

STATE OF MARYLAND
2003
BYRNE ANNUAL
REPORT

The Governor's Office
of
Crime Control & Prevention
300 East Joppa Road, Suite 1105
Baltimore, Maryland 21286
www.goccp.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary.....	1
II.	Evaluation Plan and Activities.....	4
III.	Aggregate Figures for BJA-Required Performance Measures Note – BJA has not established required performance measures are currently under development by BJA, this information has not been captured.....	12
IV.	Supplemental Information: (GOCCP-University of Maryland Partnership & the Faith Partnership Initiative).....	25
V.	Appendix: List of all Byrne Memorial Grants awarded/active during FY 2003. These grants are compiled and categorized under the Maryland Crime Control and Prevention Strategy as listed.	

I.Executive Summary

As the State Administrating Agency (SAA) for Maryland, the Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention (GOCCP) is charged with the responsibility of administering the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program. In accordance with program guidance, GOCCP is submitting this Annual Report covering all active Byrne programs during FY 2003, July 1, 2002 through June 30, 2003. In addition, information contained within the Maryland Crime Control and Prevention Strategy 2002 Edition, Executive Summary, (Crime Control and Prevention Strategy) is reflected within this report.

The Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention, which was created in 1995, is tasked with funding programs that are components of the Maryland's crime control strategy. As the SAA, this Office carries out a number of critical functions as part of implementing policies bearing on the criminal justice and public safety arena. The following Federal and State grant programs are administered by GOCCP during FY 03. The State of Maryland is currently in the process of revising its Crime Control and Prevention Strategy. The Byrne programs referred to in this document are carried out in accordance with the focus of the present Maryland Crime Control and Prevention Strategy.

Federal Programs

- Bullet Proof Vest Program (BPVP)
- Combating Underage Drinking-Block Grant (CUDB)
- Combating Underage Drinking-Discretionary (CUDD)
- Edward Byrne, Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant (BYRN)
- Family Violence Prevention Services Program (FVSP)
- Grants to Encourage Arrest Policy (GTEA)
- Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Preventions Grant Program (JJAC)
- Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention-Title V (JJTV)
- Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention-State Challenge (JJSC)
- Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant (JAIB)
- Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Programs-State Portion (LLEB)
- Maryland Forensics Task Force – ASCLS (NFSL)
- Maryland Forensics Task Force – Training (NFST)
- Police Corps and Law Enforcement Education Act (PCOR)
- STOP Violence Against Women (VAWA) Grants
- Resident Substance Abuse Treatment for State Prisoners Grant Program (RSAT)

- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Grant (SDFS)
- Substance Abuse Preventions Initiative (SAPI)
- Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth-in-Sentencing Incentive Grants (VOIT)

State Programs

- Collaborative Supervision and Focused Enforcement Program (CSAFE) * formally known as HotSpots
- Domestic Violence Unit Pilot Program Fund (DVUP)
- Juvenile Justice Community Capacity Building (DJJC)
- Maryland After School Program (ASPI)
- Maryland Victims of Crime Fund (MVOC)
- Maryland Drug Treatment Task Force (DTTF)
- Rural Domestic Violence and Child Victimization Enforcement Grant Program (RDVC)
- State Victims Assistance Academies (SVAA)
- Victim/Witness Protection & Relocation Program (VWPRP)
- War Room Program (WRBC)

The GOCCP has continued the practice of complying with the requirement for a 25% cash match by obtaining an overall match for each award year. This action has been taken in conjunction with BJA waivers for a project-by-project cash match and consistent with current program guidance. This has allowed GOCCP to have the flexibility to award funds to local jurisdictions, which, often due to fiscal restraints, would not normally be able to provide the required cash match.

As noted in the 2002 Annual Report, GOCCP has sought authorization from chief executives of local jurisdictions to accept grant funded projects as local programs which are operated by the state, but whose services are solely for the benefit of the local jurisdiction. As a consequence, GOCCP is able to maximize the use of the federal and matching funds.

Section II provides an overview of GOCCP evaluation activities conducted during this report period.

Section III, Aggregate Figures for BJA-Required Performance Measures, contains an overview of programs as they relate to the State Crime Control and Prevention Strategy and the BJA Program Areas. Due to the fact that during this reporting period BJA had not published its list of required minimum performance measures, GOCCP reports examples of programs and various performance measures that it has developed and employed.

Section IV will provide an overview of additional areas that GOCCP has engaged in to further the elements of the Maryland Crime Control and Prevention Strategy and ensure responsible stewardship of grant programs. It relates reorganization activities, partnerships, research and evaluation , policy development and also discusses several partnership projects and provides a synopsis of the Drug and Alcohol Council.

Section V contains the appendices that list all active '03 Byrne awards. They are categorized according to the format employed in the Maryland Crime Control and Prevention Strategy.

II. EVALUATION PLAN AND ACTIVITIES

It is the objective of the Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention (GOCCP) to engage in a multifaceted approach to conducting evaluation activities for grants. In addition, GOCCP has awarded grants to conduct much needed research into many of the systems, strategies and approaches that have been employed to address crime and disorder issues.

As noted in the 2002 Byrne Annual Report, the State of Maryland received one of the first Byrne Evaluation grants awarded in 1997. This grant allowed the State to undertake an outcome evaluation of the HotSpots Communities program (currently known as Collaborative Supervision and Focused Enforcement - CSAFE - zones), looking at changes in crime levels and comparing them to the rest of the state. Dr. Lawrence W. Sherman (formerly of the University of Maryland and currently with the University of Pennsylvania) conducted the evaluation and found that "...areas implementing the HotSpots model, on average, became safer more quickly than all other areas in the rest of the state." This evaluation was finalized in September 2002.

Performance Measures: CSAFE zones, formally known as HotSpots, are required to submit quarterly performance measures and progress reports on each element of their strategy. GOCCP program and fiscal support staff monitor each grant to insure compliance. Additionally, starting in 2003 each CSAFE Area, Heightened Enforcement Accountability and Treatment (HEAT) team is required to submit a monthly "key indicator report". This report is completed as a team report by the Parole Agent, Juvenile Services Case Worker and the Police Officer. The report tracks key performance indicators such as joint home visits, team meetings, information exchange, and warrant tracking. The "key indicator" report is forwarded through the respective chains of command of the team members and evaluated by the Advanced & Specialized Training Unit of the Maryland Police & Correctional Training Commissions.

Quarterly Progress Reports and performance measures are required for each grant. The quarterly reporting must accompany financial reports that result in the draw down of funds. No draw down of funds is processed without progress and performance reporting. Grantees are able to complete the reports on-line. The information from the forms can then be downloaded into an Access database for evaluation.

Grant Monitoring: Monitoring includes the reviewing of quarterly progress reports submitted by each sub-grantee and conducting on-site visits to ensure grant activity is consistent with the intended purpose of each grant. The GOCCP monitors also examine performance measures/indicators for each grant, based on the stated objectives noted in the grant application. These indicators may be statistical measures showing how well the grant is performing and to what extent goals have been achieved. This information is forwarded with the quarterly reports.

An important tool in the monitoring and evaluation of grants administered by GOCCP is the Grant Management System (GMS). This is a database system that has been designed to allow program managers and GOCCP staff to monitor the fiscal and programmatic aspects of all grants. Reflective of the changing needs of GOCCP, this system is upgraded on an ongoing basis.

Evaluation Technical Assistance: Technical assistance is provided to help sub-grantees in preparing their evaluation plans, to generate feedback during the implementation phase of the evaluation, and to aid sub-grantees in strengthening their evaluation efforts.

Grant Funded Evaluations and Studies: As previously noted, the GOCCP pursues research pilot programs with the goal of transforming research into effective policy. It continues to provide formula grant funds for evaluation of projects which may show ways to improve the supervision, treatment, or processing of drug offenders in the criminal justice system. In these cases, funds are used in conjunction with the grant program to hire evaluators to establish evaluation procedures, including data collection procedures, and prepare an evaluation report on the project's impact.

- **HotSpot Outcome Evaluation:** This evaluation was conducted by Dr. Lawrence W. Sherman (formally of the University of Maryland and currently with the University of Pennsylvania) and examined all 36 of the Phase I Maryland HotSpots. An analysis was conducted that examined changes in crime levels in the HotSpots and compared them to the rest of the state.

Dr. Sherman found that the 36 Phase I HotSpots realized "...violent crime reductions 22% greater than the rest of Maryland during the period of 1996 to 2000. For all serious (Part I) crimes reported to police in the HotSpots, for the same period, the decrease was 18% greater."

Dr. Sherman's evaluation concluded, "... The high-crime areas implementing the HotSpots model, on average, became safer more quickly than all other areas in the rest of the state." This evaluation was finalized in September 2002.

- **Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention Data Mapping:** The Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention awarded a grant to the Washington/Baltimore High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program (HIDTA) to fund a full-time Geographic Information System (GIS) Specialist to conduct crime mapping for the HotSpot Communities and other grantee related projects. In the past, the HIDTA has been able to provide services to the Division of Parole & Probation, The Department of Juvenile Services, the Maryland Alcohol and Drug Abuse Administration, as well as various programs within GOCCP. In addition, GOCCP continues to collaborate with the HIDTA to incorporate an Internet capability to allow HotSpot crime data to be viewed over the World Wide Web.
- **Crime-Smart, Using Technology to Outsmart Criminals:** Last year, GOCCP awarded a grant to the Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) to provide five police agencies (primarily small and medium sized) the necessary hardware, software and training to collect and map crime. GOCCP has awarded BMC a grant to provide five additional police agencies the necessary tools to conduct crime mapping. Crime Smart will focus on two areas of activity: (1) reporting of crime incidents in Maryland's CSAFE zones (formerly know as HotSpot Communities), and (2) sharing of crime incident data by neighboring police agencies.

- **Break The Cycle Impact Evaluation:** The Governor’s Office of Crime Control & Prevention awarded a grant to the Urban Institute to evaluate the impact of Maryland’s Break the Cycle Program (BTC). The primary goal of the impact evaluation was to test the hypothesis that criminal activity as measured by re-arrest rates during a one-year supervision period are lower among probation and parole clients in BTC than among similar offenders in jurisdictions that do not use the program. The Urban Institute found that arrests of probationers and parolees with drug conditions were lower as a result of BTC as follows:
 - Probationers and parolees with drug conditions had a slightly, but significantly lower likelihood of arrest for a drug offense and significantly fewer drug arrests;
 - In BTC areas that administered more drug tests per person under supervision, probationers and parolees with drug conditions had a significantly lower likelihood of arrest (for any offense and for drug offenses) and significantly fewer arrests (for any offense and for drug offenses); and
 - In BTC areas that administered more sanctions (immediate penalties for infraction of drug condition requirements) per person under supervision, probationers and parolees with drug conditions had slightly, but significantly lower likelihood of arrest (for any offense and for drug offenses) and significantly fewer arrests for drug offenses.

Finally, the Urban Institute interpreted “these results to mean that BTC is an effective strategy for reducing drug arrests among probationers and parolees with drug conditions.”

- **Recidivism Reduction Laboratory (RRL):** The Cabinet Council on Criminal and Juvenile Justice believed in policies that build on evidenced-based theoretically sound best practices. As part of the Council’s strategy, through GOCCP, the Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services (DPSCS) has founded the Recidivism Reduction Laboratory (RRL).

RRL is built on the principles of action research that involve the researchers in all stages of the program development and refinement process. RRL is available to assist other programs in the areas of: program development, program refinement and benchmarks, and program evaluation with an eye on using information to improve practice. Through the integration of measurement systems, RRL is working along with operating agencies to achieve the ultimate goal of making communities safe.

In addition, RRL works with agencies on strategic planning, operational planning, performance measures, and tools to improve operations. Initiatives include implementing an aggressive Proactive Community Supervision (PCS) for adults on probation or parole, and the development of community-based supervision with the Department of Juvenile Justice. Other programmatic components include changes in Break the Cycle,

Residential Substance Abuse Training, the Reentry Partnership Initiative, Offender Employment, and Pretrial Quality Case Review.

The Bureau of Governmental Research (BGR) submitted the final process evaluation on **Break the Cycle** (BTC) to GOCCP in March 2003. The report highlighted progress in both the implementation and effects of BTC. For example, BGR found:

- There is a need to expand the program beyond the original seven jurisdictions.
- Improvement is needed in system linkages with the judiciary “to address the persistent noncompliant offenders” in order to increase the speed and certainty of response. System linkages also need to be improved to ensure that assessments and drug using behavior drive treatment type.
- There is “a need to continue reinforcing accountability on both supervision staff and the offenders.”
- Non-compliance for drug testing and failure to appear has declined over four years from 67% in year one to 45% in year four.
- Sanction rates for positive urines during each of the four years rose as follows: 3% in year one, 18% in year two, 56% in year three, and 74% in the fourth year.
- Treatment utilization increased from 27% in year two to 59% in year four.
- While recidivism reduction was slight for criminal offenders, recidivism went from 42% to 26% for the addicted offender.

During the fourth year of the **Proactive Community Supervision (PCS)** effort, BGR:

- Finalized training materials for the risk assessment instrument, Life Skills Inventory- Revised (LSI-R).
- Finished software development for the case planning software, Maryland Offender Case-Planning Software for Empowerment (MOSCE), which will be used to score the LSI-R.
- Trained Division of Parole and Probation (DPP) staff on MOSCE.
- Conducted a random sample of case reviews for DPP on LSI-R and Case Planning.
- Provided on-site technical assistance to 4 pilot PCS offices.

BGR completed the **RSAT Evaluation** and submitted the report to DPSCS and GOCCP in February 2003. As part of this work, BGR found that a standardized treatment curriculum improves the quality of services. Further, they concluded that more emphasis is required on continuing care in the community.

Many of these reports are available on the BGR web Site: www.bgr.umd.edu

- **Maryland Boot Camp Study:** The Maryland Boot Camp Study is an experimental study of the correctional boot camp operated by the Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services’ Division of Corrections. To our knowledge, it is the single experimental study of boot camps. Participants are randomly assigned to either the boot camp or an alternative program that emphasizes treatment but does not use a military atmosphere.

This is a three-phase experiential study examining (1) whether the military atmosphere of the program successfully reduces the recidivism of participants after they are released from prison, and (2) changes of the participants regarding their attitudes, experiences, and adjustment. Phase one of the study began in October of 2001 with the design of the randomization process and the data collection procedures and instruments, obtaining Institutional Review Board approval and engaging staff. Phase Two (data collection) began in January 2002 and continues to date. Thus far, no obstacles have presented more than small challenges and all have been overcome. The report is expected to be completed in September 2004.

- **Prisoner Reentry in Maryland:** About 585,000 individuals per year return home from state and federal prisons. Successful reintegration is an important component of an effective criminal justice system. Yet, little is known about the return of former prisoners to their homes and communities. What is known is that these individuals are less prepared for reintegration and less connected to community-based social structures than in the past.

Studies show that nearly two-thirds of the returning home population may be rearrested within three years of release, raising concerns about public safety. We know that there is variation by state and by community.

An individual's adjustment to post-prison life will depend on such factors as physical and mental health, substance abuse, resources, employment and environmental influences yet we know nothing of their complexity or interrelationships. Further, little is known about the impact upon communities and families of high levels of removal, incarceration, and return of young men caught up in the criminal justice system.

GOCCP has funded the Urban Institute, under the leadership of Jeremy Travis to study these phenomena in order to learn how to successfully manage reintegration for former prisoners. Two studies have been commissioned: 1) A Portrait of Prisoner Reentry in Maryland; and 2) Returning Home: Understanding the Challenges of Prisoner Reentry – Maryland Pilot Study.

The first study was completed in March 2003 and highlighted the challenges and opportunities prisoner reentry poses for the State of Maryland. The second study is currently in peer review and should be finalized by the end of 2003.

- **Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court-Follow-up Evaluation:** This study extends an ongoing evaluation of the Baltimore City Drug Treatment Court (BCDTC). This study has already completed random assignment of 235 eligible clients to either drug treatment court or "treatment as usual."

The proposed study extends this ongoing study to track and interview the 235 clients approximately 39 months after entry into the study. Its objectives are to: (1) augment the existing official records on criminal activity, substance abuse treatment experiences, and criminal justice involvement with self-reports of the same; (2) assess the effects of the BCDTC on criminal activity and substance use (according to client self-reports), welfare status, employment status, education level, mental health, physical health, and family and social relationships; and (3) enhance our understanding of the mechanisms through which drug treatment courts might work. Mechanisms to be examined include increased supervision and monitoring, personal accountability for behavior, drug treatment and other services, and perceptions of procedural justice.

This report was finalized in December 2002. Some of the highlighted findings of this report include:

- The study found significantly more drug treatment services for the experimental group.
- Drug court participants were most likely to be incarcerated in response to a positive drug test.
- Drug court participants received more probation services.
- Drug court participants were happy with services received while noting the need for improvement in such services as job placement and housing assistance.
- Drug court participants reported less involvement in criminal activity.

In general, the study found that “subjects who had more days of drug testing, probation, drug treatment, and status hearings reported significantly less drug use.” Employment and improved mental health were also related to reduced drug use. Greater drug treatment, increased social control, and enhanced perceptions of procedural justice are additional explanations for the positive effects of participation in the BCDTC program on drug use and crime. In sum, where there was a reduction of substance abuse there were also positive effects on crime.

Police recommendations in the report include keeping all elements of the model, enhancing treatment services, and focusing on Circuit Court, which saw more positive effects than did the District Court.

- **Assessment of Maryland Criminal Justice Research:** The justice Policy Center at the Urban Institute is conducting an assessment of Maryland’s Criminal Justice Research Agenda. The objectives of this project are to document the scope and capacity of criminal justice research conducted in Maryland, identify innovative strategies in data collection, research development and dissemination of research findings, and develop an agenda for future research. Specifically, this assessment will:
 - Document the status of Crime and Justice Research in Maryland – How are research efforts (data collection, statistical activity, and program evaluation) being conducted in the state’s criminal justice agencies and what is the capacity for future research? What outside entities (federal government, foundations, academic community, other research organizations) act as primary consumers and producers of research in Maryland and what are their needs and objectives?

How are research findings disseminated, and do those research products meet the needs of practitioners in Maryland?

- Develop a National Perspective to Identify Innovative Research Strategies – How have other states created successful partnerships with state and local universities and other researchers to leverage research and evaluation resources? What innovative research, data collection and management, and dissemination strategies have been effectively implemented in other states? How have these strategies influenced the direction and scope of research?
- Articulate Future Research Strategies for the State of Maryland – What direction should the research agenda for the State of Maryland follow over the next ten years?

The Assessment is expected to be completed by the end of 2003.

- **Assessment of Victim Services in Maryland:** The National Center for Victims of Crime had a number of conversations with the Governor's Office of Crime Control & Prevention (GOCCP) about the need to undertake an assessment of current victim services and make recommendations as to how those services could be improved. The purpose of this assessment was to look beyond the traditional measures of service quality by starting with the perspective of individual victims and their needs.

The project consisted of four related activities to be carried out simultaneously:

- An assessment of victim assistance, meaning the extent to which the existing victim assistance delivery systems meet critical victim needs;
- An assessment of victim compensation, meaning the extent to which the current state compensation program reaches the population of eligible victims and provides the financial assistance to which they are entitled;
- An assessment of the state's policy framework related to victims of crimes, meaning the extent to which state statutes reflect best practices from around the country; and
- An assessment of the overall system's response to victims of crime, as viewed through the eyes of crime victims themselves.

The assessment concluded that "...Maryland has a very strong foundation of services and resources and, in many cases, victims of crime in Maryland are treated with the dignity, respect, and sensitivity the Maryland State Constitution mandates." In addition, the assessment produced 41 specific recommendations to provide a path forward for Maryland's leaders to create an even more compassionate, effective, and comprehensive response to all victims of crime in Maryland.

- **Crime Victims' Compensation in Maryland:** GOCCP commissioned the Urban Institute to undertake a comprehensive review of the state's Crime Injuries Compensation Board (CICB), whose mission is to provide financial assistance to victims and survivors of violent crime with offender-based revenues – not tax dollars. The goal of the assessment was to identify program accomplishments and areas for further development, and recommend specific steps that should be taken to improve program policies, operations, and services to clients.

The assessment concluded that "...the CICB provides very good services to those who file for compensation, but that its reach could be expanded to serve additional victims, and even fuller and more efficient services could be provided to claimants."

III. Aggregate Figures for BJA – Required Performance Measures

(Note – The BJA required performance measures for Byrne sub awards, as referred to in the program guidance, have not be published to date. BJA has announced that these performance measures are currently under development.)

GOCCP has continued to require that each sub-awarded grant contain established performance and/or progress report measurements. The following review of programs by State Action Area/Program Area each corresponds to one or more federal purpose areas. Each listed program title will be followed by a grant award number (BYRN #) assigned by GOCCP. See Appendix for a detailed list by federal purpose vs. program area.

Action 1/Program Area: Control Dangerous Adult Offenders

Program Overview

It has been evident for a long time that a comparatively small proportion of offenders commit a large proportion of crime. This is particularly true with career criminals. Research has shown that the greatest cost benefits are to be reaped from targeting offenders with long criminal histories.

Goals/Objectives

- Increasing police presence in high-crime areas and encourage tracking of repeat offenders
- Increasing consistency in sentencing
- Increasing security in confinement
- Increasing the likelihood of reform

Program Activities and Components

Representative of a program within this area is the “Wiretap, Anti-Violence, and Electronic Surveillance (WAVES),” BYRN-2002-1287, which supplied two experienced prosecutor attorneys to be trained in wiretap and electronic surveillance long-term investigations and the resultant complex litigation. Investigations were aimed at organized narcotic-distribution conspiracies, which generate violence. Monitoring will measure numbers of successful investigations, wiretaps, indictments, and convictions.

Representative of the activities to measure/monitor this program’s performance, there were two site visits conducted. The first visit occurred on April 3, 2003, with a follow up visit conducted shortly after the end date of the program on August 21, 2003. During one of the visits, the GOCCP Monitor noted; “I was impressed with the high level of arrest, convictions and seizure and amount of various contraband. Such as drugs, guns, vehicles, telephones, etc. The overlapping with other jurisdictions to combat crime and prosecuted criminal prove extremely successful. I was also totally impressed with the amount of accomplishments with the limited amount of staff.”

- Three specific performance measures (quantitative) were employed to evaluate this program in addition to the progress report (narrative) to be completed each quarter. The Performance Measures:
 1. Quarterly report criminal organizations that are indicted, by case number.
 2. Quarterly report number of indictments in each organization, by case number.
 3. Quarterly report seizures: amounts of money; number of vehicles; other assets.

Action 2/Program Area: Control Dangerous Juvenile Offenders

Program Overview

With juvenile offenders, we strive to provide sanctions and services consistent not only with the needs of the youthful offender, but the needs of the neighborhood and communities they live in.

Goals/Objectives

- Increase police presence in high-crime areas and encourage the tracking of repeat offenders
- Increase consistency in sentencing
- Increase security in confinement
- Increase the likelihood of reform
- Decrease the likelihood of re-incarceration

Program Activities and Components

Representative of a program within this area is BYRN-2002-1252 “Evaluation of Intensive Aftercare Program (12).” The following comments were provided by the project director in this award: “The long-term goal of the intensive aftercare process evaluation is to maximize the program’s impact on reducing the recidivism of the IAP participants. More specific objectives include:

- a. Identify IAP performance benchmarks in consultation with IAP administrators and staff.
- b. Assist the Department in developing and implementing monitoring measures that can be used by IAP staff to track participant progress and case management activities, and also be aggregated by supervisors and administrators to report performance and outcomes.
- c. Assess the implementation of the IAP model through observations, focus groups, meetings, and information discussions with administrators, staff, IAP youth, and other IAP stakeholders.”

The Bureau of Governmental Research (BGR) at the University of Maryland has been using an action research model to help propel long-term institutional change. This study is a process evaluation of the Maryland Department of Juvenile Services Intensive Aftercare Program (IAP). The research shows improvement in the coordination of community case management, in the intake process, as well as improvement in staff turnover. Progress has been made both in moving youth on probation caseloads to IAP and reducing delays in court permission to terminate youth who have either met their IAP obligations or who are effectively inactive. However, the program is still operating under capacity, and the research identified additional implementation issues that deserve concerted attention.

There are a number of outcome measures produced by this report, which will require additional follow up actions by GOCCP monitors. For the purposes of this report the most important outcome measure is that rearrest rates dropped from 31% to 25% between 2001 and 2002. The researchers suggest that this reflects improvements in IAP implementation.

- The Senior Research Associate for GOCCP conducted active monitoring of this program.

Action 3/Program Area: Keep Guns Out of the Hands of Criminals

Program Overview

Although the numbers of murders, robberies and assaults involving firearms in Maryland decreased 40 percent between 1995 and 2000, firearms were used in 69 percent of the murders in 2000. The use of guns in the commission of aggravated assaults decreased between 1995 and 1998, increased 13 percent in 1999, but decreased 25 percent in 2000. The use of firearms in domestic violence-related aggravated assaults decreased 11 percent in 2000.

Goals/Objectives

- Strengthen Maryland's gun laws
- Target illegal gun possession and trafficking

Program Activities and Components

A representative program in this area is BYRN-2002-1248, "Operation Crime Gun II" which was operated out of the Office of the Attorney General for Maryland. This program sought to prosecute violations such as: false applications to purchase firearms, straw purchasers, secondary sale violations and the sale of ammunition to juveniles.

As a component of establishing the performance of this program, a site visit was conducted on December 26, 2002. Several areas relevant to the activity and impact of this program were reviewed during the visit. Among the activities reviewed were examples of active cases (files) as well as a flow chart, which depicted the chronology, and associations of one case example. From this information, the GOCCP monitor was able to gain an appreciation on how the internal processes led to the completion of program goals and generated outputs. In addition, areas requiring the appropriate submission of reports tracking the operation of the award were addressed and resolved.

- Four specific performance measures (quantitative) were employed to evaluate this program in addition to the progress report (narrative) to be completed each quarter. The Performance Measures:
 1. Each quarter report how many false applications to purchase firearms were prosecuted.
 2. Each quarter report how many straw purchasers were prosecuted.
 3. Each quarter report how many secondary sale violations were prosecuted.
 4. Each quarter report how many sales of ammunition to juveniles were prosecuted.

Action 4/Program Area: Break the Link Between Drugs and Crime

Program Overview

Maryland has received national recognition for implementing programs that reduce reliance on incarceration as the primary means of managing its criminal justice population. Although incarceration is a viable and necessary method to address criminal behavior, it is also the most costly.

Because 91 percent of all inmates will return to the community, rehabilitative programming is a crucial component of the State's correctional system. The Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correctional Services has developed a number of prison-based, transitional, and community-based programs to accomplish this task.

Goals/Objectives

- Prepare offenders for independent living
- Reintroduce offenders to community life
- Reintegrate offenders into their communities
- Monitor the progress of offenders

Program Activities and Components

One example of a representative program within this area is the "Washington County/Hagerstown/Addiction Recovery (12)," program under BYRN-2002-1234. This program focused on several initiatives to include: maintaining or continuing the reeducation of violent and Part 1 Crime, demonstrating a commitment to proactive community supervision by partnering agencies, demonstrating exemplary community engagements through effective involvement of traditional and non-traditional partners, community organizations, and residents, and demonstrating local financial support, through cash and in-kind matches, the inclusion of strategies, visions, goals and objectives.

This program was an element of the HotSpots comprehensive strategy now known as CSAFE. As noted in one of the progress reports, an example of success within this program was the partnership established with the Washington County Hospital in order to provide addiction services for the ambulatory detoxification population. Once consumers have been detoxified at the Hospital, they are referred to the Health Department for addiction services.

- There were four specific progress report measures and questions established to assist in measuring the performance of this award:
 1. Please describe your goals and activities over the last quarter.
 2. What is your greatest challenge?
 3. What has been your greatest success? What obstacles were overcome? What resources were required? What lessons were learned?
 4. What has been your greatest failure this quarter? What lessons were learned?

Action 5/Program Area: Target Crime “HotSpots” with a Comprehensive Strategy

Program Overview

The HotSpot Communities Initiative (currently know as CSAFE) has exceeded even the most optimistic expectations. Serious crime in HotSpots fell twice as fast as in the rest of the State between the years 1996 and 2000. The objective of HotSpots was to channel our resources into identifying and targeting the neighborhoods where these hot spots of criminal activity are located. The result of this focus is to make dramatic inroads into reducing crime and revitalizing communities.

Goals/Objectives

- Expand the use of comprehensive local strategies
- Coordinate Resources

Program Activities and Components

One example of an investment made into the community to help break the cycle of crime is the program “Prince George’s County/Seat Pleasant/Community Policing (12),” BYRN-2001-1162. The focus of this program was to initiate a Community Policing effort that utilizes foot and bike patrols, addresses open-air drug markets, and works in partnership with other agencies to reduce crime related activity and fear of crime.

An example of the performance measured from this award was the activity related in one progress report. The referenced noted: “Officers continue to aggressively patrol those Hotspot areas throughout the community that contain blight, and other disorders. On March 29, officers from Seat Pleasant Police Department and bordering jurisdictions conducted a saturated patrol assignment that resulted in (7) seven arrest, (4) four summons in Lieu of Arrest, (1) one recovered handgun, seized 14 grams of Marijuana, and 22 grams of Crack Cocaine.”

- Four specific progress report questions were employed to evaluate this program:
 1. Please describe the community event/activity that you feel was the most successful this quarter. Who was involved? Why was it effective? What lessons were learned?
 2. Please describe your working relationship with: Community Members, Adult Probation and Parole, Juvenile Probation and Parole, Community Residents, Businesses, Associations, Non-Profits.
 3. What works best about case staffing?
 4. What does not work so well about case staffing?

Action 6/Program Area: Promoting Community Policing

Program Overview

Community policing fosters partnerships among police and residents, medical facilities, businesses, religious institutions and other community stakeholders.

While past (traditional) police practices could be described as reactive, community policing is *proactive*, requiring officers to actively search for solutions to specific community problems. It requires that the police are sensitive to community concerns, opinions, and issues.

It involves the use of innovative strategies to free up officers time by reassigning sworn officers from desk duties to communities, redirecting non-emergency calls and providing support through technological advances and multi-agency teams.

Goals/Objectives

- Attract Top-Quality Officers by Providing Top-Quality Training
- Free Officer Time for Problem Solving

Program Activities and Components

The following sub-award is a representative program: BYRN-2002-1149, “Wicomico County/Church Street/Community Policing (12).” A critical area of funding for this program is the school resource officer. This officer fosters activities geared towards conflict resolution, at-risk intervention, mentoring activities, gang mediation, problem-solving projects and truancy programs.

Some of the monitoring activities conducted on this award were geared to measure/examine what worked best in regards to case staffing and what failed to work. These questions would serve as examples of output measurements as apposed to process measurement questions.

- Five specific programmatic questions were employed to and evaluate this program:
 1. What major activities did you participate in this quarter?
 2. What were your objectives this quarter?
 3. What were your biggest successes this quarter? What obstacles were overcome? What resources were required? What lessons have you learned?
 4. What were your biggest failures this quarter? What were the obstacles? What lessons have you learned?
 5. What will you try next?

Action7/Program Area: Engage Citizens in Crime Control

Program Overview

Encouraging citizen involvement is essential to community revitalization and is the foundation of the Crime Control and Prevention Strategy. Neighborhood residents, businesses, religious institutions, and other community-based organizations play a critical role in reducing and preventing crime in the State.

Goals/Objectives

- Support grassroots neighborhood efforts
- Harness volunteer efforts

Program Activities and Components

Areas of crime prevention and control that cannot be ignored affect our youth, adult and elder citizens who are often the target of crime. By empowering this segment of the community, we have helped to reduce an area of criminal opportunity. An example of a grant that targets this area of concern was BYRN-2001-1195, "Baltimore County/Yorkway/Community Mobilization (12).

This award assisted the Community Mobilization Coordinator in established educational programs, taught at the Dundalk Middle School, to enable youth to better understand the Juvenile Justice System. It offered programs directed to tenants and homeowners, which instructed residents on how to keep their homes safe from burglars. In addition, programs were offered to businesses and landlords on how to reduce the criminal element will also be offered. Performance measures examined: major mobilization activities, methods employed, successes and failures.

- Four specific programmatic questions were employed to and evaluate this program:
 1. Please list the major mobilization activities engaged in this quarter.
 2. What methods did you use to get people involved?
 3. What were your greatest successes this quarter? What obstacles did you overcome? What resources were required? What lessons were learned?
 4. What were your failures?

Action 8/Program Area: Revitalize Aging Neighborhoods

Program Overview

The declining size of the average family means that we need more housing to accommodate population increases than we did in the past. The State of Maryland is committed to combating sprawl by directing growth back into existing communities, thus preserving farmlands, forests, the Chesapeake Bay, and other natural resources.

Goals/Objectives

- Direct State resources to developed areas
- Provide market incentives
- Reduce quality-of-life crimes

Program Activities and Components

A representative example of a program in this area is BYRN-2001-1163, "Prince George's County/Seat Pleasant/Community Maintenance (12). This program involved activities to accomplish a number of goals to include: walk-throughs to target public and private properties in need of repair, letters with copies of the property improvement checklist were sent to each designated household to introduce the Community Demonstration Project, and a lottery drawing to select one property in each neighborhood to be a Community Demonstration House

- Five specific progress report measurement questions were employed to evaluate this program:
 1. What is your community maintenance strategy?
 2. What progress have you made this quarter?
 3. What was your greatest success? What obstacles were overcome? What resources were required? What lessons were learned?
 4. What was your greatest failure? What lessons were learned?
 5. What are the next major steps in your strategy for the next quarter?

Action 9/Program Area: Reduce and Prevent Family Violence

Program Overview

Domestic violence or intimate partner crimes decreased 13 percent in Maryland from 1995 to 2000. In spite of this, the Maryland Network Against Domestic Violence reported that from July 2000 through June 2001, 68 Maryland women, men, and children died as a result of domestic violence. The Program Area is created to reduce that number.

Goals/Objectives

- Expand the availability of support services
- Intervene in child abuse and neglect
- Protect and educate Maryland's elderly and vulnerable adults

Program Activities and Components

A program that is representative of efforts in this area is BYRN-2000-1069, "Rural Victim Assistance Program." The focus of this program was to provide counseling services, emergency sheltering, supporting victims through the criminal justice system, assisting victims in obtaining services through housing programs and other service providing agencies.

Among the areas monitored within this award were the numbers of domestic occurrences with/without assault, arrests for domestic assaults and violation of orders, interim ex parte orders, rapes and sexual offenses. In addition the following training seminars were conducted: "Domestic Violence Training," "Training on Bereavement," "Training on Stalking and Strangulation," "Domestic Violence – Intervention & Investigation," "Impact of Child Sex Abuse on Family," and "Nonviolent Crisis Intervention Training."

- Four specific programmatic questions were employed to and evaluate this program:
 1. ... Provide a brief narrative assessment of the project's effectiveness thus far. The narrative should include qualitative and quantitative evidence, as available, and also highlight factors that the author considers to have facilitated or impaired the project's effectiveness.
 2. A summary of the progress in completing goals for the grant must include the implementation status of specific objectives, including dates of completion, when applicable. The grantee should also highlight the status of any objectives that were delayed in the previous quarter.

3. Describe any barriers to implementing or completing any objectives and the corrective actions taken or planned to overcome the barriers.
4. Describe any proposed changes in objectives and the rationale for changing any objectives. Include a description of the anticipated benefits to making such changes and the implications that those changes have for completing other tasks.

Action 10/Program Area: Enhance Victims' Rights and Services

Program Overview

The rate of violent victimization in the State of Maryland in 2000 was 790 per 100,000. This Program Area is designed to respond aggressively to victims' rights issues. Numerous committees and task forces have coordinated efforts to ensure that Maryland residents are aware of their rights as possible victims and are informed and involved in criminal justice proceedings.

Goals/Objectives

- Enhance awareness of victim's rights and services
- Keep victims informed and involved
- Prevent repeat victimization

Program Activities and Components

An important ongoing project that is key to this area is the "Stop the Violence Against Women" program, BYRN-2002-1257. As state in the project summary, the goal of this program is to: "...increase the number of victims contacted during the initial crises and to encourage an increase in follow up interviews to insure successful prosecution of violent domestic offenders... to discourage the intimidation tactics used by abusers by explaining the cycle of violence in every contact we have with victims and the community in general."

- Four specific programmatic measures were employed to and evaluate this program:
 1. Provide a brief narrative assessment of the project's effectiveness thus far. The narrative should include qualitative and quantitative evidence, as available, and also highlight factors that the author considers to have facilitated or impaired the project's effectiveness.
 2. A summary of the progress in completing goals for the grant must include the implementation status of specific objectives, including dates of completion, when applicable. The grantee should also highlight the status of any objectives that were delayed in the previous quarter.
 3. Describe any barriers to implementing or completing any objectives and the corrective actions taken or planned to overcome the barriers.
 4. Describe any proposed changes in objectives and the rationale for changing any objectives. Include a description of the anticipated benefits to making such changes and the implications that those changes have for completing other tasks.

Action 11/Program Area: Demand Individual Responsibility

Program Overview

The State recognizes that our youth are an integral part of communities and at times, may play both productive and nonproductive roles in the health of the community. With this in mind, it is vital component of an involved state government to aggressively influence those factors that will lead to a safer environment that gives our youth the best chance to thrive and mature.

It needs to be understood that even though violent crime and illicit drug use remain the focal point for the Crime Control Strategy, it also important to keep in prospective the extent of involvement of juvenile offenders in the crime picture. In general, the majority of youth within our communities are productive individuals who do not get involved in crime and of those that do, the majority of offenses involve non-violent crimes.

Research has established that risk factors that our youth face, fall into four basic levels: individual, family, school, and community. It has also proven out that prevention programs that start early, target multiple risk factors, and strengthen protective or “resiliency” factors have the best chance of being successful.

The State plan places important resources directly on the key risk and protective factors in each of the four areas. After school programs are a major emphasis.

Goals/Objectives

- Hold Juvenile Offenders Accountable
- Build Character and Citizenship

Program Activities and Components

A representative program in this area is BYRN-2002-1183, “Charles County/Smallwood/Benjamin Stoddert/Youth Prevention (12).” This program sought to assist at-risk students in skill development. As noted in a progress report for this award, involving youth in role-playing proved to be very effective. The grantee also noted that one area that proved to be initially challenging was in the completion of documents intended to track the performance of the award.

- Five specific progress report measures were employed to monitor and evaluate this program:
 1. Please describe the activities/events that you feel were the most successful this quarter. What resources were required? What obstacles were overcome?
 2. Please describe some of your failures and lessons learned about resources, obstacles, and other issues.
 3. Who was involved?
 4. Why was it effective?
 5. What are the most important lessons that you have learned?

Action 12/Program Area: Strengthen Families

Program Overview

The State continues to operate from the perspective that strong and healthy families are essential to the goal of reducing and preventing crime. This core unit, *families*, is most often the most important source of influence in the lives and maturation of our children. Research has shown that the role that families play, from the earliest stages, in the lives of our children can be an important balance to negative influences within the environment, giving our youth the chance to grow and become productive members of society.

Goals/Objectives

- Promote Parent Training and Support
- Ensure That Children are Healthy and Ready to Learn
- Focus on Fathers
- Prevent Teen Pregnancy

Program Activities and Components

An important and representative program in this area is BYRN-2002-1162, “Queen Anne's County/Grasonville/Chester/Youth Prevention (12).” This program was targeted towards 4th and 5th grade at-risk students. It offered extended learning opportunities and exposed children to career choices, strengthened academics and social skills. One of the guiding principles was to encourage and assist residents, persons, and families that are targeted to obtain available assistance.

- Five specific progress report measures and questions were employed to evaluate this program:
 1. Please describe the program that you feel was the most successful this quarter. What resources were required? What obstacles were overcome?
 2. What was it?
 3. Who was involved?
 4. Why was it effective?
 5. What are the most important lessons that you have learned?

Action 13/Program Area: Enhance School Safety

Program Overview

The State has worked tirelessly to ensure the safety of our youth within the school system and in spite of this effort; Maryland is no exception to the school violence that has been experienced nationally. The 2000-2001 school year for the State recorded 40,850 suspensions for violent offenses, a 12 percent decrease from the 1999-2000 school year. This will remain an area to support programs with the goal to further reduce these numbers.

Goals/Objectives

- Increase Penalties for School-Related Crime
- Boost School Security

- Remove Disruptive Students
- Promote Order and Respect
- Keep Youths Occupied and Safe During High-Risk Hours

Program Activities and Components

BYRN-2002-1226 “Washington County/Hagerstown/Character Counts/Youth Prevention (12),” is an example of a program that was geared to impact this area of the strategy. As noted in the project summary: Character Counts! provides a framework for building good character with the use of values called "six pillars" (trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship) and by using a common language.

- Five specific progress report measures and questions were employed to evaluate this program:
 1. Please describe the activities/events that you feel were the most successful this quarter. What resources were required? What obstacles were overcome?
 2. Please describe some of your failures and lessons learned about resources, obstacles, other issues.
 3. Who was involved?
 4. Why was it effective?
 5. What are the most important lessons that you have learned?

Action 14/Program Area: Promote Supportive Communities

Program Overview

It has been determined that communities that foster family bonds and strong ties to schools and educational goals are substantially less likely to experience high rates of drug use and delinquency.

The State has fostered policies and programs that inhibit the use of substances by youth and encouraging greater awareness among Maryland citizens about prevention, education and law enforcement measures likely to enhance high community standards.

Goals/Objectives

- Reduce Acceptance of Illegal Substances
- Support High Community Standards for Youth Behavior by Implementing Targeted Policy Responses

Program Activities and Components

A new grant that is intended to impact this area is BYRN-2001-1083, “Wicomico County/Westside/Community Mobilization (12).” As noted in the project summary: “A Community Organizer will provide neighborhood leadership, impart information on resources, and act as a liaison in the community. Quarterly community forums will focus on topics of concern and interest and will include members of the Safety Team.

Community night out events, holiday events, beautification projects, clean-ups, trainings, special events and printing for events will be funded by this grant...”

- The Criminal Justice Program Manager conducted active monitoring of this program.

IV. Supplemental Information

Reorganization of GOCCP

During this fiscal year and in accordance with a change in the gubernatorial administration for the State, this office underwent an organizational evaluation. This evaluation and the ultimate reorganization of GOCCP was accomplished through a collaborative effort with the Department of Budget and Management for Maryland. GOCCP has been reorganized into the following five divisions: Administration, CSAFE & Homeland Security, Criminal Justice, Victim of Crimes, and Youth Services. The result has been to streamline internal processes, and increase efficiency, coordination and collaboration between the various initiatives of the Maryland Crime Control and Prevention Strategy and the corresponding federal and state funding streams that support them.

GOCCP is currently involved in a process to develop a new state crime strategy. This collaborative effort involves cabinet department representatives and additional stakeholders essential to the development of an effective strategy. In conjunction with the State Crime Strategy, GOCCP will submit a new Byrne Strategy along with its 2004 funding application.

US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs Audit

Following the November 2002 election of a new gubernatorial administration in Maryland, a new Director for GOCCP was appointed on March 24, 2003. On July 18, 2003, after a preliminary review of the operations of GOCCP, the Director requested an audit of the pattern and practices of this SAA as they relate to the management of grant programs to include the Byrne Program. The objective of this audit request was to ensure compliance with established federal guidelines and to further ensure the responsible stewardship of all grant programs managed by GOCCP. This audit was initiated on October 7, 2003. The results of this audit are not expected to be published until 2004.

University of Maryland & GOCCP Partnership

During state fiscal year 2002, GOCCP continued its partnership with the University of Maryland, which provided personnel and technical assistance to help deal with the continuing demands resulting from the dramatic growth in grants and grant administration over the past four years. The Center for Substance Abuse Research (CESAR), the Bureau of Governmental Research (BGR) and the Washington/Baltimore High Intensity Drug Trafficking Analysis (HIDTA) program were among the university offices providing information technology experts, web design, policy development, program evaluation and research to help GOCCP accomplish its mission.

In addition to the University of Maryland, GOCCP has developed relationships with the University of Baltimore and Johns Hopkins University that resulted in the incorporation of leading research in the fields of criminal justice and law enforcement into projects funded by GOCCP with Byrne Memorial grants. Studies have also identified "best practices" of these programs and technical assistance provided by these institutions has encouraged the replication

of these practices in other Byrne-funded programs. This research, as well as program evaluation, is conducted in accordance with Chapter Six in the Byrne Programs guidance and application materials.

Of particular note is the work done by the Department of Criminology at the University of Maryland, College Park. The Department, designated as one of the top five in the country by US News & World Report, has focused on implementing evaluation, research and “best practices” through policy initiatives and its assistance has been important in the development of Maryland state criminal justice policy.

These partnerships were supported in FY 2002 through six Byrne grants, totaling \$1,132,815. This amount does not include funding for direct research undertaken by educational institutions.

Additional GOCCP Projects

These projects describe the work undertaken by GOCCP in support of grant monitoring and administration. During FY 2002 funding in this category included:

- The hiring of a consultant to look at GOCCP’s business process to come up with recommendations for addressing issues of concern and any improvements that would result in time or cost savings.
- Continued enhancements to the Grants Management System (GMS) GOCCP’s in-house Management Information System that provides real-time tracking and updates on all 1,200 active projects funded by GOCCP.
- GOCCP has changed the partnership for its website as described in the 2002 Annual Report. GOCCP hired a Website/Applications Developer to design and maintain a new GOCCP website providing information on grant funding opportunities, press releases, electronic application software that ties into GOCCP’s Grant Management System and starting in 2003, a searchable web database providing detail on all open sub-awards made by GOCCP.

Drug and Alcohol Council

In 1998, the Maryland General Assembly passed legislation establishing the Task Force to Study Increasing the Availability of Substance Abuse Programs, otherwise known as the Drug Treatment Task Force. One of the recommendations of the Task Force was "To create a Drug and Alcohol Council to coordinate drug and alcohol treatment activities across State agencies". The purpose of the Council is to improve coordination among state agencies in an effort to expand and improve the quality of substance abuse treatment. During FY 2003, the Council:

- Continued to assist in the development of a statewide electronic data reporting system (i.e. SAMIS) with a pilot of 30 programs participating.
- Continued to participate in legislative hearings and briefings on substance abuse funding, and treatment performance and effectiveness.
- Byrne money continued to fund the salary of the Task Force director.
- Byrne money was used to fund a consultant to help with community probation efforts. This expert assisted programs in the area of drug.

- Submitted an annual report for calendar year 2002. This report included long-term strategic planning, drug treatment education, needs assessment execution, solicitation of expert opinion, budget recommendations, collaboration with state agencies that work with substance abuse issues, and building a drug treatment performance measurement system.
- Reviewed and revised the proposed methadone community education kit developed for the Center of Substance Abuse Treatment.
- Collaborated with other state agencies to apply for two SAMHSA grants submitted by the Governor's Office.
 - The Treatment of Persons with Co-Occurring Substance Related and Mental Disorders Grant (COSIG).
 - The Screening, Brief Intervention, Referral and Treatment Grant (SBIT).
 - Note, neither grant was awarded to the state.
- Council staff began working with a consultant on developing a plan to address recommendations on staff recruitment and retention.
- Assisted an MCO in describing to County Addictions Coordinators recent procedural changes regarding HealthChoice substance abuse benefits.
- Continued working with Baltimore City on the development of a plan for introducing buprenorphine into the treatment system.

Research and Evaluation

Funding under the category of Research and Evaluation allowed for partial funding of the personnel in the Research and Evaluation Unit. This unit oversees more than 17 different process and outcome evaluations dealing with everything from crime mapping to the provision of victim services.

This unit also provides analytical capacity to the other parts of GOCCP to assist in preparing for legislative hearings, drafting applications and annual reports and providing direction in technical areas such as the proper use of information technology.

- Byrne grant money continued to fund the salary of the Evaluation Coordinator and the Senior Research Associate.

Policy Development

As new information is learned about what works and what does not in the area of crime control and prevention, there is a need to translate many of those items into policy. In addition, there is a need to have someone on staff to examine pending federal and state legislation and regulations and to coordinate the development of new initiatives.

Faith Partnership Initiative

This initiative, which was referred to in the 2002 Byrne Annual Report, no longer falls under GOCCP. In January 2003, this initiative was placed under Lt. Governor Steele's office.