



**Ideas in Indiana:
A Report from SIPR's
Executive Session of Criminal Justice Professionals
Indianapolis, Indiana
March 28, 2005**

Introduction

*Jay Hein, President
Sagamore Institute for Policy Research*

The Ideas in Indiana series goes to the heart of our mission and our methodology at Sagamore Institute for Policy Research (SIPR). First, we're a think tank, so we do believe that ideas have consequences. But we also believe that ideas without action are incomplete. Innovation and positive change only occur when we join the best ideas with leaders who can put them into practice, which is where the Indiana part comes in.

Connecting the right ideas to the right leaders at the right time is no easy task. As such, SIPR adopts a methodological pluralism to our activities, which is a complicated way of saying that we strive to operate in several areas of policy: We need to perform higher-order scholarship in order to do rigorous research and influence public opinion. At other times, we need to offer very concrete policy insights in order to shape government reform and be relevant and applicable to policymakers' day-to-day experience. And lastly, perhaps most importantly, we need to be very pragmatic in offering concrete solutions to those practitioners who are executing reform at the street level. Nowhere is this methodology on display better than the Ideas in Indiana forums, which wouldn't be possible without the support of our friends at Lilly Endowment.

For many years now, Indianapolis has been adept at putting innovative ideas to work in the realm of law enforcement and criminal justice. Programs like restorative justice, community policing, data-driven law enforcement and community justice are just a few examples. SIPR is proud that its network of crime-control experts includes some of the people who pushed Indianapolis to the leading edge of law-enforcement innovation. For example, Ed McGarrell, Kay Crawford, and Jason Hutchens worked on innovative criminal justice programs at Hudson Institute and now are Associate Fellows at SIPR. Colleen Copple, who was previously with the National Crime Prevention Council, is now a Senior Fellow at SIPR working on Weed &

Seed and other national efforts to fight crime—and the contributing factors of crime—at the community level.

Blending bold thinking, openness to multi-sector cooperation and innovative leadership, former Assistant U.S. Attorney General Deborah J. Daniels is the personification of what SIPR aspires to do and be in the realm of crime control and prevention. She is not only one of our nation's foremost thinkers and doers in the realm of crime prevention, but one of our community's most valuable civic leaders as well. She began her career in the Marion County prosecutor's office, before she became U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of Indiana. During the first Bush administration, Deborah put her community-mindedness and national policy skills to use as the first director of the executive office of Weed & Seed within the Department of Justice. It was during this period that she helped establish Project Weed & Seed here in Indianapolis. Deborah was appointed Assistant U.S. Attorney General by President George W. Bush and confirmed by the U.S. Senate on September 21, 2001. Of course, we all remember what happened ten days before her Senate confirmation. Her job description was immediately revised to take on functions directly related to our nation's ability to detect, prevent, and respond to future terrorist attacks. She continues to address these issues from her new position as counsel at the Indianapolis-based firm of Krieg DeVault.

Her thoughtful leadership and keen insights into law enforcement trends have earned her the admiration and respect of national and local officials alike, so it's no surprise why we are proud to have her back home in Indiana. SIPR is humbled by her willingness to partner with us on this important discussion.

Keynote Address

The Honorable Deborah J. Daniels

We're not in the "Roaring '90s" anymore. Consider, as an example of this, the agency that I just left, the Office of Justice Programs, which is responsible for the Office on Victims of Crime; the Bureau of Justice Statistics; the National Institute of Justice; the Bureau of

Justice Assistance; the Office on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; the Office on Violence Against Women; and the Office for Domestic Preparedness, before it was transferred to Homeland Security. In other words, it is a large umbrella. When I left the Department of Justice in 1993, that budget was between \$800 million and \$900 million. In a very short time, it rose to an all-time high, in 2002, of \$4.2 billion. With a special supplemental appropriation, we approached \$4.5 billion. So the budget mushroomed from under \$1 billion to \$4.5 billion in the space of nine years.

Now, it has necessarily had to drop since that time. Particularly since 9/11, there has been a need to pull back and restructure. We had to deal with the deficit, we had to deal with the fact that we don't have the roaring economic engine that we had in the '90s, and we had to find money for Homeland Security. So that \$4.5 billion was down to about \$2.5 billion in the 2005 fiscal year, and the President's budget for 2006 called for about \$1.5 billion.

Now, less than \$1 billion of this drop is really attributable to the fact that the Office on Violence Against Women and the Office for Domestic Preparedness are now looked at separately. The Office on Violence Against Women has a budget of about \$385 million. The Office for Domestic Preparedness, when we had it, was only about \$260 million, and then there was additional money added after 9/11. So those funds really don't make up the difference. But some significant decrease in the Office of Justice programs funding is attributable to the aftermath of 9/11 and the need to find significant funding to support Homeland Security, and not just law enforcement, but fire and emergency management and health service and all the things that go into first response, not to mention terrorism prevention.

The Office for Domestic Preparedness went from a \$260 million budget before 9/11 to \$3.6 billion, because that's the office that equips and trains first-responders and also provides money for terrorism prevention. At the same time, there have been cuts in other areas. For instance, the COPS (Community-Oriented Policing Services) budget has suffered. Remember the promise to put 100,000 officers on the street? Well, after 100,000 officers had been put on the street, the administration tried to end the COPS hiring grants, and that has reduced over time.

What happened with COPS hiring grants was exactly what people like me expected. Using federal money to fund personnel is really fraught with problems because once you put it out there, even if you say we're going to ratchet it down every year and at the end of three years you're on your own, that's a hard thing for a local community to do. Once a local community has taken the money and hired the police, those services come to be expected. But the federal support is no longer there. During the lean times, it's hard to maintain those new hires. Some of those officers are now being laid off. I'll ask rhetorically, should the federal government be in

the business of hiring local police any more than local teachers or local health-care workers? That's a very difficult question and every time it comes up, it results in these sorts of difficulties and debates. But we've all become dependent on federal funding in a very short period of time.

What do we face in 2006 and beyond? Well, this year, for the first time, the President's budget proposes to eliminate the block grants that have gone to state and local governments for law enforcement. I envision that it won't be cut entirely, but that funding source has been dipping since it hit its high of about \$1 billion in 2001. The funding has been dropping because there just isn't enough money there to put \$1 billion out every year for these block grants. So in 2005, the amount that the Congress appropriated was about \$500 million—only half of what had been appropriated in 2001. Now the President's budget proposes to eliminate these block grants. I would expect Congress to put some money into block grants there, but they are going to be forced to cut significantly. Even the Congress, which supports the block grants because these grants support their constituents, can't find the money right now.

Whenever you look at these budgets, you have to try to figure out what's really going on. There are proposals to do away with certain line items in the forensic category, but that's only because we were trying to restructure it in order to do a better job, particularly with DNA analysis, because we see that as the wave of the future. My personal view is that DNA will certainly be to the 21st Century what fingerprinting was to the 20th, and we need to do everything we can to advance investment in that fund. The recent budgets submitted by the President have, in fact, significantly increased the amounts requested for DNA.

What's likely to happen in the FY2006 appropriation is that there will be some block-grant funding, but not more than \$500 million for the whole country, possibly less. But about \$100 million of the \$500 million will be earmarked. In this fiscal year we had \$80 million earmarked right out of the law-enforcement block grants to the Boys & Girls Clubs of America. Now, I love the Boys & Girls Clubs, and I think they do wonderful work, but that comes right out of law enforcement's block grant. That becomes very difficult when law enforcement's block-grant funding is reduced to no more than \$400 million for the entire country. And I think you will see that even though the Congress wants to fund more things, they too see that there is a deficit that they need to deal with, and they are going to try to be more disciplined this year, which is going to demand a lot of hard choices.

Of course, there are other pressures on Congress. What about Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security? There are a lot of fiscal pressures resulting in continued shrinkage of the budget authority for the people that deal in appropriations for Commerce, Justice, and State.

So there's the bad news. Now the good news. What's still viable? There will still be funding for Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN), which has been very important to this community, and this community has done a great job with it. PSN really helps with local violence reduction, and I think it's essential. The Justice Department is going to work hard to make sure that PSN continues to be funded.

DNA funding: A couple of years ago, the President came out with a five-year, \$1 billion initiative, and each year there is over \$200 million proposed in the budget to improve our ability as a nation to use DNA evidence, to solve crimes, to exonerate the innocent, and to protect potential victims. I predict that each year Congress will come out with about half of what the President has proposed, so probably there will be another \$110 to \$120 million in DNA research.

Re-entry: It is critical to seek to reintegrate returning offenders safely into the community. We and other agencies back in 2002 put \$100 million into this effort, and every state got some funding to engage in re-entry. The President has pledged another \$300 million over a period of a few years for this purpose. This is an important issue. There are over 600,000 returning offenders all across the country, every year. So you can't just lock people up and throw away the key, because most of the offenders are going to come back. Sixty-seven percent of these, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, re-offend within three years of their release. These folks, I think, are the greatest challenge to communities. And frankly, to quote the President, if America is the land of second chances, then there are multiple reasons why we need to be working with this group of people.

Many of the people who come out of prison are unemployable due to a myriad of problems: lack of significant education; drug abuse—we estimate that 70 percent of all inmates may have drug abuse problems; mental health problems—we estimate that 15 percent of all inmates have mental health problems, and my guess is that's low; and no job or life-skills training.

Once they get out, most of them are ineffectively supervised or supported. One in five of the people who leave prison is not supervised at all, and most of the rest of them, as those of you in the trenches know, are effectively unsupervised. Now, that's a recipe for disaster. It's critical to bring together the stakeholders who normally don't work together: workforce training, drug and mental health treatment professionals, the courts, the faith-based community. So everybody has a part to play.

I would like to point out what a great job Fort Wayne, Indiana, has done bringing these diverse stakeholders to the table and getting their commitments to work together on re-entry. Fort Wayne did this by virtue of a few key factors. One of them was very strong support from the mayor—Graham Richard, who is a sharp guy. He saw the need that had developed and

participated actively in the solution. When you develop those relationships and you leverage what you have available in the community, you can make a difference.

Another key area is juvenile-delinquency prevention. If re-entry represents the shorter term, and DNA represents the immediate, juvenile-delinquency prevention represents the long term. I think even the most skeptical law-enforcement officers now recognize the necessity of delinquency prevention. I would use as an example the Nurse-Family Partnership idea that was developed by Dr. David Olds. It involves people from nursing agencies that visit the home during the pregnancy of a young, unwed mother and work with her for a period until the child is two years old. It is amazing the difference that this makes in mothers and children alike. And they've now done a longitudinal study that exceeds 20 years. In the mothers, we saw significant reduced likelihood of drug abuse and child abuse, and of course, anybody who has dealt with child-abuse issues knows that there is, in fact, a cycle of violence, and there is a cycle of criminality associated with child abuse. In the children, there was a significantly reduced likelihood of drug use and other delinquent behavior in their teen years. And those who work with young people know that a delay of drug use or other delinquent activity well into a child's teens bodes very well for his or her continued lawful conduct as an adult.

Community strategic planning can aid in delinquency prevention. Littleton, Colorado, after the tragic school shootings at Columbine High School, is a perfect example of great community planning. They were besieged by hordes of people saying, "I have the thing that is going to solve your problems. Just sign here on the dotted line and pay me a lot of money and I'll give you this program." But Littleton resisted. Instead, Littleton brought together everybody from the Chamber of Commerce to the educators to the City Council to the nonprofit community to law enforcement. And they said, "Okay, look, let's figure out the problem first."

We always suggest that funding follows vision anyway. You must have a vision first, and they were very careful. They didn't accept anything from outsiders until they had figured out their vision, and they have done a remarkable job identifying developmentally appropriate, proven programming for each age level so they can follow kids from grade school on up, protect them, and teach them how to live and work in the community as law-abiding adults.

Indiana communities can use the structures they already have in place. Weed & Seed is a perfect structure for bringing people to the table. Central Indiana has already figured out how to do it. There is no need to reinvent a new group for every new challenge, and that's a trap we often fall into. But we should be creative in identifying and pursuing ways to fund programs that support our goals as members of the criminal justice community. For example, law-enforcement funding is not needed for the Nurse-Family Partnership. Those

young women are eligible for TANF funds, so TANF can fund some of that effort, even as it supports broader criminal justice/crime prevention goals. There are a number of ways to be creative, but if you don't have everybody at the table, you're not going to be as successful. After all, law enforcement knows about the law-enforcement funding, and the human-services experts know about HHS funding, and workforce-development people know about Labor and welfare-to-work funding.

The point is this: together, we can identify more opportunities. Insufficient coordination at the state and local level causes individual initiatives to seek earmarked funding independently, which really doesn't get anyone very far.

Moreover, it is critical to identify proven initiatives that work. But even then, after you have found an initiative that has worked somewhere else, you must measure its effectiveness as applied locally. This will be critical both to the effectiveness of any initiative and to the future funding of that initiative.

I'll mention a landmark experiment that we did right here in Indianapolis with Dr. David Ford at IUPUI back in the mid-1980s, when we tested the effects of alternative criminal-justice policies in preventing further abuse in misdemeanor domestic violence cases. At the time we had started what we called the no-drop policy: Do not let the victims drop charges, because we know the pressures on these victims, and if we stand up and make them go through this process, they'll be better protected. Interestingly, contrary to conventional wisdom, the victims whose cases were filed under a victim-initiated warrant and who were given a choice whether to drop charges or continue the prosecution, were significantly more likely to be safe from continuing violence than those who had no such choice.

There was a stunning difference in the level of re-victimization within the next six months after the case ended. Dr. Ford felt that was attributable to the affirmation that the victim felt from law enforcement giving her that option and the power it gave her in her relationship with the perpetrator. So who knew? We were just going on blindly with our no-drop policy, but until we measured its effectiveness, we didn't know that was the wrong thing to do. And I'm sorry to say that there are still no-drop policies in effect around the country despite this fascinating finding.

Measuring success not only makes a program more effective, but it's also going to enhance funding opportunities. I will suggest that you think of foundations and other sources as potential funders for some of these initiatives—not just Washington. However, don't expect largesse from these foundations and endowments based on hometown appeal or friendship. We have to be able to demonstrate, first, that there's a need, and second, that we can produce results.

In addition to these other approaches, we should make maximum possible use of DNA analysis in solving

crimes. We shouldn't have to wait until somebody has been in prison for 17 years to find out that he didn't do it. We should be able to find out right at the outset. And we can prevent people from being victimized if we can identify and bring swift justice to perpetrators early.

I would suggest that taking samples from those convicted of violent crimes is not enough; in my view, we need to take samples from, at a minimum, those convicted of all crimes. In the United Kingdom, they're using DNA even to solve burglary cases, which would be a tremendous boon because, as law-enforcement officials know, burglars generally are not one-time offenders. If we can identify and incapacitate them, we can solve significant problems.

With all of this said, I want to emphasize that the criminal-justice community should never just chase the money. Instead, think strategically about how to use available funding to address critical issues. There are lots of opportunities within the Department of Homeland Security, for instance, to obtain equipment that is what I call dual-use equipment—anything that you have a legitimate Homeland Security need for, but which can also be helpful in day-to-day law-enforcement activities. This is particularly critical with respect to information systems and communications inoperability. That funding is available for that purpose.

These are times that call for creative thinking, a problem-solving approach. We need to collaborate, and we need to develop initiatives that are not reliant solely on federal dollars to survive. Each decade brings new challenges to law enforcement and communities, and this decade is particularly challenging. It will take our collective efforts and significantly improved collaboration to make us effective. I hope to contribute to these ongoing discussions about how we can continue to keep our communities safe.

Central Indiana's Successes and Challenges

Jason Hutchens, Associate Fellow at SIPR, Chief Administrator of Special Projects at the Marion County Justice Agency, and Coordinator of the Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership

Indianapolis has become a model for a number of innovative programs, and I want to discuss just three of them: community involvement; research and data-driven strategies; and partnerships and coordination.

Make no mistake about it, what we have achieved in Indianapolis in the last ten to fifteen years, sustaining 30-percent reductions in homicides and other violent crime, has not happened in every other city. And this has a lot to do with leaders such as Deborah Daniels and many others who took on strategies and philosophies that were data-driven—leaders who asked and answered the hard questions: *If we make so many more arrests, who cares if it doesn't have the outcome that we want? Are people feeling safe?*

Weed & Seed is one of those data-driven programs that offered lots of answers. It's a rather simple philosophy and strategy: Law-enforcement and community prosecutors weed out the criminals from the community, then our community-based groups come in, seed the area with human services, education, employment, revitalization, and whatever else it takes. It's a partnership between law-enforcement and the community. And it works.

Number two is community prosecution and community policing. Community prosecution is a very simple proposition. Our community prosecutors here work in our police department; they attend the same meetings as our law-enforcement officers, with our community leaders, from the Weed & Seed areas, from the hot-spot locations. They also use the research and data that is provided to law-enforcement and the prosecutors from researchers like those at SIPR and other places that conduct research, even internally from crime-analysis units. We use this data over and over, so the system begins to build on itself; from Weed & Seed to community prosecution, they all build on each other.

Then we begin to get into community policing, which I know IPD has taken a very aggressive stance on. It's something they believe in. The philosophy is a partnership with the community. Once again, it's the three ideals—partnerships, using data and research, and community involvement—to make an impact in these communities. These three work hand in hand.

Third is Project Safe Neighborhoods. This is one that I can talk a little more in depth about because I have had hands-on knowledge of it. It began here in 1998, with the Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership. In 1997, as our law-enforcement community knows, we were at a crisis level in homicides: around 162 in the county. At that time, we already had community prosecution and Weed & Seed in place.

One of the next steps was to get law-enforcement at the local, state, and federal levels collaborating together more often and more routinely. IVRP offered a meeting place for this. The result was that homicides and violent crime have sustained 30 percent reductions since 1997 levels.

Over the last two and a half years, Indianapolis has played a key role in the national training of Project Safe Neighborhoods, which distributed financial and partnership-building resources all across the nation. What Project Safe Neighborhoods meant to Marion County was about \$1.1 million between 2003 and 2005, and all that money was deployed here for community programs and law-enforcement to do some very new and creative things.

Unfortunately, at that time, what we had were a lot of UCR trends, maps, and graphs. What we realized, though, is that we needed more. So the researchers were available to provide that. We did what we call homicide reviews. Researchers sit down with law-enforcement and break down what these patterns look like. What kind

of strategies could we develop from these maps and graphs that they were doing? From that, we asked, "What kind of partnerships do we need in order to utilize the data that we have and design intervention strategies?"

Before we could even begin to implement those strategies, we had to work with the community. That meant reaching out to those Weed & Seed sites, those community-prosecution people, to go after their community, and to share what we were planning on doing between all these local, state, and federal law-enforcement agencies.

We have trained literally hundreds of cities to employ these three programs. They all work in conjunction with each other, with those three fundamental elements—data, partnerships, and community involvement.

Those are the success, but we have a few challenges as well.

The first challenge we have in Indianapolis is, quite simply, to sustain the successes we have had in those three programs. Without those three, the foundation goes away.

The second challenge we face is a bit overwhelming at this point. If you have picked up a paper recently in Indianapolis, you know the city is broke, the county is broke and the state is broke. What does that mean for us? Law-enforcement must get a little more efficient at what we do, take advantage of those relationships we have developed, and refocus what we have done.

The third challenge we are going to have to face in Indianapolis, or an opportunity we are going to have to face, is the potential consolidation between IPD and the Sheriff's Department. Non-consolidation means layoffs and losing some officers, as a worst-case scenario. That is going to have an effect on some of the special programs that we do. If we do a consolidation, there are going to be some changes as well. The Louisville Police Department just went through a year and a half consolidation. All of the major programs have effectively ceased because of this consolidation. So whether we have consolidation or not, we are going to have consequences here in Indianapolis.

Something I absolutely agree with Ms. Daniels about is the reentry of individuals coming back to Marion County. In Marion County, from June 3, 2003, to July 1, 2004, 1,600 males and 235 females re-entered Marion County after time in correctional facilities. That is a lot of people coming back from incarceration. That's not probation, that's just parole. That requires us to work, once again, with those Weed & Seed communities, where these people so often return. We have the foundations there, and now we have a great opportunity to take advantage of those resources.

Finally, we have to sharpen the tools in the toolbox, and perhaps acquire some new tools.

One of the best new tools is our adult probation office, which now includes juvenile probation. We are carrying out some new and collaborative programs with

our police department and our law-enforcement colleagues in probation and parole. In fact, how they work together is getting national attention. We have cities lined up for the next five months to look at how probation and law-enforcement work together in Indianapolis, using data and research to go out and make a difference that has outcome measurements, not just output.

The second tool is taking advantage of technology, DNA being one of those. We in law-enforcement have to bridge the gap between technology and the criminal-justice field. The gap in that field is so much greater than what you see in the private sector. Unfortunately, we are lagging far behind. And I can say that because less than two years ago in Indianapolis, we created a website here for law-enforcement to exchange information. We created an \$80,000 website, which in relative terms is not a lot of money. Yet we won the Department of Justice National Achievement Award for the most innovative use of technology in law-enforcement in the nation—all with an \$80,000 website.

If that is the best piece of technology, web-based, in the nation right now, we are really behind the eight ball. This is technology that business has been using for years. It is basically an email distribution system and a searchable database via the web. But at least we are getting that kind of technology in place to have that foundation there. Technology is going to play a huge role in the amount of information we have now with Homeland Security, merging of databases between different agencies. The FBI is working on this extensively. The technology that we are going to need to do this in real time is going to be a great strain on funding resources.

Third, we are going to have to do better in leveraging targeted enforcement with general programs. Many things that we have done, such as the Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership and Project Safe Neighborhoods, have been more general programs. We are going to have to start doing a little more in the way of targeting and incapacitating violent offenders who show up through our homicide reviews, which we do very, very well. So we are going to have to step up to the plate on that.

Another thing we are going to have to do in Marion County is begin to reach out to our neighboring communities—Hamilton County, Johnson County, and other neighboring counties—because violent crime does not respect county borders. It spreads and impacts people throughout the metropolitan regions.

In summary, it is going to take a lot of leadership, coordination, and research to get us where we need to be. We have done a good job, but we are not there yet. We have to continue to focus on community involvement, research and data-driven strategies, partnerships, coordination, and once again, outcome measurements. That's why we are here.

An Interdisciplinary Approach to Crime Control and Prevention

*Colleen Copple, Senior Fellow at SIPR,
U.S. Department of Justice Community Capacity
Development Office*

We've heard today that Indianapolis leads the country as a model of how political leadership and law-enforcement leadership come together to encourage positive change. In other words, local community leaders and criminal justice leaders are on the leading edge of reform. SIPR wants to support these leaders as they reform and transform communities. As my new boss at Weed & Seed (Nelson Hernandez), says, in a phrase he borrows from Home Depot, "You can do it; we can help."

Thanks to the input of Central Indiana law-enforcement and community leaders, we have been able to put together a snapshot of some of the challenges, strengths and needs facing Central Indiana right now. We have broken this down into the top three criminal justice issues facing agencies and the top two policy or systems challenges facing agencies and individuals.

The top criminal-justice issues are jail overcrowding and early-release issues, combined with the additional burdens on the court system, over-crowded dockets, and insufficient resources to manage offenders.

We have more than doubled the number of offenders we incarcerate in this country over the last decade. We've gone from one million offenders incarcerated on felony charges to more than two million individuals incarcerated, which has increased a number of unintended consequences—impacts on families; children whose parents are incarcerated; more women incarcerated, disproportionate minority confinement that is significantly impacting specific communities within our cities; and now HIV-AIDS issues among the re-entry population. In other words, we have some amazing challenges ahead of us as large numbers of the prison population returns to society.

There are, of course, a number of issues related to re-entry—employment, housing, community-corrections alternatives, the red tape that returning offenders face. Methamphetamine came up in our survey as well. We realize that the problem is prevalent in other parts of the state more than Central Indiana, but it was mentioned here as an issue where collaboration is needed.

In terms of policy or systems issues, areas that were identified as needing particular support were lack of coordinated and strategic planning, lack of coordinated law-enforcement priorities and accountability with community engagement, and the inability for systems to change from the current culture to a new culture, new systems, new ways of doing business. All of these reflect comments that we heard both from Ms. Daniels and Jason Hutchens, particularly in relation to budget cuts, restructuring, and reconnecting the dots in new ways that

challenge us to look at this as one of two things: It's either a huge crisis and we're in big trouble, or it's an opportunity to force change that has to happen. We believe that it is the latter, that difficult circumstances give us the opportunity to bring people to the table who

might not be willing or ready to come to the table otherwise.

Our goal would be to help reformers and leaders across various fields to come together in ways that will encourage that change to happen.

Conference Participants

The Honorable Deborah Daniels, Krieg DeVault • Michael Alley, Patriot Investments, LLC • Roland Cole, Software Patent Institute • Melanie Conour, United States Attorney's Office • Kay Crawford, Center on Aging and Community and SIPR • Rosemary Dorsa, Central Indiana Community Foundation • Thomas Fisher, Indiana Attorney General's Office • Michael Fogarty, Chief of Police, Carmel Police Department • Dottie Gerner • Dr. Henry Gerner • Jason Hutchens, Marion County Justice Agency and SIPR • The Honorable Andy Jacobs • Bryon Jensen, Goodwill Industries • Gregg Keesling, Workforce, Inc. • Keith Lordeau, Federal Bureau of Investigation • Todd Lugar, Indiana Supply Corporation • Mark Massa, Assistant U.S. Attorney, United States Attorney's Office • James McClelland, Goodwill Industries of Central Indiana, Inc. • Jerry McCory, Public Safety Advisor to the Mayor of Indianapolis • Neal Moore, Sease, Gerig & Associates and SIPR • Mary Murdock, Marion County Justice Agency • Thomas Orr, Workforce, Inc. • Todd Phelps, United States Attorney's Office • Charles Preston, Lilly Endowment, Inc. • Russell Pulliam, The Indianapolis Star • Lyman Rhodes, Indianapolis Commission on African American Males • David Russell • Sven Schumacher, Lutheran Child and Family Services • Sherry Seiwert, Indiana Housing Finance Authority • Jerry Semler, OneAmerica Financial Partners/SIPR Board of Trustees • Dr. Jay Alan Siegel, IUPUI School of Science • Wesley Simms, Goodwill Industries • The Honorable Mark D. Stoner, Marion County Criminal Court 14 • Kathy Money • Patricia Sweeney • Sheryll Teverbaugh, Marion County Justice Agency • Harold Thompson, Seniors Unlimited • Julie Van Arx, Department of Corrections • Olgen Williams, Christamore Community Center • James Wyatt, Assistant Chief of Police, Indianapolis Police Department • Dr. John Clark, SIPR • Colleen Copple, SIPR • Eric Cox, SIPR • Alan Dowd, SIPR • Pat Hasselblad, SIPR • Jay Hein, SIPR • Maureen Lee, SIPR • Scott Truex, SIPR