



***Choosing Performance Indicators for Your  
Community Prosecution Initiative***

*by*

**Rachel Porter**

**Hon. John T. Chisholm**

***Chairman & Milwaukee County***

***District Attorney***

**David LaBahn**  
***President, CEO***

**Steven Jansen**  
***Vice-President, COO***



**BJA**  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
U.S. Department of Justice

**PROSECUTOR'S REPORT II**

© 2011 by the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys.

All rights reserved. No part of the book may be reproduced in any manner without written permission.

This project was supported by Grant No. 2009-DG-BX-K101 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, the SMART Office, 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.

**Association of Prosecuting Attorneys**

1615 L St. NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20036  
[www.APAInc.org](http://www.APAInc.org)

**Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs**

*United States Department of Justice*  
810 Seventh Street NW  
Washington, DC 20531  
<http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/BJA>



*Choosing Performance Indicators for Your  
Community Prosecution Initiative*

*by*

**Rachel Porter**

**Hon. John T. Chisholm**  
*Chairman & Milwaukee County  
District Attorney*

**David LaBahn**  
*President, CEO*

**Steven Jansen**  
*Vice-President, COO*

CENTER  
FOR  
COURT  
INNOVATION

**PROSECUTOR'S REPORT II**

# Choosing Performance Indicators for Your Community Prosecution Initiative\*

Rachel Porter

Senior Research Associate, Center for Court Innovation

## Introduction

The term *community prosecution* has been used to describe many things, including strategies other than traditional prosecution to address problems in the community, improved interagency coordination, more efficient prosecution, and a greater community presence for prosecutors. While the term provides a thumbnail description for a range of innovations and an inspirational goal, its flexibility sometimes makes a precise definition elusive. Several publications propose that community prosecution always includes the core elements of *problem solving*, *community involvement*, *partnerships*, and *evaluation* (see Jansen 2008; Nugent-Borakove, Budzilowicz, and Rainville 2007; Wolf and Worrall 2004). While a helpful starting point, these elements can imply a diverse array of strategies, from opening neighborhood-based offices to fostering greater intelligence sharing with law enforcement to exploring alternatives to incarceration and treatment-based diversion programs. Since community prosecution by its very nature is malleable, it can be challenging for prosecutors to assess or evaluate the success of their efforts.

To assist prosecutors, this report attempts to synthesize the various goals that community prosecution initiatives have adopted, identifies the objectives associated with these goals, and develops performance measures that can be used to evaluate whether those goals and objectives are met. Drawing on existing research and program literature, this report proposes a table of *Performance Indicators for Community Prosecution*. The table lays out five potential goals of community prosecution programs, linking each one, in turn, to a concrete set of objectives and a set of quantifiable performance indicators.

Not every goal that is identified in the table will be relevant to every community prosecution initiative. Accordingly, prosecutors can use the table as a menu, selecting one or more goals that are appropriate for their local initiative. It can also be used as a template to develop additional goals, objectives, and performance indicators. Ultimately, the purpose of this report is to assist prosecutors who have adopted community prosecution, whether wholesale or in part, to engage in meaningful self-assessment and ongoing reflection.

## Community Prosecution

Prosecutors have been engaged with communities formally and informally across the country for decades. Without calling the effort community prosecution, in 1985 the Manhattan District Attorney's office assigned a non-attorney staff member to serve as a community affairs officer, who could act as a liaison with neighborhood representatives and local police precincts (Boland 1998). In 1990, the Multnomah County (Oregon) District Attorney Michael Schrunk established what is widely considered the country's first formal community prosecution initiative (Boland

---

\* This report was supported by the Bureau of Justice Assistance under grant number 2009-DG-BX-K101 awarded to the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the U.S. Department of Justice's 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, the Office for Victims of Crime, and the Office of Sex Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, Registering, and Tracking. Points of view or opinions in this document do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

2007; Wolf and Worrall 2004). That initiative allocated a staff person and other resources from the prosecutor's office to work with community groups, legislators, and law enforcement to reduce drug-related crime in three Portland neighborhoods.

Around the same time, other initiatives took hold that also defined themselves as community prosecution. In 1991, the Kings County (Brooklyn, NY) District Attorney Charles Hynes divided many of his 400 attorneys into five geographic zones to increase community engagement and improve coordination with local police precincts. District Attorney Hynes also began maintaining a single attorney or team of attorneys throughout the prosecution of each case ("vertical prosecution") and, eventually, implemented a range of alternative-to-incarceration initiatives (Goldkamp et al. 2003; Wolf and Worrall 2004). Other initiatives focused on a specific case type. Washington D.C. and Middlesex County (MA) focused on violent crime and Placer County (CA) focused on elder abuse (Boland, 2001; Goldkamp et al. 2003; Wolf and Worrall 2004). By the turn of the century, a 2001 survey suggested that 49% of prosecutors nationwide use some form of community prosecution, the specific nature of which varied widely (Nugent and Rainville 2001). A 2004 survey found that 55% said they had implemented at least one type of specific initiative that could be seen as community prosecution-oriented (Nugent 2004).

Despite the interest in the field, the Justice Research and Statistics Association (2009) recently concluded that the "Information available on the success of community prosecution consists primarily of anecdotes, case studies, and reports describing decreases in crime following the implementation of community prosecution programs" (p. 1). Two studies, respectively, found that community prosecution initiatives in Multnomah County, OR (Boland 2007) and Washington, D.C. (2001) were both associated with crime reductions within a small number of targeted neighborhoods. Although it is difficult to tease out community prosecution effects from other neighborhood-based changes such as economic development and law enforcement initiatives, both studies found that the neighborhood-based crime reductions exceeded those in other parts of the city. Formal research is close to non-existent on a range of other relevant measures, such as the quantity and nature of community outreach; resident and police perceptions; information sharing within the prosecutor's office; and compliance, recidivism, or other outcomes of specific cases that were processed using a community prosecution strategy.

### **Performance Indicators**

Performance indicators have been used in corporate, nonprofit, and public settings to measure progress in achieving desired goals. In a criminal justice context, these goals can be broad and systemic, such as reducing crime; or they can be more targeted, such as reducing the recidivism of individual offenders through mechanisms of either deterrence or rehabilitation. In addition, some performance indicators may focus only indirectly on the ultimate goals of an initiative (e.g., reduced crime) and, instead, have more to do with how the initiative is implemented. Such "process indicators" (e.g., frequency of community meeting attendance, frequency of contacts with law enforcement, or number of defendants enrolled in rehabilitative programs) allow managers to assess whether their staff are proceeding on an everyday basis in a manner that is consistent with the intended program model (see Vera Institute of Justice 2003; Home Office 2008). Performance indicators have been widely used in courts, most notably those developed by

the National Center for State Courts in 2005, Courttools, which are a set of ten measures designed to assess the functioning of state courts (National Center for State Courts 2005).

### **Performance Indicators for Community Prosecution**

Several authors have worked to identify key elements of community prosecution (e.g., Boland 1996; Coles and Kelling 1998; Goldkamp et al. 2003; Jansen 2008; Justice Research and Statistics Association 2009; Nugent-Borakove 2007; Nugent-Borakove et al. 2007; Thompson and Wolf 2004). Goldkamp and colleagues (2003) looked at initiatives in 36 prosecutor's offices to develop seven "key dimensions." They were: (1) target problems, (2) geographic target area (which may, but is not always confined to specific neighborhoods), (3) role of community, (4) content of response to community problems, (5) organizational changes within prosecutor's office, (6) case processing adaptations (e.g., vertical prosecution or geographic prosecution), and (7) interagency collaboration and partnerships. Goldkamp et al. go on to offer brief classifications of the 36 initiatives on these dimensions, highlighting common patterns (frequent quality of life focus; near universal role for the community; and near universal role of the police as a partner); as well as numerous differences by site.

Nugent-Borakove et al. (2007) extended the focus from general policy dimensions to specific performance indicators, isolating eight that they recommend comparing across programs: sentence length; case processing time; gun, gang, and robbery crime rates; juvenile crime rates; ratio of repeat offenders to total offenders; fear of crime; climate of safety; and community attitudes about prosecutor effectiveness. Although these indicators are important, the authors themselves acknowledge that they are difficult ones on which to collect reliable data. In a different monograph, Nugent (2007) offers examples of more easily tracked measures, such as the number of community meetings held, the number of community concerns eliciting some prosecutorial response, and number of people enrolled in prosecutor-run intervention programs. More recently, the Justice Research and Statistics Association (2009) finalized a less extensive set of performance indicator recommendations than those proposed by Nugent, which nonetheless contain many of the same indicators.

In spite of these efforts, there is still neither a consensus nor broad synthesis available, identifying potential performance indicators that could be appropriate to each of the many possible community prosecution models that now prevail. Accordingly, this bulletin offers a wide menu of performance indicators that can meet the needs of any prosecutorial office choosing to use them.

### **How to Use the Table**

The table, *Performance Indicators for Community Prosecution*, provided at the end of this bulletin, identifies performance indicators associated with five potential goals of community prosecution: Community Engagement; Problem-Solving; Effective Case Administration; Public Safety; and Interagency Partnerships. The table is broken into four columns:

- **Goals:** The overarching purpose (or purposes) of the community prosecution initiative;
- **Objectives:** The specific tasks or activities that are needed to reach each goal;
- **Performance Indicators:** Discrete, quantifiable, and realistically measurable outcomes of each objective; performance indicators should virtually always involve a *number*, *frequency* (e.g., X times per month or per year), *percent*, or answer to a relatively

straightforward *yes/no* question (i.e., did a particular program activity take place or not); that is, performance indicators should be *quantitative* in nature; and

- Collection Schedule: The recommended frequency for tracking/reporting each indicator.

Together, these components lay out a schema for measuring initiatives: GOALS are comprised of OBJECTIVES that can be measured with PERFORMANCE INDICATORS on a timely but realistic COLLECTION SCHEDULE.

The first step in using the table is to select the goals that are consistent with the local community prosecution initiative. Some of the related objectives may not be relevant for a specific initiative and can be disregarded. However, objectives should not be disregarded simply because program managers have not previously identified them; i.e., if an objective is relevant to the intended goal and consistent with the logic of an initiative, then program managers should consider it for measurement. The table specifies several performance indicators for each objective and a recommended collection schedule for each indicator. (As a practical matter, the actual frequency of data collection, reporting, and reflection can be expected to vary based on the staffing, organization, and data collection capacity of the local prosecutor's office or partner agency.)

For example, the first potential goal of community prosecution is "Community Engagement." The first of four objectives associated with that goal is to increase the community presence of the prosecutor's office. In order to measure whether an initiative is indeed succeeding in increasing the community presence of the prosecutor's office, the table suggests six performance indicators, the first of which is simply enumerating how many community-based subdivisions exist within the prosecutor's jurisdiction. Finally, the table recommends that this information be updated yearly – hence, every year, a designated staff member within the prosecutor's office would specify the number of designated subdivisions within a summary report or spreadsheet that could be created for the express purpose of performance monitoring. Other performance indicators delve deeper into the nature of establishing a presence in the community: for example, the number of community liaisons and whether the prosecutor's office maintains an up-to-date list of community meetings.

It is important to note that the process of defining performance indicators should be dynamic, so the table is not intended to be comprehensive. The indicators listed are ready-to-use examples but prosecutors may develop other performance indicators to target precise activities of interest.

### **Summary of Recommended Options**

This section provides a narrative supplement to the accompanying table, briefly explaining each of the five goals and its associated objectives. This section will also provide an example of one performance indicator for each goal, indicating how that one indicator can be measured.

#### ***Goal: Community Engagement***

Prosecutors may want to increase the interaction their office has with the communities they serve, whether to become more responsive to community priorities or to achieve better intelligence collection on local problems. Specific objectives include:

1. To increase community presence: By spending time in communities, prosecutors increase public access to the prosecutor's office, increase the perception of transparency, and increase perceptions that the prosecutor understands the concerns of community members.
  2. To increase understanding of relevant community characteristics: Prosecutors may benefit from knowledge about the way neighborhoods and communities are structured, the social and economic patterns, and the cultures that make up different areas within a jurisdiction.
  3. To solicit and regularly respond to community input: Prosecutors seeking to establish a community-based presence should aim to develop two-way communication. This includes not only mechanisms by which prosecutors communicate initiatives and results, but also mechanisms by which they solicit community input (e.g., regarding crime fighting priorities, local "hot spots," etc.).
  4. To increase community confidence in the prosecutor's office: Once communication and transparency are increased (see point 1 above), the prosecutor's office will want to examine whether these qualities lead to increased public confidence that the prosecutor's office is acting in the best interest of the community. Although this objective is also more difficult to track than the first three, prosecutors may want to conduct periodic surveys of community members, victims' groups, and other key constituents to examine satisfaction. Some offices conduct formal quantitative surveys (the ideal method for documenting quantifiable changes in public confidence over time). Because such surveys are somewhat burdensome to conduct, prosecutors could also consider running occasional focus groups with key community stakeholders regarding their qualitative perceptions of the prosecutor's office and its current policies. However, for assistance with more systematic surveying of community attitudes, prosecutors might consider partnering with a local college or university professor, who might be interested in the subject matter and provide assistance at low or no cost.
- ★ Example of a Performance Indicator: For the (third) objective *to solicit and regularly respond to community input*, one indicator is, "Community priority concerns related to crime are identified and updated regularly." To measure this indicator (which should be answered with a simple "Yes" or "No"), the prosecutor's office would assess in a straightforward manner whether it has identified a functioning method to collect concerns from different communities within the prosecutor's jurisdiction: i.e., has input been systematically collected and organized in an easily referenced document or not? The prosecutor's office should make this self-assessment every six months to keep track of whether the system to gather community input is in place and working as intended.

### ***Goal: Problem-Solving***

In addition to traditional markers of success, such as indictments and convictions, prosecutors may want to expand the role their offices play in responding to and preventing crime. Problem-solving techniques have evolved in the last two decades to include diversion programs, specialized courts (e.g., drug, mental health, or community courts), alternative sentencing,



educational programs, and deterrence initiatives. Prosecutors who seek to develop the problem-solving function of the office will take on a set of objectives associated with crime reduction, crime prevention, education, and diversion:

1. To strengthen programs providing crime prevention, diversion, and alternatives to incarceration: The prosecutor's office that is interested in problem-solving should seek to prevent crime both through crime-prevention initiatives, such as after-school programs, and through alternative sentencing that provides skills, drug treatment, and other services that help ex-offenders develop the resources to remain crime-free. Diversion programs of all sorts should be tracked both for the number of participants and for the level of involvement of the prosecutor's office: does the prosecutor run the program or participate in collaboration with other agencies? Ideally, programs will also be distinguished by types of services used (drug treatment, mental health, job readiness, health education, etc.) and tracked according to participant retention and completion rates.
2. To develop information and support mechanisms for parolees and probationers in communities: In a problem-solving framework, prosecutors' offices will be notified of offenders on probation and parole. But notification may not necessarily be sufficient. Where feasible, each person under community supervision might undergo an evidence-based risk-needs assessment (e.g., administered by probation, parole, or pre-release at a correction facility). To the extent that local information sharing protocols allow, the findings of that assessment might then be routinely shared with relevant stakeholders, including the prosecutor's office.
3. Increase crime prevention initiatives: Community prosecutors often seek to identify specific crimes of interest within the areas they serve and develop innovative practices to reduce their prevalence. These initiatives should not only be started but should continue as long as they are needed; and should result in lowered rates of the targeted crimes.
4. To reduce target offenses: Safety increases as target offenses decline. Reductions in target offenses should be measured in terms of arrest, conviction, and sentence severity for crimes targeted by community prosecution initiatives. Ultimately, the most fundamental measure will be if the targeted crimes are indeed reported less often. However, conviction rates for targeted offenses are also a critical component of documenting reductions in order to demonstrate that initiatives yield compelling evidence in court. Sentence severity will demonstrate whether the initiatives result in offenders actually being punished for the targeted offenses, as opposed merely to becoming absorbed into the system, for example, through sentences to time served.
5. To reduce recidivism of chronic offenders: Community prosecution initiatives frequently target specific offenders who are habitual burdens on their communities. The objective is met when these offenders are re-arrested at lower rates or when the crimes they are committing decline in severity. Importantly, recidivism analyses typically require a comparison group composed of offenders who are similar to the identified chronic offenders but who were not processed utilizing any community prosecution strategy. This type of analysis is difficult to implement without the aid of researchers who are skilled in

identifying appropriate comparison groups and conducting careful statistical comparisons. Accordingly, prosecutors should consider partnering with a local college or university professors with a relevant subject matter interest. Given the difficulty and expense involved in conducting methodologically rigorous recidivism analyses, prosecutor's offices might, alternatively, choose to focus less on performance indicators related to recidivism and more on overall crime trends (see point #4 above), which can be discerned using readily available aggregate data.

6. To identify nuisance properties and "hot spots" for targeted interventions: Safety is increased when local properties and areas that have consistently caused trouble for community members are remedied. Prosecutors will want to maintain updated lists of both nuisance properties and "hot spots" and track the number of cases involving these areas.
  7. To reduce the number of active "hot spots" and nuisance properties: In order to improve safety, residents must feel that specific locations – stores, houses, blocks, parks, etc. -- are not threatening. An initiative will succeed in this when it demonstrates that calls to police and the prosecutor's office regarding nuisance properties and "hot spot" locations are reduced over time. Initially, of course, calls may actually increase as the community gains confidence that the prosecutor will be responsive to community concerns. But eventually, prosecutors will want to track reductions in community concerns related to "hot spots."
  8. To enhance victim services: Prosecutors should track the availability of services for victims, as well as their use, and the satisfaction that victims have with the services that are available and those that they actually receive.
- ★ Example of a Performance Indicator: For the objective, *to establish initiatives to reduce targeted crimes*, the idea is not simply to count the number of initiatives, but also the number of these initiatives that continue for a meaningful period of time, which the table proposes to comprise six months or longer. In other words, program managers will want to look at whether initiatives have been maintained as long as necessary, not simply started and then abandoned. This indicator should be assessed yearly.

***Goal: Effective Case Administration***

This goal seeks to reduce redundancy and increase the care and knowledge with which each case is pursued. The objectives associated with this goal hone in on those strategies that will maximize prosecutorial resources (e.g., vertical prosecution, better intelligence gathering on problems, improved case tracking).

1. To improve communication within the prosecutor's office: Prosecutors seeking to improve efficiency will look to take advantage of the fact that some attorneys or other prosecutorial staff are based in communities or have special knowledge of community problems in general or of specific defendants. To measure whether this kind of communication is taking place, prosecutors should track the number of cases in which

community liaisons or other staff members with community-oriented responsibilities are consulted about both community issues and individual defendants.

2. To increase efficiency of case processing: A basic measure of any effort to reduce inefficiencies is to examine whether redundancies have declined over time. Redundancy can be measured by noting the frequency with which investigations, data requests, victim-related outreach and other efforts are replicated for a single case, particularly when the case is transferred from one attorney to another. At the same time, those prosecutors who can use existing information – for example, data documenting nuisance properties – to inform prosecutorial strategy will reduce redundancies and time spent developing a case.
  3. To identify chronic/problem offenders: One of the focused ways in which data can be used to improve administration is through recognizing chronic offenders when their cases come up. Measures of how well an office uses this type of data include: whether there is an up-to-date list of chronic offenders; whether offenders are screened, preferably using a standardized risk assessment tool; and whether criminal history and related data (e.g., ties to known gangs or to other known problem offenders) are used to develop prosecutorial strategy on individual cases.
  4. To increase vertical prosecution: The more that cases are prosecuted by a single attorney or a team of attorneys who work together throughout the case, the more information will be retained that will be useful in developing the prosecution. In addition to simply examining how many cases are handled entirely by the same attorney, it is also important to ask whether there is a thorough protocol to transfer cases when vertical prosecution is not possible.
  5. To increase conviction rate: This standard objective is critical to track. Public safety improves both when the public feels safer and when fewer crimes are committed. Increased conviction rates demonstrate to the public that prosecution is effective. Improved conviction rates for all crimes can be used by prosecutors to demonstrate increased safety to their constituencies – although conviction rates for targeted crimes, including those crimes about which community members expressed specific concern, should be broken-out due to their particular salience. Numbers should not be manipulated by, for example, removing cases in which prosecution was dropped.
- ★ Example of a Performance Indicator: For the objective *to improve communication within the prosecutor's office*, we suggest documenting the number of cases in which attorneys or other prosecution staff members who have knowledge of particular communities were asked to assist in a prosecution. This information could readily be collected in a database or by reviewing case files.

### **Goal: Interagency Partnerships**

Prosecutors may look to community prosecution as a means to improve coordination between law enforcement and related agencies in order to respond more effectively and efficiently to community concerns. Conversely, existing relationships can provide a foundation for community

prosecution initiatives. Developing strong relationships between agencies requires discrete objectives that increase communication, coordination and cooperation:

1. To improve communication, intelligence sharing, and collaborations with local police, and relevant local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies: Collaboration must be demonstrated through regular meetings, for example, regularly scheduled meetings with local police or school officials that address problem locations or likely offenders.
  2. To increase accurate information sharing about cases and neighborhoods: Prosecutors can track the number of initiatives targeting a specific location that involve formal and informal partnerships with other agencies.
  3. To use partnerships to strengthen prosecution of cases: Prosecutors will want to track the number and percent of cases for which partnership with an external agency was an integral part of prosecuting the case.
  4. To use partnerships to develop diversion programs, alternatives to incarceration and community-based prosecutorial responses to crime: External agencies can provide insight and assistance in developing, implementing, and using special programs. Partnerships should be tracked annually.
- ★ Example of a Performance Indicator: For the objective *to improve communication, intelligence sharing, and collaborations with local police, and relevant local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies* we encourage prosecutors to document such contacts. A key indicator is simply the number of meetings that are held with specified agencies on a regular basis. This indicator can be counted by agency (e.g., number of meetings between prosecutor's office and state police), time period (e.g., number of meetings with at least one of four specified agencies each month), or content area (e.g., number of meetings about Hot Spot A attended by at least two agencies). The key is to track regular meetings with regular participants on a regular basis. This should be re-examined every six months to assess continuity.

**Performance Indicators for Community Prosecution**

<b>GOAL</b>	<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>	<b>COLLECTION SCHEDULE</b>
<b>Community Engagement</b>	Increase community presence	Number of formal, community-based subdivisions within prosecutor's office	Yearly
		Number of staff assigned to community-based subdivisions	Every six months
		Number of community liaison or community affairs staff throughout prosecutor's office	Yearly
		Number of communities with prosecutor's office staff person on site in community: (a) at least one day/week; (b) full-time	Every three months
		Updated list maintained of regular community meetings (Yes/No)	At least every six months
		Average number of community events attended by prosecutor staff/month (ideally with a break-down by community and by type of meeting, e.g., Community Advisory Board, tenants' association, etc.)	Monthly
	Increase understanding of relevant community characteristics	Documentation of other community data including economic, cultural, racial and ethnic characteristics (Yes/No)	Yearly
	Solicit and regularly respond to community input	Community priority concerns related to crime are identified and updated regularly (Yes/No)	Every year

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	COLLECTION SCHEDULE
<b>Community Engagement</b> <i>(continued)</i>	Solicit and regularly respond to community input	Long-term goals of community established, reviewed and assessed annually (Yes/No)	Every year
		Number of identified community concerns that elicit a prosecutorial response or initiative (ideally with breakdown by community)	Every six months
		Percent of identified communities' concerns that are resolved (i.e., no longer considered problems upon further inquiry)	Yearly
		Number of community identified nuisance properties and "hot spots" that no longer cause concern to community members	Every three months
		Number of cases linked to community priorities	Every three months
		Percent of cases linked to community priorities that result in convictions	Every three months
	Increase community confidence	Regular updates and opportunity for comment presented to community (Yes/No)	Every six months
		Percent of community identified nuisance properties and "hot spots" that are considered resolved within one year of original complaint	Yearly
		Percent of community members who identify safety levels as acceptable	Yearly

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	COLLECTION SCHEDULE
<b>Community Engagement</b> <i>(continued)</i>	Increase community confidence	Percent of community members who express satisfaction with prosecutor's office	Yearly
		Victim satisfaction rating/Percent of victims who rate satisfaction with prosecutor's office as high	Yearly
<b>Problem-Solving</b>	Strengthen programs providing crime prevention, diversion and alternatives to incarceration	Number and percent of cases that are diverted from traditional prosecution (of all cases handled by prosecutor)	Yearly
		Number and percent of cases that are sentenced to alternative sanctions recommended by prosecutor's office (of all cases sentenced)	Yearly
		Number of diversion or alternative to incarceration programs that are run by the prosecutor's office; annual caseload per program; annual number of new participants completing each program	Yearly
		Number of programs providing alternatives to incarceration that are in active partnership with prosecutor's office	Yearly
		Number/percent of cases per year that are mandated to a) community service, b) drug treatment, c) mental health services, d) vocational or educational development, e) health services, and f) other social services	Yearly

<b>GOAL</b>	<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>	<b>COLLECTION SCHEDULE</b>
<b>Problem-Solving</b> <i>(continued)</i>	Develop information and support mechanisms for parolees and probationers in communities	Routine notification to prosecutor of ex-offenders returning to jurisdiction from jail and prison (Yes/No)	Every six months
		Routine use of evidence-based risk and needs assessments for all ex-offenders returning to jurisdiction(Yes/No)	Yearly
		Results of risk and needs assessments shared with all relevant agencies (Yes/No)	Every six months
	Increase crime prevention initiatives	Number of crime prevention initiatives ongoing	Yearly
		Number of above that continue after 1 year	Yearly
		Number of people participating in crime prevention programs	Every six months
		Percent of crime prevention initiatives involving one or more agencies	Yearly
	Reduce target offences	Target offense arrests (measure quarterly, ideally from start of Community Prosecution)	Every three months
		Target offense convictions (measure quarterly from start of Community Prosecution)	Every three months
		Severity of sentence for convictions of targeted offenders	Every three months



<b>GOAL</b>	<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>	<b>COLLECTION SCHEDULE</b>
<b>Problem-Solving</b> <i>(continued)</i>	Reduce target offences	One or more offenses targeted for reduction (Yes/No)	Yearly
	Reduce recidivism of chronic offenders or offenders targeted for special initiatives (diversion, alternatives to incarceration, etc.)	Re-arrest rate of targeted offenders (ideally compared with the arrest rate of similar offenders prior to inception of initiative)	Yearly
		Severity of offenses committed by targeted offenders (based on offender history)	Yearly
		Time to rearrest for targeted offenders (ideally compared with the arrest rate of similar offenders prior to inception of initiative)	Yearly
	Identify nuisance properties and “hot spots” for targeted interventions	Updated list of nuisance properties and “hot spots” (Yes/No)	Every six months
		Number of cases involving identified nuisance properties and “hot spots”	Every six months
	Identify number of calls to active “hot spots” and nuisance properties	Number of calls to police relating to nuisance properties	Yearly
		Number of calls to prosecutor’s office relating to nuisance properties	Yearly
		Number of calls to police relating to identified “hot spots”	Yearly
		Number of calls to prosecutor’s office relating to identified “hot spots”	Yearly

<b>GOAL</b>	<b>OBJECTIVE</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>	<b>COLLECTION SCHEDULE</b>
<b>Problem-Solving</b> <i>(continued)</i>	Reduce number of active “hot spots” and nuisance properties	Number of nuisance properties considered resolved	Yearly
		Number of “hot spots” considered eradicated	Yearly
	Enhance victim services	Dedicated victims’ liaison: full-time (Yes/No) or part-time (Yes/No)	Yearly
		Number of programs for victims run by prosecutor	Yearly
		Number of partnerships with external agencies designed to provide services for victims	Yearly
		Satisfaction with victim services based on survey administered to a reasonably representative sample of victims or victims’ advocates	Yearly
<b>Effective Case Administration</b>	Improve communication within the prosecutor’s office	Number of cases in which community prosecutor staff was asked to assist by providing details about the community where the crime occurred	Every three months
		Number of cases in which community prosecutor staff was asked to assist by providing details about the defendant	Every three months
	Increase efficiency of case processing	Percent of reduction in duplicative activities (expect reduction)	Every six months

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	COLLECTION SCHEDULE
<b>Effective Case Administration</b> <i>(continued)</i>	Increase efficiency of case processing	Percent of cases in which data about (a) defendant history; (b) defendant's criminal associations; or (c) offense location information was used to develop prosecution strategy	Every six months
	Identify chronic/problem offenders	Updated list of problem offenders (Yes/No)	Every six months
		Routine use of standardized risk assessment by prosecutor or partner agency (Yes/No)	Yearly
		Routinely share high-risk defendant flag with relevant agencies (Yes/No)	Every six months
		Percent of cases that use defendant history and patterns to develop prosecution	Yearly
	Increase vertical prosecution	Percent of cases prosecuted by a single attorney	Every six months
		Protocol developed to improve efficiencies when cases are transferred (Yes/No)	Yearly
	Increase conviction rate (for all offenses, not only targeted offenses)	Conviction rate by offense (measure quarterly, ideally from start of Community Prosecution)	Every three months

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	COLLECTION SCHEDULE
<b>Interagency Partnerships</b>	Improve communication, intelligence sharing and collaborations with local police, and relevant local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies	Average number of meetings with one or more external agencies attended each month (ideally, break this out by number of meetings with each agency)	Every six months
		Existence of regularly scheduled meetings (not ad hoc) with multiple external agencies (Yes/No)	Every six months
		Routine discussion of local “hot spots” and nuisance properties with local police and other local agencies (Yes/No)	Every six months
		Routine discussion of targeted offenders with police and other agencies (Yes/No)	Every six months
	Increase accurate information sharing about cases and neighborhoods	Number of location-focused initiatives involving external agencies	Every six months
		Number/percent of cases for which external agencies are consulted	Every six months
	Use partnerships to strengthen prosecution of cases	Number/percent of cases that included partnerships with one or more agencies (either within or outside the justice system)	Every six months
	Use partnerships to develop diversion programs, alternatives to incarceration and community-based prosecutorial responses to crime	External agencies consulted on the appropriate use of diversion and alternatives to incarceration (Yes/No)	Yearly

GOAL	OBJECTIVE	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	COLLECTION SCHEDULE
<b>Interagency Partnerships</b> <i>(continued)</i>	Use partnerships to develop diversion programs, alternatives to incarceration and community-based prosecutorial responses to crime	External agencies partner in implementing diversion and alternative to incarceration programs (Yes/No)	Yearly
		Number of partnerships that address community issues (e.g., park clean ups, better lighting, increased security on public transportation)	Yearly

### Sharing Results

Offices that develop community prosecution initiatives will want to provide clear information about initiative goals and outcomes. The menu of performance indicators developed in this paper will be useful if selected indicators are tracked and analyzed, and if the resulting information triggers ongoing reflection and reassessment. To that end, prosecutor’s offices will need to identify priorities and develop data systems to measure performance on all identified indicators. Prosecutors will need to establish robust data capacity, paying particular attention to data maintenance, accuracy, timeliness, and to data literacy among all relevant staff. Data, such as witness contact, nature of “hot spot” complaints, and number of complaints, should routinely be recorded in an electronic database, so that it is available for future or concurrent prosecutions. Such a database assumes that all of the prosecutors in an office regularly enter case information and that it will be widely used as a tool in developing and documenting prosecution.

In addition to maintaining sound data, prosecutors will want to report on initiative outcomes that have been identified as priorities. These regular reports should be made to staff, community members, relevant local and partner agencies, and victims’ groups.

## References

- Boland, B. 1996. "What is Community Prosecution?" *National Institute of Justice Journal* (August): 35-40.
- Boland, B. 1998. "The Manhattan Experiment" in *Crime and Place: Plenary Papers of the 1997 Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Boland, B. 2001. *Community Prosecution in Washington, D.C.: The U.S. Attorney's Fifth District Pilot Project*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Boland, B. 2007. *The Response of Multnomah County to Neighborhood Crime: 1990-2005*. Alexandria, VA: American Prosecutors Research Institute.
- Coles, C. M., and Kelling, G. L., with Moore, M. H. 1998. *Prosecution in the Community: A Study of Emergent Strategies*. Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Goldkamp, J. S., Irons-Guynn, C., and Weiland, D. 2003. *Community Prosecution Strategies*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- Home Office. 2008. *Guidance on Statutory Performance Indicators for Policing and Community Safety 2008-2009*. London: Home Office, Police and Crime Standards Directorate.
- Jansen, S. 2008. *Key Principles of Community Prosecution*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- Justice Research and Statistics Association. 2009. *What Have We Learned from Evaluations of Community Prosecution?* Washington, D.C.: Justice Research and Statistics Association.
- National Center for State Courts. 2005. *CourTools: Trial Court Performance Measures*. Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts. Retrieved from: [http://www.ncsconline.org/D\\_Research/CourTools/Images/courtools\\_measure7.pdf](http://www.ncsconline.org/D_Research/CourTools/Images/courtools_measure7.pdf).
- Nugent, E. 2004. *The Changing Nature of Prosecution: Community Prosecution vs. Traditional Prosecution Approaches*. Alexandria, VA: American Prosecutors Research Institute.
- Nugent, E., and Rainville, G. A. 2001. "The State of Community Prosecution: Results from a National Survey." *The Prosecutor* (March/April): 36-33.
- Nugent-Borakove, M.E. 2007. *Just Look What You've Done: Determining the Effectiveness of Community Prosecution*. Alexandria, VA: American Prosecutors Research Institute.
- Nugent-Borakove, M.E., Budzilowicz, L.M., and Rainville, G. 2007. *Performance Measures for Prosecutors: Findings from the Application of Performance Measures in Two Prosecutors' Offices*. Alexandria, VA: American Prosecutors Research Institute.
- Thompson, A. C., and Wolf, R. V. 2004. *The Prosecutor as Problem-Solver: An Overview of Community Prosecution: A Workshop for Prosecutors: Teacher's Guide*. New York, NY: Center for

Court Innovation.

Vera Institute of Justice. 2003. *Measuring Progress Towards Safety and Justice: A Global Guide to the Design of Performance Indicators Across the Justice Sector*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

Wolf, R. V., and Worrall, J. L. 2004. *Lessons from the Field: Ten Community Prosecution Leadership Profiles*. Alexandria, VA: American Prosecutors Research Institute.