



# BJA Bureau of Justice Assistance Bulletin

## Comprehensive Communities Program: Program Account

### Introduction

Crime continues as a major concern in our nation's communities. Public safety and quality of life are of critical importance to citizens, elected representatives, and service providers. Although public and private agencies and businesses have an interest and investment in preserving public safety, neither public agencies nor private businesses can do this job alone.

Experience has taught us that problems can be solved better and more efficiently when tackled by communities as a whole rather than by individuals working alone. Partnerships work, and the Comprehensive Communities Program (CCP) is a collaborative approach that has proved its effectiveness in reducing crime and increasing public safety.

This bulletin addresses issues that individual stakeholders such as mayors, city managers, members of city or county councils, city or county department heads, law enforcement officials, community organizations, nonprofit agencies, local business owners, and neighborhood residents must face as they work together toward crime reduction and a better quality of life. The bulletin suggests that community partners can carry out a more strategic and focused

approach to solving crime problems. Basic information is provided about the CCP approach by highlighting jurisdictions that have used it successfully.

This account describes the principles and critical elements comprising CCP and shares the findings and experiences of jurisdictions that have participated in the program. It also presents findings from the national evaluation and local assessments of the program and describes the plans developed by jurisdictions to sustain their programs. By learning more about the CCP approach, communities can enhance their ability to build partnerships, implement effective strategies, and engage local residents as important and equal partners.

### Overview

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) initiated the nationwide crime prevention and crime control initiative CCP in 1994. Fifteen jurisdictions have participated in this public safety initiative. The problem-solving strategies developed by these sites serve as blueprints for reducing crime and improving the quality of life in our nation's communities.

CCP sites developed visions of safer communities, empowered residents,

included key stakeholders as partners in problem solving, and crafted interventions to make their neighborhoods and communities safer. Two essential components of CCP, community policing and community mobilization, are the linchpins for achieving meaningful and long-term success. CCP brings neighborhood residents and police together to solve crime-related problems. Additional crime control/prevention initiatives adopted by CCP sites include community prosecution, drug courts, crime prevention through environmental design, antigang initiatives, and community corrections.

CCP's straightforward approach

- Brings together the people who are most affected by crime.
- Enables them to define a meaningful role for themselves in solving the problem.
- Empowers them to tackle crime problems through a deliberate planning, implementation, and sustainment process.

A national evaluation found that CCP had accelerated public safety initiatives in its communities and had deepened and broadened their range of collaborations. CCP sites have reported violent crime rate reductions in target

areas compared with rates in non-CCP areas. They also reported significant increases in levels of activity in CCP-related programs such as community policing training, neighborhood leadership training, gang resistance training, drug courts, teen courts, alternatives to incarceration, truancy reduction partnerships, and police/resident partnerships.

## Program Approach

The CCP approach views reduced crime and enhanced public safety as vital parts of an overall effort to improve quality of life. The goals,<sup>1</sup> principles, and critical elements<sup>2</sup> comprising CCP are described below.

### Goals

CCP's goals are to

- ❑ Suppress violence and restore the community well-being needed to recapture neighborhoods for law-abiding residents.
- ❑ Initiate comprehensive planning and enhance intergovernmental and community relationships to focus on the problems and concerns of local residents.
- ❑ Develop a comprehensive, multi-agency strategy within the community to identify the causes and origins of violence and to control and prevent violent and drug-related crime.
- ❑ Use community policing and other efforts to encourage citizens to take an active role in problem solving.
- ❑ Coordinate federal, state, local, and private agency resources, and concentrate those resources on reducing violent and drug-related crime.

### Program Principles

Several key principles form the foundation for CCP. They include partnership and collaboration, shared problem solving, and changing how public safety works.

### Partnership and collaboration.

Crime prevention, intervention, and enforcement must be reinvented to support a collaborative approach that involves key stakeholders continuously in the planning and delivery of public safety services. This collaborative approach includes federal, state, and local government representation. It is jurisdictionwide in membership, invites the participation of residents from affected neighborhoods, and gives each member an equal voice in the collaborative's deliberations.

**Shared problem solving.** CCP's crime control and prevention strategy is built at the local level from the start. There is a community/neighborhood focus on defining problems and developing and applying solutions. Innovative ideas and approaches are encouraged in formulating the crime prevention, intervention, and enforcement strategy, with a minimum imposition of constraints on that strategy.

**Changing how public safety works.** A common vision of the community's future is developed by the partners engaged in the collaborative approach to public safety. This shared vision is reflected in the community's mission statement and goals for its strategy. The objectives are feasible, trackable, and measurable. Resources are provided and shared among the collaborative's members to carry out and sustain the public safety strategy.

### Critical Elements

In addition to the program principles, the CCP approach is characterized by a set of critical elements. Each element is fundamental to the overall CCP philosophy and involves strategic planning, program management and operation, evaluation, and sustainment.

**Strategic planning.** The CCP approach should start with a strategic planning process that brings key stakeholders together to achieve a mutual understanding and definition

of their community's public safety problems. The process should be based on an analysis of data and include the formation of a shared vision of the jurisdiction's future and the development of a mission statement, goals, and performance measures that support the vision. The strategic planning effort should include representatives from the neighborhoods affected by the public safety problem. This group should continue in a program oversight capacity during both program planning and implementation to assess progress and to update or modify plans.

The implemented program strategy should be based on data-driven problem identification, comprehensively address the multiple causes of crime, and support experimentation with new ideas and innovative approaches to the solution of persistent problems.

### Management and operation.

A well-defined management structure, with clearly delineated roles and responsibilities, is needed to coordinate the strategic planning efforts and to see that the various tasks involved in operating the public safety initiative are implemented.

**Evaluation.** Process and outcome evaluations should be built into the design of the public safety strategy. Evaluation findings should be used to improve or modify program operation.

**Sustainment.** To be successful, the public safety strategy must be viewed as a long-term effort. Therefore, plans for sustaining the strategy should be built from the start. These plans must include a method to find or develop local funds to replace funds derived from external sources, as well as ways to obtain nonfinancial resources.

## CCP in Practice

Fifteen sites participated in CCP:<sup>3</sup> Metro-Atlanta, Georgia; Baltimore, Maryland; Boston, Massachusetts; Columbia, South Carolina; Metro-Denver, Colorado; Metro-District of Columbia; East Bay Corridor Area,

California; Fort Worth, Texas; Hartford, Connecticut; Metro-Omaha, Nebraska; Phoenix, Arizona; Salt Lake City, Utah; Seattle, Washington; Wichita, Kansas; and Wilmington, Delaware.

All the major regions of the contiguous United States are represented by these sites, which range in size from large cities such as Atlanta to smaller cities such as Wilmington. Five sites are multijurisdictional regions: Metro-Atlanta, Metro-Denver, Metro-District of Columbia, East Bay Corridor Area, and Metro-Omaha. Various site characteristics and approaches have been accommodated within CCP. For example:

- ❑ CCP includes multijurisdictional, multineighborhood, and single-neighborhood target sites.
- ❑ The legal entity leading CCP differs among the sites and includes police departments, the office of the mayor or city manager, state or local criminal justice coordinating councils or agencies, a city planning office, a city grants office, and a university.
- ❑ In four sites, CCP is part of a larger federal initiative, PACT (Pulling American Cities Together).
- ❑ The sites differ in the primary focus of their CCP approach, which ranges from strategies that deal with at-risk youth to drug abatement programs to initiatives aimed at enhancing the broader quality of life in targeted neighborhoods.
- ❑ Each site has identified a promising practice that is believed to be worth replicating elsewhere. With the exception of two sites that chose drug courts as their promising practice, each site chose a different promising practice, again suggestive of the different ways in which the sites have implemented the CCP approach.
- ❑ Each site has sustained its approach to crime prevention and control in ways that reflect its individual needs, resources, infrastructure, and leadership.

## CCP Principles and the Sites

All CCP sites function within the underlying principles outlined above. Although the sites differ in geography, population, local culture, politics, economics, and resources, they all maximize the flexibility of the CCP approach by adhering to the principles in ways tailored to their individual needs. The examples in this section illustrate some of the ways CCP sites have realized the program's principles.

### Partnership and Collaboration

The success of the CCP approach stems from the unique nature of the partnerships developed within each site. Stakeholders are neighborhood residents, local political leaders, government agency representatives, the business community, educators, social service providers, the faith community, and other groups. Broad-based partnerships are critical to building consensus and achieving long-lasting results.

**Strengthen commitment.** Individuals actively involved in project planning and implementation become committed to the success of a project. Ownership of an initiative is felt by the different members as they work together toward developing solutions to problems.

**Provide better solutions.** Different stakeholders bring different perspectives to the process. Successful public safety strategies address the needs, interests, and concerns of all stakeholders, not just a select group.

**Ensure accountability.** A strong degree of accountability for carrying out promises is realized when stakeholders conduct work and make commitments—much more so than when nonparticipants simply sign off on a proposal they did not help develop.

In the planning phase, the stakeholders should work as a team to define a problem and agree on a course of

action. The team must bring various perspectives together if the initiative is to succeed. Team composition is critical and must include the stakeholders whose action, or inaction, could have a significant impact on the initiative or who would themselves be significantly affected by the effort. These individuals must be able to make decisions and commit resources for their organizations or agencies. No important stakeholder can be ignored. All key stakeholders must endorse the task and accept the level of participation required to plan, implement, and sustain the jurisdiction's public safety strategy.

The team must devote the time and energy needed to make the endeavor successful from its inception through program implementation and sustainment. To ensure continued commitment, the team must make effective use of the members' time, mandating the need for strong leadership. A strong leader must be able to foster team building and help overcome agency rivalry, member conflicts, and distrust.

**Salt Lake City** created Community Action Teams (CATs), groups of service professionals representing government agencies that address crime and disorder problems. CATs are organized according to the city's seven council districts. Each CAT brings together a wide range of resources and expertise to focus on problems in the district.

CATs serve as the conduit for communication between neighborhood residents and government agencies. They have successfully addressed issues ranging from quality-of-life concerns, such as parking and code enforcement, to serious public safety problems, such as drive-by shootings. The diversity and dedication of CAT members have made them a powerful problem-solving tool.

**Shared problem solving.** What stakeholders have in common or what they can agree on must be identified.

**Table 1: CCP Site Characteristics**

Jurisdiction	Geographic Target Size	Coordinating Office or Agency	Focus of CCP Approach	Promising Practice
<b>Metro-Atlanta</b>	Multicounty, PACT	Pulling America's Cities Together (PACT)	Crime/violence reduction	Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design
<b>Baltimore</b>	Eight neighborhoods	Mayor's Coordinating Council on Criminal Justice	Antidrug activity	Maryland HotSpots Initiative
<b>Boston</b>	Citywide	Police department	Youth	Strategic planning, Youth Service Providers Network
<b>Columbia</b>	Three neighborhoods	Mayor's office	At-risk youth, drug addiction	Community mobilizers
<b>Metro-Denver</b>	Six counties, PACT	State Administrative Agency	Community mobilization/ quality of life	Line officer grant program
<b>Metro-District of Columbia</b>	District PACT	Grants office	At-risk youth, drug addiction	Urban services program
<b>East Bay Corridor Area</b>	Multicity, multicounty	East Bay Corridor Partnership	Reduction in homicides/ quality of life	Domestic violence policy
<b>Fort Worth</b>	Citywide	Police department	Crime reduction/ community mobilization	Adult drug court
<b>Hartford</b>	Citywide	City manager	Neighborhood quality of life	Problem-solving committees
<b>Metro-Omaha</b>	Two counties, PACT	University of Nebraska	Juveniles	School safety
<b>Phoenix</b>	One neighborhood	Police department	Quality of life/ crime reduction	Community policing expansion
<b>Salt Lake City</b>	Citywide	Mayor's office	Youth offenders/gangs/ quality of life	Community action teams
<b>Seattle</b>	Citywide	Police department	Problem-solving training	Problem-solving training
<b>Wichita</b>	Citywide	City manager	Crime reduction	Community education, community mobilization
<b>Wilmington</b>	Citywide	City planning	At-risk youth	Juvenile drug court

One way to do this is to assess a jurisdiction to determine and prioritize its problems so that remedies can be developed. This requires a process that rewards new ideas, is focused on neighborhoods, consists of an agreed-upon vision of the future, and uses combined resources and leadership skills.

The decision process is critical. Decisions should be made by consensus instead of by majority vote

because an initiative's success depends on the cooperation and support of all stakeholders. Generally, stakeholders will follow through on decisions they agree with but not necessarily on those voted for over their objections. The decisionmaking process should be formalized. Rules and policies should be set up before a conflict brings attention to the need for such policies.

**Hartford** established problem-solving committees (PSCs) in each of the city's 17 neighborhoods to provide an opportunity for every resident to participate in the development of neighborhood priorities. Each PSC is composed of the leaders of participating neighborhood groups including congregations, clubs, and tenant, merchant, and block associations.

Hartford drew up a list of neighborhood groups and identified and interviewed their leaders to establish PSCs. The leaders were then trained in problem-solving strategies and the development of neighborhood-focused crime control and prevention plans. The Community Planning and Mobilization Committee, a citywide mechanism comprising representatives of each PSC, enables leaders to share information and work on issues of mutual concern.

PSCs link neighborhood leaders with government officials to solve problems pertaining to public safety and the quality of life. The Hartford Community Court was developed in response to the PSCs' concerns about the impact of nuisance crimes on the quality of life in neighborhoods and the ineffectiveness of existing court procedures to deal with such crimes.

**Changing how public safety works.** Changing how a jurisdiction does its daily business is an important outcome of the CCP approach. Frequently, individuals and organizations resent and resist change. Promoting change and sustaining an initiative require enthusiasm, leadership, persistence, and commitment. CCP sites have shown that it is possible to change how things are done in various ways.

Using CCP funding, **Seattle** created a cadre of police department trainers with expertise in the SARA model of problem solving.<sup>4</sup> These officers, in turn, have provided basic problem-solving training both within the department and to other city employees and residents. Individuals going through the train-the-trainer curriculum receive an initial 3-day course that includes basic problem solving, coaching skills, and a cultural competency session that stresses race, gender, and sexual orientation issues. This is followed by a continuous series of in-service sessions stressing communication and teaching skills.

Before CCP, each police precinct in **Phoenix** had seven officers and a sergeant assigned to a neighborhood unit. CCP funds enabled Phoenix to post a lieutenant with considerable autonomy to tackle local problems in some of the neighborhood units. The lieutenants work with residents to formulate goals and solve problems, oversee the neighborhood police and community action officers in the precinct, and build community relations. Working closely with other city agencies to solve problems is an important part of their job, and the lieutenants meet monthly to share problems and ideas. These meetings have become a vehicle for developing concepts and disseminating knowledge about what works throughout the department. Through these meetings and because of the lieutenants' enthusiasm, what began as a pilot project in 1995 is now a citywide initiative sustained through the city budget.

## Critical Elements and the Sites

### Strategic Planning

Strategic planning for CCP has been a comprehensive, time-intensive process. Before engaging in such an effort, a need to bring a diverse group of people together for an extended period to deal with crime must be established, and the jurisdiction's chief political executive must support the following:

- ❑ An inclusive and comprehensive strategic planning process.
- ❑ Community input for problem solving.
- ❑ A long-term effort (at least 5 years) to plan, implement, and sustain the program.
- ❑ An evaluation of the program and processes and a plan for taking corrective action.
- ❑ An innovative approach to crime prevention, intervention, and control.

Strategic planning is a process of deciding what to do and how to do it before action is taken. It is concerned with both avoiding incorrect actions and increasing the likelihood that opportunities will be maximized. Because the environment in which planning occurs is always changing, the strategies developed are always subject to revision.

Strategic planning is a process that has no natural conclusion. It is a fluid and flexible process that requires long-term commitment. Although it requires time and patience, the benefits of good planning make the investment worthwhile. It helps provide stakeholders with a clear sense of purpose, a sense of comradery, and a clearer understanding of shared values that bind the partners.

All CCP sites engaged in a data-driven strategic planning process to develop crime prevention, intervention, and enforcement strategies for their jurisdictions. Through this process, they developed

- ❑ A vision of where they wanted their jurisdiction to be at a future point with regard to decreasing crime and improving the quality of life.
- ❑ A mission statement for their crime prevention and control strategies.
- ❑ Realistic, specific, and measurable goals and objectives for their mission.
- ❑ Performance measures as indicators of success and progress.
- ❑ Action steps for implementing and carrying out their crime prevention and control strategy.

In 1994, **Boston** initiated a decentralized strategic planning effort with 16 planning teams involving more than 400 participants. The participants represented a broad cross section of citizens and 10 Boston Police Department (BPD) districts, 5 BPD functions, and 1 citywide effort. The purpose of the planning effort was to

create a strategic plan for a neighborhood policing strategy that would reduce crime and fear by identifying and addressing community priorities, involve line police and citizens in creating the plan, promote an understanding that the community is its own best asset in its defense and improvement, and demonstrate that the police and the community acting together can make a difference in the reduction of crime and fear.

The two-phase planning effort first concentrated on neighborhood problems that needed to be addressed to improve the quality of life and then on developing strategies, tactics, and resources to manage those problems. The police and communities jointly created each neighborhood's plan under the citywide planning process. They aired serious issues, had important conversations, agreed, disagreed, struggled, and risked trusting each other. Once in motion, the project was driven from the beat level of BPD.

**Strategic Planning:  
Lessons Learned**

CCP sites took up to 3 years to plan, implement, and sustain their public safety strategies. Several of the sites found this to be too short. Five years is preferable, with 1 year to plan, 3 years to implement, and 1 year to sustain the initiative.

The CCP approach requires bringing together a diverse group of individuals who have different levels of authority and responsibility. CCP sites found that getting the acceptance of all stakeholders as equals was a major challenge, as was dealing with competition among the stakeholders for limited funds. Other challenges included getting stakeholders to agree on the nature and causes of the problems, how to address the problems, and the importance of maintaining a long-term perspective in addressing them.

Bringing together agencies and individuals to work collaboratively on a common problem has many benefits. Such

collaborations enhance the delivery of services and create new problem-solving capacities.

One of CCP's most noteworthy characteristics is its bottom-up approach, rather than one in which program characteristics are dictated from above. Despite welcoming this approach, many CCP sites found it difficult to deal effectively with their common mandate of including neighborhood residents, community organizations, government agencies, and private entities as equal partners in the formulation of policy, plans, and action steps.

Providing opportunities for all stakeholders to actively participate in the planning process is critical to success. During the strategic planning sessions in **Boston**, for example, criticism sessions were held with team members and team leaders that proved to be particularly helpful for troubleshooting problems.

**Program Management  
and Operation**

A well-defined management structure that provides oversight and coordination is critical to the success of any public safety initiative. Management must have strong skills in areas such as financial planning, budgeting, and program development. CCP sites found several characteristics to be critical components of a successful management strategy and of effective program managers:

- ❑ Well-defined management responsibilities and clear lines of authority.
- ❑ Trustworthiness, reliability, perseverance, patience, and commitment.
- ❑ Honesty about what can and cannot be accomplished.
- ❑ An ability to view both successes and failures as learning experiences.
- ❑ Strong leadership and organizational skills.
- ❑ Immediate access to key leaders.

- ❑ Knowledge about the jurisdiction's history.
- ❑ Political neutrality.

**Managerial Tasks**

**Administrating and coordinating.** Management must oversee the development of a clear vision and mission for the public safety initiative. The vision, mission, goals, and objectives must be reiterated as often as needed to help establish program parameters and direct the stakeholders to their common ground.

**Managing expectations.** Management must focus on both challenges and solutions, not just one or the other. Management must create expectations that are in the purview of the vision and reasonable in terms of program resources and capabilities.

**Recruiting.** Management must recruit new stakeholders and maintain their active participation throughout the community. The manager must assist in delineating and clarifying the roles and responsibilities of all the partners and in identifying and developing leaders within the group of stakeholders. The manager should provide positive reinforcement and tangible benefits (e.g., incentive grants, leadership positions/roles) to maintain stakeholders' continued interest.

**Communications.** Management should provide opportunities for constant communication among partners at all levels. Regular meetings should be held to promote increased cooperation and sharing among the stakeholders.

**Marketing.** Management must constantly market its comprehensive crime prevention and control strategy to expand the program and recruit new partners. Even small successes should be communicated to advertise the program and provide positive feedback to active participants. Management must learn from obstacles and challenges and apply that knowledge to future endeavors, as opposed to using obstacles to inhibit future activity.

**Securing financial support.** Management must generate integrated funding streams to reduce dependency on any one supporter. Opportunities for financial investment from stakeholders, including neighborhood groups, should be developed as a way to demonstrate commitment.

**Developing contracts.** Management should establish concrete, written documents such as contracts or memoranda of understanding among the stakeholders participating in the initiative. These documents formalize partnerships and clarify roles, expectations, products, and outcomes.

The organizational placement of the manager may differ, as is the case with the CCP sites, but the manager must have access to policymakers and stakeholders and the authority to take action.

The **East Bay Public Safety Corridor Partnership** adopted a committee structure to manage its CCP initiative. The Corridor Council, its coordinating body, is designed to oversee and facilitate the work of the partnership. The council sets policy, approves the annual budget, authorizes grant applications, and hires the partnership's executive director. The council comprises mayors, city managers, legislators, school superintendents, members of community-based organizations, and business, labor, and religious leaders. Several standing committees—including those dealing with education, law enforcement, juvenile justice, economic development, community outreach, personnel, and youth—are responsible for strategic planning and grant management. The executive director manages the committees and provides oversight.

The management structure in **Baltimore** consists of a coordinator and neighborhood-based community organizers. Community organizers work with neighborhood groups, residents, community policing officers, and

representatives of city agencies. The organizers are trained and supported from the centrally based coordinator, located in the Mayor's Coordinating Council on Criminal Justice. Despite three changes in the coordinator position, the CCP structure remains intact.

### Lessons Learned

Community mobilization efforts have the best chance for success in sites where there is strong community leadership, the importance of citizen input is understood, the mechanisms for soliciting ongoing input are institutionalized, the achievements of successful community groups are celebrated, and attention is paid to continued effective communication.

Inclusion of community groups is not trouble free. For example, some grassroots organizations may be accused of selling out their constituencies, especially groups that work with gangs or in circumstances where the relationship between police and gangs has been contentious. Such groups may have a problem maintaining credibility with their constituencies when they become involved with police, prosecutors, and other government agencies.

Inclusion may be troublesome for traditional government agencies. When police become involved in neighborhood problem solving, for example, they may find themselves squeezed between emerging neighborhood priorities and longstanding law enforcement priorities.

CCP sites encountered challenges in bringing about change, including overcoming the fear of change, dealing with cynicism, and maintaining momentum as changes were implemented. Several sites had leadership changes, primarily midmanagement, during the course of the program and found it challenging to maintain program momentum during and after these changes.

## Program Evaluation and Sustainment

### Evaluation

Evaluation must be integrated into the strategic planning process from its inception to help determine whether the effort is on track to meet stakeholders' expectations. Furthermore, evaluation helps identify lessons learned and program characteristics that can be defined and shared with others facing similar challenges.

Evaluation addresses questions such as: Is the program accomplishing what it intends? Is it cost effective? Should it be continued into a future funding cycle? Could certain changes increase the possibility of success?

Most CCP sites conducted local evaluations of their public safety collaborative or specific projects.

**Phoenix** partnered with the Morrison Institute for Public Policy at the University of Arizona to train members of the Greater Coronado Neighborhood Association in how to conduct an evaluation. Association members surveyed more than 300 neighborhood residents regarding their perceptions of public safety and fear of crime. The institute assisted the residents in this effort and determined that more than one-third of the respondents felt crime had decreased and they were safer.

In **Fort Worth**, an evaluation of the Tarrant County Drug Impact and Rehabilitation Enhanced Comprehensive Treatment Project was conducted in conjunction with the University of North Texas to determine the project's effectiveness in reducing recidivism among participants. The drug court project analysis concentrated on the effects of the 3-year-old program.

On the national level, the BOTEC Analysis Corporation conducted a program evaluation of CCP with funds provided by the National Institute of

Justice.<sup>5</sup> Six CCP sites were studied in-depth, and findings from that evaluation are described below in Program Outcomes and Results.

### Sustainment

The CCP approach to reducing crime and improving the quality of life is a long-term undertaking. It involves significant change in how local government, community organizations, and residents relate to each other and function as a group. When successful, use of the CCP approach results in a major shift in how business is done. In this context, sustainment is defined by the 1997 *CCP Sustainment Action Plan Review Report* as “the continuation of the jurisdiction’s collaborative crime prevention and control strategy, regardless of the name ‘CCP’.”<sup>6</sup>

Sustainment requires a long-term commitment of financial resources, in-kind (nonfinancial) resources, staff, and time and a strong commitment to the process itself. Obtaining the participation and support of new stakeholders, in addition to maintaining the support of those already involved, is an essential step. Sustainment cannot be an afterthought. Planning for sustainment should be part of the process from the start to preserve the total strategy.

**Wichita** ensured sustainment by including CCP in its citywide strategic plan, the Neighborhood Initiative, Neighborhood Strategy. This plan was formulated in 1993 and continues to involve stakeholders throughout the city as more programs are added. Sustainment of Wichita’s comprehensive collaborative approach to crime control is focused on more than just CCP because it involves several initiatives that move the stakeholders closer to their vision for the city. The plan commitment by the stakeholders is evident in that the plan has survived major changes in the local political landscape.

**Columbia** constructed a sustainment action plan that reassessed its planning strategy for long-term change. These subsequent revisions and assessments led to the realization that additional stakeholders would be critical to the plan’s success. The plan provided opportunities for stakeholders to measure how much progress they had made, affording them instances to highlight and applaud their progress and paving the way for positive future outcomes. In short, it reaffirmed their commitment to pursue changes in how public safety works and provided the excitement and enthusiasm needed to push their strategy further.

**Metro-Denver’s** CCP has been sustained and is an integral part of a larger statewide comprehensive crime prevention strategy. The principal partners in Metro-Denver’s original effort were committed to the CCP approach and continued their collaboration even after CCP funding expired. In 1998, the original participants reflected on their efforts and decided to extend the geographic reach of their collaboration. In 1999, they developed the statewide Colorado Public Safety Partnership, drawing its executive board members from diverse units of local government. The partnership is staffed through the Colorado Department of Public Safety in cooperation with BJA and the Executive Office for Weed and Seed.

**Baltimore’s** CCP has been sustained and expanded within the city through the municipal budget and adapted as a statewide strategy through Maryland’s HotSpots Initiative. HotSpots provides statewide grants and technical assistance to communities and neighborhoods that meet certain criteria in public safety and crime prevention. The statewide HotSpots Initiative is coordinated through the Governor’s Office on Crime Control and Prevention (GOCCP). GOCCP works in partnership with the original CCP

community organizers, neighborhood teams, and other representatives from the Mayor’s Office on Criminal Justice in Baltimore.

A HotSpots grant brings to a community both city and state resources to help reduce crime and improve a community’s quality of life. Areas that communities may focus on include antidrug activities, community education, community unification, innovative solutions to neighborhood problems, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) (particularly involving public parks and areas with pay phones that have become open-air drug markets), youth involvement such as the Youth Tribunal, improved response from human and social services to neighborhoods, and coordinated planning efforts and action steps with other grant awards such as Weed and Seed.

## Program Outcomes and Results

### National

CCP has produced significant outcomes for the jurisdictions in which it has been implemented. These outcomes have been noted both in the national evaluation undertaken for the National Institute of Justice by the BOTEC Analysis Corporation and in local evaluations, experiences, and observations undertaken by the sites themselves.

BOTEC describes the following outcomes:

- ❑ Robust partnerships were formed among several federal, state, and local stakeholders that are broader and deeper than were expected.
- ❑ Within the sites, the integration of police, criminal justice agencies, and other public and private agencies exceeded expectations.
- ❑ New leadership was developed while current leadership was



included, maintained, and often strengthened.

- ❑ Enthusiasm and ongoing participation in planning led to action that produced visible results, which reinforce the importance and effectiveness of this collaborative approach.
- ❑ Community policing was implemented and/or expanded in conjunction with community mobilization advancements.
- ❑ This commingling of community policing and mobilization produced greater results than either initiative could have achieved independently.
- ❑ Comprehensive crime prevention and control strategies were localized and adapted to meet individual sites' needs and were implemented based on local capacities. Each site then approached its problems with tailored solutions that helped make it unique and effective.
- ❑ Government and service delivery systems were reinvented not just in the area of public safety but also in basic city services such as housing, sanitation, and public works. These new systems will not easily be undone and have changed how day-to-day business is conducted.
- ❑ Neighborhoods and communities are being taken seriously as the basic units for thinking about problems and working toward solutions, lessening the idea that professionals are the primary repository of best practices.
- ❑ Sustainment of CCP after federal funding ended has been striking and widespread. All of the sites have maintained significant portions of their CCPs, including maintaining organizational and community networks that did not exist at the start. Although these developments may have occurred regardless of CCP, BOTEC believes that CCP accelerated the process and broadened and deepened the range and level of collaborations and that

"CCP was the right program, at the right time, in the right places."

### Local

On the local level, the sites report

- ❑ Violent crime rate reductions of up to 50 percent in CCP target areas.
- ❑ Reductions in ancillary measures such as property crime, gang crime, and reported overall crime.
- ❑ Significant increases in levels of activity in CCP-related programs such as community policing training, drug courts, teen courts, alternatives to incarceration, truancy reduction partnerships, and police-resident partnerships.
- ❑ Increases in the number of closed drug houses, active block watchers, and organized neighborhood cleanups.

These local outcomes reflect the overall flexibility and effectiveness of the CCP approach to combating crime and strengthening communities. The following examples are reported by the sites themselves.

**Metro-Atlanta.** CPTED recommendations were included in the Gwinnett Central High School's \$7 million renovation. CPTED work in Roosevelt Circle, Cobb County, won a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development award. A CPTED workbook and training CD were created and sent across the country. To get youth involved in public safety, a Youth Empowerment Grants program was established to provide incentive grants to youth groups for innovative initiatives.

**Baltimore.** In most CCP target areas, violent crime rates decreased between 20 and 40 percent over the grant period. More than 250 stakeholders received a community resource manual developed by the Baltimore City Community Support for Recovery Program that began under CCP.

**Boston.** No juvenile was killed by firearms in the city between July 1995 and December 1997. The Youth Service Providers Network has served more than 700 youth since its inception in 1996.

**Columbia.** In its first year, 90 youth were involved in an alternative-to-incarceration partnership among the city, the Department of Juvenile Justice, the Columbia Police Department, and a school district. Twenty students were chosen by the community mobilizers to participate in the city's first Youth Leadership Training provided by the city, the Richland School District, and area businesses.

**Metro-Denver.** An analysis of 1995 crime data shows an overall downward trend for Metro-Denver compared with the rest of the state. Aurora, a CCP partner, has been graffiti free since its cleanup effort in July 1998.

**Metro-District of Columbia.** District PACT has focused its CCP approach on at-risk youth and drug addiction through an urban services program.

**East Bay Corridor Area.** The extended-day program involves 400 schools in the area with 75 full-service sites that provide youth violence prevention and afterschool day care. In 1996, a working policy-level committee of youth, the Youth Council, was formed to involve youth in public safety. The council has developed programs and recommended funding to groups for youth activities.

**Fort Worth.** Part I reported crimes showed a 15-percent decrease in 1996. More than 3,000 Fort Worth residents participate in the police-resident partnership Citizens on Patrol.

**Hartford.** Since beginning its CCP partnership, violent crime has been reduced by more than 20 percent in Hartford and continues to decrease

each year. Neighborhood residents, in partnership with the city and state criminal justice agencies, are now working on solutions for improving quality of life and decreasing criminal activity. The Hartford Community Court, a partnership between the city and the state of Connecticut, opened on November 10, 1998, to adjudicate nonviolent misdemeanor offenses and violations of the municipal code. Since opening, more than 20,000 hours of community service have been completed in Hartford's neighborhoods.

**Metro-Omaha.** Registration for Neighborhood Builders, a training course for neighborhood leaders, continues to increase. To date, 126 people have been trained, and most have assumed leadership positions within their neighborhoods. Also, the Nebraska Legislature adopted a uniform definition of school truancy modeled after the definition developed by the Omaha Community Partnership working group.

**Phoenix.** Over a 3-year period in the CCP-targeted area, property crimes have dropped 20 percent, calls for service decreased over 27 percent, and gang-related crime decreased over 24 percent, compared to citywide crime rates, which are increasing or decreasing much more slowly. More than 70 drug houses have been closed in the targeted neighborhood, and more than 3,000 arrests have been made. Home values in the neighborhood have increased by 50 percent.

**Salt Lake City.** In cooperation with the county felony drug court, Salt Lake City has developed a misdemeanor drug-sentencing protocol whose goals include lessening the felony court's caseload and providing faster sentencing. This early intervention program uses peer review panels that issue both sanctions and rewards. Judicial resources are only involved when an offender does not successfully complete the program.

**Seattle.** Police referred more than 250 defendants to the King County Drug Court in its first 6 months of operation. The recently developed Seattle Watch Program uses crime analysis statistics and anecdotal evidence from communities to enhance coordination of resources and accountability in the precincts.

**Wichita.** Beginning in January 1999, all commissioned police officers in the city received training in community policing. Fifty-two youth participated in the Lighted School's Summer Latch Key Program during the first 8 weeks of the summer. The goal of the program is to "latch on" to at-risk youth with "keys" to keep them productive, active, and off the streets.

**Wilmington.** The recidivism rate for the CCP Drug Diversion Program is less than 4.3 percent, in contrast to the national rate of 67 percent. The Community Restorative Justice Program provides neighborhood cleanups, and approximately 40 probationers and community service team members participate on weekends.

## Conclusion

CCP is an effective, proven approach to increasing crime prevention, reducing the fear of crime, and improving quality of life in neighborhoods. Jurisdictions using this approach have had positive results, ranging from reduced crime rates to residents being able to sit on their front porches without fear of harassment.

Equally important, CCP communities and neighborhoods have developed new and innovative partnerships, found solutions through a problem-solving process, and committed to changing how public safety works. By following CCP's underlying principles, they have made progress in and feel better about their communities as safer places in which to live.

## Notes

1. *Bureau of Justice Assistance Comprehensive Communities Program Update*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, 1996.
2. Criminal Justice Associates. Focus Group Synthesis Report (unpublished). Washington, DC: Criminal Justice Associates, 1998.
3. CCP sites listed as "Metro" or metropolitan are also Pulling America's Cities Together (PACT) sites. PACT is a BJA-sponsored multijurisdictional/multicounty collaborative program coordinated by each site's U.S. Attorney's Office. PACT sites include Metro-Atlanta, Metro-Denver, Metro-District of Columbia, and Metro-Omaha.
4. SARA (scanning, analysis, response, and assessment) is a particular and deliberate problem-solving process used by many sites in community policing and community mobilization initiatives. Its focus is on identifying and researching the problem, taking action to resolve it, and examining the solutions to determine whether they were appropriate and effective.
5. Kelling, G.L., et al. "The Bureau of Justice Assistance Comprehensive Communities Program: A Preliminary Report." National Institute of Justice Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, 1998.
6. CCP site teams developed sustainability action plans through a planning process. A review team of BJA staff, technical assistance providers, and site peers assessed the plans and provided the sites with implementation assistance.

## For Further Information

For information about Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) grants and programs, contact:

### **Bureau of Justice Assistance**

810 Seventh Street NW.  
Washington, DC 20531  
202-514-6278  
World Wide Web:  
[www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA)

For further information on program evaluation at the state and local levels, visit the BJA Evaluation Web Site:  
[www.bja.evaluationwebsite.org](http://www.bja.evaluationwebsite.org).

### **Bureau of Justice Assistance Clearinghouse**

P.O. Box 6000  
Rockville, MD 20849-6000  
1-800-688-4252  
World Wide Web: [www.ncjrs.org](http://www.ncjrs.org)

Clearinghouse staff are available Monday through Friday, 8:30 a.m. to 7 p.m. eastern time. Ask to be placed on the BJA mailing list.

### **U.S. Department of Justice Response Center**

1-800-421-6770 or 202-307-1480

Response Center staff are available Monday through Friday, 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. eastern time.

This document was prepared by Criminal Justice Associates, under grant number 95-DD-BX-K017, awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

NCJ 184955  
March 2001

**U.S. Department of Justice**  
Office of Justice Programs  
*Bureau of Justice Assistance*

*Washington, DC 20531*

---

Official Business

Penalty for Private Use \$300

PRESORTED STANDARD  
POSTAGE & FEES PAID  
DOJ/BJA  
PERMIT NO. G-91

## **BJA World Wide Web Address**

**For a copy of this document online,  
as well as more information on BJA,  
check the BJA Home Page at  
[www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA](http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA)**