman
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531

Joan Moore
Department of Sociology
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Milwaukee, WI 53201
(414)-962-3395
(414)-229-3860 fax
lajoan@csd.uwm.edu

Mark Moore
Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
Room 306-KSG
Cambridge, MA 02138
tele: 617-495-1113
fax: 617-496-6372

Kent Portney

Department of Political Science
Tufts University
Medford, MA 02155
tele: 617-627-3465
fax: 617-627-3660
email: kportney@pearl.tufts.edu
http://www.tufts.edu/as/polsci/PoliSci/fac_staf/pfportne.html

Kay Pranis
Minnesota Department of Corrections
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 200
St. Paul, MN 55108-5219
tele: 612-642-0329
fax: 612-642-0417
email: kpranis@smtp-co.doc.state.mn.us

Orlando Rodriguez
Department of Sociology
Fordham University
Hispanic Resource Center Rose Hill Campus
Faber Hall
Bronx, NY 10458
tele: 718-817-4091
fax: 718-365-1591
email: rodrigu1@murray.fordham.edu

Robert Sampson
Department of Sociology
University of Chicago
1126 E. 59th Street
Chicago, IL 60637
tele: 773-256-6357
fax: 773-702-4849
rjsam@cicero.spc.uchicago.edu

Philip Selznick
University of California, Law School
2240 Piedmont Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94720
tele: 510-653-5031 (H)
fax: 510-642-2951
selznick@uclink2.berkeley.edu

Ralph Taylor
Department of Criminal Justice
Temple University
Gladfelter Hall
Philadelphia, PA 19122
tele: 215-204-7169
fax: 610-446-0023

Jeremy Travis
National Institute of Justice
633 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20531

Tom Tyler
Department of Psychology
University of California-Berkeley
Berkeley, CA 94720
tele: 510-642-5292
fax: 510-642-5293
tomtyler@violet.berkeley.edu

Observer List

Twila Hughley Earle
Travis County District Attorney's Office
P.O. Box 1748
Austin, TX 78767
(512) 473-9400
(512) 473-9695 (Fax)

Susan Herman
Director of Community Services
Enterprise Foundation
10227 Wincopin Circle, Suite 500
Columbia MD 21044
(410)-964-1230
(410)-964-1918fax

Benita Melton
Charles Stuart Mott Foundation
1200 Mott Foundation Building
Flint MI 48502
(810)-238-5651
(810)-238-8152fax

Jim O'Sullivan
Center for Crime, Communities, and Culture
Open Society Institute
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10106
(212)-887-0152

Lisbeth Schorr
Lecturer in Social Medicine
Direction, Project on Effective Science
Harvard University
3113 Woodley Road, NW
Washington, DC 20008
202-319-7085 or 462-3071

Observers from NIJ:
Winnifred Reed
Jeffrey Ross
Richard Titus
John Thomas
Christy Visher

V. Participant Biographies

David Chavis

David Chavis is President of the Association for the Study and Development of Community. He is internationally recognized for his work in the implementation, support, and evaluation of community initiatives, including a distinguished career award from the American Psychological Association. His work focuses primarily on the relationship between community development and the prevention of poverty, violence, substance abuse, illness, and other social problems; collaborative strategies; diffusion of knowledge and innovations; and participatory evaluation methods that improve the use of the evaluation process. The theory of a sense of community and measurement methods he has developed have been widely used. He has also conducted research on the benefits of a SOC for neighborhood and community development.

Dr. Chavis assists foundations, nonprofit organizations, and government agencies to design, implement, and use evaluations and community building strategies. He currently works with several organizations, including the Milton S. Eisenhower Foundation, Center for Community Change, Local Initiatives Support Corporation, National Funding Collaborative for Violence Prevention, and National Cancer Institute.

Previously, Dr. Chavis was Director of the Center for Community Development at COSMOS Corporations, where he provided leadership in designing and implementing evaluations of federal and foundation funded programs. These programs included from 12 to

123 school and community initiatives to prevent violence, crime substance abuse, and promote collaboration and community building. Dr. Chavis was also Associate Professor in the School of Social Work and Director of the Center for Social and Community Development at Rutgers University, a research organization devoted to the study of social and community development. He oversaw research, training, and evaluation programs designed to assist communities in implementing strategies that support community social and economic development.

Dr. Chavis also has experience in conducting evaluations, workshops, and technical assistance services in Italy, Russia, The Netherlands, and Ecuador. He has worked with a wide range of communities and cultures in the United States.

Ronald Clarke

Ronald Clarke is Professor and Dean at the School of Criminal Justice, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey. Trained as a psychologist, he holds a master's degree (1965) and a Ph.D. (1968) from the University of London. He was formerly Director of the British government's criminological research department (The Home Office Research and Planning Unit), where he had a significant role in the development of situational crime prevention. He also helped to establish the Home Office.

Todd R. Clear

Todd R. Clear is Professor and Associate Dean, School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Florida State University. He has a B.A. from Anderson College and a Ph.D. from the State University of New York at Albany. He is a specialist on penal policy, especially alternatives to prison. His recent works include *Harm in American Penology* and *Offenders in the Community*. He is interested in the concept of risk management, on which he has written extensively, and is currently writing on *Religion and Crime* and *Community Justice*.

Ronald D. Earle

Ronald D. Earle is a graduate of the University of Texas with B.A. and J.D. degrees. His career history includes service as an assistant to Governor John Connally, presiding judge of the Austin Municipal Court, chief counsel of the Texas Judicial Council, election to the Texas House of Representatives in 1973, and to his present office as Travis County District Attorney in 1976. He has gained recognition as an advocate of crime victim's rights, for prosecution of crimes involving state government, for innovation in the prosecution of child abuse, and for pioneering the concept of community justice. He has served on the boards of numerous organizations, including the Travis County Bar Association and the Texas District and County Attorneys Association. Mr. Earle was named Outstanding Young Lawyer in Austin in 1974 and was honored as Public Administrator of the Year for Austin in

1990. In 1991, Mr. Earle was presented the Lola Wright Foundation Award by the Texas Bar Foundation for his outstanding public service in advancing and enhancing legal ethics in Texas. In 1996, Mr. Earle was named Outstanding Prosecutor by the Texas Crime Victims Clearinghouse of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice.

Felton Earles

Felton Earles is professor of child psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, professor of human behavior and development at the Harvard School of Public Health, and a member of the adjunct faculty at the Rockefeller University. Over the past two decades, he has conducted pioneering research on the distribution and determinants of child and adolescent behavioral problems in several societies around the world. Dr. Earles is currently principal investigator of the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods. Funded by the John D. And Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation National Institute of Justice, and the National Institute of Mental Health, this large-scale study is providing a detailed understanding of how the multiple influences of social class, race/ethnicity, neighborhoods, schools, and families determine children's vulnerability to school underachievement, delinquency, substance use and violent behavior. To accomplish this, the project is sampling more than 7,000 children residing in 80 neighborhoods in Chicago, with the aim of studying their growth and development for a decade.

After attending both undergraduate and medical schools at Howard University in Washington, D.C., Dr. Earles completed postgraduate training in neurophysiology at the University of Wisconsin. He was an intern in pediatrics at Metropolitan Hospital in New York, and he trained in psychiatry and child psychiatry at Massachusetts General Hospital and Children's Hospital in Boston. He joined the faculty of Harvard Medical School in 1978.

Dr. Earles is the recipient of several awards, including the Distinguished Psychiatrist Award and the Blanche F. Ittleson Award from the American Psychiatric Association and the Dale Richmond Award from the Academy of Pediatrics. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a member of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences.

Amitai Etzioni

Dr. Amitai Etzioni is the first University Professor of The George Washington University. In 1987-1989, he served as the Thomas Henry Carroll Ford Foundation Professor at the Harvard Business School. He served as Senior Adviser in the White House from 1979-1980. He was guest scholar at the Brookings Institution in 1978-1979. For 20 years (1958-1978), he served as Professor of Sociology at Columbia University; part of the time, as Chairman of the department.

He founded and was the first president (89- 90) of the international Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics. He is the editor of *The Responsive Community: Rights and Responsibilities*, a communitarian quarterly.

He is the author of nineteen books, including *The Moral Dimension: Toward a New Economics*, *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda* (Crown Books, 1993), and most recently, *The New Golden Rule: Community and Morality in a Democratic Society* (New York: Basic Books, 1997.)

Outside of academia, Dr. Etzioni's voice is frequently heard in the leading news media, in articles in publications such as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and *The Wall Street Journal* and in appearances on network television.

A 1982 study ranked Dr. Etzioni as the leading expert of 30 who made major contributions to public policy on the preceding decade. He was awarded an honorary degree by The University of Utah in 1991.

In 1993, Dr. Etzioni was elected President of the American Sociological Association, and served through 1995.

John Hagan

John Hagan is presently Professor of Sociology at the University of Toronto. His work has concentrated on four topics: the study of criminal sentencing, the explanation of delinquency, the effects of delinquency and other adolescent problem behaviors in the life

course, and the stratification of the legal profession. An elaboration and empirical test of his power-control theory appears in his book, *Structural Criminology*, published by Rutgers University Press in 1988.

Hagan was awarded a Senior Killam Fellowship in the early 1990s that allowed him to continue his development of power-control theory and to begin panel studies of the effects of delinquent and other adolescent problem behaviors in the early adult life course. This work includes a twenty-year longitudinal study of about 600 suburban Torontonians first surveyed in 1976 when they were teenagers. This research extends Hagan's theoretical contributions by focusing on the way adolescent subcultural involvements in delinquency and related activities can influence later life occupational outcomes.

John Hagan has also undertaken important research on the legal profession, resulting in the publication by Oxford University Press in 1995 of his book (with Fiona Kay), *Gender in Practice: a Study of Lawyer's Lives*. He is currently the editor of the *Annual Review of Sociology*.

Sally T. Hillsman

Sally T. Hillsman is Deputy Director of the National Institute of Justice with responsibility for the Office of Research and Evaluation. As the search and development agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, NIJ awarded about 59 million dollars in research during 1996 to improve and strengthen the Nation's system of justice through a balanced

program of basic and applied research and technology. Dr. Hillsman develops and manages NIJ's external behavioral science research program, its Congressionally mandated evaluation program, and its intramural research program. Dr. Hillsman joined NIJ in February 1995 from the National Center for State Courts, where she was Vice President with responsibility for the Center's national-scope research and court technology programs. She was previously an Associate Director of the Vera Institute of Justice in New York City and its Director of Research. She conducted a wide range of research on justice system policy issues, including intermediate sanctions, pretrial diversion, case processing, prosecution and court delays, as well as policing and narcotics law enforcement. Dr. Hillsman holds a Ph.D. in Sociology from Columbia University.

David R. Karp

David R. Karp is Research Scientist at The George Washington University Center for Communitarian Policy Studies. His current research examines the role of communities in preventing crime and promoting justice from a communitarian perspective. Recent papers include *Judicial and Judicious Use of Shaming*, *Americans as Communitarians*, and *The Case for Individualism: From Durkheim to Des Moines*. In 1995, he received his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Washington.

Joan Moore

Joan Moore is Distinguished Professor Emerita of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Most of her research has followed two major paths. The first has led to a broad concern with Latinos as an American minority group. For example, she co-edited a collection of studies of Latino communities (*In the Barrios*, 1993) that examined the extent to which underclass theories apply to the Latino population. The second path represents a more focused concern with poor Latino communities and with special subgroups--particularly street gangs--within those communities. For example, she followed up on an earlier study of Chicano street gangs (*Homeboys*, 1979) with research that emphasized the ways in which male and female gangs responded to social and economic changes (*Going Down to the Barrio*, 1991). These community-oriented studies have led to a deepening concern with the increasing American dependence on imprisonment as the major instrument of social control. For a 1995 conference on the Unintended Consequences of Incarceration, conducted by the Vera Institute, she developed a chapter about the impact of incarceration on poor communities. In her ongoing research on street gangs continues to search for sources of renewal both within individual careers and in surrounding social structures.

Mark Harrison Moore

Mark Harrison Moore is the Guggenheim Professor of Criminal Justice Policy and Management at the Kennedy School of Government. He was the Founding Chairman of the

Kennedy School's Committee on Executive Programs, and served in that role for over a decade. He is also the Faculty Chairman of the School's Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management. His research interests are in public management and leadership; in criminal justice policy and management; and in the intersection of the two. In the area of public management, his most recent book is *Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government*. He has written (with others) *Public Duties: The Moral Obligations of Public Officials*; *Ethics in Government: The Moral Challenges of Public Leadership*; *Inspectors-General: Junkyard Dogs or Man's Best Friend*; *Accounting for Change: reconciling the Demands for Accountability and Innovation in the Public Sector*. In the area of criminal justice policy, he has written *Buy and Bust: The Effective Regulation of an Illicit Market in Heroin*; and *Dangerous Offenders: Elusive targets of Justice*. In the intersection of public management and criminal justice, he has written (with others) *From Children to Citizens: Vol. 1: The Mandate for Juvenile Justice and Beyond 911: A New Era for Policing*.

Kent E. Portney

Kent E. Portney is Professor of Political Science at Tufts University. He received an B.A. from Rutgers University, an M.A. from the University of Connecticut, and a Ph.D. from Florida State University. He is the author of *Approaching Public Policy Analysis* (Prentice-Hall, 1986), *Siting Hazardous Waste Treatment Facilities: The NIMBY Syndrome* (Auburn House, 1991), and *Controversial Issues in Environmental Policy* (Sage Publications, 1992). He is also the co-author of *The Rebirth of Urban Democracy* (Brookings Institution Press, 1993), winner of the American Political Science Association's 1994 Gladys Kammerer Award for the Best Book in American politics, and the American Political Science Association Organized Section on Urban Politics' 1994 Best Book in Urban Politics award. And he is the co-editor of *The Distributional Impacts of Public Policies* (St. Martin's, 1988). Portney has held grants from the Ford Foundation, the National Science Foundation, the Polaroid Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Education's Fund for Improvement in Post-Secondary Education (IPSE). Recent papers include "Mobilizing Minority Communities," "Race, Neighborhoods, and Strong Democracy," and "Centralizing Regulatory Control and Interest Group Access: The Quayle Council on Competitiveness." He is currently heading a project (with Jerry Goldman, Northwestern University) to develop a multimedia-based teaching and research simulation of the local criminal sentencing process called "Crime and Punishment."

Kay Pranis

Since 1994 Kay Pranis has held the position of Restorative Justice Planner with the Minnesota Department of Corrections. In that position she provides education to the criminal justice system and the public about restorative justice and assistance to jurisdictions interested in implementing the principles of restorative justice in their criminal justice process. She works with leaders in corrections, law enforcement, the judiciary, civic organizations, neighborhood groups, faith communities and education to develop a comprehensive response to crime based on restorative justice.

Ms. Pranis is a member of the Minneapolis area United Way Family Visions Council and the Steering Committee for the Campaign for Effective Crime Policy, a national criminal justice reform effort. She is a consultant and trainer for the National Institute of Justice, the National Institute of Corrections, and the Balanced and Restorative Justice Project at the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

From 1988 to 1994 Ms. Pranis worked for the Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice doing public policy research and advocacy. Her background in community activism includes nine years of service on a local school board and three years as chair of the board of the Southern Valley Alliance for Battered Women.

Orlando Rodriguez

Orlando Rodriguez serves as Director of the Hispanic Research Center and as Professor of Sociology at Fordham University. His fields of interest are mental health of minority and migrant populations; program evaluation research methods in disadvantaged minority and migrant communities; and crime, juvenile delinquency, and criminal justice processes affecting Hispanics and other minorities. Among numerous other publications, Professor Rodriguez has recently published *Clarifying Peer Relations and Delinquency* (with E. Pabon and G. Gurin) in *Youth and Society* (1992); *Causal Models of Substance Abuse Among Puerto Rican Adolescents: Implications for Prevention* in *Drug Use Prevention With Multiethnic Youth* (Sage 1995); and *The New Immigrant Hispanic Population: An Integrated Approach to Preventing Delinquency and Crime* in *Research Review* (NIJ, 1996).

Robert J. Sampson

Robert J. Sampson is Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago and Research Fellow, American Bar Foundation. His major research interests include criminology, the life course, and community/urban sociology. He is currently studying the sources and consequences of community-level social organization (e.g., collective monitoring, social cohesion, mutual trust, density of local networks, organizational participation) as part of the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods. He

is also engaged in a longitudinal study of crime and deviance over the life course of 1,000 disadvantaged men born in Boston during the Great Depression era. His recent book with John Laub on this project, *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life* (Harvard University Press, 1993), received the outstanding book award from the American Society of Criminology, the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, and the Crime, Law, and Deviance Section of the American Sociological Association.

Philip Selznick

Philip Selznick is Professor Emeritus of Law and Sociology in the School of Law and the Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley. He received his Ph.D. in sociology from Columbia University in 1947, and taught at the University of Minnesota and UCLA before joining the Berkeley faculty in 1952. His main interests have been sociological theory, organization theory, and sociology of law. In recent years he has given most attention to the relation between social and moral theory, and more specifically to communitarian theory. His books include *TVA and the Grass Roots*; *The Organizational Weapon*; *Leadership in Administration*; *Law, Society, and Industrial Justice*; *Law and Society in Transition* (with P. Nonet); and most recently *The Moral Commonwealth: Social Theory and the Promise of Community*. Professor Selznick was founding chair of the Center for the Study of Law and Society and of the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program in the School of Law at Berkeley.

Ralph B. Taylor

Ralph B. Taylor received his Ph.D. in social psychology at Johns Hopkins University in 1977. He has held positions at Virginia Tech (1977-1979), Johns Hopkins University (1978-1985) and is currently professor of Criminal Justice at Temple University where he has been since 1984. From 1989-1992 he served a tour of duty as Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, Research, and External Funding in the College of Arts and Sciences at Temple University. He is the editor of *Urban Neighborhoods* (Praeger, 1986), and the author of *Human Territorial Functioning* (Cambridge, 1988) and *Research Methods in Criminal Justice* (McGraw Hill, 1994). Much of his work of late has examined issues related to crime and fear of crime in Baltimore neighborhoods and street blocks. He recently completed work examining connections between crime, deterioration, structural changes, and residents reactions to crime, over several years, in some thirty Baltimore neighborhoods. He is particularly interested in understanding better the connections between changes in neighborhood fabric, external conditions, and life on the street in urban residential neighborhoods.

Jeremy Travis

Jeremy Travis was nominated by President Clinton to head the National Institute of Justice on March 31, 1994, and was confirmed by the Senate on September 23, 1994. Before

joining the National Institute of Justice, Mr. Travis was the Deputy Commissioner For Legal Matters of the New York City Police Department. In this position, he served as advisor to the Police Commissioner and as General counsel to the Department and oversaw the Legal Bureau, the License Division, and the Criminal Justice Bureau. While with the Department, Mr. Travis also developed the Civil Enforcement Initiative, which provided lawyers as counsel to police precincts; authored New York City's ban on assault weapons; introduced new technologies into the arrest process; drafted the Police Department's quality-of-life strategy, entitled Reclaiming New York's Public Spaces; and, as Chair of the Chancellor's Advisory Panel on School Safety, developed a proposal for a new approach to school violence. In a previous position, Mr. Travis served as Chief Counsel to the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice for the House of Representatives Committee of the Judiciary. Working with the subcommittee chairman, Representative Charles E. Schumer, Mr. Travis developed new agendas for oversight hearings and legislative initiatives on criminal justice issues. Prior to his service with the subcommittee, Mr. Travis was Special Advisor to Mayor Edward L. Koch of New York City. Among other tasks, he conducted a management and legal review of the City Human Rights Commission, coordinated the city's implementation of the federal immigration legalization program, formed the Commission to Establish the High School Institute for Law and Justice, established the Mayor's Advisory Council on Community Relations following the Howard Beach incident, and served as the coordinator of the Mayor's Office of Educational Services. Before becoming Special Advisor to the

Mayor, Mr. Travis was Special Counsel to the First Deputy Mayor and Assistant Director for Law Enforcement Services for the City of New York and earlier, was Special Counsel to the Police Commissioner for the New York City Police Department. In addition to his many consulting and research positions, Mr. Travis's extensive legal and criminal justice experience includes serving as Law Clerk to Judge Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Executive Director for the New York City Criminal Justice Agency, and Executive Director of the Victim/Witness Assistance Project for the Vera Institute of Justice.

Tom Tyler

Tom Tyler is a Professor of Psychology at the University of California, Berkeley. His research and writing concern the social values and attitudes that promote citizen acceptance of legal authority. He has been particularly concerned with citizen judgments about the justice or injustice of police and court practices and the role such judgments play in shaping law-related behavior. His work suggests that justice and morality are central to people's orientations toward law and legal authorities. He has written several books, including: *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice* (1988); *Why People Obey the Law* (1990); *Trust In Organizations* (Edited, 1996); and *Social Justice in a Diverse Society* (1997).