

Collaborating for Justice: Involvement of Prosecutors in Criminal Justice Collaborations



By Judith Berman, Ph.D.

Introduction

As the community's top law enforcement officials, prosecutors are essential players in any effort to create change within the criminal justice system. Whether the issue is jail overcrowding, offenders with mental illness, or white collar crime, prosecutors play a leading role as front line decision makers. Increasingly, prosecutors are participating in policymaking efforts not only to respond to crime, but to prevent criminal activity and address the causes of crime in the community. Community prosecution is only the latest manifestation of this growing role. Before that came coordinated community responses to domestic violence, sexual assault, and child abuse, diversion programs for drug offenders, and increased enforcement of child support, among others. One element that these policymaking efforts have in common, whether they remain within the official bounds of the justice system or extend further into the community, is the need for collaboration across agency and disciplinary lines.

It would be the rare prosecutor's office that has not been asked to participate in an inter-agency collaborative team, whether a criminal justice policy team, coordinated community response team, or other similar activity. Many prosecutors have, in fact, spearheaded these projects. Some are concerned with broad criminal justice policy issues while others are more case-specific, such as domestic violence or child abuse death review teams. It would also be the rare prosecutor who has not suffered from being part of a team that was inefficient and ineffective, or worse, argumentative and outright antagonistic. What makes the

difference between teams that succeed and teams that fail to accomplish what they set out to do? While there will always be some mystery around the chemistry of individuals and teams, scholars of organizational development, primarily in the private sector but increasingly in public sector environments as well, have researched the principles and practices at work in effective collaborations. In the application of these principles and practices to the criminal justice context, the National Resource Center on Collaboration in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Systems [a project of the State Justice Institute (SJI) and Center for Effective Public Policy (the Center)] have found that collaboration is both a goal in itself, and the necessary starting point for success in other endeavors. When called for, collaboration must be actively cultivated in order to serve as the basis for achieving a specific end.

The application of collaboration to the criminal justice system is fraught with unique challenges. Unlike collaborators in business who share a common bottom line, or collaborators in public health who share a common enemy, collaborators in the criminal justice system may feel challenged to identify their common purpose. The system, which is, in truth, less a system than a coordinated set of procedures, was designed to be adversarial, with each agency charged with advocating a specific perspective and managing their own part of the process. This "system" involves a wide mix of stakeholders ranging from elected and appointed officials who answer to different authorities, including the authority of the electorate, to private citizens. This combination can further erode the sense of common purpose.

This document was developed under grant number SJI-99 N-039-CO1-1 from the State Justice Institute. The points of view expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the State Justice Institute.

Nevertheless, collaboration is happening in criminal justice systems throughout the country in a variety of jurisdictions addressing a wide range of criminal justice issues. The common ground includes the need to be efficient and effective at addressing crime, the need to serve the public and victims of crime, and the need to meet the public's expectations that the criminal justice system should increase community safety. In the juvenile system, the common ground includes the need to serve the best interests of children and youth, and create the greatest likelihood of rehabilitation. Some of these activities include death review teams and other similar efforts in which specific cases are reviewed to learn if any gaps in the system can be closed. Others involve more expansive, non-case-specific criminal justice policy. These broader issues include: general administration of the courts, improving responses to women offenders, managing adult and/or juvenile sex offenders, establishing intermediate sanctions for adults or graduated sanctions for juveniles, addressing jail overcrowding, and a host of others. Specialized courts like drug and mental health courts require collaborative relationships among the judiciary, prosecutors, defense attorneys, treatment providers, social service administrators, correctional supervisors and others to work effectively. Jurisdictions throughout the country are recognizing the benefits of using collaboration to overcome some of the criminal justice system's stickiest problems.

This article will address the challenges and benefits of collaboration, specifically to prosecutors. It will address what collaboration is, and is not; what components are necessary for collaboration to work effectively; and what kinds of tools are available to assist those who are interested in cultivating effective collaborative approaches within their jurisdiction.

What Is Collaboration?

Collaboration has become something of a buzzword in the last several years. Federal grant programs often require evidence of a multidisciplinary project team as a condition

of funding, and projects in both the public and private sectors are touted as collaboratives, as if this signifies either particular creativity, efficiency, or both. Collaboration has been recognized as an appropriate and effective strategy for addressing some of the country's most complicated, multidimensional problems, as well as for maximizing efficient use of available resources. But this does not mean that everyone who uses the term collaboration is actually doing it.

In some jurisdictions, holding interdisciplinary meetings to share information passes for collaboration. In others, signing a memorandum of understanding supporting another agency's project is considered collaboration. But these activities fall short of the commitment, investment, and vision necessary for true collaboration. Collaboration, according to David Chrislip and Carl Larson, two prominent experts in the field, "is a mutually beneficial relationship between two or more parties to achieve common goals by sharing responsibility, authority and accountability for achieving results. It is more than simply sharing knowledge and information (communication) and more than a relationship that helps each party achieve its own goals (cooperation and coordination). The purpose of collaboration is to create a shared vision and joint strategies to address concerns that go beyond the purview of any particular party."¹

In the context of the criminal justice system, there are many concerns that affect each organization or agency that "go beyond the purview of any particular party." Collaboration makes change possible within the criminal and juvenile justice systems that would be otherwise impossible.

While definitions of collaboration can vary according to the particular context to which they are applied, all researchers in this field identify the need for a shared vision or common purpose to both motivate and structure the collaborative endeavor. Chris Huxham, for example, notes that when we collaborate, we exchange information, alter our activities, share resources and "enhance the capacity of another for the mutual benefit of all and to achieve a common purpose."²

Collaborations may be built around values that are common to those working in a particular field. Many working in the justice system, for example, share a commitment to promoting public safety. The leadership of a collaborative may choose to invite only those stakeholders who are believed to share a particular set of values.

Nonetheless, the shared vision or common purpose must be defined and articulated by those stakeholders that comprise the collaborative team to ensure buy-in and agreement. Each member must come to see the team's purpose as larger than their individual interests, whatever those may be (reputation, revenue, publicity, personal satisfaction, etc.). Members need to believe that any member of the team can be trusted to advance that larger purpose.

Indeed, when Carl Larson and Frank LaFasto studied the work of teams from a diverse set of fields including business, sports, community development, and public health in order to determine what makes teams succeed, the presence of a "clear and elevating goal" was the first and most important characteristic they identified.³

This goal provides motivation as well as direction and guidance. Interestingly, in order to be sufficiently inspiring, it needs to be something that is just out of reach, an ideal. It needs to elevate the work of the collaborative team above the mundane and the everyday and direct it toward the future. "A shared vision can provide a revolutionary reconception of future possibilities," writes David Chrislip in *Collaborative Leadership* (2002).

"By providing a broader context for action, a shared vision allows people to break out of historic mind-sets. It shifts emphasis from the present to the future by redirecting energy toward positive, desirable outcomes rather than avoidance of negative, undesirable consequences" (109).

Note that, according to Larson and LaFasto, the goal must be both elevating AND clear. In order to unite the purpose of the team, the vision must be fully and unambiguously understood by each team member.

Vision is therefore absolutely necessary to a successful team. But it is not sufficient. Other characteristics Larson and LaFasto

discovered among the variety of successful teams included:

- *A results-driven structure*, a structure that best suits the results that the team is trying to achieve, whatever those may be;
- *Competent team members*, individuals who possess both the substantive or technical skills and knowledge required to accomplish the tasks, as well as the personal attributes that make them good at working with others;
- *Unified commitment*, an enthusiastic sense of loyalty and dedication to the team, fostered by active involvement in the work;
- *A collaborative climate*, one where honesty, openness, consistency and respect are prominent, and trust is established and maintained;
- *Standards of excellence* that create pressure on each team member to perform;
- *External support and recognition* such that the team has sufficient resources to accomplish its goals; and
- *Principled leadership* that establishes the vision, makes it compelling, creates change, and unleashes the energy and talent of team members without over-involvement of the leader's ego.⁴

As Larsen and LaFasto identify in their description of a "collaborative climate," the presence of trust among team members is one of the hallmarks of a collaborative endeavor. We must trust that our teammates will respect our positions and our limits. We must trust that our discussions will be kept confidential; that conflict, whether of opinion or style, will be managed such that the team is better rather than worse off for having opened the conflict to scrutiny; and that team members will support each other publicly in the face of either success or failure along the project's path. The level of trust required takes both time and effort to develop, but it is an essential prerequisite to any collaborative accomplishment.

Trust is often difficult to achieve in a professional environment, especially one like the criminal justice system where roles are defined as adversarial. The very idea of a prosecutor and defense attorney collaborating strikes many as unlikely, if not downright impossible. And yet, both prosecutors and defense attorneys need to be at the table in order that the needs and interests of both can be represented and taken into account in criminal justice policy decisions. Building trust can also be difficult if there has been a history of poor relationships either between the individuals or agencies involved in the collaboration. But it is possible. In order to have trust, a team must have consistent participation by members, consistent behavior by members both within and outside the group setting, respectful interaction at all times, clear roles and responsibilities, clear standards and expectations, and accountability. In the absence of these factors, team members will not trust each other sufficiently to speak openly and develop a clear understanding of issues, nor will they be willing to take the risks necessary to create change. Often collaborative teams require time away from members' typical work environments, for example on retreat or at a workshop, where concentrated time can be spent building the foundation of trust that will carry the team through its substantive work.

Leadership is essential to the development of trust. A skilled collaborative leader will model the kind of interaction that should occur between all members. The leader of a collaborative needs to understand group dynamics, and help create the kind of working atmosphere where defenses can be let down and honest exchange take place. Judge John West of Hamilton County, Ohio, describes the work of a policy team for which he served as co-chair as, in part, the creation and institutionalization of "a forum for the key players to listen, learn, discuss, and resolve the most difficult and sensitive issues."⁵ If any team member violates the group's trust, or is acting in a way that will undermine trust if allowed to continue, the leader has the responsibility to address that behavior either in private or with the group, whichever the leader deems will be most effective. Ultimately, team members need to trust that the leader will enforce standards of

behavior as well as standards of performance. From there, team members can begin to hold each other accountable to the group's standards, knowing that the leader will support any team member's legitimate efforts to do so.

The Challenges of Collaboration

Collaboration changes the way we work because it requires us to shift "from competing to consensus building; from working alone to including others; from thinking about activities to thinking about results and strategies; and from focusing on short-term accomplishments to demanding long-term results."⁶ Collaboration is designed to solve problems rather than stake out positions. Collaboration forces us to think differently about the other individuals and organizations that are stakeholders in the criminal justice system, to think about them as partners with each other as well as with us.

Collaboration is hard work in any context. Prosecutors, judges, defense attorneys and others in the typically overtaxed and under-resourced criminal justice system, face tremendous demands on their time. Collaboration requires commitment, and it can be very difficult to consistently attend meetings no matter how compelling the subject. In addition, the process of achieving consensus is often slower and more time-consuming than other forms of decision making, making necessary an extended time commitment. Many people become impatient with collaboration, presuming that there are faster, easier ways to create change, which there are. The question is whether they are equally effective. Research demonstrates, writes James Surowiecki in *The Wisdom of Crowds*, "that the simple fact of making a group diverse makes it better at problem solving...A large group of diverse individuals will...make more intelligent decisions than even the most skilled 'decision maker.'"⁷ Taking account of diverse perspectives from the outset ensures buy-in from everyone, including those who would be most likely to object or interfere at the implementation

stage. And groups are not necessarily slow. Surowiecki cites studies demonstrating that “groups could make intelligent decisions quickly, and could do so better than their smartest members.”⁸

For prosecutors, whose overarching interest is the public good and whose goal is to see that offenders are held accountable for criminal behavior, it can be challenging to reach consensus with those who are most interested in protecting individual defendants. Collaboration wisdom suggests, however, that we should bring to the table those most likely to disagree with us in order to address their concerns from the outset and win their buy-in. While prosecutors and defense attorneys may not agree on whose interest is best served by certain policy decisions, it is vital to the process that both participate and articulate their perspectives. Any policy decision that does not sufficiently protect defendant rights will be fought, and likewise for any decision that does not sufficiently protect public safety. The common ground will be a policy acceptable to all sides and most likely to be supported and maintained for the long term.

Benefits of Collaboration

While collaboration is not the answer to every problem, it can be the answer to some of the most intractable problems faced by the criminal and juvenile justice systems. When a problem is complex, when it appears to be influenced by and to affect a number of different departments or agencies, and when a solution would require buy-in from a variety of stakeholders in order to succeed, then collaboration may well be worth the time and energy. Challenges like the revolving door phenomenon for drug offenders, the pressure put on the criminal justice system by the deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill, the shift in national policy focus from stiff punishment to rehabilitation and offender reentry, managing issues like domestic violence that traverse criminal, civil and often juvenile court jurisdiction, creating comprehensive juvenile justice, finding effective strategies for managing sex offenders – these are all challenges that address broad policy issues and are most appropriately addressed through

interdisciplinary collaboration. Alan Goulart, Deputy Director of the Criminal Division of Rhode Island’s Department of the Attorney General, has worked with a collaborative team for the past several years to build a comprehensive approach to managing sex offenders. He calls his experience with collaboration “an incredible learning experience.” “Sometimes prosecutors can learn things from people who aren’t lawyers,” he jokes. “I’ve learned to keep an open mind. And it’s been good for me to learn that I need other people to help tackle the biggest problems we face.”⁹

Collaboration can also serve to support an effective planning process. If budget cuts are planned throughout the jurisdiction, for example, it would make very good sense for agencies to consider the impact of their cuts on the other agencies, and to consider developing a jurisdictional plan for criminal justice rather than making piecemeal cuts. If each agency cut programs that assisted a particular population of offenders, for example, such as those with mental illness and substance abuse problems, prosecutors might find themselves with fewer options to recommend for sentencing or diversion, the jail might become overpopulated with these offenders without the necessary staff to manage them, and some offenders might need to be released from jail to the community to alleviate overcrowding. The public, which expects that the criminal justice system function like a coordinated entity, will see only that offenders are being released and question whether public safety is being achieved through their release. Collaborating to achieve a system-wide perspective on the criminal justice population would benefit the public as well as those charged with managing the offender population.

As elected officials, prosecutors have much to gain when they choose to enter into collaborative relationships, especially on high profile issues. The community can see that the criminal justice system is responding to public safety not only on a case-by-case basis, but is looking at the bigger picture of the effective administration of justice and is adjusting itself to meet the needs of the community. As Robert Horowitz, former Prosecuting Attorney for

Stark County, Ohio, explained of his work with an intermediate sanctions project: "We learned very early on that as a board, the group of us had a lot more power with the Commissioner's Office and the public than we did individually."¹⁰ Collaboration harnesses the power of diverse groups and agencies, and can impact issues more significantly than any agency acting alone. Certain criminal behaviors affect families and communities beyond that which the justice system is designed to address. Domestic violence, for example, has repercussions for schools, housing, public benefits, mental health services, as well as victim services, corrections, and intervention programs. Bringing together stakeholders and helping them to understand and do their jobs better allows prosecutors to focus better on what they are equipped to do – prosecute the offenders. By participating in collaboration, prosecutors can ensure that the policies and procedures of the system better meet the needs of their office, whether those are needs for a special docket to improve efficiency and victim services in certain kinds of cases, or for cooperation by pre-trial services or others in sharing information about the offenders. Prosecutors can work to increase the options available at disposition, and ensure that any programs that are created best fit the needs and public safety challenges of the types of offenders that are coming through the system, as well as ensure that jail and prison beds are available for those who most require them. As system advocates for crime victims, prosecutors are also well situated to speak up for victims' needs, since helping victims can significantly impact their willingness and ability to participate in prosecution.

At the same time, collaboration creates the possibility of transforming how prosecutors do what they do. As Suzanne Tallarico (formerly Suzanne Pullen), Senior Court Management Consultant for the National Center for State Courts, puts it, "when team members at all levels better understand what the others need to do their jobs, everyone can do their jobs more effectively."¹¹ Collaboration offers increased knowledge of how our decisions affect others in the system. For example, when prosecutors understand that pleading down

sex offense cases to equally serious but non-sexual crimes reduces the likelihood that sex offenders will receive treatment, they might choose to change that practice to ensure that charges retain some elements of the sexual nature of the crime.

Collaboration also helps others in the system to understand that sometimes, charges are pled down because a victim is too young to testify, or evidence does not exist to pursue the more serious charge. A good collaboration will never result in a member being forced to violate his or her own beliefs or standards of practice. Collaboratives do, however, require a certain level of power-sharing. While members retain control over *what* they are willing to give, part of the trust that must exist among members comes from a belief that all members are willing to participate in the give and take. Prosecuting attorneys will always retain authority over charging and other intra-office decisions, for example. Participation in a collaborative, however, may influence those decisions by putting them in a more holistic context.

In its capacity to build relationships among system actors, and promote information sharing and good communication, collaboration can benefit prosecutors fulfilling their traditional prosecutorial role. But it has perhaps even more to offer to those interested in expanding their role to include crime prevention and enhancement of community quality of life. Community prosecution is an area in which prosecutors are taking the lead of both system and community stakeholders. It involves working with community groups and individuals and allowing them to identify those criminal behaviors that most directly impact their quality of life. Whether the issue is how to respond to drug houses more quickly and efficiently, or how to reduce prostitution in a particular neighborhood, or how to address noise problems, community prosecutors listen to community members describe the problems, and seek out allies who might be brought in to help address them. For example, some communities have discovered that enforcing municipal building codes is a faster way to close down drug houses than using criminal charges against drug dealers. This requires that the community prosecutor on the county level

collaborate with the municipal attorneys and housing inspectors in the jurisdiction, as well as resident councils and other community groups to identify and respond to problem properties. Similarly, a problem with truancy may require close collaboration with the schools as well as social service agencies that may represent the first line response for families whose young children are not attending school on a regular basis. In community prosecution, the prosecutor acts as a convener of stakeholders to create a collaborative environment in which problems can be solved.

For practitioners in the juvenile justice system, this level of collaboration is not likely to seem foreign. The juvenile justice system has traditionally been less adversarial and more cooperative than the adult system. Nonetheless, new approaches to juvenile justice have challenged those in the system to improve their ability to collaborate effectively as well. Juvenile drug courts, for example, have been developed, and team members often come to the table with very different ideas about how drug courts should operate. The move toward graduated sanctions, like intermediate sanctions for adults, requires consensus around the purpose of sanctioning, the particular target populations in need of specific programs, and the type of risk and need assessment information that will guide decisionmaking. In this time of paradigm shifts, the perspective and buy-in of prosecutors is essential to ensure the effectiveness of juvenile justice.

Tools of the Trade

The first challenge of collaboration is getting the right people to the table. A stakeholder analysis – reviewing the particular problem and identifying all those who have a stake in the problem or its resolution – can assist a group in ensuring that everyone who needs to participate has been invited. Even with all stakeholders present, the challenge remains of ensuring the success of a particular collaborative endeavor. Collaborations face many obstacles, from ineffective meeting facilitation, to incompatible missions among stakeholder agencies, to thorny personalities, to subtle but persistent forms

of sabotage. Not many people have truly experienced successful collaboration, and the specter of a team project looms large with images of poor communication, turf issues, and the set of policy recommendations that sits on the shelf.

One way to ensure that a collaborative effort succeeds is to dedicate energy to the process of collaborating. Team work generally involves two types of activities: task functions and process functions. Task functions include those that directly address the substantive topic at hand, such as collecting data on the number and types of offenders coming through the system, or discussing the use of a particular type of intermediate sanction and under what circumstances it might be applied. Process functions include those that address *how* the team is going to do its work together. Process functions include setting a schedule of meetings, articulating a confidentiality policy for the group, or deciding whether decisions will be made by majority or consensus. Process functions also include those activities that distinguish collaboration from other kinds of team activities, such as articulating the vision that will guide the team's work, and defining roles and responsibilities of each team member. Both task and process functions are necessary for teams to be successful, but most teams are both more familiar and more comfortable with task functions. Indeed, process functions can make some team members very uncomfortable since many criminal justice policy makers are "doers," who have achieved success in their fields because they are confident, decisive, and action-oriented.

What many "doers" miss is that actions are most effective when the goals are clear. If a team does not dedicate time to establishing a *shared* vision and mission, then an action (which a particular individual might consider effective) may not get the team any closer to its goals, since each team member may have a different idea of what those goals should be. Larson and LaFasto point out that "whenever an *ineffectively* functioning team was identified and described, the explanation for the team's ineffectiveness involved, in one sense or another, the goal."¹² Similarly, if time is not dedicated to

articulating roles and responsibilities of team members, accountability will be impossible and low standards will dominate. Getting a team ready to collaborate on substance does not require that all task functions be set aside. In fact, incremental progress on task is essential to building team momentum and securing commitment. But it does mean that time is also dedicated to the process of effective collaboration.

The other key to collaboration success is the creation of an environment that is dedicated to problem-solving rather than finger-pointing. In the fragmented world of the criminal justice system, it is easy to locate problems in other departments, offices, or agencies. It is much harder to share ownership of a problem for the purpose of finding solutions. Developing high quality data to identify and understand the problem can help teams conduct their analysis in a neutral, non-blaming way. One tool that is often used is “decision mapping.” Criminal justice decision mapping involves charting the flow of individuals – in general or a particular offender population – through the decision points in the system. This can start with arrest, through booking, charging, arraignment, all the way to sentencing, and beyond. Each decision point can be analyzed quantitatively – How many people reach this stage? – and qualitatively – What information is used to make this decision and who makes it? Decision points can also be assessed both quantitatively and qualitatively for the role of the victim and victim services in case management – How many victims are involved at each step? What is happening to the victim? Who is responsible for providing information or services at this stage? When teams work together both to collect and analyze this kind of data, they begin the process of seeing each other as part of a bigger picture, and can use objective information to inform decisions rather than relying solely on opinion or anecdotal experience.

The Center for Effective Public Policy has partnered with SJI, the U.S. Department of Justice, and others, to improve the capacity of state, local, and tribal collaborative teams to develop effective criminal justice policies on a variety of issues. In over two decades of work, there have been few policy teams

that did not, at least at first, balk at the notion of spending project time and money on something as apparently superfluous as process. But these same teams, especially ones that consider their work successful, have invariably looked back on activities such as the process of developing a vision and mission statement, and on the statements themselves, as providing crucial guidance to their work. In fact, the greater the challenges and obstacles faced by the team, the more they came to appreciate the steadiness of purpose that these documents and the experience of creating them provided. A drug court team from Gallatin County, Montana decided, for example, to post their value, vision, and mission statement in the treatment court courtroom, “a testament to the team’s solidified commitment to the importance of collaboration and belief in “process.”... It serves both the team and the court program’s participants to know that they are part of a larger vision for a strong and healthy community. The activities which led to the creation of their many products—the listing of their deeply held values, the articulation of a shared vision for the future, the setting aside of time to talk about relationships – demonstrated to the team members how the process can lead to substantive improvements, and a greater resilience in the face of the inevitable challenges facing many justice-related programs, from personnel changes, to funding shortages, to lack of community services that support justice system efforts.”¹³

Collaborative Justice

In recognition of the need for support in many jurisdictions throughout the country where collaborations are being developed either by necessity or by funding requirements (or both), SJI and the Center have developed a Web site: www.collaborativejustice.org to contain several products dedicated to supporting collaboration in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Products on the Web site include a training curriculum for a multi-day workshop to enhance the effectiveness of criminal justice teams (*Collaboration: A Training Curriculum to Enhance the*

Effectiveness of Criminal Justice Teams). The curriculum includes nine modules addressing such issues as values, vision, problem identification and mission, group dynamics, and roles and responsibilities of team members. It also includes an experiential learning exercise that gives teams a new and vital perspective on themselves and their work together. The curriculum has been piloted with hundreds of teams from around the country, including reentry policy projects, sex offender management teams, drug courts, juvenile justice enhancement teams, domestic violence coordinating councils, and others. Individuals who have attended these workshops have been singularly impressed. Judge Nancy Corsones from the Bennington Family Court of Vermont called her experience at the First Annual Collaboration Institute “inspirational.”¹⁴ Judge Jim McCarthy, Acting Supreme Court Justice from Oswego, New York said it was unlike other conferences because it was “substantively worthwhile and solidified a lot of the team’s thinking about how to get from point A to point B to point C.”¹⁵ Monographs on the Collaborative Justice Web site cover a number of topics of importance to teams. These include effective facilitation (*The Role of Facilitators and Staff in Supporting Collaborative Teams*), leadership (*The Importance of Collaborative Leadership in Achieving Effective Criminal Justice Outcomes*), and information-based system planning (*The Use of Data and Information to Guide Collaborative Decisionmaking*). Other products include several in-depth case studies from jurisdictions that sought assistance from SJJ and the Center in improving and sustaining their collaborative efforts, and an article addressing the growth of collaboration in criminal justice contexts (*The Emergence of Collaboration as the Preferred Approach in Criminal Justice*). These resources are unique insofar as they address the particular benefits and challenges specifically for criminal justice professionals who are attempting to use collaborative approaches to problem-solving in their jurisdictions.

Choosing to Collaborate

Doing the best we can in each case is important. Stepping back at times to ask what would make the local system more just and effective in all cases is equally important. When the solution requires change from others beyond the prosecutor’s office, then it may be time to collaborate and try to change collectively what no individual or agency can do by itself. Collaboration, when it works well, can inspire passion, enthusiasm, and creativity. Equally importantly, it can result in solutions to the many challenges vexing our system of justice. No one stands to benefit more from these results than those who want to see the system work on behalf of victims and the community as a whole.

Resources

In addition to the resources found on www.collaborativejustice.org, the following resources are available to assist criminal and juvenile justice teams with their collaborative work:

- David Chrislip and Carl Larson (1994). *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference*. San Francisco: JosseyBass.
- Frank Lafasto, Carl Larson (2001). *When Teams Work Best: 6,000 Team Members and Leaders Tell What It Takes to Succeed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Frank Lafasto and Carl Larson (1989). *TeamWork: What Must Go Right, What Can Go Wrong*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Institute of Corrections (2004). “Implementing Evidence-Based Principles in Community Corrections: Collaboration for Systemic Change in the Criminal Justice System.” Washington, DC: Author. (Available at www.nicic.org)
- David Straus (2002). *How to Make Collaboration Work: Powerful Ways to Build Consensus, Solve Problems, and Make Decisions*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

¹ Chrislip and Larson, COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP 5, (1994): 42.

² Huxham, CREATING COLLABORATIVE ADVANTAGE 28 (London: SAGE Publications, 1996).

³ Larson and LaFaso, TEAMWORK, (California: SAGE Publications, 1989).

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Cited in Judy Berman (2005). Systemic Criminal Justice Planning: Improving Responses to Women Offenders in Hamilton County, Ohio. National Institute of Corrections Gender Responsive Strategies for Women Offenders Bulletin Series, December 2005. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections. NIC Accession Number 020872.

⁶ Carter, The Emergence of Collaboration as the Preferred Approach in Criminal Justice, Silver Spring, MD: Center for Effective Public Policy (2005), p.4.

⁷ James Surowiecki, THE WISDOM OF CROWDS (New York: Anchor Books, 2004) pp 30, 32.

⁸ Ibid., 190.

⁹ Alan Goulart, personal communication, December 16, 2005.

¹⁰ Center for Effective Public Policy, FACILITATING THE APPROPRIATE USE OF INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS: A VIDEO SEMINAR SERIES FOR JUDGES, Module 2 (1997).

¹¹ Center for Effective Public Policy, A VIDEO SEMINAR FOR JUDGES: IMPLEMENTING EFFECTIVE SENTENCING STRATEGIES FOR SEX OFFENDERS (2000).

¹² TEAMWORK, 27, original emphasis.

¹³ For more information about teams with whom the Center for Effective Policy has worked on collaboration, see the Case Studies section of the Collaborative Justice Web site: www.collaborativejustice.org/products.htm

¹⁴ Nancy Corsones, Workshop Evaluation. First Annual Collaboration Institute, December 5-7, 2005, Washington, DC.

¹⁵ Jim McCarthy, Interview with Rachelle Giguere, Center for Effective Public Policy, December 8, 2005, Washington, DC.