Collaborating for Justice: Involvement of Judges in Criminal Justice Collaborations

By Judith Berman, Ph.D.

Introduction

Judges receive increasing numbers of requests inviting them to participate in task forces, commissions, coordinating councils, policy teams, or project advisory boards. Some of these requests follow upon the receipt of a grant or passage of legislation. More often recently, they precede the submission of a grant that requires collaboration among the agencies or systems involved in the proposed project. Many of these activities are calling upon judges to become involved in broad policymaking and system change efforts within the justice system. Each request must be carefully reviewed to assess its adherence to the canons of ethical judicial conduct. Is it sufficiently concerned with the improvement of the law, the legal system, or the administration of justice? Will it cast any doubt on a judge's ability to act impartially? If it passes muster on that account, it must then be considered in terms of how well it accords with personal interests and its likelihood of success. Even when a project touches on an area of particular interest, there is little worse than committing valuable time to a project that is unlikely to succeed.

What dooms team projects to failure or, more importantly, what increases the likelihood of success? While team project success may seem to rely on vague or ineffable qualities of individuals or work environments, or more skeptically, on such basics as funding, in fact the work of teams has been studied extensively. 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 organizations and successful projects. They have found that one of the keys to success is collaboration – individuals or organizations working together to enhance "the capacity of another for the mutual benefit of all and to achieve a common purpose."[1] 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.

This article will address the challenges and benefits of collaboration, specifically to the judiciary and those responsible for administering justice through the courts. 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 collaborative approaches within their jurisdiction.

Collaboration in Criminal Justice

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. Judges are meant to be the arbiters in this system, advocating no perspective except the neutrality of justice. Yet they too must manage the process of moving cases through to their conclusion. Similarly, the system involves

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.

a mix of elected officials, appointed officials, and private citizens who have to answer to different authorities, including the authority of the electorate. This combination can further erode the sense of common purpose.

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 collaborative activities include child abuse or domestic violence 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. Jurisdictions throughout the country are recognizing the benefits of using collaboration to overcome some of the criminal justice system's stickiest problems.

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."[2]

In the context of the criminal justice system, there are many concerns that affect each organization or agency, but that "go beyond the purview of any particular party." Collaboration, in fact, makes change possible within the criminal justice system that otherwise would be 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. 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, 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 Larson 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. Judges, specifically, must believe that teammates will respect the canons of judicial ethics and understand the limits placed on extra-courtroom judicial activities. Judges can assist their teammates by explaining not only what they cannot do, but what they can and are willing to do to within these prescribed 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, and boundaries are strictly enforced. It 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. Common Pleas Court Judge John West, co-chair of a criminal justice policy team in Hamilton County, Ohio, explains that the atmosphere of trust that they created within their team contributed to their ability to effect real change, which was essential to their work in improving responses to women offenders:

> "We created and institutionalized a forum for the key players to listen, learn, discuss and resolve the most difficult and sensitive issues. At the same time, we also created a mechanism that breaks down and cuts through the various layers of bureaucracy so that valid concerns can be addressed quickly and more efficiently."[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] (Carter 2005) 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. For judges, especially in the criminal justice system but also in civil, family, or juvenile settings, collaboration can be a particular challenge. Judges are accustomed to working independently and to carefully fending off any threats to that independence. Taking on partners requires careful negotiation and constant monitoring to ensure that neither individuals nor their offices, and neither the substance of meetings nor the process by which decisions are reached impinge on judicial independence. At the same time, collaboration also requires a leveling of hierarchy within the team context so that each team member's input is valued equally. This can be difficult both for some judges who are accustomed to commanding a level of respect based on their office, and for other members of the team who are equally unaccustomed to addressing a judge as a peer.

Judges, and others in the typically overtaxed and under-resourced criminal justice system, face tremendous demands on their time. Collaboration requires commitment, and commitment requires time. It can be very difficult to consistently attend meetings, for example, 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. Including diverse perspectives and reaching consensus is certainly slower than issuing executive orders. And, as Acting Supreme Court Justice Jim McCarthy (Oswego County, NY) notes, "Judges are not used to opening up the decision-making process."[7] Diverse perspectives, however, enhance the understanding of problems and therefore the quality of the solutions. 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.'"[8] 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."[9] As Judge McCarthy's recent experience in collaboration taught him, "the expertise of everyone at the table is going to get you where you want to go."[10]

Benefits of Collaborating

While collaboration is not the answer to every problem, it can be the answer to some of the most intractable problems faced by the court. 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 are appropriately addressed through interdisciplinary collaboration. And these are all system change issues that stand to benefit substantially from judicial input.

Collaboration can also serve to support an effective planning process. For example, if budget cuts are planned throughout the jurisdiction, 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, judges would find themselves with fewer options for diversion, the jail might find itself 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. Collaborating to achieve a system-wide perspective on the criminal justice population would benefit offenders as well as those charged with managing them.

Judges occupy a unique position within the criminal justice system in terms of their ability to bear witness to the system's successes and failures. Whether it is the same offenders returning to a judge's courtroom, or a program that is perpetually unavailable and under-utilized because of unrealistic eligibility criteria, or consistently well-prepared defense attorneys or prosecutors, judges see multiple dimensions of the system in action. What judges stand to gain by participating in these collaborative efforts, then, is to address these successes and failures with the system's other stakeholders in a safe, neutral, and problem-solving-focused environment, and to help hold others in the system accountable for making necessary changes. 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] Judges can ensure that the policies and procedures of the system meet the needs of the bench, whether those are needs for a specific kind of information at a particular point in the process, or the need to create special dockets to better serve certain categories of defendants and/or victims. Judges can work to increase the options available at disposition, and ensure that programs that the court invests in are ones that are most needed and will be well-used. As Ramsey County (Minnesota) District Judge Kathleen Gearin explained in *An Introduction to Intermediate Sanctions for Judges*[12] (1997), if judges choose not to be involved in policymaking activities outside the courtroom, "policy decisions are going to be made but without judicial input." Other policy makers surely benefit from the judicial perspective, and judges are more likely to see their own objectives for the system met if they actively participate in policy discussions.

Leadership

Judges also have an inherent leadership role in criminal justice collaborations. There is no question that among criminal and juvenile justice policymakers, it is judges who inspire trust among others, and represent fairness and high standards. Judges can bring these qualities to

bear on activities that require consensus, such as agreeing to the general goals and principles of sentencing and other significant criminal justice issues. Their leadership demonstrates to the community that the criminal justice system is not only responding to public safety 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. The presence of judges lends credibility to these efforts. Judge Ronald Reinstein of the Superior Court of Arizona, Maricopa County, calls on judges to take a lead role in bringing other people together. "Judges," he explains, "perhaps more than any others in the justice system, can likely bring the various players to the table, because most at least respect the office of the judge. I have never had anyone refuse to come to a meeting I have convened."[13]

One example of judicial leadership in collaborative efforts can be seen in "problem-solving courts" like drug and mental health courts, where issues that have been especially challenging for the criminal and juvenile justice systems are now commonly addressed. In many cases, these are problems for which, under other circumstances, individuals would be shuttled back and forth between systems, such as substance abuse treatment services and the justice system in the case of the drug court offender. Neither system is able to address the whole problem effectively. It is not until the systems determine to work together that the individuals are able to find relief. The individuals are not the only beneficiaries, however. When the court better manages these cases, they are more likely to reach resolution and free up the court to handle other matters. As Retired Alameda County (California) Judge Jeffrey Tauber wrote in *Drug Courts: A Judicial Manual*: "Judges often tend to regard any judicial activity outside the courtroom with suspicion. The truth is, however, that judges can only be as effective in their courtrooms as the systems they build outside that courtroom will allow."[14]

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, though recent trends toward treating juveniles more like adults is pushing the juvenile system closer to its adult counterpart. Practices such as pre-trial diversion and restorative justice conferencing continue to be considered appropriate for a large portion of the juveniles that are seen by the court. Recent research, such as that supported by the U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP)[15], has confirmed what many in the field of juvenile justice have long known, that comprehensive approaches to juvenile crime and behavior problems are the most effective. Stakeholders have had to work together to ensure that the different systems in which youth are involved – family, school, treatment, corrections – all recognize and understand the role of the court in addressing problem behavior by juveniles.

Tools to Facilitate Effective Collaboration

A judge's first responsibility is to ensure that participation in the particular endeavor does not violate the canons of judicial ethics as they are interpreted within his or her state (or federal) jurisdiction. Most states have a mechanism, such as an ethics advisory board, for advising judges on the propriety of a particular activity. The American Judicature Society has published a series of bulletins on judicial ethics, including "Ethics and Judges' Evolving Roles Off the Bench: Serving on Governmental Commissions (Gray, 2002)[16]. This well-researched article summarizes and characterizes the decisions of ethics advisory boards throughout the country on judicial participation on commissions that address such issues as domestic violence, juvenile justice, victim services, and crime prevention. Author Cynthia Gray points out that membership of a judge on a governmental commission is more likely to be considered appropriate under certain conditions, including that the commission has a diverse membership that represents more than one point of view; and relates to matters a judge, by virtue of judicial experience, is uniquely qualified to address.[17] Judges can certainly encourage inclusiveness in their jurisdictions, and can even make it a condition of their participation.

Even with that particular hurdle cleared, 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. Judges, however, have the capacity to move a criminal justice team to greater success. As Tom Talbot, Senior Manager at the Center for Effective Public Policy (the Center) and Project Manager for the Collaborative Justice project explains, "those teams that have had strong judicial participation have gone on to do excellent, influential work in their jurisdictions, and the likelihood of a team's success is enhanced significantly if a judge is at the table and takes a proactive leadership role."[18] The reason that teams with judges succeed, explains Talbot, is that judges are natural leaders and skilled communicators who listen well and influence not only the others at the table but also their colleagues on the bench. If a judge requests data and information to inform decision making, team members are likely to cooperate. And generally speaking, when judges talk, the community listens.

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 the 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".[19] 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. Using their support to lend credibility, judges can very effectively influence the team's willingness to participate in collaborative process, which can be a content-neutral way to move the team forward.

The Center for Effective Public Policy has partnered with the State Justice Institute (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 by the Center, 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 a vision and mission statement. But these same teams, especially ones that consider their work successful, have invariably looked back on both the process of developing a vision and mission statement, and on the statements themselves, as providing crucial guidance to their work. 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, that worked with the Center 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."[20]

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, adult and juvenile sex offender management teams, drug courts, domestic violence coordinating councils, juvenile justice enhancement teams, and others. Judges who have attended these workshops have been singularly impressed with the curriculum. At the First Annual Collaboration Institute, for example, Judge Nancy Corsones from the Bennington Family Court of Vermont called the workshop "inspirational."[21] Judge McCarthy 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."[22]

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 SJI 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 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 for each defendant and victim is important. Stepping back at times to ask what would make the local system more just and effective for all parties is equally important. When the solution requires change from others beyond the judiciary, 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 the court and our system of justice. No one stands to benefit more from these results than judges and the individuals who appear before them.

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] Huxham, CREATING COLLABORATIVE ADVANTAGE 28 (London: SAGE Publications, 1996).
[2] Chrislip and Larson, COLLABORATIVE LEADERSHIP 5, (1994): 42.
[3] Larson and LaFasto, 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] Jim McCarthy, Interview with Rachelle Giguere, Center for Effective Public Policy, December 8, 2005, Washington, DC.
[8] James Surowiecki, THE WISDOM OF CROWDS (New York: Anchor Books, 2004) pp 30, 32.
[9] Ibid., 190.
[10] Jim McCarthy, Interview with Rachelle Giguere, Center for Effective Public Policy, December 8, 2005, Washington, DC.

---

[11] A Video Seminar for Judges: Implementing Effective Sentencing Strategies for Sex Offenders, (Center for Effective Public Policy, 2000).
[12] Center for Effective Public Policy, FACILITATING THE APPROPRIATE USE OF INTERMEDIATE SANCTIONS: A VIDEO SEMINAR SERIES FOR JUDGES (1997)
[13] Judge Ronald Reinstein, Superior Court of Arizona. Personal correspondence, December 1, 2005.
[14] Tauber, Drug Courts: A Judicial Manual, Summer 1994 CJER 17 (1994).
[15] See, for example, OJJDP's Comprehensive Strategy for Serious, Violent, and Chronic Juvenile Offenders: Program Summary (Wilson and Howell, 1993). More recent projects that grew out of the Comprehensive Strategy include study groups on Very Young Offenders, and Serious and Violent Offenders; the Juvenile Integrated Information Sharing project (http://www.juvenileiis.org); and Blueprints for Violence Prevention initiative.
[16] Gray, Ethics and Judges' Evolving Roles Off the Bench: Serving on Governmental Commissions, American Judicature Society (2002).
[17] Ibid, 20.
[18] Tom Talbot, Senior Manager, Center for Effective Public Policy. Personal correspondence.
[19] Larson and LaFasto, TEAMWORK 27, (California: SAGE Publications, 1989).
[20] 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: http://www.collaborativejustice.org/products.htm
[21] Workshop Evaluation. First Annual Collaboration Institute, December 5-7, 2005, Washington, DC.
[22] Jim McCarthy, Interview with Rachelle Giguere, Center for Effective Public Policy, December 8, 2005, Washington, DC.