

CENTER

FOR

COURT

INNOVATION

CURRICULUM

A Project of the
Fund for the City of New York

Introduction to Problem Solving: Key Issues and Challenges

A Two-Workshop Series for Practitioners

520 Eighth Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10018
212.397.3050 fax 212.397.0985
www.courtinnovation.org

This project was supported by Grant No. 2005-PP-CX-K008 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. 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. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
<i>Introduction</i>	2
WORKSHOP #1: SAMPLE AGENDA	4
DAY ONE.....	4
DAY TWO.....	7
WORKSHOP #2: SAMPLE AGENDA	9
DAY ONE.....	9
DAY TWO.....	15
RECOMMENDED MATERIALS FOR PARTICIPANT HANDBOOK (all materials available for free download from the internet)	17

Introduction

In the last decade and a half, a host of courts have sprung up that attempt to address the underlying problems of defendants, victims, and communities: community courts seek to improve the quality of life in neighborhoods struggling with crime and disorder; drug courts and mental health courts link addicted and mentally ill offenders to treatment instead of incarceration; and domestic violence courts shine a spotlight on a group of cases—violence between intimates—that have historically gotten short shrift from the justice system. While each of these models is different, what they share is an underlying belief that courts should do more than just process cases, but make a difference in the lives of victims, the lives of defendants, and the lives of neighborhoods. The National Association of Drug Court Professionals estimates that there are nearly 2,500 problem-solving courts in the U.S. today, spread across every state in the Union. And in recent years England, South Africa, Canada, Ireland, Scotland, Australia, and other countries have sought to replicate these models.

Research has demonstrated that, if implemented properly, the problem-solving approach can decrease recidivism, reduce crime, improve coordination among justice agencies, enhance services to victims, and increase trust in the justice system. Results like these have led to problem-solving justice being endorsed by national criminal justice mainstream organizations. States like California, New York, Maryland, and Indiana have begun to develop efforts to coordinate at least some of their problem-solving initiatives on a statewide level. California, which now features approximately 250 problem-solving dockets within the regular trial courts, coordinates its efforts through a special Collaborative Justice Courts Advisory Committee. The Conference of Chief Justices and Conference of State Court Administrators endorsed the problem-solving approach in 2000 and again in 2004, enhancing interest in which problem-solving techniques could effectively be applied in general court settings.

In September 2005, the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the U.S. Department of Justice funded ten demonstration projects under its new Community-Based Problem-Solving Criminal Justice Initiative, with the Center for Court Innovation as technical assistance provider. The aim of the initiative was to broaden the scope of problem-solving courts, testing their approach to wider defendant populations and applying key problem-solving principles—links to social services, rigorous judicial monitoring, aggressive community outreach—outside of the specialized court context. Jurisdictions funded under the grant range in size from tiny Overland Park, Oregon, to the densely populated New York City borough of the Bronx.

In 2006, the Center for Court Innovation conducted a one and one-half day start-up workshop, “Problem-Solving Justice: Working with the Community to Increase Public Safety,” in San Diego, California, attended by judges, court administrators, police officers, probation officers, prosecutors, legal officers, and specialists from ten grant sites. This workshop introduced participants to the basic principles of problem-solving justice and prepared them for their first year of operations.

The following year, the Center conducted a second one and one-half day workshop, “Expanding the Use of Problem-Solving Justice: Reflections on what works, what doesn’t, and how to overcome challenges,” which allowed the participants to discuss challenges they’d experienced in their first years of operation and to identify key next steps for their problem-solving initiatives.

This training manual is based on the agendas and participant handbooks created for these workshops, and is intended to provide practitioners with the tools to initiate their own problem-solving initiative. The manual is meant to be flexible and includes a number of resources that can be adapted for a variety of purposes. It is intended to assist court managers, judicial trainers, and other in putting on trainings at the local level, creating agendas and participant handbooks based on these materials. The hope is that this manual will help jurisdictions train their local system players in planning and implementing a community-based problem-solving criminal justice initiative. For more information, please visit www.courtinnovation.org.

WORKSHOP #1: SAMPLE AGENDA

[From a workshop held in San Diego, California, in January 2006]

DAY ONE

Faculty Notes:

Prior to 9:00 a.m., faculty members should be seated throughout the training audience. Faculty members are asked to make sure that they've introduced themselves to all persons seated at their table, and to encourage team members from different jurisdictions to introduce themselves to one another.

Wednesday, January 25, 2006

8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.

Registration & Continental Breakfast

9:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.

Welcoming Remarks

Speakers:

Julius Lang

Director of Technical Assistance

Center for Court Innovation

A. Elizabeth Griffith

Associate Deputy Director, Office of Justice Programs

Bureau of Justice Assistance

9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

How Did We Get Here?

Speaker:

Greg Berman

Director, Center for Court Innovation

(Description of the history of problem-solving court movement)

10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Site Introduction: Problem? Response?

Faculty Notes:

A representative from each jurisdiction should briefly describe the primary problems that their project is seeking to address, and explain what they are planning to do differently.

11:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.

BREAK

11:15 a.m. – 12:15 p.m.

Collaborating with the Community and Other Partners

Moderator:

Christopher Watler
Deputy Director of Technical Assistance
Center for Court Innovation

Speakers:
Joy Ashton
National. Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges
Pima County, Arizona

Michael Doucette
Commonwealth's Attorney
Lynchburg, Virginia

Hon. Kandra Robbins
Presiding Judge, Sault Ste. Marie. Chippewa Tribal Court
Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan

Representative Ted Vick
Chesterfield, South Carolina

*(Speakers describe how they're involving the community in
planning and implementing their project)*

Faculty Notes:

*To the extent possible, select practitioners/panelists who have had success in their own
problem-solving initiatives, specifically in the area of collaborating with the community
and other partners, such as law enforcement and probation, etc. Leave 15 minutes at the
end of each presentation for audience questions.*

12:15 p.m. – 1:20 p.m. **Working Lunch**

Speaker:
Hon. Alex Calabrese
Presiding Judge
Red Hook Community Justice Center

*(Speaker screens DVD on Red Hook Community Justice
Center, and describes his role as presiding judge)*

1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. **Social Service Linkages**

Moderator:
Alan Henry
Executive Director
Pretrial Services Resource Center

Speakers:
Elizabeth Bartell
Program Manager, Clackamas County Social Services
Clackamas County, Oregon

Sherrri Crock
Mental Health Court Liaison
Athens County Municipal Court
Athens County, Ohio

Hon. Susan Finlay
Judge, San Diego Domestic Violence Court,
San Diego, California

Bob Hood
Presiding Judge, Seattle Community Court
Seattle, Washington

(Speakers describe how they're linking offenders to social services)

Faculty Notes:

To the extent possible, select practitioners/panelists who have had success in their own problem-solving initiatives, specifically in the area of identifying local social service providers, assessing the needs of offenders, and linking offenders to on-site or community-based services. Leave 15 minutes at the end of each presentation for audience questions.

2:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

Community Service

Moderator:
Alfred Siegel
Deputy Director
Center for Court Innovation

Speakers:
Aubrey Fox
Director, Bronx Community Solutions
Bronx, New York

Phil McDonald
Court Programs Administrator
Atlanta Community Court
Atlanta, Georgia

Angie Reddish-Day

Head Deputy City Attorney
Neighborhood Prosecution Unit
San Diego, California

(Speakers describe their community service programs)

Faculty Notes:

To the extent possible, select practitioners/panelists who have had success in their own problem-solving initiatives, specifically in the area of identifying ways offenders can perform community restitution projects. Encourage presenters to discuss the role that community members can play in identifying these activities, as well as challenges encountered, such as how to make community service immediate and visible and how to measure its effect. Leave 15 minutes at the end of each presentation for audience questions.

3:30 p.m. – 3:45 p.m. **BREAK**

3:45 p.m. – 4:30 p.m. **Measuring Results**

Speaker:
Mike Rempel
Director of Research
Center for Court Innovation

(Speaker describes methods for tracking data and measuring the results of problem-solving initiatives)

4:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. **BJA Reporting Requirements**

Speaker:
Dara Schulman
Policy Advisor
Bureau of Justice Assistance

5:00 p.m. – 5:15 p.m. **Wrap-up**

5:15 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. **Networking**

DAY TWO

Thursday, January 26, 2006

8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Continental Breakfast**

9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m. **Welcome & Review Agenda**

9:15 a.m. – 10:15 a.m. **Key Elements, Activities, and Indicators**

Facilitator:
Julius Lang

Faculty Notes:

Learning Objectives: Training audience should understand the key common elements of a community-based problem-solving criminal justice initiative, and be able to describe what activities they'll conduct for each element as well as how activities will be measured.

10:15 – 10:30 a.m. **BREAK**

10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Planning Next Steps**

(Participants break into five smaller groups, two sites to a group. Each site is asked to review progress to date and develop a list of next steps for project implementation. Faculty coaches the groups.)

Faculty Notes:

Learning Objective: Each jurisdiction should be able to articulate key goals and next steps for its problem-solving initiative.

Faculty Notes – Facilitation Tips for Small Group Discussion:

- *Summarize/repeat back what is said in the small groups before each presentation.*
- *Listen and ask questions; offer suggestions if necessary to help advance the group's conversation.*
- *Make sure everyone has a chance to participate.*
- *Provide time warnings.*
- *Encourage other faculty to observe, listen and ask questions, rather than provide solutions.*

12:30 p.m. – 12:45 p.m. **Wrap-Up & Final Evaluation**

WORKSHOP #2: SAMPLE AGENDA
[From a workshop held in Atlanta, Georgia, in May 2007]

DAY ONE

Wednesday, May 23, 2007

8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. **Registration & Continental Breakfast**

Faculty Small Group Assignments

Aaron Arnold, Center for Court Innovation Upstate Office: Pima and Seattle (Table 1)

Greg Berman, Center for Court Innovation: Bronx and Lynchburg (Table 2)

Diana Karafin, Center for Court Innovation Research Team: Athens and South Carolina (Table 3)

Steve Jansen, National District Attorney’s Association: San Diego and Sault Tribe of Chippewa Indians (Table 4)

Karen Moen, Center for Families, Children and the Courts, California Administrative Office of the Courts: Atlanta and Clackamas (Table 5)

Faculty Notes:

Prior to 9:00 a.m., each faculty member should be seated at the “home table” noted above. In addition, faculty members are asked to help guide workshop participants to their “home tables” so the workshop can begin on time. Faculty are also asked to make sure that they’ve introduced themselves to all persons seated at their table, and to encourage team members from different jurisdictions to introduce themselves to one another.

9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m. **Welcoming Remarks**

Speakers:

Julius Lang
Director of Technical Assistance
Center for Court Innovation

Preeti Menon
Policy Advisor for Adjudication
Bureau of Justice Assistance

9:15 am – 9:30 a.m. **A Vision for Community Justice in Atlanta**

City Council President Lisa Borders
(Introduced by Judge Cheryl Gaines)

9:30 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. **Keynote Address**

The Honorable Domingo S. Herraiz
Director
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U. S. Department of Justice

10:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m. **Identifying Successes and Challenges**

Participants will work in small groups to identify successes and challenges of their programs to date, and then present to larger group.

Faculty Notes: Facilitation Tips for Small Group Discussion:

- *Summarize/repeat back what is said in the small groups before each presentation.*
- *Listen and ask questions; offer suggestions if necessary to help advance the group's conversation.*
- *Make sure everyone has a chance to participate.*
- *Ensure that each group completes their tasks for each segment.*
- *Provide time warnings.*
- *Encourage other faculty to observe, listen and ask questions, rather than provide solutions, if they join your group.*

Faculty Notes:

Learning Objective: Each jurisdiction should be able to articulate key strengths—and key challenges—of its problem-solving initiative.

- Going into this exercise, each table should have a faculty member and two teams.
- Introduce activity. (5 minutes) (Chris Watler)
- At each table, faculty members should distribute HANDOUT 1, “Identifying Success & Challenges” to each person at the table At each table, faculty should ask each team answer the questions on HANDOUT 1. (15 minutes)
- After discussion within each team, faculty should ask each team to designate someone to present to the other team on: (i) strengths of their program, (ii) challenges they’re facing, and (iii) improvements they have made since their project’s inception. (7 minutes for each team; 15 minutes all together)
- At each table, faculty should ask the person who presented each team’s strengths and challenges to the other team to give a 4-minute report to the larger group.

- In large group, each jurisdiction will be asked to highlight their key strengths and challenges. Strengths and challenges will be charted separately, being sure to underscore common successes and challenges, also noting progress made in meeting former challenges. (4 minutes for each team; 40 minutes altogether) (Chris Watler)

11:15 a.m. – 11:30 a.m. **BREAK /Red Dot Activity**

During break, participants will pick the five most pressing challenges they'd like to discuss further.

Faculty Notes:

Learning Objective: The training audience will learn how to guide groups with different interests towards consensus in prioritizing issues, and will also identify five priority issues to be worked on in the exercise that follows.

- Each table host will receive an envelope with a sufficient number of “red dots” for people at the table. Just prior to the break, faculty should distribute three “red dots” to each participant.
- Participants will be asked to come up to the front of the room during the break and use their three “votes” to highlight the most important challenges they would like the group to focus on during the next segment. (Julius Lang)

11:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Meeting Challenges: Brainstorming Activity**

Participants will break into five small groups, each discussing one of the priority challenges identified above. Each breakout will share with the larger group their best ideas for meeting the challenge discussed.

[Julius Lang]

Faculty Small Group Assignments

Aaron Arnold: Issue 1
 Greg Berman: Issue 2
 Steve Jansen: Issue 3
 Diana Karafin: Issue 4
 Karen Moen: Issue 5

Faculty Notes:

Learning Objective: In this activity, participants will generate actionable solutions for five key priority challenges.

- Using the results of the “red dot” exercise, the top five challenges prioritized by the group will be identified by a numeral “1” through “5”. Participants will be asked to

get up and move to the table corresponding to the number of the issue they'd most like to work on during this exercise. (10 minutes) (Julius Lang)

- Each faculty should bring a flip chart over to their table for use in the exercise.
- Faculty members should assist in trying to keep the tables balanced and, if one table seems to be attracting a disproportionately large number of people, that table's host should encourage members of the same team to "fan out" among different issues.
- Once again, a spokesperson from the group should be identified to make a 6-minute report on the top ideas that the group comes up with. Throughout the day, try to encourage new spokespersons for each report out. Also, someone should be designated as the scribe to record key points on the flip chart.
- At each table, faculty should ask participants to examine the challenge closely, and develop ideas for responding to it. Faculty should encourage some discussion about the exact nature of the challenge that the group has gathered to discuss, and then guide them into brainstorming solutions. (20 minutes)
- In the larger group, a spokesperson for each "challenge group" will present their top ideas for meeting the challenge assigned. (6 minutes each; 30 minutes altogether) (Julius Lang)

12:30 p.m. – 1:35 p.m.

Working Lunch Presentation: "*Finding the Resources to Sustain--and Grow--your Project*"

Speaker:

Greg Berman

Director

Center for Court Innovation

Faculty Notes:

People may be seated at lunch as they choose. Wherever people have decided to sit for lunch, faculty and participants are asked to return to their "home tables" for the following exercise. After lunch, we will take a short break.

1:45 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.

"*Problem-Solving Idol*" Exercise

In this exercise, participants will practice "pitching" their projects to a panel of three mock local funders, who will offer feedback on what they found most compelling about the pitch, and how it might be even more effective.

Panelists:

Preeti Menon

Policy Advisor
Bureau of Justice Assistance
U.S. Department of Justice

Michael Magnani
Director
Division of Grants and Program Development
New York State Unified Court System

Phillip Rush
Program Officer
Atlanta Community Foundation

Faculty Notes (All):

Learning Objective: Participants will practice seeking support for their initiative and gain expert feedback on effective ways to highlight the strengths of their initiative.

- Chris Watler will serve as host and help moderate feedback between participants and judges.
- Introduce the exercise and the panel of three “potential funders” (5 minutes) (Chris Watler)

Faculty Notes (Small Groups):

Table assignments (“home tables”):

Aaron Arnold: Pima and Seattle (Table 1)

Greg Berman: Bronx and Lynchburg (Table 2)

Diana Karafin: Athens and South Carolina (Table 3)

Steve Jansen: San Diego and Sault Tribe of Chippewa Indians (Table 4)

Karen Moen: Atlanta and Clackamas (Table 5)

- At each table, faculty should ask each jurisdiction to prepare a five minute funding solicitation for their initiative. A spokesperson for each jurisdiction should be identified at the start.
- Faculty should note that, even though two teams are seated at each table, this time the groups will work on their “pitches” independently. (25 minutes)
- At each table, faculty should distribute HANDOUT 2, which is a worksheet to help prepare each “pitch.” Presentations should communicate: *What problem(s) is your initiative addressing? How does your initiative engage the community and partners? What progress has been made since you started? What challenges did your initiative overcome? What have you learned so far that you will use to improve your project?*

- Faculty should seek to make sure each team understands the challenge, and move around the table to make sure no one is getting “stuck.”
- The spokesperson for each team will be asked to make their pitch before the panel of three judges. Afterwards, judges will give feedback to each group. (5 minutes for each presentation and 5 minutes of feedback from the judges; 100 minutes altogether) (Chris Watler)
- Faculty should be available during the “judging” to provide feedback if requested.
- *Remember:* Everyone is a winner in this Idol competition!

Faculty Notes (Three “judges”):

- The three “judges” for this exercise are acting in each case as a multi-agency panel that’s been convened in the local jurisdiction to evaluate proposals to fund local justice initiatives.
- Each jurisdiction has been asked to designate a spokesperson, who will have 5 minutes to make a pitch to your panel for local support for their problem-solving initiative.
- Presenters have been asked to address the following issues in their presentations: *What problem(s) is your initiative addressing? How does your initiative engage the community and partners? What progress has been made since you started? What challenges did your initiative overcome? What have you learned so far that you will use to improve your project?*
- Following each 5-minute pitch, there will be 5 more minutes for feedback from the judges.
- During the 5-minute feedback period, as judges you are asked to give a brief statement about what you liked best about the presentation—what resonated the most with you as a potential funder? In addition, each judge should offer one or two suggestions about how the presentation could’ve been even stronger.
- Note: We hope that participants do not find this exercise to be stressful, so anything you can do to help put presenters at their ease (such as nodding as they speak, smiling, etc.) would be helpful. As presenters are speaking, you may find it helpful to jot down a few notes so that you will be prepared when it’s time to offer your feedback. As you give feedback, please remember that your entire panel has a total of five minutes, so please keep your remarks as succinct as possible.

3:45 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. BREAK

4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. “*What Next?*”

Participants will break into small groups by team, and brainstorm the two or three ideas they'd like to try to increase local support (financial or otherwise) for their project.

Faculty Notes:

Learning Objective: Participants from each site will be asked to develop two or three actionable steps their site can make to increase local support for their problem-solving initiative.

- Introduction of activity (5 minutes) (Julius Lang)
- At each table, faculty should distribute HANDOUT 3, which is a worksheet to help develop next steps to increase local support for their problem-solving initiative. Each team should receive ONE worksheet, which will be collected, copied and returned to the jurisdiction.
- At each table, faculty should ask each jurisdiction to discuss the questions noted on HANDOUT 3, and designate a representative to fill in their team's copy of the handout. Faculty should encourage teams to begin by discussing what their needs are before moving on to discussing how to meet them. (30 minutes)
- Remind participants that these handouts will be collected at the end of the activity.
- In large group, a representative of each jurisdiction will be asked to share one idea. (2 minutes each; 25 minutes altogether) (Chris Watler)

5:00 p.m. – 5:15 p.m. **Wrap-up/DAY 1 EVALUATIONS**

6:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. **RECEPTION – Old Council Chambers,
Atlanta City Hall**

DAY TWO

Thursday, May 24, 2006

8:00 a.m – 9:00 a.m. **Continental Breakfast**

9:00 a.m. – 9:15 a.m. **Welcome & Review Agenda (Julius Lang)**

9:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Changing our Systems: Panel Discussion**

Panel discussion on making changes at a system-wide level, and evolution of problem-solving initiatives into new areas.

Panelists:

Judge Douglas Van Dyk
Presiding Judge, Overland Park Community Court

Bob Hood
Presiding Judge, Seattle Community Court

Aubrey Fox
Director, Bronx Community Solutions

Faculty Note:

DVD of Bronx Community Solutions, included in workshop materials, will be screened as part of the introduction of this topic.

10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m. **BREAK**

10:45 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. ***The Community-Based Problem Solving Movement***

Speaker:
Hon. Mike Schruck
District Attorney, Multnomah County, Oregon

11:45 p.m. – 12:15 p.m. ***Staying Connected – Ideas for Keeping the Problem-Solving Grantees Working Towards Common Goals***

Participants will discuss ideas for expanding practice of problem-solving techniques in their systems.
(Julius Lang)

12:15 p.m. – 12:30 p.m. **Wrap-Up & Final Evaluation**

RECOMMENDED MATERIALS FOR PARTICIPANT HANDBOOK

(all materials available for free download from the internet)

[Organizers of each workshop may choose from any of the following materials for inclusion in participant handbooks]

<u>TAB #</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
1	<p><i>How Did We Get Here?</i> (Powerpoint Presentation) Greg Berman, Center for Court Innovation © 2005 by Greg Berman. Included with permission of copyright owner. http://www.courtinnovation.org/How_Did_We_Get_Here_PowerPoint.pdf</p>
2	<p><i>Conference of Chief Justices and Conference of State Court Administrators: Joint Resolution in Support of Problem Solving Court Principles and Methods</i> http://ccj.ncsc.dni.us/CourtAdminResolutions/ProblemSolvingCourtPrinciplesAndMethods.pdf</p>
<p><u>Problem-Solving Background</u></p>	
3	<p><i>Principles of Problem-Solving Justice</i> Robert V. Wolf, Center for Court Innovation An examination of the six principles that animate problem-solving justice. The principles are based on the Center for Court Innovation's experience developing problem-solving initiatives, an analysis of problem-solving projects from across the country, and feedback from leading practitioners. http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Principles.pdf</p>
4	<p><i>Expanding the Use of Problem Solving: The U.S. Department of Justice Community-Based Problem-Solving Criminal Justice Initiative</i> Robert V. Wolf, Center for Court Innovation An in-depth look at the 10 projects awarded grants under the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Community-Based Problem-Solving Criminal Justice Initiative. All the grantees are trying something new: expanding problem solving to include new populations, new geographic territory, or new agencies within the criminal justice system. http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Expanding%20PS.pdf</p>
5	<p><i>Don't Reinvent the Wheel: Lessons from Problem-Solving Courts</i> Robert V. Wolf, Center for Court Innovation A review of nine practical strategies to break down the conceptual and in some cases practical barriers that separate specialized courts from each other and the world of problem-solving from traditional courts. http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Dont%20Reinvent.pdf</p>

Problem-Solving Fact Sheets

- 6 *Problem-Solving Justice in the United States: Common Principles*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Problem_Solving_Justice_in_the_US.pdf
- 7 *Using Data to Build Your Program*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Using_Data_to_Build_Your_Program.pdf
- 8 *Engaging Stakeholders in Your Project*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Engaging_Stakeholders_in_Your_Project.pdf
- 9 *Publicizing Your Program and Its Successes*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Publicizing_Your_Program.pdf
- 10 *Finding the Resources to Help Your Program Thrive*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Finding_the_Resources.pdf

Problem-Solving Tools

- 11 *Planning Checklist*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Planning_Checklist.pdf
- 12 *Mapping Community Resources*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Mapping_Community_Resources.pdf
- 13 *Using Diversion as Part of a Problem-Solving Strategy*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Using_Diversion.pdf
- 14 *Developing a Community Service Protocol*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Developing_a_CS_Protocol.pdf
- 15 *Evaluating your Program*
http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Evaluating_Your_Program.pdf
- 16 *The Hardest Sell? Problem-Solving Justice and the Challenges of Statewide Implementation*
Greg Berman, Center for Court Innovation
An overview of the issues faced by states attempting to mainstream problem-solving innovation.
<http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Hardest%20Sell1.pdf>
- 17 *Engaging the Community - A Guide for Community Justice Planners*
Greg Berman and David Anderson, Center for Court Innovation
Tips for community justice planners about how to build stronger connections between neighborhoods and the criminal justice system.
<http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Engaging%20the%20Community.pdf>
- 18 *Defining the Problem - Using Data to Plan a Community Justice Project*
Robert V. Wolf, Center for Court Innovation
A look at how community justice initiatives across the county have used concrete data to define local problems.
<http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Defining%20the%20Problem.pdf>

- 19 *Surveying Communities - A Resource for Community Justice Planners*
BJA Monograph by Leslie Paik, Center for Court Innovation
Outlines how criminal justice officials can use community surveys to gather data about neighborhood public safety problems.
<http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/surveyingcommunities.pdf>
- 20 *Strategies for Court Collaboration with Service Communities*
BJA Program Brief based on monograph by National Center for State Courts.
<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bja/196945.pdf>
- 21 *Red Hook Community Justice Center* (DVD)
A mini-documentary based on the hour-long "Red Hook Justice," which aired on PBS. This video, by award-winning film maker Meema Spadola, offers a look into the workings of this innovative justice center.
<http://www.courtinnovation.org/research/red-hook-community-justice-center-video>
- 22 *The Changing Nature of Prosecution - Community Prosecution vs. Traditional Approaches*
M. Elaine Nugent, American Prosecutors Research Institute
Community prosecution versus traditional prosecution approaches.
http://www.ndaa.org/pdf/changing_nature_of_prosecution.pdf
- 23 *Community Defenders in the 21st Century: Building on a Tradition of Problem-Solving for Clients, Families and Needy Communities*
Cait Clarke, United States' Attorneys Bulletin, January 2001 (page 20)
http://www.justice.gov/usao/eousa/foia_reading_room/usab4901.pdf
- 24 *Measuring Results* (Powerpoint Presentation)
Mike Rempel, Center for Court Innovation
© 2005 by Mike Rempel. Included with permission of copyright owner.
http://www.courtinnovation.org/How_Did_We_Get_Here_PowerPoint.pdf
- 25 *Bronx Community Solutions* (DVD)
A documentary-style overview of Bronx Community Solutions, an experimental project that brings the problem-solving principles of the Midtown Community Court and Red Hook Community Justice Center to over 40 courtrooms in a busy urban courthouse. This eight-minute video was produced and directed by award-winning film maker Meema Spadola. To preview, visit:
<http://www.courtinnovation.org/research/bronx-community-solutions-video>
- 26 *Learning from Failure: A Roundtable on Criminal Justice Innovation*
Greg Berman, Center for Court Innovation
In January 2007, the Center for Court Innovation and the U.S. Department of Justice's Bureau of Justice Assistance convened a day-long roundtable in New York that brought together judges, court administrators, probation officials, prosecutors, police chiefs and defense attorneys from across the country to discuss lessons they have learned from projects that did not succeed. The goal was to take a deeper look at failed reform efforts and extract concrete lessons that might aid the next generation of innovators, as well as those who authorize and fund

innovation.

http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Learning_from_Failure%5B1%5D.pdf

27

Good Courts, Chapter 5: "Success Stories"

Greg Berman and John Feinblatt

© 2005 by Greg Berman and John Feinblatt. Included with permission of copyright owners.

http://www.courtinnovation.org/Good_Courts_chapter_5.pdf

28

How Do We Pay for That? Sustaining Community Prosecution on a Tight Budget

Robert V. Wolf, Center for Court Innovation

A detailed look at strategies prosecutors have used to fund community prosecution programs. The paper includes a comprehensive list of internet resources. Originally written for community prosecution programs, but just as relevant for community-based problem-solving criminal justice initiatives.

<http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/Sustainability%203.pdf>

29

Breaking with Tradition: Introducing Problem Solving in Conventional Courts

Robert V. Wolf, Center for Court Innovation

An overview of why problem solving strategies are desirable and techniques practitioners can deploy to introduce these strategies in conventional courtrooms. Focusing primarily on the "conventional" court context, but full of ideas from defense attorneys, prosecutors, judges and court administrators for planners of community-based problem-solving criminal justice initiatives.

<http://www.courtinnovation.org/sites/default/files/break%20with%20trad.pdf>