



TECHNICAL REPORT

**Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice:
A Compilation of Projects**

**George Kiefl
Research and Statistics Division**

March 1999

TR1999-2e

UNEDITED

**Research and Statistics Division/
Division de la recherche et
de la statistique**

**Policy Sector/
Secteur des politiques**

TECHNICAL REPORT

**Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice:
A Compilation of Projects**

**George Kiefl
Research and Statistics Division**

March 1999

TR1999-2e

UNEDITED

*The present study was funded by the Research and Statistics Division,
Department of Justice Canada. The views expressed herein are
solely those of the author and do not necessarily
represent the views of the Department of Justice Canada.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Background	1.
Integrated Justice Initiative & Multidisciplinary Justice Projects	1.
A Note on Responses	2.
Responses: The Numbers	3.

Multidisciplinary Projects

Alberta

Family Violence Initiatives & Domestic Violence Registry Project	16.
Framework for Action on Family Violence — Alberta Government Action Plan	19.
Protocol Relating to Section 715.1 of the <i>Criminal Code</i>	21.
Provincial Child Abuse Protocol	23.
Relocating Abused Women to Another Province	25.
Child Witness Preparation Pilot Project	27.
Interdepartmental Committee on Family Violence	29.

British Columbia

Restorative Approaches to Alternative Measures	31.
Mentally Disordered Offenders Protocol — Sexual Assault	33.
Strategic Reforms of BC's Justice System — Civil / Family	35.
Strategic Reforms of BC's Justice System — Criminal Justice	37.
Strategic Reforms of BC's Justice System — Justice System Administration	39.
First Nations Journeys of Justice — An Elementary (K-7) Curriculum	41.

Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police

Victim Services — Waterloo Regional Police	47.
Victoria Hills Community Garden — Waterloo Regional Police	49.
Fast Water, Fast Friends — Waterloo Regional Police	52.
Values, Influences & Peers — Waterloo Regional Police	55.
Vision 2000 Police / Youth Mentoring Program — Waterloo Regional Police	57.

Department of Justice Canada

Access to Justice Agreements with the Territories	62.
Access-to-Justice Network	64.
Plain Language Partnership	66.
Youth Justice Education Partnership	68.

Manitoba

Queen's Bench (Family Division) Case Management	70.
Custody Coordination Project	73.
Community Notification Advisory Committee	75.
Manitoba Justice Committees	77.
Hollow Water Community Holistic Circle Healing Project	79.
Mediation Services	81.
First Nations Justice Strategy	84.

National Crime Prevention Council

Models of Crime Prevention Coordination	86.
---	-----

New Brunswick

Domestic Legal Aid	88.
Public Awareness on Family Violence through Community Partnerships	90.

New Brunswick Integrated Justice	92.
<u>Newfoundland & Labrador</u>	
Support Applications Project	94.
Provincial Strategy Against Violence	97.
Interface, Child Protection and Secure Custody For Youth	102.
MACSO (Multi-Agency Committee for Sex Offender Treatment)	104.
Detention / Treatment of Intoxicated Persons	106.
Interface, Sheriff's Office and Secure Custody and Remand Services	108.
<u>Northwest Territories</u>	
Community Justice	110.
Community Wellness	113.
<u>Ontario</u>	
Peer Mediation	115.
Violence Free Schools Policy	118.
School Based Services	121.
Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project	123.
Human Services Implementation Guidelines	127.
Youth Justice Education Partnership (YJEP)	129.
Criminal Procedure Reform — Ticketing Procedure for Minor Criminal Offences ...	131.
Criminal Procedure Reform — Remands by Administrative Procedure	133.
Inter-Ministerial Community Safety and Crime Prevention Project Team	135.
<u>Prince Edward Island</u>	
2020 Vision — Justice into the 21st Century	137.
Provincial Impaired Driving Strategy	140.
Long-Term Provincial Crime Prevention & Community Safety Strategy	143.
Family Violence Prevention Strategy	146.
<u>Québec</u>	
Screening Volunteers	148.
Change in Correctional Approaches at Correctional Services Québec	151.
Supervision & Guidance in Open Custody Project	154.
Compensatory Work Program	156.
Consultation Team on Administration of Justice for Young Persons	158.
Consultation Committee on Administration of Criminal Justice	160.
Audiovisual Hearings	162.
Simplified Procedure By Way of Declaration in Certain Civil Cases	164.
Computerization of Criminal Procedure	167.
Automatic Collection of Support	170.
<u>Saskatchewan</u>	
Regina Aboriginal Human Services Cooperative	174.
Saskatchewan's Action Plan for Children	177.
Family & Youth Plan	180.
Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence	184.
<u>Yukon</u>	
Community Based Justice	187.
Coordinating Committee on Family Violence	190.
Keeping Kids Safe	193.
Community Based Approach to Crime Prevention	195.
<u>Appendices</u>	197.
Attachment 1: Integrated Justice Call Letter	
Attachment 2: Multidisciplinary Justice Call Letter	

Tables

[Table 1](#): Multidisciplinary Justice Call-Letter — Contacts 4.
[Table 2](#): Responses — Multidisciplinary Justice Projects 5.
[Table 3](#): Projects Providing Best Practices / Lessons Learned 10.
[Table 4](#): Projects Submitted for Evaluation 12.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

As requested by the forum of Deputy Ministers Responsible for Justice in June 1996, the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on Multidisciplinary Approaches to Justice Issues undertook four projects:

- ♦ a Compilation of Multidisciplinary Justice Initiatives from across the country;
- ♦ a Report on Best Practices and Lesson Learned from these multidisciplinary justice projects;
- ♦ select evaluations of existing, exemplary multidisciplinary justice projects; and,
- ♦ an exploration of the possibilities for better involving NGOs (non-governmental organizations) in multidisciplinary approaches to justice and justice-related issues.

A Research Sub-Group of the Multidisciplinary Justice Working Group was formed to develop an action plan for addressing the first three research-related tasks (a separate Sub-Group was formed to address the fourth task of better involving NGOs in multidisciplinary justice projects).

The Research Sub-Group agreed that all jurisdictions would be contacted by call-letter and asked to select multidisciplinary justice projects within their jurisdiction and provide answers to a questionnaire for each project. It was thought that the responses would form the basis for all three tasks: (1) the submitted projects would be compiled into a compilation of multidisciplinary justice initiatives; (2) working from the various submitted projects, a sample of promising or exemplary projects would form the basis for the report on best practices and lessons learned; and, (3) working from the submitted projects, two or three promising projects would be identified for possible evaluation, subject to resources and approval.

INTEGRATED JUSTICE INITIATIVE & MULTIDISCIPLINARY JUSTICE PROJECTS

When Deputy Ministers asked the existing Multidisciplinary Justice Working Group to undertake these four projects in June 1996, they also asked that a Working Group be formed to explore integration in the justice system. This request followed discussion concerning matters such as the use of technology to better integrate and coordinate the justice system, using a more integrated approach to achieve a more focused justice system, and building better partnerships to address justice-related problems. Deputy Ministers asked that the new Integrated Justice Working Group develop a collection of model integrated justice projects from across the country and undertake other work in exploring integrated justice. The Integrated Justice Working Group undertook the task of developing a collection of model integrated justice projects by releasing a call-letter, dated July 4, 1996 (see [Attachment 1](#)), which included a questionnaire to help elicit specific kinds of information and asked about best practices and lessons learned.

The multidisciplinary justice call-letter with questionnaire (see [Attachment 2](#)) was released on August 13, 1996, and asked for specific information intended to assist in developing the best practices and lessons learned project as well as the work on evaluations. Thus, within a short

time period, all jurisdictions received two similar call-letters, one concerning integrated justice projects and the other concerning multidisciplinary justice projects. The receipt of the two similar letters led to some confusion and delays in responding to the multidisciplinary justice call-letter.

At their August 1996 meetings, following the release of the two call-letters, Deputy Ministers reviewed an early, preliminary draft of the compendium of integrated justice projects prepared by the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics (CCJS) and discussed the work of both the Integrated Justice and Multidisciplinary Justice Working Groups. The draft compendium of integrated justice projects (and not multidisciplinary justice projects), as requested in June 1996, provided in-depth project descriptions and information. Upon review of the compendium, Deputies noted that the work of the Groups was similar in nature and similar in process and subsequently asked that the work be combined. Since that time, the multidisciplinary justice work has been subsumed under the Integrated Justice Initiative. Concerning the integrated justice compendium, Deputy Ministers agreed that it should be revised to (a) include both integrated justice projects and multidisciplinary justice projects, and (b) include only basic, descriptive information and contacts for each project rather than all the information gathered through the questionnaires. The *Compendium of Canadian Integrated and Multi-disciplinary Justice Initiatives* has been finalized, tabled and accepted by Deputy Ministers Responsible for Justice.¹

While the compendium, including multidisciplinary justice projects, has been completed and accepted, the Research Sub-Group of the Multidisciplinary Justice Working Group felt that it was still important to develop this compilation of multidisciplinary justice projects for various reasons. First, the creation and availability of this document will assist in information sharing across jurisdictions for those interested in pursuing further the development of multidisciplinary approaches to justice issues and problems. Second, it is important to make this information available to compliment the work being undertaken in other areas such as the evaluations. Third, since the work of multidisciplinary justice has been subsumed under the Integrated Justice Initiative, it is important to show the links between multidisciplinary justice and integrated justice. The link between the two will be more fully developed in the best practices and lesson learned report, but it is important to provide this compilation of projects which helps show that projects submitted in one domain also fit into the other domain.

A NOTE ON RESPONSES

The multidisciplinary justice projects call-letter of August 1996, asking for responses by September 6, 1996, was sent to all thirteen jurisdictions aimed at contacts working in justice ministries from across the country (see [Table 1](#)). Due in part to the similarities in the two multidisciplinary and integrated justice call-letters, there were delays in receiving responses as many contacts called for clarification and to express a sentiment that the work was being duplicated and that the two projects should be combined. As noted above, this problem was addressed and rectified when Deputy Ministers asked that the two Working Groups and their

¹ Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. *Compendium of Canadian Integrated and Multi-disciplinary Justice Initiatives*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada, February 1997.

work be combined.

Since there was confusion and overlap in the two projects, responses to the multidisciplinary justice call-letter came in many forms. In some instances, jurisdictions simply re-submitted their response to the integrated justice call-letter for certain projects. In other instances, jurisdictions answered the letter and attached some documentation, but did not answer the questionnaire. In other cases, jurisdictions opted to re-affirm previously identified multidisciplinary justice projects.

In the last case, the multidisciplinary justice call-letter included an attachment which listed previously identified multidisciplinary justice projects. The previous list was prepared by the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on a Framework for Multidisciplinary Justice. The Framework Working Group had provided Deputy Ministers Responsible for Justice with their final report in 1995. That final report included a compilation of identified multidisciplinary justice projects classified under the following headings: existing multidisciplinary justice initiatives; new multidisciplinary initiatives; efficiency initiatives; new efficiency initiatives; and, multidisciplinary networks.

RESPONSES: THE NUMBERS

Counting all projects submitted and re-submitted either from the previous list or from the integrated justice initiative, there were a total of seventy-two (72) projects submitted in response to the August 13, 1996 call-letter for multidisciplinary justice projects (see [Table 2](#)).²

Only twenty-four (24) of the submitted projects included answers to the multidisciplinary justice questionnaire; however, given that both call-letters asked about best practices and lessons learned, a total of thirty-three (33) responses included information on best practices and lessons learned (see [Table 3](#)). Of these, thirty-one (31) projects referred to best practices, but only seven (7) provided information on lessons learned.

A total of fourteen (14) projects were submitted for consideration for possible evaluation work. Toward the goal of providing and sharing information, the questionnaire also asked whether the project included an evaluation or monitoring component and whether a report was available, and this kind of information is summarized for the fourteen projects (see [Table 4](#)).

² Three contacted respondents did not respond: Nova Scotia, Solicitor General Canada, and Statistics Canada.

Table 1: Multidisciplinary Justice Call-Letter — Contacts

Jurisdiction	Agency Contacted	Number of Contacts
Alberta	Department of Justice	4
British Columbia	Ministry of Attorney General	2
Canada	CACP	1
	CCJS	1
	Department of Justice	6
	NCPC	1
	Solicitor General	2
	Statistics Canada	1
Manitoba	Department of Justice	3
New Brunswick	Department of Justice	2
	Solicitor General	2
Newfoundland	Department of Justice	2
	Social Services	1
Northwest Territories	Department of Justice	2
	Justice Canada, Regional Office	1
Nova Scotia	Department of Justice	3
Ontario	Ministry of Attorney General	4
	Solicitor General & Correctional Services	2
	Community & Social Services	1
Prince Edward Island	Provincial Affairs & Attorney General	1
	Department of Justice & Attorney General	1
Québec	Department of Justice	3
	Public Security	3
Saskatchewan	Department of Justice	1
	Social Services	1
Yukon	Department of Justice	2
n = 13	n = 26	n = 63

Table 2: Responses — Multidisciplinary Justice Projects

Jurisdiction	Respondent Agency / Department	Project	Answered Questions	Answered Letter but not Questions	Affirmed Projects from previous list	Re-Submitted Integrated Justice Response	Did not Respond
Alberta	Justice	Alta-1	x				
	Justice	Alta-2			x		
	Justice	Alta-3			x		
	Justice	Alta-4			x		
	Justice	Alta-5			x		
	Justice	Alta-6			x		
	Justice	Alta-7			x		
B.C.	Attorney General	BC-1		x			
	Attorney General	BC-2	x				
	Attorney General	BC-3			x		
	Attorney General	BC-4			x		
	Attorney General	BC-5			x		
	Law Courts Education Society	BC-6	x				
CACP	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-1	x				
	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-2	x				
	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-3	x				
	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-4	x				
	Waterloo Regional Police	CACP-5	x				
Justice	Programs Directorate	Jus-1		x			

	Programs Directorate	Jus-2		x			
	Programs Directorate	Jus-3		x			
	Programs Directorate	Jus-4		x			

Table 2: Responses — Multidisciplinary Justice Projects (continued)

Jurisdiction	Respondent Agency / Department	Project	Answered Questions	Answered Letter but not Questions	Affirmed Projects from previous list	Re-Submitted Integrated Justice Response	Did not Respond
Manitoba	Justice	Man-1	x				
	Justice	Man-2	x				
	Justice	Man-3				x	
	Justice	Man-4				x	
	Justice	Man-5				x	
	Justice	Man-6				x	
	Justice	Man-7	x				
NCPC	Crime Prevention Council	NCPC-1		x			
N.B.	Justice	NB-1		x			
	Justice	NB-2		x			
	Justice	NB-3		x			
Nfld	Justice	Nfld-1	x				
	Justice	Nfld-2	x				
	Justice	Nfld-3		x			
	Justice	Nfld-4		x			
	Justice	Nfld-5		x			
	Justice	Nfld-6		x			
NWT	Justice	NWT-1	x				
	Justice	NWT-2	x				
N.S.	n/a						x

Table 2: Responses — Multidisciplinary Justice Projects (continued)

Jurisdiction	Respondent Agency / Department	Project	Answered Questions	Answered Letter but not Questions	Affirmed Projects from previous list	Re-Submitted Integrated Justice Response	Did not Respond
Ontario	Attorney General	Ont-1	x				
	Attorney General	Ont-2	x				
	Attorney General	Ont-3	x				
	Attorney General	Ont-4	x				
	Attorney General	Ont-5			x		
	Attorney General	Ont-6			x		
	Attorney General	Ont-7			x		
	Attorney General	Ont-8			x		
	Attorney General	Ont-9			x		
P.E.I.	Corrections	PEI-1		x			
	Corrections	PEI-2		x			
	Corrections	PEI-3		x			
	Corrections	PEI-4		x			
Québec	Sécurité publique	PQ-1				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-2				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-3				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-4				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-5				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-6				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-7				x	
	Sécurité	PQ-8				x	

	publique						
	Sécurité publique	PQ-9				x	
	Sécurité publique	PQ-10				x	

Table 2: Responses — Multidisciplinary Justice Projects (continued)

Jurisdiction	Respondent Agency / Department	Project	Answered Questions	Answered Letter but not Questions	Affirmed Projects from previous list	Re-Submitted Integrated Justice Response	Did not Respond
Saskatchewan	Justice	Sask-1	x				
	Justice	Sask-2	x				
	Social Services	Sask-3	x				
	Social Services	Sask-4		x			
Solicitor General	n/a						x
Statistics Canada	n/a						x
Yukon	Justice Canada	Yuk-1	x				
	Justice Canada	Yuk-2	x				
	Justice Canada	Yuk-3		x			
	Justice Canada	Yuk-4		x			
Totals		n = 72	24	20	14	14	3

Table 3: Projects Providing Best Practices / Lessons Learned³

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Best Practices?	Lessons Learned?
Alberta	Alberta Family Violence Initiatives & Domestic Violence Registry Project	Yes	No
B.C.	Mentally Disordered Offenders Protocol — Sexual Assaults	Yes	No
B.C.	First Nations Journeys of Justice — An Elementary (K-7) Curriculum	Yes	Yes
CACP	Victim Services — Waterloo Regional Police	Yes	No
CACP	Victory Hills Community Garden — Waterloo Regional Police	Yes	Yes
CACP	Fast Water, Fast Friends — Waterloo Regional Police	Yes	No
CACP	Values, Influences & Peers — Waterloo Regional Police	Yes	No
CACP	Vision 2000 Police / Youth mentoring Program — Waterloo Regional Police	Yes	No
Manitoba	Queen’s Bench (family division) Case Management	Yes	No
Manitoba	Custody Coordination Project (Portage La Prairie & Winnipeg)	Yes	No
Manitoba	Manitoba Community Notification Advisory Committee (CNAC)	Yes	No
Manitoba	Manitoba Justice Committees	Yes	No
Manitoba	Hollow Water Community Holistic Circle Healing Project (CHCH)	Yes	No
Manitoba	Mediation Services	Yes	No
Manitoba	First Nations Justice Strategy	Too early	Too early
N.B.	Public Awareness on Family Violence through Community Partnerships	Yes	No
Newfoundland	Provincial Strategy Against Violence	Too early	Too early
NWT	Community Justice — Northwest Territories	Yes	Yes
NWT	Community Wellness	Yes	No
Ontario	Peer Mediation	Yes	Yes
Ontario	Violence Free Schools Policy	Yes	Yes
Ontario	School Based Services	Yes	No
Ontario	Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project	Yes	Yes

³ This list contains all projects which provided answers to the questions concerning best practices and lessons learned, regardless whether the project was submitted as a multidisciplinary justice project or an integrated justice project.

Table 3: Projects Providing Best Practices / Lessons Learned (continued)

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Best Practices?	Lessons Learned?
Québec	The Change in Correctional Approaches at Correctional Services Québec	Yes	No
Québec	Supervision and Guidance in Open Custody Project	Yes	No
Québec	Compensatory Work Program	Yes	No
Québec	Consultation Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice	Yes	No
Saskatchewan	Regina Aboriginal Human Services Cooperative — operative	Yes	No
Saskatchewan	Saskatchewan’s Action Plan for Children	Yes	No
Saskatchewan	The Family and Youth Plan	Yes	No
Saskatchewan	Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence	Yes	No
Yukon	Community Based Justice	Yes	Yes
Yukon	Coordinating Committee on Family Violence	Yes	No
	n = 33	n = 31	n = 7

Table 4: Projects Submitted for Evaluation

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Research Component?	Performance Indicators?
Alberta	Alberta Justice Family Violence Initiatives & Domestic Violence Registry Project	No: Monitored — status report on key objectives developed, but no research component.	Yes: Performance indicators are under review, but include factors such as police charge rates, court sentencing and disposition data.
B.C.	Mentally Disordered Offenders Protocol — Sexual Assaults	No: Evaluation in 1996.	Not indicated.
B.C.	First Nations Journeys of Justice — An Elementary (K-7) Curriculum	Yes: Currently conducting research to assess impact on student’s knowledge, attitude and behaviour; and, to assess which learning activities are most effective.	Yes: Specific learning activities in grades 4 - 6 have been examined for knowledge, attitudes and behaviours which these activities promote.
CACP	Victory Hills Community Garden — Waterloo Regional Police	Yes. Research with pre- and post-test interviews.	Yes. Performance indicators are: reduced need for community support; decreased call for police service; and, increased feeling of safety.
CACP	Fast Water, Fast Friends — Waterloo Regional Police	Yes. Research component involves participant’s pre- and post-event opinions.	Yes. Including community feedback, continued open dialogue among participants, media coverage, and data from police, corrections etc.
Manitoba	First Nations Justice Strategy	Yes: Research under design.	Not indicated.
NCPC	Models of Crime Prevention Coordination	No (submission was a proposal to do research and evaluate).	Not indicated.

Table 4: Projects Submitted for Evaluation (continued)

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Research Component?	Performance Indicators?
Ontario	Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project	Yes: Evaluation will be both short- and long-term. Children involved will be tested periodically and compared to control group. Process evaluation has also been completed.	Yes: Including: longitudinal family and family measures; teacher measures; and, community measures.
P.E.I.	Provincial Impaired Driving Strategy — 1995-1999	Not indicated.	Not indicated. But would be appropriate for retrospective evaluation.
P.E.I.	Long-Term Provincial Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy	Not indicated.	Not indicated. But may best lend itself to a longitudinal evaluation.
Saskatchewan	Regina Aboriginal Human Services Cooperative	Yes, research and evaluation component. Final evaluation will look at reduced reliance on formal justice system; increased use of alternative measures; increased community capacity to assist offenders / victims; and, collaboration among community agencies and government.	Yes. Activities for reaching objectives have been developed and performance indicators attached to each activity (e.g., referrals to diversion programs).

Table 4: Projects Submitted for Evaluation (continued)

Jurisdiction	Project Title	Research Component?	Performance Indicators?
Saskatchewan	Saskatchewan's Action Plan for Children	Yes, an evaluation component for prevention and support grants and individual projects within these.	Yes. Performance indicators are in place for matters such as number of communities involved, projects underway, success of interdepartmental process, etc. However, need to develop key measures for wellness of children.
Saskatchewan	Family and Youth Plan	Yes. Research involves monitoring of the deliverables, and youth have been monitored on a daily basis.	Yes. Performance indicators are: reduced use of custody; increased reviews and early releases; reduced offending by youths in programs; and, reduced involvement in CJS by youth in programs.
Yukon	Coordinating Committee on Family Violence	No.	Yes. A performance indicator is reduced family violence.
	n = 14	n = 8	n = 9

Alberta-1

Alberta Justice Family Violence Initiatives & Domestic Violence Registry Project

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The Alberta Solicitor General's Department introduced family violence initiatives in October 1990 after consultation with all Alberta police services and police commissions focusing on two key objectives, early intervention and increased public awareness of the criminal nature of family violence. Five areas were developed within this initiative: enforcement, education, victim support, public awareness and research.

The project reflects a multidisciplinary initiative focused on education, early intervention and prevention of ongoing involvement with the justice system.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Family Violence Initiatives and the Domestic Violence Registry Project reflects a multidisciplinary approach with Alberta Justice serving the lead role. In addition, other agencies include RCMP, other provincial law enforcement agencies and Alberta Family and Social Services, and involves the Alberta Solicitor General's Department which introduced family violence initiatives after consultation with all Alberta police services and police commissions. As well, the project involves agencies representing victims of domestic violence.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The project involves victims of domestic violence, children of partners affected by domestic violence and women's shelters. For example, the Council of Women's Shelters, all police services, and criminal justice representatives are involved in an advisory capacity regarding current and future initiatives.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

This is a multidisciplinary approach reflective of the previously identified integrated justice values of:

- ♦ a focused and appropriate use of the justice system;
- ♦ a coordinated community and justice system response;
- ♦ more efficient access to justice services;
- ♦ efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems; and,
- ♦ use of innovative technologies.

Of significance is that the initiatives were developed following consultation and partnership with other services (i.e., police, women's shelters, advocacy groups, *et cetera*).

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The family violence initiatives have been operating since 1990.

Stated Objectives: Primary goals of the family violence initiatives:

- ♦ reduce the incidence of family violence through early police intervention;
- ♦ increase public awareness of the criminal nature of family violence;
- ♦ assist female offenders who are victims of family violence, understand why they have been victims and how to break the cycle of violence for themselves and their children;
- ♦ educate perpetrators about how they can change their abusive behaviour and direct them to appropriate community-based treatment programs to help them end the physical violence against their spouses or children; and,
- ♦ increase awareness among criminal justice staff of the issues underlying family violence and enable them to work more effectively with victims and perpetrators.

Policing objectives:

- ♦ establish uniform police guidelines for charging, intervention, referrals and training;
- ♦ establish an advisory committee with representatives from all municipal police services, the RCMP, Alberta council of women's shelters and Alberta personnel;
- ♦ provide enhanced training to police instructors, recruits, senior constables and management;
- ♦ reduce the incidence of injuries to victims and police;
- ♦ increase public awareness of the criminal nature of the problem;
- ♦ establish a mechanism for collecting and processing police and court data on incidence of family violence; and,
- ♦ increase strength and enforcement of restraining orders.

Domestic Registry Project objectives:

- ♦ establish a restraining order registry on CPIC to be used by all Alberta police services;
- ♦ provide information relating to spousal abuse cases to the chief provincial firearms officer prior to issuance of firearms acquisition certificates; and,
- ♦ establish a provincial conviction and sentencing data base.

Key Deliverables: The primary key deliverable is effective initial intervention and prevention by the criminal justice system.

Monitored/Evaluated: The family violence initiatives have been monitored and a status report on the key objectives developed.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

While the project is monitored, a detailed research component has not been developed.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

The project's performance indicators are currently under review; however, such factors as police charging rates in domestic violence incidents have been carefully monitored over the past five years. Court sentencing and disposition data is also under review.

CONTACT(S):

Ms. Paddy Meade
Executive Director
Young Offender Branch
Correctional Services
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 422-4019
fax: not indicated

Peter Teasdale
Criminal Justice Division
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 427-5050
fax: (403) 422-9747

Alberta-2

Framework for Action on Family Violence — Alberta Government Action Plan - Working Together to Prevent Family Violence

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Prevention: Promote healthy family functioning and eliminate factors which contribute to abusive behaviour.

Protection: Ensure that a greater number of victims are protected.

Intervention / Treatment: Minimize the effects of abuse on victims and help abusers to change their behaviour.

Education / Coordination: Contribute to common understanding of family violence dynamics and facilitate a coordinated response in addressing issues.

Policy: Improve the response of current government programs through policy review and refinement.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Office for the Prevention of Family Violence, Support to Families and Children, Alberta Family and Social Services; Legislative Services, Alberta Education; Alberta Women's Secretariat; Public Security Division, Correctional Services and Criminal Justice Division; Alberta Department of Justice; Alberta Municipal Affairs; Mental Health, Alberta Health; Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission; Home Economics, Alberta Agriculture; Alberta Advanced Education; Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned

LESSONS LEARNED: (i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe:

- ♦ in 1992-93, Alberta announced it would undertake 27 initiatives in this area which were recommended by the Interdepartmental Committee on Family Violence and which are in keeping with stated objectives of this initiative.
- ♦ many specific initiatives have been completed.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ designed to address the abuse of family members by other family members.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ms. Paddy Meade
Executive Director
Young Offender Branch
Correctional Services
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 422-4019
fax: not indicated

Peter Teasdale
Criminal Justice Division
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 427-5050
fax: (403) 422-9747

Alberta-3

Protocol Relating to Section 715.1 of the *Criminal Code*

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

- ♦ avoid repeated interviews of victims.
- ♦ maximize the use of resources in the videotaping of such interviews and the training for such interviews.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Alberta Family and Social Services; Alberta Department of Justice; RCMP "K" Division; Edmonton Police Services.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the projects stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: A protocol was endorsed by key stakeholders in Fall 1989.

Stated Objectives: Addresses Bill C-15, which gives evidentiary status to videotaped interviews of child sexual assault / abuse victims. A coordinated training program was developed under the lead of Alberta Family and Social Services.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ms. Paddy Meade
Executive Director
Young Offender Branch
Correctional Services
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 422-4019
fax: not indicated

Peter Teasdale
Criminal Justice Division
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 427-5050
fax: (403) 422-9747

Alberta-4

Provincial Child Abuse Protocol

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Establishment of a provincial protocol for investigation of child abuse cases based upon a partnership of government departments, key professionals and community stakeholders.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Alberta Department of Justice; Alberta Family and Social Services; Alberta Education; Alberta Health; Law Enforcement agencies.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: An interdepartmental Task Force was established to develop a protocol following a letter from the Deputy Minister, Family and Social Services, to other departmental Deputy Ministers in April 1992. Task force met in September 1994 and hopes to have the Protocol ready for public distribution in the near future.

Stated Objectives: Designed to respond to abuse of children complaints.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ms. Paddy Meade
Executive Director
Young Offender Branch
Correctional Services
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 422-4019
fax: not indicated

Peter Teasdale
Criminal Justice Division
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 427-5050
fax: (403) 422-9747

Alberta-5

Relocating Abused Women to Another Province

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Coordination of Alberta Government activities in addressing the need to relocate abused women.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Support for Independence — Alberta Family and Social Services; Alberta Department of Justice; RCMP "K" Division; Similar Agencies in other jurisdictions. Similar agencies in other jurisdictions.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ms. Paddy Meade
Executive Director
Young Offender Branch
Correctional Services
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 422-4019
fax: not indicated

Peter Teasdale
Criminal Justice Division
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 427-5050
fax: (403) 422-9747

Alberta-6

Child Witness Preparation Project

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Implementation of a consistent and timely court preparation program for child witnesses that can operate throughout the province.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

- ♦ Canadian Society for the Investigation of Child Abuse — Calgary
- ♦ Alberta Department of Justice
- ♦ Victims Assistance Units, Police Agencies
- ♦ Alberta Family and Social Services
- ♦ Victims, Programs and Services Committee

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ms. Paddy Meade
Executive Director
Young Offender Branch
Correctional Services
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 422-4019
fax: not indicated

Peter Teasdale
Criminal Justice Division
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 427-5050
fax: (403) 422-9747

Alberta-7

Interdepartmental Committee on Family Violence

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

This committee coordinates provincial government activities in addressing family violence.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

In addition to the Office for the Prevention of Family Violence, the following also are members on the committee: Support to Families and Children, Alberta Family and Social Services; Alberta Education; Women's and Senior's Secretariat, Alberta Community Development; Public Security Division, Correctional Services & Criminal Justice Division, Alberta Department of Justice; Alberta Municipal Affairs; Mental Health, Alberta Health; Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission; Home Economics, Alberta Agriculture; Alberta Advanced Education and Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: A ten member Interdepartmental Committee on Family Violence was created in 1985 to develop and oversee a government plan of action for responding to family violence.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ms. Paddy Meade
Executive Director
Young Offender Branch
Correctional Services
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8

tel: (403) 422-4019
fax: not indicated

Peter Teasdale
Criminal Justice Division
9833-109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8
tel: (403) 427-5050
fax: (403) 422-9747

British Columbia-1

Restorative Approaches to Alternative Measures

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Yes (apparently), the project concerns Alternative Measures.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Led by Ministry of Attorney General, B.C. in partnership with B.C. Ministry for Children and Families, federal Department of Justice, Ministry of Solicitor General Canada, R.C.M.P. "E" Division, B.C. Municipal Police Departments and B.C. Association of Chiefs of Police, Municipal governments of B.C., judiciary, Crown counsel, Defence Bar, Aboriginal organizations, non-government organizations.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Yes (apparently), see above "partners."

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: To advance the principles of restorative justice in the application of alternative measures (s.717 CCC and s.4 YOA) by:

- ♦ supporting the development and implementation of restorative approaches to youth and adult alternative measures;
- ♦ increasing offender accountability;

- ♦ increasing victim and community satisfaction with outcomes; and,
- ♦ expending a greater proportion of criminal justice system resources on serious crime.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Jacquelyn Nelson
Senior Policy Advisor
Policy & Resource Analysis
Ministry of the Attorney General
11th Floor, 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4
tel: (250) 387-5004
fax: (250) 387-3719

Susan Christie
Special Advisor, Gender Equality
Ministry of the Attorney General
11th Floor, 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4
tel: (250) 356-9666
fax: (250) 953-5182

British Columbia-2

Mentally Disordered Offenders Protocol — Sexual Assaults

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

This project is designed to reduce the number of times that mentally disordered offenders in conflict with the law come into contact with the justice system by encouraging various service providers to cooperate in order to assist the subject in better managing his or her life. Participants are encouraged to cooperate with this initiative. In the past, participants with limited budgets have sometimes looked for reasons to suggest that other service providers have primary responsibility, thereby avoiding effort and expense on their own part.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Amongst the partners on the project are the Ministry of Health, including Forensic Psychiatric Services Commission; the Ministry of Attorney General, including Criminal Justice and Corrections; and community service providers, including volunteer organizations dealing with the mentally disordered. Corrections has the lead role in this initiative.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

As stated above, private organizations which provide service to the mentally disordered are involved in that service providers mentioned above may refer subjects to them.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Encouraging the partners in this project to think cooperatively and to deal with all aspects of the subject's situation. This has to be done while ensuring that in order to achieve a laudable objective, there is not unwarranted interference with the subject's autonomy. Criminal Justice representatives, in particular, have to be careful that the justice system is not misused in order to keep controls over an alleged offender "for his own good."

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?
Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).*

Project Timeframe: This project has been operating for approximately 3 years.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: There was an evaluation of this project in 1996. There was concern that personnel in the various agencies and Ministries were not always aware of the protocol. It appeared to work best when there was a person dedicated to managing "those who are subject to the protocol" on a more or less full-time basis.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

This project does not have a research component.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Jacquelyn Nelson
Senior Policy Advisor
Policy & Resource Analysis
Ministry of the Attorney General
11th Floor, 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4
tel: (250) 387-5004
fax: (250) 387-3719

David L. Winkler
A/Director
Policy and Legislation
Ministry of the Attorney General
9th Floor, 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4
tel: (250) 387-3840
fax: (250) 387-0090

British Columbia-3

Strategic Reforms of BC's Justice System: Civil / Family

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

- ♦ promote timely and just resolution of civil / family disputes that are affordable for individuals and the system as a whole;
- ♦ ensure that women and children receive the financial support to which they are entitled; and,
- ♦ improve the efficiency of the delivery of civil / family justice in the province.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

- ♦ judiciary
- ♦ ADR practitioners
- ♦ advocacy groups
- ♦ private bar
- ♦ Legal Services Society of BC

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ increase the use of early intervention, mediation and arbitration;
- ♦ create new opportunities outside the traditional court system for individuals / families /

- organizations to resolve their disputes;
- ♦ improve children’s lives through improved enforcement of child support orders and use of standardized guidelines; and,
- ♦ streamline family court caseload and paperwork.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Jacquelyn Nelson
Senior Policy Advisor
Policy & Resource Analysis
Ministry of the Attorney General
11th Floor, 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4
tel: (250) 387-5004
fax: (250) 387-3719

British Columbia-4

Strategic Reforms of British Columbia's Justice System: Criminal Justice

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

- ♦ employ the full weight of the traditional system to protect the public from high-risk violent offenders;
- ♦ ensure offenders are held accountable for their actions and ensure victim's voices are heard in the criminal process;
- ♦ improve the efficiency of the delivery of criminal justice in the province; and,
- ♦ reduce the level of crime through early intervention.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

- ♦ police
- ♦ judiciary
- ♦ municipalities
- ♦ advocacy groups
- ♦ community-based programs
- ♦ private bar
- ♦ Legal Services Society of BC

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ focus court and corrections resources on high-risk, violent offenders through enhanced use of assessment tools;
- ♦ increase the use of community-based alternatives for low-risk offenders;
- ♦ encourage victim involvement in determining responses to criminal behaviour;
- ♦ intervene early with at-risk youth to provide positive lifestyle choices; and,
- ♦ work closely with all levels of government to ensure justice services address the interests of the community, the victim and the offender.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Jacquelyn Nelson
Senior Policy Advisor
Policy & Resource Analysis
Ministry of the Attorney General
11th Floor, 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4
tel: (250) 387-5004
fax: (250) 387-3719

British Columbia-5

Strategic Reforms of British Columbia's Justice System: Justice System Administration

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

- ♦ realign the province's court facilities to ensure equitable access in response to project population growth.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

- ♦ judiciary
- ♦ police
- ♦ municipalities
- ♦ correctional services

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ achieve efficiencies by consolidating existing court facilities and avoiding future capital cost;
- ♦ apply new technology to improve access to, and the efficiency of, the administration of justice services;
- ♦ establish renewed partnerships in the justice system, working cooperatively to improve the administration of justice; and,

- ♦ develop a comprehensive management information system to monitor standards and assist future planning.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Jacquelyn Nelson
Senior Policy Advisor
Policy & Resource Analysis
Ministry of the Attorney General
11th Floor, 1001 Douglas Street
Victoria, British Columbia
V8V 1X4

tel: (250) 387-5004

fax: (250) 387-3719

British Columbia-6

First Nations Journeys of Justice — An Elementary (K-7) Curriculum

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

This law-related curriculum introduces students to First Nations justice issues and the B.C. court system, and allows them to appreciate the cooperation that may be possible. It is based on oral tradition, through stories told by community Elders. Over 30 First Nations Elders and storytellers contributed. Through these stories, the curriculum explores First Nations justice concepts of safety, responsibility, conflict resolution, and fairness.

Objective of minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system. This objective is met in two ways: through education as a preventive measure, and through highlighting First Nations alternatives to the justice system, some of which work in conjunction with mainstream alternative measures or diversion programs.

More specifically, the curriculum is a preventive tool in that the lessons are aimed at teaching the following core values: sharing, reciprocity, cooperation, respect, rights, role of caregivers, harmony, interdependence, honour, and balance. It also introduces students to their responsibilities as citizens through discussion of the Young Offenders Act, and consequences of not upholding the law. The curriculum also introduces students to conflict resolution skills and responsibility circles.

Alternatives to court are introduced in Unit Three of the Grade Five curriculum, including First Nations alternatives such as Elders Councils, Community Councils, and Family Councils. Then in Grade Seven, detailed case studies of actual First Nations local initiatives in justice are explored, including: Unlocking Aboriginal Justice (British Columbia), the Sandy Lake Justice Project (Prince Edward Island), and the Teslin Tlingit Tribal Justice System (Yukon). Students are encouraged to think of what types of local justice initiative would "work best" in their communities.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Law Courts Education Society of B.C. has the lead role in this project. In addition, there are several other players involved in various roles. To aid the development of the curriculum, an Advisory Committee comprised of First Nations educators from throughout the province was set up. Much of the material, particularly in the primary grades, is based on First Nations stories that were contributed by Elders and storytellers. Many of the Advisory Committee members

have maintained their role in the implementation of the curriculum in British Columbia and

Band-operated schools.

Funding for the curriculum development and implementation has been provided by the following:

- ♦ The Law Foundation of British Columbia
- ♦ Ministry of Attorney General
- ♦ Ministry of Education and Ministry Responsible for Multiculturalism and Human Rights (Aboriginal Education and Learning Resources Branch)
- ♦ Solicitor General Canada
- ♦ Vancouver Foundation
- ♦ Canadian Heritage
- ♦ Department of Justice (Aboriginal Justice Directorate)
- ♦ Vancouver / Sunshine Coast Aboriginal Management Society

We are currently conducting a research project on the effects of the curriculum on the knowledge, attitude, and behaviour of students towards the law (see below). This project is being jointly funded by the Department of Justice Canada (Research and Statistics Division and Aboriginal Justice Directorate) and the Law Courts Education Society.

The curriculum is being implemented with the support of many members of the Justice system. The curriculum provides a framework for Elders, community leaders, aboriginal police, RCMP, city police, judges, court personnel, crown counsel, defence lawyers, and other justice personnel to interact productively with the classroom. Visits to class can be timed to support the units of study of the students and to ensure that students have the necessary background to maximize their learning. In this way the school-community linking can be more pro-active and less *ad hoc* in nature.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Because the project involves the delivery of curriculum, the major player in the implementation is the school. However, within the curriculum, teachers are encouraged to involve other community members in the lessons in various capacities (e.g., Elders, storytellers, parents). We also encourage the participation of personnel who work either in or with the justice system (e.g., police officers, lawyers, social workers). The curriculum includes a section on Family and Community involvement, and each unit suggests community members who could get involved in the activities of particular lessons.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what ‘best practices’ are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

In this type of project, the most important element is local involvement, and following proper protocol. First of all, local resource people were asked to contribute to the curriculum, which makes it relevant to those communities. In addition, the curriculum is flexible in that it allows each community to “plug in” much of their own content (in particular, local stories) to make it interesting for the students. Feedback from schools who are using the curriculum comment upon the ease with which the curriculum can be used since the lesson plans are very detailed, while at the same time there is allowance for local input to make it coherent and applicable to that particular community.

The lesson learned had to do with not following proper protocol in some cases. For example, stories must be placed within the context of the curriculum before being verified with Elders as appropriate material to teach a particular concept. Also, one must know the proper channels to go through to get permission to conduct projects in First Nations communities. Finally, the curriculum was launched formally with a traditional ceremony and the participation of Elders, community leaders and justice system leaders.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the projects stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: This was a two-year project to research and develop a high quality court education curriculum model for First Nations and non-First Nations primary and intermediate students begun in 1992. The implementation phase is ongoing. There is also a three-year research project tied to the curriculum begun in the 1996/97 school year.

There is an urgency of need for law-related education with special relevance to First Nations students. In addition, much experimentation is occurring within the province of British Columbia to explore alternate justice processes for First Nations communities. Given this, the issue of strengthening relationships between the justice system and First Nations communities is a priority.

Much time and effort has gone into the development of the First Nations Journeys of Justice curriculum. The curriculum was developed in conjunction with different First Nations communities throughout the province, and control over and involvement in its delivery is being done at the community level, with involvement of the local school system, community organizations, justice system personnel and the regional offices of the Law Courts Education Society.

The project is grounded in the belief that a bridge can be built to develop common understandings between First Nations and mainstream Canadian peoples through an

understanding of cultural differences and similarities. The curriculum aims at strengthening cultural values and building self-esteem as bedrock for broader educational developments.

The curriculum provides the tools for students to understand the existing justice system, and to explore alternatives to it in the context of community justice. The project included research, curriculum and materials development, field-testing, revision, and publishing. The model uses the oral tradition of storytelling to stimulate children to explore concepts of justice found in their traditional stories. The curriculum also teaches how the court system works in British Columbia, in part through mock trials. Two of the mock trials are based on traditional First Nations stories, and two others on real court cases involving the aboriginal rights of hunting and fishing. Eight curriculum booklets, covering Kindergarten to grade Seven, were developed, with accompanying teacher guides and visual aids. Also, costumes were produced for the main characters in two scripted mock trials.

The curriculum highlights the need for family and community participation in a child's learning. It is well recognized among educators that one crucial aspect of the acceptance and smooth operation of a program, particularly within a school with a high First Nations population, is community involvement. Areas where various community members can become involved in the curriculum have been built into each teaching unit, and include:

- ♦ family members to watch performance put on by students.
- ♦ Elders and others to tell stories and share cultural knowledge with students.
- ♦ Chiefs, Band councilors, and municipal councilors to speak about their community roles.
- ♦ school personnel to discuss their roles.
- ♦ local police officers to speak about their role in the community.
- ♦ tribal police officers (in communities that have them) to speak about their role.
- ♦ justice system personnel to speak about their careers (lawyers, judges, courtworkers, corrections officers).
- ♦ people whose job is related to the justice system to speak about what they do (fisheries and conservation officers, social workers, MPs, MLAs).
- ♦ parents to help out with gathering information from home.

There are suggestions for field trips to the courts and to local community offices that work within the justice system. In this way, the curriculum provides a framework for ongoing and sustained interaction between communities and justice system personnel. This is in keeping with the Society's philosophy of bridging the gap between the community and the justice system.

There is a need for families and community members to become involved so that students will feel that the knowledge being imparted to them about their traditional society and mainstream Canadian law is important and relevant to their lives. Community involvement will mean that not only the students learn; all family and community members share their knowledge of traditional aspects of their own society with each other, and will learn more about Canadian law. Some community members will not have had the opportunity in their education to learn about First Nations societies, and many will not have had experience with the Canadian system of law. In this respect, the aim of the curriculum is not only to educate the students, but the whole community, through this sharing of knowledge.

Before the development of First Nations Journeys of Justice, there were no similar First Nations curricula in British Columbia, or elsewhere in North America to the knowledge of the society.

Stated Objectives: Not specifically stated (see above).

Key Deliverables: Not specifically stated (see below).

Monitored/Evaluated: The curriculum was pilot tested in six communities. The Society is currently conducting a research project to assess what impact the curriculum may have on student's knowledge, attitude, and behaviour. This is a three-year project currently in its second year. Students are being tracked from grade four through grade seven with a series of tests and interviews. Classes in "Module B" act as the control group to ascertain whether or not the curriculum is a factor in the lives of the students in "Module A".

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

As mentioned above, the primary objective of the evaluation will be to examine whether or not the curriculum has a positive effect on students' knowledge, attitude, and behaviour towards the law. The secondary objective of the evaluation is to assess which learning activities of the curriculum, if any, are most effective in promoting positive attitude and behaviour change, and to examine the effectiveness of the teacher implementation strategies used.

Each class involved in the project will follow one of the following two modules over the first two years:

Module A: Grade 4 (include grade 5 split class)

1. Year One: October 1997
 - ♦ give 3 pre-tests to students (allow one half hour per test, minimum).
 - ♦ teacher is interviewed (one hour maximum).
 - ♦ 10 parent / community member interviews (one hour maximum per interview).
 - ♦ student interviews (30-45 minutes per interview).
2. Year One: Sometime between November 1997 and May 1998
 - ♦ teach grade 4 unit over a minimum 10 week period (20 lessons at 2 lessons per week).
 - ♦ teacher provides feedback through a journal (1 journal entry per week).
3. Year One: May 1998 (or earlier if unit is finished).
 - ♦ give 3 post-tests.
 - ♦ same 10 parents / community members are interviewed.
 - ♦ same 10 students are interviewed.
 - ♦ teacher is interviewed.

Module B: Grade 4 (include grade 5 if split class)

1. Year One: October 1997
 - ♦ give 3 tests (allow one half hour per test).
 - ♦ 10 parent / community member interviews.
 - ♦ 10 student interviews.
2. Year Two: December 1998
 - ♦ give 3 tests (allow one half hour per test).
3. Year Two: February 1999-June 1999
 - ♦ teacher combined grade 4 and 5 units (with assistance from Law Courts Education Society). This module will require at maximum a 4-month period. The unit material will be collapsed into a teaching unit.
 - ♦ teacher journal to be completed during unit.
4. Year Two: June 1999
 - ♦ give test after unit.
 - ♦ 10 parent / community member interviews.
 - ♦ 10 student interviews.
 - ♦ teacher interview.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Specific learning activities in grades four through six have been examined by researchers for the knowledge, attitudes and behavior which these activities promote. Both quantitative and qualitative measurement tools have been developed (in the form of testing and interviewing respectively) to measure the impact of these classroom activities in these three areas.

CONTACT(S):

Rick Craig
Executive Director
Law Courts Education Society
221-800 Smithe Street
Vancouver, B.C.
V8Z 2E1
tel: (604) 660-9870
fax: (604) 775-3476

Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police-1

Victim Services — Waterloo Regional Police

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Victim Services is a civilian component of the Community Relations Branch of the Waterloo Regional Police Service. The civilian counselors provide assistance to victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, and other crimes and non-criminal issues. This unit educates victims to prevent future occurrences. They also keep victims up to date on court proceedings to their case.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Waterloo Regional Police has the lead role in this unit receiving additional funding from the Region of Waterloo and the Ministry of Community and Social Services.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The Victim Services Unit does not work with any one specific group but has broad contact with all community resources.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Victims are referred to a credible agency that gives information and support to individuals in a state of crisis.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Victim Services has operated since 1982, assisting police officers by providing follow up.

Stated Objectives: Not specifically stated (but see above).

Key Deliverables: The service includes key deliverables such as:

- ♦ crisis counseling;
- ♦ help in understanding police procedures and the court system;
- ♦ information about the victim to the court;
- ♦ assistance in applying for criminal injuries compensation; and,
- ♦ referrals to other helping agencies.

Monitored/Evaluated: There has been no formal evaluation.

CONTACT(S):

Inspector Michael Mann
Commander
Community Relations Branch
Waterloo Regional Police Service
P.O. Box 3070
200 Maple Grove Road
Cambridge, Ontario
N3H 5M1
tel: (519) 570-3000
fax: (519) 650-1793

Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police-2

Victory Hills Community Garden — Waterloo Regional Police

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The Community Garden Project is an example of a creative approach to crime prevention. It recognizes that a sense of community had to be developed in Victoria Hills for collective crime prevention approaches to work. The community garden was formed as a tool to educate and prevent crime in a non-traditional setting. It must be stressed it is only meant to be an example of one of many approaches to address crime in a troubled neighborhood. The police role was to act as a catalyst in implementing this project.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

In 1990, the John Howard Society of Waterloo Wellington launched a community crime prevention program within an area jointly identified with the Waterloo Regional Police Service. The John Howard Society took the lead role in organizing the Safer Community Group of Victoria Hills. They have now withdrawn support due to financial restraints. The Safer Community Group of Victoria Hills brings together, on a monthly basis, a wide range of representatives, both living and working, in the area for the purpose of planning and developing creative responses to safety / social issues that have been identified by the community.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Yes, the Community Garden involved ethnic minority groups to interact with the larger population.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The garden project created an increased sense of community for all involved, including police. Over 100 families now participate. Two specific apartment buildings overlooking the garden showed a decrease from 119 occurrences that police responded to in 1993 to 84 occurrences in 1994 — a 30% decrease for the street as a whole:

- ♦ increased awareness of a multicultural society;

- ♦ increased community interaction;
- ♦ increase in the sense of empowerment;
- ♦ increased safety and trust in the community;
- ♦ excellent use of crime prevention through environmental design principle, putting a safe activity into an unsafe area produces a reduction in crime;
- ♦ puts into action the Community Based Policing philosophy that focuses on “planting the seed” to empower community members to use initiative and accept a partnership responsibility in crime prevention.

The lesson learned was that funding for a full time coordinator would be beneficial.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the projects stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Immediate objectives:

- ♦ to get residents actively involved in developing a safer community through participation in a community garden;
- ♦ to provide an informal opportunity for the police and racial minorities to learn more about each other; and,
- ♦ to increase the contact of racial minority groups with members of the larger community.

Intermediate objectives:

- ♦ to increase residents’ awareness of the social causes of crime and their role in the prevention of crime;
- ♦ to improve the relationship between racial minorities and the police and to increase knowledge about each other; and,
- ♦ to integrate racial minorities into the larger community.

Ultimate objectives:

- ♦ the reduction of crime;
- ♦ to increase harmonious relations between the police and racial minorities; and,
- ♦ to increase community cohesiveness.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: The project was evaluated in its second year by a Master of Social Work student. Although a 30% reduction in crime was found in the neighbourhood, credit should also be given to other social agencies that worked in partnership to reduce crime in the neighbourhood.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

The project has a research component with pre- and post-test interviews. The reduction in the number of police service calls in the neighbourhood between 1993 - 1994 showed a 30% decrease in police calls for service.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

- ♦ less need for community support.
- ♦ decreased number of police calls for service.
- ♦ increase report of feeling safer.

CONTACT(S):

Inspector Michael Mann
Commander
Community Relations Branch
Waterloo Regional Police Service
P.O. Box 3070
200 Maple Grove Road
Cambridge, Ontario
N3H 5M1
tel: (519) 570-3000
fax: (519) 650-1793

Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police-3

Fast Water, Fast Friends — Waterloo Regional Police

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The objectives of Fast Water, Fast Friends are to:

- ♦ foster good relations between law enforcement personnel, other service providers in the community and Canada's First Nations people;
- ♦ encourage a career in law enforcement for Aboriginal youth as well as educate those in the justice system on Native values and beliefs.

This is a pro-active approach in a non-confrontational setting educating all participants in a variety of areas.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Pine Tree Native Centre of Brant initiated this event in 1992 to address severe tension between Native youth and police officers. The success of the first event prompted the Centre to expand the event to include Waterloo Regional Police and other surrounding police services.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Aboriginal people perceive law enforcement and judicial personnel as historical adversaries. Their member participation on this day gives credence to their values and beliefs while educating the community on their heritage and culture. This understanding assists those who are in front line service to the community in maintaining good race relations which is an essential foundation for effective policing. Youth of all races often feel discriminated against and react with a negative attitude. For the service providers, it alleviates the normal tensions and orchestrates communications and comprehension of differences and similarities.

BEST PRACTICES / LESSONS LEARNED: *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned (i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

This program is effective because it combines a sense of recreation, adventure and teamwork instead of the usual structured, dry delivery of a desired thought process. Anti-racism measures are seldom effective if forced upon any group. Attitudes of racism are developed over a period of time, influenced by many factors. The relief of this problem must come from a true desire to

initiate change or in an opportunity that will embarrass the participants.

Due to lack of government financial support, evaluation is performed by limited human resources of the Pine Tree Native Centre and cannot possibly reflect all the changes that this event is responsible for.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Fast Water, Fast Friends has been in operation as an annual event for four years.

Stated Objectives: The objectives are as follows:

- ◆ to provide a healthy environment which is conducive to casual conversation and teamwork between law enforcement, service agencies, youth and Aboriginal people;
- ◆ to promote law enforcement and community service as a career for youth; and,
- ◆ to promote mutual respect between cultures, towards the elimination of hate crimes, discrimination and bias against minorities and youth.

Key Deliverables: The annual event paired one Aboriginal participant and one individual from law enforcement / social service for a three hour canoe trip from Paris to Brantford where a traditional Native social and meal were presented. A total of 125 canoes and 250 individuals participated in the event. As well as promoting, canoeing as a recreational activity, the river was conducive to quiet conversation as well as necessitating teamwork in the rapid water. Equalized by the river, the participants were on a parallel basis and open to understanding similarities and differences in their lives. Favourable media coverage enhanced the images of all services involved. Youth participants were encouraged to plan careers in law enforcement, social work fields to understand the dynamics of these positions. Participation of community members has provided them with an appreciation of the agencies involvement towards equitable employment practices and harmonious race relations.

Monitored/Evaluated: This event has been evaluated through informal and clinical analysis:

- ◆ positive feedback from participants (i.e., letters of commendation from police services, judges, crown attorney, etc.), as well as attendance of Aboriginal youth in Centre programs;
- ◆ the notation of a decrease of repeat offenders who were participants in the Native Inmate Program;
- ◆ the participation of local police service personnel on the Board of Directors of the Native Centre;
- ◆ the decrease in human rights violation complaints; and,
- ◆ the increased attendance in this annual event and other community events.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

This project has a research component with measurable outcomes as it would relate to the opinions of each participant both prior to and following the event. All agencies, police services and individuals could be polled for their perception of the effect of this event and post event results.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Community feedback, continued open dialogue and favourable media coverage would be some of the performance indicators in this project as well as statistical information from police services, correctional institutions and social service agencies.

CONTACT(S):

Inspector Michael Mann
Commander
Community Relations Branch
Waterloo Regional Police Service
P.O. Box 3070
200 Maple Grove Road
Cambridge, Ontario
N3H 5M1
tel: (519) 570-3000
fax: (519) 650-1793

Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police-4

Values, Influences & Peers — Waterloo Regional Police

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The Values, Influences and Peers (VIP) project has an educational approach into crime prevention. It also includes a broader scope of subjects that address the root causes of crime.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The VIP Program teachers include the School Boards, Community Relations Police Officers and many other community resources:

- ♦ security staff — Sears, The Bay, Zellers;
- ♦ doctor, pharmacist;
- ♦ local politician, lawyer, judges;
- ♦ John Howard Society;
- ♦ city maintenance / public works;
- ♦ Lung Association;
- ♦ Probation Officer; and,
- ♦ Police — Canine Officers & Emergency Response Officers.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The program was developed to address grade six students in the Region of Waterloo.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

VIP benefits:

- ♦ accept responsibility for own actions;
- ♦ understand the influence of peer pressure;
- ♦ better decision making skills;
- ♦ aware of importance of self respect and self confidence;
- ♦ interact with others in meaningful ways;

- ♦ understand the dangers of tobacco, alcohol, drugs; and,

- ♦ understand the serious impacts of shoplifting, drugs, vandalism.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the projects stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The VIP project has been in use since 1982. It is in use in over 130 Ontario School Boards. It is designed to be preventative in nature. The class teacher draws upon 12 key subjects taught over 12 weeks:

- ♦ From Values to Standards;
- ♦ Creating Impressions;
- ♦ Authority and Authority Figures;
- ♦ Belittling Others;
- ♦ Peer Pressure;
- ♦ Decision Making;
- ♦ Being Truthful;
- ♦ The Dangers of Drugs;
- ♦ Vandalism and Destructive Behaviour;
- ♦ Shoplifting is Stealing;
- ♦ Youth and the Law; and,
- ♦ Friends and Friendships.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Inspector Michael Mann
Commander
Community Relations Branch
Waterloo Regional Police Service
P.O. Box 3070
200 Maple Grove Road
Cambridge, Ontario
N3H 5M1

tel: (519) 570-3000

fax: (519) 650-1793

Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police-5

Vision 2000 Police / Youth Mentoring Program — Waterloo Regional Police

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

One of the greatest concerns in our community today is how to address the at-risk students. At-risk students often begin to experiment with drugs, exhibit delinquent behaviour in and outside school, and sometimes drop out of school. Their lack of purpose and direction usually follow these students into and throughout their adult working lives, and their problems often impinge on the very quality of the communities in which they live.

Although these children are often bright and capable of achievement, they often receive very little support and encouragement outside school. The Waterloo Regional Police Service and local youth 12-17 entered into a mentoring relationship. The mentor relationship takes place in a recreational setting where both police and youth meet on neutral setting.

One of the intended outcomes of this project is to minimize the contact that youth participants will have with the traditional justice system. Objectives for the project are being met through preventative and educational approaches.

Vision 2000 Program Objectives:

- ♦ provide summer employment for a college or university student;
- ♦ improve relations between youth and police so that youth will see policing (a) as an integral part of our community, and (b) as a viable career opportunity;
- ♦ break down stereotypical communication barriers between youth and police;
- ♦ break down communications barriers between police and youth; and,
- ♦ improve relations between police and youth.

Preventative Approach:

- ♦ mentorship programs are considered to be preventative in nature.

Educational Approach:

- ♦ each stage of the program has an educational component built into it. This is a major strength of the program design.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

A. Phase One of Vision 2000 Police / Mentoring Project

Summer 1994 (May-September)

Lead Role: Waterloo Regional Police
Waterloo County Board of Education
Waterloo Roman Catholic Separate School Board

Funded by Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services

Participating Partners include:

- ♦ Cambridge Multicultural Association
- ♦ KW Race Relations Committee
- ♦ Weejeendemin Native Resources Centre
- ♦ KW Multicultural Centre
- ♦ Safer Community Group of Victoria Hills

B. Phase Two of Vision 2000 Police / Youth Mentoring Project

Summer 1996 (June-September)

Lead Role: Waterloo Regional Police
Funded by local Waterloo Regional Optimists Club

Participating Partners include:

- ♦ Waterloo County Boards of Education
- ♦ Waterloo Roman Catholic Separate School Board
- ♦ KW Race Relations Committee
- ♦ Family and Children Services
- ♦ ROOF
- ♦ John Howard Society
- ♦ KW Multicultural Centre
- ♦ Optimist Club

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

According to a recent Statistics Canada survey, young people, who accounted for 6.8% of the population in 1992, accounted for 25% of all those charged with criminal offences in the same year.

Target population: At-Risk Youth

This Vision 2000 Program was developed to support and begin to build a network for at-risk youth in Waterloo Region. All of the participating young people were identified as being at-risk in some way by their sponsoring organizations or schools.

Many organizations and schools support this initiative in our community. Each one of the organizations work toward solving a great variety of justice issues.

How were young people involved?

All young participants contributed daily to the program implementation plans. They were also a very important component of the evaluations stage (Phase One).

Evaluation activities are presently underway for Vision 2000 Phase Two.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The community is responsible for teaching our youth how to make the right decisions during difficult times. Vision 2000 will try and fulfill many diverse needs in the community and officers will be encouraged to create their own program. The police service can be seen as an advocate of youth who can connect a youth to resources and support.

This program has the potential to lead to student employment if funding is found. This entire program could be replicated in almost any police service.

What are the benefits of a mentor program?

Students benefit by:

- ◆ receiving the support and guidance of a caring adult;
- ◆ receiving assistance with academic endeavour;
- ◆ experiencing greater self esteem and motivation to succeed;
- ◆ receiving encouragement to stay in school and graduate;
- ◆ receiving encouragement to avoid the use of drugs and alcohol;
- ◆ improving interpersonal relationships, such as with teachers and family; and,
- ◆ receiving assistance in choosing a career path.

Adult mentors benefit by:

- ◆ increasing their involvement in the community;
- ◆ recognizing they can make a difference;
- ◆ making a new friend;
- ◆ gaining new experience and knowledge about youth and the community's schools; and,
- ◆ contributing to the quality of the future workplace.

Business and Organizations benefit by:

- ◆ fostering good community relations;
- ◆ contributing to the quality of the future workforce;
- ◆ improving employee morale; and,
- ◆ enhancing employee skills.

Schools benefit by:

- ♦ improving student performance;
- ♦ improving student attendance; and,
- ♦ increasing student retention.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Vision 2000 has been operating in the summer since 1994.

Stated Objectives: Under the *Police Act of Ontario*, law enforcement agencies are charged with the preservation of the public peace, the prevention of crime and the apprehension of criminals. The Vision 2000 Police Youth Mentoring Program is to prevent crime. Vision 2000 will help and enhance other social agency programs. The program will help police to carry out and fulfill our primary duty as required by law, that is the prevention of crime.

Project Objectives:

- ♦ to build stronger relationships between police organizations / officers and local youth;
- ♦ to provide youth with a closer look at police functions and their importance in the community;
- ♦ to assist youth in the development of life and development skills;
- ♦ to help in the recruitment of police personnel in the future; and,
- ♦ to provide leadership in the larger community by demonstrating a cutting-edge model for the developing of community partnerships.

Key Deliverables:

- ♦ a community based infrastructure which can be supportive between adults and at-risk youth;
- ♦ a model for the development of a support network for at-risk youth;
- ♦ a model which can be replicated in any number of communities and which can be expanded to include any number of businesses, organizations, institutions, groups; and,
- ♦ a model that the justice system can use to contribute to community development and provide leadership on a local and/or provincial level.

Monitored/Evaluated: Phase One evaluation was completed and submitted to Ministry of Solicitor General in fall 1994. Phase Two evaluation will consist of one on one telephone interviews. The evaluation is now in progress and a summary report will be made available in October 1996.

CONTACT(S):

Inspector Michael Mann
Commander
Community Relations Branch
Waterloo Regional Police Service
P.O. Box 3070
200 Maple Grove Road
Cambridge, Ontario
N3H 5M1
tel: (519) 570-3000
fax: (519) 650-1793

Department of Justice Canada-1

Access to Justice Agreements with the Territories

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Not specifically indicated (but the agreement is between Department of Justice and territorial governments).

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: The Department is in the process of finalizing new agreements with the territories, which will provide federal funding for a number of access to justice services (criminal and young offender legal aid, civil legal aid, native courtworker, and public legal education and information) under a single agreement. This new approach is intended to provide the territories with more flexibility and control in relation to coverage and funding of these services.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Evaluation not planned, but there will be on-going monitoring of agreements.

CONTACT(S):

Ajit Mehat
Director General
Programs Directorate
Justice Canada
239 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

tel: (613) 957-4344

fax: (613) 941-2269

Department of Justice Canada-2

Access to Justice Network (ACJNet)

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

University of Alberta Legal Studies Program; University of Montréal, Center de recherche en droit public; University of Ottawa, Human Rights Research and Education Centre; Industry Canada, SchoolNet; Canadian Heritage, Multiculturalism; and, WebNetworks.

ACJNet includes the Network, the Access to Justice documentation centre, and the ACJNet virtual library.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Treasury Board approved the ACJNet workplan.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ to provide Canadians with opportunities to obtain a uniform level of legal, justice and justice-related information;
- ♦ to improve access to the justice system for Canadians with special needs (e.g., victims of crime; immigrant communities; youth; aboriginal people; women);

- ♦ to improve and create cost effective communications and coordination among elements of Canada's justice system as well as to create international links;
- ♦ to provide a mechanism by which the community and justice system can share ideas, information and experiences; and,
- ♦ to create a bilingual, national electronic communication and information network that provides access to the justice system and to Canadian law for the public.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ajit Mehat
Director General
Programs Directorate
Justice Canada
239 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

tel: (613) 957-4344

fax: (613) 941-2269

Department of Justice Canada-3

Plain Language Partnership

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Treasury Board, Industry Canada, Human Resources and Development Canada, Revenue Canada, Transport Canada, and Justice Canada (PLEI, Legislative Services, Communications, and Executive Services).

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ajit Mehat
Director General
Programs Directorate
Justice Canada
239 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

tel: (613) 957-4344

fax: (613) 941-2269

Department of Justice Canada-4

Youth Justice Education Partnership

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Federal Departments of the Solicitor General, Canadian Heritage, Health Canada, Justice (PLEI, Family, Children & Youth Section, Communications, and Executive Services), the RCMP, the National Crime Prevention Council, as well as provincial / territorial justice, education and social service ministries, and individuals representing diverse agencies and backgrounds (e.g., criminology, public legal education psychology, correctional services, youth services, the Bench).

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The YJEP program was developed in cooperation with governments, NGOs, and national associations working in the area of youth crime and crime prevention.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ ensure that Canadians have accurate information about the youth justice system and the Young Offender's Act;
- ♦ promote equitable, appropriate, and effective treatment for youth;
- ♦ contribute to the prevention of crime;

- ♦ enhance the capacity of communities, organizations and justice services to address youth justice issues; and,
- ♦ to enhance the understanding of youth justice.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Ajit Mehat
Director General
Programs Directorate
Justice Canada
239 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

tel: (613) 957-4344

fax: (613) 941-2269

Manitoba-1

Queen's Bench (family division) Case management

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The objectives of the Case Management Project are:

- ♦ to reduce the costs to the litigants in legal fees, and the public in general, incurred from the opening of the file by the lawyers to its conclusion by Court Order, agreement, or pursuant to a client's instructions;
- ♦ to reduce unreasonable delay between the initiation and completion of a matter;
- ♦ to increase litigant, lawyer, Judge and court staff satisfaction with the court process; and,
- ♦ to reduce the number of contested hearings, for both interim and final orders, including the number scheduled and the number which proceed.

Two essential components of case management are the setting of a timetable for pre-determined events and the supervision of the progress of the action through its timetable. It is hoped that through early intervention by way of case-conferencing before a Justice of the Queen's Bench (Family Division) more cases can be settled at any early stage, rather than having matters in court for lengthy periods of time and resulting in numerous Court appearances and trial.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Advisory Committee on the Pilot Project on Case Management in the Family Division was established comprised of the Queen's Bench Judiciary, representatives of the Family Law Section of the Manitoba Bar Association, Courts Administration, and the Policy and Planning Branch of the Department of Justice. The Chairman of the Advisory Committee is Associate Chief Justice G. Mercier of the Queen's Bench (Family Division). The Queen's Bench Judiciary took the lead role in recognizing the potential for such a project, and ensuring that the above mentioned participants were consulted and participated in the development of the project.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The Family Law Subsection of the Manitoba Bar Association are members of the Advisory Committee and have played a large role in the development of the Project.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what ‘best practices’ are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The consultation process at the very beginning of the concept included the Judiciary, the Family Law Subsection, Courts administration and Planning and Research. Having all of these parties involved at the outset facilitated a more cooperative and comprehensive approach to the overall development and implementation.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project’s stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The project has been operating since November 1, 1995 and is a two year project.

Stated Objectives: Case Management is a plan designed to assist parties and counsel in controlling the amount of time it takes for a litigation file to be completed while in the court process. It is recognized that sometimes the passage of time may be a necessary ingredient to the successful disposition of a family law case.

Case Management seeks to reduce the time and cost for a case to proceed through the court system from initial file to resolution.

The purpose is to reduce delay and to facilitate earlier resolutions in more cases. Reduction in the duration of an action decreases the time required by parties and their lawyers to manage the events within the case, with concurrent reduction in the cost of litigation to the parties. A reduction in parties’ costs will, in turn, facilitate increased access by a broader range of citizens to the services provided by courts.

Supervision of the action is intended to facilitate more and earlier resolutions, resulting in significant savings to the parties and to court administration. These savings are realized by reducing the number of expensive court services required (principally, trials with their heavy demand on judicial, administrative and client resources). In short, the goal of case management is to achieve earlier resolutions in more cases through effective and efficient court processes.

Presently, 10% of all matters initiated by originating process in the Court of Queen’s Bench (Family Division) Winnipeg Centre are being case managed (except for child protection matters and un-contested matters).

Under Case Management, the Bench becomes much more involved in the management of cases in the court system:

- ♦ they help counsel adhere to a time frame -- in some cases will more actively direct counsel as to the manner in which a case will be conducted; and,
- ♦ they must ensure that settlement is discussed and, wherever possible, that settlement is reached as soon as possible in the proceedings.

The Bar must comply with the rules and manage their clients' lawsuits so the timetables are complied with:

- ♦ they have to be well prepared before they appear before the Case Conference Judge, and must be prepared to address settlement at any stage in the proceeding, and earlier than usual.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: The evaluation model contains the following major components:

- ♦ a pre-case management sample of 200 files from 1992. Detailed information was collected from each file with a particular focus on the time which elapsed between various procedural points;
- ♦ the collection of statistics in Case Management cases relating to time lapses between various occurrences as well as numbers of motions, *et cetera*; a separate research team from Planning & Research collecting statistical data on each case managed file; a summary being completed by the Case Conference Clerk of the events that occur at each Case Conference, as well as expectations for any subsequent Conference; and a Case Conference memorandum completed by the Judge at the end of each Case Conference which summarizes what occurred at the Conference and any expectations. As well, a questionnaire is to be completed by all Judges for each file they manage, for the purpose of evaluating their impressions.

CONTACT(S):

Mr. Greg Yost
Executive Director
Policy Planning & Special Projects
14th Floor, 405 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3L6

tel: (204) 945-0537

fax: (204) 945-0433

Manitoba-2

Custody Coordination Project (Portage La Prairie & Winnipeg)

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Each time a prisoner is moved: 1) the security risk increases, and 2) attendant costs associated with prisoner transfers increases. In 1991, for example, 54.79% of all court dispositions were remands. Matters are routinely remanded six or more times before disposition. This process creates a significant security risk each time an accused in custody is moved under escort. This project will eliminate unneeded prisoner movements where remands can be determined in advance. Phase 1 of the project involves prisoner movement between Winnipeg, Portage la Prairie, Amaranth, Carman and Morden.

All accused persons who are in custody will be escorted to their circuit location only for first appearance, bail application and disposition by way of guilty plea or trial. In other words, only where a specific activity is to occur, other than a remand. Where an accused is in custody and the matter is remanded, the accused will remain in the Remand Centre and a Magistrate will attend at the Remand Centre to facilitate remand.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The development of the project has involved the judiciary, court administration and Sheriff's Office. Consultation will include Correctional staff and the local Bar Association. Court administration and the judiciary have the lead role.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

No. This is seen as a security risk which involves the judiciary, court administration and Sheriff's Office.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

As in other projects that have been developed with the Courts, early consultation with all parties affected by changes is paramount. The opportunity to be a stakeholder in projects that are designed to improve the justice system offers persons more of an incentive to ensure that the project is a success.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?
Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).*

Project Timeframe: The project is scheduled to commence on September 1, 1996.

Stated Objectives: The stated objective is to improve security by reducing prisoner movements for matters where remands can be determined in advance.

Key Deliverables: There should be a definite reduction in not only numbers of prisoners being escorted, but as well in the number of trips having to be made between locations by the Sheriff's Officers and thereby hopefully resulting in some cost savings.

Monitored/Evaluated: The statistical collection component is still under development but will involve numbers of persons remanded in custody at the Remand Centre rather than being transported to a Court location, numbers of actual trips made by the Sheriff's Officers vis-à-vis what would have occurred prior to September 1, 1996, *et cetera*.

CONTACT(S):

Mr. Greg Yost
Executive Director
Policy Planning & Special Projects
14th Floor, 405 Broadway,
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3L6
tel: (204) 945-0537
fax: (204) 945-0433

Manitoba-3

Manitoba Community Notification Advisory Committee (CNAC)

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Values corresponding to CNAC:

- ♦ focused use of the justice system;
- ♦ coordinated justice system response; and,
- ♦ use of innovative technologies.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

CNAC brings together law enforcement agencies, federal and provincial corrections, forensic mental health workers, Crown Counsel and policy officials to determine if, when and how the public should be alerted to the release / presence of high-risk offenders in Manitoba communities.

Participating agencies: RCMP, Winnipeg Police Service, Brandon Police Service, Public Prosecutions, Manitoba Health, Manitoba Corrections, Manitoba Civil Legal Services, and the Correctional Services of Canada. The committee is chaired by a Winnipeg Lawyer.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

No.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

CNAC has integrated law enforcement, justice, corrections, mental health agencies in the difficult task of assessing when the public need for information to protect itself outweighs the privacy interests of an individual. CNAC personnel have noted that inter-agency cooperation and communication has increased between member-agencies as a result of this initiative. The specific nature of the Committee's tasks, combined with a common protocol and agreed upon policies have resulted in a successful inter-sectoral approach to public protection.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Established February 8, 1995 by the Honourable Rosemary Vodrey, Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Manitoba. The Community Notification Advisory Committee guides the work of the Committee.

Stated Objectives: Public concern over the need to be informed about the dangers posed by high-risk sex offenders, combined with specific incidents of recidivism by such offenders led to the development of an integrated team to design the CNAC protocol. An underlying theme giving rise to the program is the need for the justice system to be more accountable to and be cognizant of the information needs of the community.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: CNAC is in the process of establishing a database to track individual offenders and overall offender characteristics. A subcommittee of CNAC has been established to design an evaluating framework. A total of thirty-two (32) cases have been reviewed as of July 31, 1996. Of these six (6) were full notifications; eighteen (18) were targeted notifications; two (2) were postponed; in six (6) cases CNAC recommended no notification. Evaluation is anticipated to be completed in 1996/1997. CNAC issues semi-annual reports outlining key program developments and characteristics of cases reviewed by the committee. Two reports have been issued to date: November 1995; and May 1996.

CONTACT(S):

Glen Lewis
Policy and Program Consultant
Manitoba Justice
5-405 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3L6
tel: (204) 945-7180
fax: (204) 945-1260

Manitoba-4

Manitoba Justice Committees

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Values corresponding to Justice Committees:

- ♦ focused and appropriate use of the justice system;
- ♦ coordinated community and justice system response;
- ♦ more efficient access to justice services; and,
- ♦ efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems.

Youth violence and gang activity in a specific Manitoba community in 1975 stands as the original impetus for the implementation of the justice committee model. Since that period, and in part due to the introduction of the Young Offenders Act, and FPT initiatives aimed at community involvement in the justice system, the number of committees has risen to over 70 committees across the province. The mandates range from alternative measures under the Young Offenders Act, adult diversion, to crime prevention programs.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Not indicated.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Key principles leading to the success of justice committees include providing justice committees with a maximum amount of autonomy within the general policy and legal parameters established by Manitoba Justice; providing administrative and training support to committees through liaison probation officers assigned to each committee; diverse expertise and experiences are brought together on each committee; continuity of committee membership, as it is not uncommon to find members with 10-12 years experience; flexibility of the model to operate in rural, urban, and Aboriginal communities; the ability of committees to act quickly following a referral of a case;

and, providing a structure to promote and channel community ownership and responsibility for responding to crime and crime prevention.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Each justice committee establishes its own objectives.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: While no formal evaluations have occurred, statistics are collected on the number and nature of cases referred to justice committees, along with the type and success of dispositions.

CONTACT(S):

Mr. Greg Yost
Executive Director
Policy Planning & Special Projects
14th Floor, 405 Broadway,
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3L6

tel: (204) 945-0537

fax: (204) 945-0433

Manitoba-5

Hollow Water Community Holistic Circle Healing Project (CHCH)

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Values corresponding to CHCH:

- ♦ focused and appropriate use of the justice system;
- ♦ coordinated community and justice system response;
- ♦ more efficient access to justice services;
- ♦ efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems; and,
- ♦ other: use of culturally appropriate means of addressing problems in Aboriginal communities.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The CHCH program is designed to provide a comprehensive response to sexual abuse in the Manitoba communities of Hollow Water First Nation, and the Métis communities of Aghaming, Seymourville and Manigotagen. The program consists of seven (7) local workers who have been trained in sexual abuse intervention who provide pre-, peri- and post-court intervention for those cases which proceed through the criminal courts, as well as assistance to victims and victimizers whose cases do not proceed to court.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The success of the CHCH Program is based on a variety of factors, including the successful integration of traditional and contemporary treatment methods; utilizing local resource persons and a team approach to intervention with victims, victimizers and all those affected by sexual abuse; establishing a strong partnership with justice and social service agencies; and, implementing an intervention model which is sensitive to the complex dynamics of sexual abuse.

The final intervention model reflects a belief in the power of integrating traditional and contemporary treatment models. Furthermore, the model demonstrates the importance and

success of working with the community, justice and social service systems to address this complex problem.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The program originated in 1994. A three (3) year pilot phase was completed in 1996. A tripartite meeting has been scheduled for Fall 1996 to discuss the future of the initiative.

Stated Objectives: The CHCH Program is designed to provide a comprehensive response to sexual abuse in the Manitoba communities of Hollow Water First Nation, and the Métis communities of Aghaming, Seymourville and Manigotagan.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: A comprehensive evaluation indicated that the program is effective. The evaluation of the program indicates strong community and 'system' support for this unique initiative. The evaluation indicated areas requiring improvement, such as training. Overall results indicate the positive impact of this program. A means of determining financial benefits has not been determined. Copies of the evaluation can be obtained by contacting the Aboriginal Corrections Branch of the Ministry of the Solicitor General in Ottawa.

CONTACT(S):

Michael Watson, Q.C.
Director of Regional Prosecutions
Manitoba Justice
409-1011 Rosser Avenue
Brandon, Manitoba
R7A 0L5

tel: (204) 726-6013

fax: (204) 276-6501

Manitoba-6

Mediation Services

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Values Corresponding to Mediation Services:

- ♦ focused and appropriate use of the justice system;
- ♦ coordinated community and justice system response;
- ♦ more efficient access to justice services;
- ♦ efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems; and,
- ♦ other: provides a positive alternative to the resolution of conflicts beyond the adversarial trial model.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Mediation Services is a Winnipeg-based agency which provides a range of mediation services to the community, and public and private sectors. The major relationship between Manitoba Justice and Mediation Services is the Victim-Offender Mediation (VOM) Program.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Mediation Services is overseen by a Board of Directors comprised of representatives of funding agencies, the community and persons actively involved in Mediation. The agency has eleven (11) staff who perform case work and follow-up on mediation provided by approximately sixty (60) trained volunteers.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Key features to the success of Mediation Services include a model grounded in strong theory and practice; high client satisfaction; strong relationship with justice agencies; on-going program and case analysis; and, a comprehensive approach to training and support to its volunteers.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The origins of Mediation Services can be traced back to 1979 when a pilot project was launched by the Mennonite Central Committee — Manitoba. Mediation Services was established in 1979 and it now ranks as one of North America's largest post-charge VOM programs.

Stated Objectives: Presently the purpose of Mediation Services is to “promote peace and restorative justice within the community, by empowering people through education and mediation, resolving conflict using non-violent conflict resolution processes.” Program objectives include:

- ♦ responding to crime in a way that interprets the incident as involving persons with feelings, concern, and needs;
- ♦ providing a way for victims of crime to be directly involved in resolving matters, and dealing with matters that affect them;
- ♦ holding persons accountable for their behaviour, particularly where they have victimized someone;
- ♦ providing opportunity to deal with criminal and civil matters in one process rather than two;
- ♦ allowing accused persons to take responsibility for their actions in a constructive manner;
- ♦ diverting matters from the court process that can be more effectively and efficiently dealt with in mediation; and,
- ♦ helping people to deal with conflict in a way that can lead to reconciliation.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: In 1994, the latest year for which statistics are available, 826 cases were referred (539 adults; 287 youths), of these 56% were assault-related, 10% mischief / disturbances, 13% break, enter and theft, 12% uttering threats, 5% weapons charges, and 4% other. \$20,387 was paid to victims.

VOM Programs are operating in most Canadian jurisdictions. The model is clearly applicable in nearly all settings. Emerging research and programs are now targeting how mediation can be successfully applied in cross cultural settings. High levels of satisfaction have been reported by the participants. This suggests VOM clearly represents an important element of the administration of justice.

A 1995 assessment of four Canadian mediation programs found high levels of client satisfaction; that the quality of justice experienced by mediation participants can be enhanced by expanded use of mediation; diverting cases holds significant potential “for freeing-up court resources”; mediation provides a strong vehicle for victims to take an active role in holding offenders

accountable; and, that mediation Services should be expanded through policy support, funding,

legislative initiatives.

CONTACT(S):

Ron Perozzo, Q.C.
Associate Deputy Attorney General
Manitoba Justice
7-405 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3L6

tel: (204) 945-284

fax: not indicated

Manitoba-7

First Nations Justice Strategy

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

As a joint project between MKO (Manitoba Keewatinowi Okimakanak), Waywayseecappo, and the Department of Justice, this project will decrease the involvement of the traditional Euro-Canadian Court system and develop more Aboriginal based alternatives such as the development of Aboriginal clerks / magistrates, and Elder Advisory program, greater community awareness of the justice system, community service options, and further inputs which reflect Aboriginal traditions as well as community based diversion projects.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The partners include the Department of Justice, Waywayseecappo, and MKO Inc. Agencies include the police, probation, crown and judiciary. The two First Nations political arms include a total of 26 reserve communities. The Department of Justice sees this project as a partnership with MKO and Waywayseecappo.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The twenty-six (26) reserve communities will be recruiting volunteers to sit on justice committees and they will have representatives of victims and the communities in general.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

This is an emerging project but best practices will likely include:

- ♦ increased First Nations involvement in planning change for the justice system will increase their sense of ownership;
- ♦ more culturally appropriate responses to crime in the 26 reserve areas will increase greater impact on offenders; and,
- ♦ diverting less serious offenders to community diversion projects will leave the court to deal with more serious cases.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?
Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).*

Project Timeframe: To commence September 1, 1996 and run for two (2) years.

Stated Objectives: The objectives include:

- ♦ administering justice in a more culturally appropriate manner;
- ♦ developing community based alternates to court proceedings and to sentencing;
- ♦ dealing with criminal matters in a more timely manner.

Key Deliverables: Key deliverables will include:

- ♦ First Nations input to changes;
- ♦ participation of communities in resolving justice issues;
- ♦ reduced delay for cases going to court and trial; and,
- ♦ increased options for diversion activities for adults and youth.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

Research design to be completed September 30, 1996.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Not indicated.

CONTACTS:

Mr. Greg Yost
Executive Director
Policy Planning & Special Projects
14th Floor, 405 Broadway
Winnipeg, Manitoba
R3C 3L6
tel: (204) 945-0537
fax: (204) 945-0433

National Crime Prevention Council⁴

Models of Crime Prevention Coordination

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Jurisdictions from across the country participate in a Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on Community Safety and Crime Prevention.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated. But, one of the key features of multidisciplinary crime prevention is coordination. Presently, a variety of coordination models exist across the country. These models have developed in response to differing needs and realities of federal and provincial governments with respect to crime prevention.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

⁴ The NCPC did not specifically answer the Multi-Disciplinary Justice Projects questionnaire; rather, they submitted a request for funding for a research project on "models of crime prevention coordination" which did not include information to the majority of answers in the questionnaire.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

The NCPC does not have a research component but is submitting a research proposal to have models of crime prevention compared by the F-P-T Working Group on Multidisciplinary Justice: “The goal of the research project is to generate greater knowledge about coordination and enable F-P-T Working Group members, Deputy Ministers and others to benefit from a good analysis of coordination models and of ‘lessons learned’.”

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Francine Charlesbois
Chief, Policy Analysis
National Crime Prevention Council Secretariat
Department of Justice Canada
239 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

tel: (613) 957-7654

fax: (613) 952-3515

New Brunswick-1

Domestic Legal Aid

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The Domestic Legal Aid program is intended to minimize people's contact with the traditional justice system. The approaches it uses are restorative and educational.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Department of Justice is the lead organization for Domestic Legal Aid. Legal Aid New Brunswick is also involved.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

No community groups are involved in any formal way in the domestic legal aid program.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Pending the receipt of the evaluation, it would be premature to identify what we believe are the best practices illustrated in Domestic Legal Aid or features that should be avoided.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Domestic Legal Aid has been operating since May 1993.

Stated Objectives: Objectives are to assist abused spouses to leave the abusive relationship, and to encourage the use of ADRs and self-help mechanisms in resolving the abusive situation.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: An independent evaluation was commissioned and is expected to be received in the near future.

CONTACT(S):

Bryan Whitfield / Pauline Desrosier-Hickey
Research and Planning
Department of Justice
P.O. Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

tel: (506) 453-3693

fax: (506) 453-7483

New Brunswick-2

Public Awareness on Family Violence through Community Partnerships

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Public Awareness on Family Violence through Community Partnerships is intended to minimize people's contact with the traditional justice system. The approaches it uses are preventive, restorative and educational.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Department of Justice was the lead organization in the development and start-up of the program. The Departments of the Solicitor General and Health and Community Services are partners in the program. The program is now being run by the Muriel McQueen Foundation under funding provided through the Department of the Solicitor General.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Various community-based volunteer groups, such as Women's Institutes and Dames d'Acadie, are also partners in the project.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The project demonstrated that a contact person to link, motivate and help organize the community volunteers was necessary both to get the programs started and to keep them running. The need for the program to be flexible to meet the different needs of each community was also a critical factor in the program's success.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The first projects have been running for nearly two years.

Stated Objectives: The project's general objectives are to create awareness of the problem of violence and to reduce the amount of violence. Within these general objectives, each community group develops its own strategic plan, sets its own goals, and plans its own activities.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: The projects are subject to on-going evaluation and modification, where necessary.

CONTACT(S):

Bryan Whitfield / Pauline Desrosier-Hickey
Research and Planning
Department of Justice
P.O. Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

tel: (506) 453-3693

fax: (506) 453-7483

New Brunswick-3

New Brunswick Integrated Justice (NBIJ)

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The principal partners are the Departments of Justice and the Solicitor General, and Anderson Consulting. In addition, the judiciary, the bar, the RCMP, local police and other government Departments will be partners in the project.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

All stakeholder groups will be consulted in the creation of the new justice enterprise through an extensive stakeholder liaison process.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The NBIJ initiative officially began on September 1, 1996. The project is forecast to take approximately four years.

Stated Objectives: The New Brunswick Integrated Justice initiative is intended to transform the administration of justice to provide services that are fair, citizen-centred, easily accessible, and community-focused. It will emphasize preemptive services that are aimed at minimizing the involvement of individuals with the core elements of the traditional justice system. It will utilize four approaches to service delivery: preemptive; monitoring; resolution; and, enforcement.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: It will be subject to on-going evaluation during the developmental and implementation phases.

CONTACT(S):

Bryan Whitfield / Pauline Desrosier-Hickey
Research and Planning
Department of Justice
P.O. Box 6000
Fredericton, New Brunswick
E3B 5H1

tel: (506) 453-3693

fax: (506) 453-7483

Newfoundland & Labrador-1

Support Applications Project

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The project makes the traditional justice system more accessible to single parents in receipt of social assistance benefits. In January 1993, the Western Regional Social Services Office, in conjunction with the Provincial Court Judge in Corner Brook, developed a procedure which enabled single parents who were on social assistance in that region to apply for and obtain support orders. Essentially, a social worker was assigned to assist single parents to prepare and serve court documents relating to applications for support. The procedure also involved the social worker appearing in court with the clients as their agent, asking them questions and, where appropriate, cross examining the respondent.

The project minimizes contact with the traditional system in the Unified Family Court jurisdiction. In 1992, a social worker was assigned to the Support Applications Pilot Project. The social worker is responsible for interviewing all clients with potential for support, determining whether or not an order or voluntary agreement could be pursued, and where voluntary agreements were in the interest of the client and the Department, assisting parties in negotiating a satisfactory agreement and competing a domestic contract. Cases requiring court hearings are referred to the Project's lawyer.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

A joint Pilot Project between the Departments of Justice and Social Services was approved by Cabinet in 1992. The Department of Justice provides legal advice to the Department of Social Services with respect to the Project and, initially, was heavily involved in developing the procedure and forms. At the present time, Social Services has the lead role and Justice provides legal advice and assistance in training the social workers who appear in court.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

No.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what ‘best practices’ are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project’s stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The project has been in operation for just over 4 years.

Stated Objectives: As a condition for eligibility for Social Assistance, Regulation 16 of the Social Assistance Regulations requires that all single parents make every reasonable effort to obtain support from the father of the child or children. During past years, it has become increasingly difficult for single parents to obtain support for the following reasons:

- ◆ a number of judges within the Province refused to hear cases unless the complainant had legal representation; and,
- ◆ the Legal Aid Commission would not provide legal representation where the only issue was one of support.

Because of the positions taken by Legal Aid and court judges in this matter, many single parents could not obtain maintenance. Since this created a problem for single parents who were receiving Social Assistance in that they could not afford the services of a lawyer and therefore could not obtain support, and for Government since they were now assuming the financial responsibility of the absent parent, the Pilot Project was introduced.

The purpose of the project is to assist single parents in their endeavor to obtain support payments from the absent parent where there is potential for spousal and/or child support. It is recognized that all parents are financially responsible for their children, and Government assistance should only be required to supplement the support payments of the absent parent.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: The project has been evaluated and the results were such that it has been expanded to cover the whole province, excluding Labrador.

CONTACT(S):

Mary E. Hatherly
Civil Division
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
4th floor, East Block
Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 4J6

tel: (709) 729-1360

fax: (709) 729-2129

Newfoundland & Labrador-2

Provincial Strategy Against Violence

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The Provincial Strategy Against Violence was announced by the provincial in June, 1995, following an extensive period of research and public consultation commencing in 1991. The Strategy represents a coordinated and multi-faceted initiative on the part of the Departments of Justice, Health, Social Services, Education and Women's Policy, which is intended to reduce the level of violence against women, children, racial minorities, gays and lesbians and vulnerable adults through a two-pronged approach:

- ♦ prevention: recognizing that violence is rooted in inequality, a wide range of prevention and education activities to promote social change will be developed and delivered through a partnership between government and the community; and,
- ♦ service delivery: through a partnership between government and the community, people who experienced violence will have access to a comprehensive, high quality, integrated system of formal and informal services.

The Strategy is, broadly speaking, intended to reduce contact with the justice system through the elimination of violence by preventive measures related to public education and awareness, and by the early intervention of other community-based social services. However, since it is recognized that violence cannot be totally eradicated, the Strategy is also intended to facilitate access to justice by victims of violence, through *inter alia* restructuring of court processes in the case of domestic violence; legislative amendment to correct inequalities; the extension of policing and court service to remote communities; the adoption of protocols which will facilitate information between Departments; and, the development of institutional programs for young offenders and male batterers, child abusers and sex offenders.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The named partners are the Departments of Social Services, Health, Education, Justice and Women's Policy Office. Since the strategy endorses a community-based philosophy of service delivery, it also provides for the establishment of community-based regional coordinating committees which will advise and consult with Departmental Ministries respecting public awareness activities, service delivery pilot projects, *et cetera*. Specific initiatives of the Strategy also emphasize public / private partnerships including:

- ♦ funding for community groups / proposals;
- ♦ the review of current fiscal arrangements between government and transition houses;

- ♦ the development of private agency agreements with community groups to provide services to victims of violence;
- ♦ the development of self-help / mutual aid groups; and,
- ♦ the development of a permanent process to involve community groups in setting priorities and developing projects aimed at the prevention of violence.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

A key component of the strategy is the establishment of partnerships and other collaborative mechanisms with community agencies. The provincial Coordinating Team is in the process of developing such relationships with a variety of bodies, including existing Victim Services Advisory Committees (which have been established in each region of the Province), the resource centres sponsored by the Department of Health and the Advisory Council on the Status of Women. In addition, coordinating committees will be established in each region of the Province. The participation of community groups and agencies is an essential element in the public awareness and education campaign.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The process for implementing the Strategy began in March 1996, with the appointment of a Coordinator and Coordinating Team. As a result, it may be too early to determine best practices. However, it is clear that the philosophy of the strategy is one which emphasizes coordination / integration of governmental efforts and government / community partnerships in prevention and service delivery initiatives. Possible targets for evaluation of best practices, are the four Pilot Projects mandated by the Strategy:

- ♦ the establishment of a multidisciplinary service centre;
- ♦ the establishment of crisis intervention, assessment and referral services at a District Social Services Office;
- ♦ the establishment of an intervention and treatment centre which deals not only with individual victims but with other family members; and,
- ♦ the co-location of staff from one agency to another.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The Provincial Strategy Against Violence was approved by government in June, 1995. However, owing to budgetary restrictions, a Coordinator and Coordinating Team were not put in place until March, 1996. The Strategy is a five year initiative.

Stated Objectives: The Strategy is directed at the achievement of two principle objectives: prevention and service delivery. These objectives will be accomplished through an Action Plan which consists of four elements:

- ♦ legislation and policy;
- ♦ service delivery;
- ♦ public awareness / community education; and,
- ♦ research / data collection / evaluation.

Key Deliverables: Key Deliverables include:

- ♦ expedition of passage of new child welfare and child care legislation — 1997;
- ♦ development of legislation to address situation of neglected adults — 1997;
- ♦ review of current policies and practices regarding peace bonds in cases of domestic violence — 1996-1997;
- ♦ review of legislation, policies, protocols and program delivery, to eliminate gaps and barriers in services to the disabled, Aboriginals, lesbians and gays, visible minorities, youths and seniors — 1997;
- ♦ explore links between social and economic conditions and violence, to assist in planning intervention and prevention, and incorporate the strategy against violence into the provincial strategic social plan — ongoing;
- ♦ ensure all Departments and agencies have policies and protocols that reflect current knowledge in the field of services to victims; develop and implement interdepartmental protocols on violence against women and elderly and dependent adults — 1997;
- ♦ review current policies / practices with regard to court hearings in cases of wife assault and other family violence, in order to improve the experience for victims — 1997;
- ♦ expedite the implementation of interdepartmental protocols on child abuse reporting;
- ♦ revise current abuse of persons policy of the Department of Health, to require all health care facilities and community health care boards to develop and implement appropriate policies / protocols — ongoing;
- ♦ develop policies that outline training requirements for government personnel, including orientation, in-service training and public service commission courses on working with victims of violence — 1997;
- ♦ review Saskatchewan Victims of Domestic Violence law and consider the possibility of enacting similar legislation in Newfoundland — 1997;
- ♦ expand victim services to other areas of the province;
- ♦ develop and deliver programs for male batterers, child abusers and sex offenders in correctional institutions or on probation, while ensuring the safety of the victims continues to be regarded as the highest priority — 1995-2000;
- ♦ ensure sex offenders and batterers are effectively monitored while on probation — on-going;
- ♦ develop and implement specific programs for juveniles convicted of sex offences and other violent crimes — on-going;
- ♦ ensure all government offices and agencies that provide services to the public, including health care facilities, provide appropriate support and crisis intervention services to child and adult victims of violence — 1997;
- ♦ pilot projects — 1997-98;

- ♦ funding to community groups to assist in development of project proposals — on-going;
- ♦ review of government / transition houses relationship — 1996;
- ♦ conclusion of private agency agreements with community groups, to provide services to victims of violence — on-going;
- ♦ develop services to victims of violence in remote / rural areas — 1997;
- ♦ increase police services in Labrador — on-hold due to budgetary restrictions;
- ♦ develop a multi-phased, multi-year information campaign against violence;
- ♦ explore the benefits of joint public awareness / prevention programs with other Atlantic provinces — 1996;
- ♦ develop peer education programs on prevention, for community groups — 1997 pilot project;
- ♦ development of gender sensitivity, anti-violence programs for use at primary and secondary school levels, and encourage post-secondary institutions to develop and implement comprehensive responses to violence; including the formulation of policies on sexual assault / harassment, preparation of educational materials on child abuse, dating violence, domestic violence and abuse of dependent adults — on-going;
- ♦ develop in-take and in-service training for public service on violence — on-going;
- ♦ work with professional associations to develop guidelines to be used by members whose responsibilities bring them in contact with victims of violence (e.g., medical, legal) — on-going;
- ♦ provide interdisciplinary training for addiction workers to explore links between substance abuse and violence — on-going;
- ♦ build upon existing data collection systems to improve and coordinate collection and compilation of data on victims of violence — on-going; and,
- ♦ conduct research to define issues related to sex offenders to assist in planning and intervention — on-going.

Monitored/Evaluated: Each individual initiative and the strategy as a whole has a built-in evaluation component. There is a distinct research / data collection component to the Strategy. No performance indicators have been defined. These will be developed as part of the evaluation process.

CONTACT(S):

Mary E. Hatherly
Civil Division
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
4th floor, East Block
Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 4J6
tel: (709) 729-1360
fax: (709) 729-2129

Newfoundland & Labrador-3

Interface, Child Protection and Secure Custody for Youth

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Not indicated.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: For the most part, this Protocol has stood solidly since its initial creation in 1993. It has been re-visited regularly since then and as modifications have been deemed necessary, they have been made. There is an on-going commitment by both partners to ensure youths in secure custody receive protection and care in an assault-free environment and that where incidents do occur, they are appropriately reported to the child protection authorities.

Stated Objectives: The Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Center provides a secure custody program in a three cottage, six unit facility with a minimum population of 60 youths and an overflow capacity of up to 20 youths. The Pleasantville Youth Centre is a satellite facility of the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Centre and provides secure custody and remand program in a

ten bed facility secure building. The residents in these facilities normally range in age from 14-18 years of age and live in a co-ed environment.

Given the nature of these environments, staff may expect to encounter, from time to time, situations of alleged abuse and/or assault. In recognition of this reality, but operating from the principle that every youth in secure custody or remand detention has the right to complete his/her disposition in an environment free of violence, aggression, intimidation, or any other behaviour that may be considered abusive, administrators of the secure custody system and officials of the Director of Child Welfare negotiated a protocol for necessary action in the event of an allegation of abuse and/or assault.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Mary E. Hatherly
Civil Division
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
4th floor, East Block
Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 4J6

tel: (709) 729-1360

fax: (709) 729-2129

Newfoundland & Labrador-4

MACSO (Multi-Agency Committee for Sex Offender Treatment)

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

MACSO has membership from adult corrections, youth corrections, child welfare, the RCMP, the RNC, Her Majesty's Penitentiary, Secure Custody Services for Youth, Emmanuel House, the John Howard Society and Correctional Services of Canada, *et al.*

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Following the cessation of pilot funding from Solicitor General Canada, the work of the MACSO committee struggled to keep the committee alive. Fortunately for this group of committed government and non-government agencies, the provincial response to the Violence Against Women study included limited support funding for the development of the community to support and treat sex offenders. Unfortunately in the past two years, fiscal restraint measures have impeded the initiation of this work, even though the committee remains in existence, has established a good professional network of colleagues and treatment service providers, and still remains committed to its original objective. The commitment of the MACSO committee still remains, even though it is currently inactive due to other pressing workloads.

Stated Objectives: Born out of the Working Group on Child Sexual Abuse, subsequent to the Mount Cashel Inquiry, MACSO began as a sub-committee of the parent group with the self directed mandate to look at the prevention of victimization by the development of community and institutional based, multidisciplinary treatment services for sex offenders.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: During the pilot of the initiative, the Solicitor General undertook an evaluation of the project as a part of its contractual arrangements. This evaluation was very positive and supportive, especially of the commitment of the partners to continue with the initiative, despite the cessation of federal funding.

CONTACT(S):

Mary E. Hatherly
Civil Division
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
4th floor, East Block
Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 4J6
tel: (709) 729-1360
fax: (709) 729-2129

Newfoundland & Labrador-5

Detention / Treatment of Intoxicated Persons

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

In 1984, nine agencies within the jurisdictional boundaries of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary (RNC) negotiated and signed a Memorandum of Understanding for the care, detention, and treatment of intoxicated young persons. The purpose of the agreement was to clarify that youths in a serious intoxicated state were in need of non-criminal intervention (except where an offence allegation was involved) and to specify the role and responsibility each of the signature agencies has in this intervention.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The signatories to the MOU included the RNC, Mental Health Services, Youth Corrections, Child Welfare, Drug Dependency Service, the Janeway Child Health Centre, Talbot House, St. Clare's Mercy Hospital, and the General Hospital.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Project began in 1984 with the signed MOU. This agreement has stood with minor modification since the date of original signature. It is presently being reviewed again due to some recent significant changes to the face of service delivery (e.g., creation of Health Care Corporations, split jurisdiction for young offender services). The original agencies are due

to convene on October 30, 1996, at which time it is expected that agreement on modifications to the MOU to reflect current organization changes will occur with minimum challenge.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Mary E. Hatherly
Civil Division
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
4th floor, East Block
Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 4J6
tel: (709) 729-1360
fax: (709) 729-2129

Newfoundland & Labrador-6

Interface, Sheriff's Office and Secure Custody and Remand Services

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Sheriff's Office and Secure Custody and Remand Services

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: In 1995, in consideration of a newly created service of a Sheriff's Office for prisoner escorts from institutional facilities, negotiation commenced between Sheriff's Office and Secure Custody and Remand Services. Officials of the Sheriff's Office and Secure Custody and Remand have met regularly over the past year and continue to attempt to resolve new issues as they arise. One of the pressing problems is the lack of person power in the Sheriff's Office and the distance of the young offender facility from the St. John's Youth Court. While these issues are on-going, communications between both agencies remains positive.

Stated Objectives: To develop a policy on the interfacing of these two agencies. The ensuing Interface Agreement provided clarity in relation to certain protocols for the escort and transport of young offenders; how both agencies would communicate with each other to ensure there were no unnecessary delays in the Youth Court schedule; how youths would be supervised and cared

for while out of the facilities and in the custody of the Sheriff's deputies; and, what responsibilities there were for the secure custody facilities to ensure the deputies were not unduly delayed in maintaining their transport schedule.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Mary E. Hatherly
Civil Division
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador
4th floor, East Block
Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700
St. John's, Newfoundland
A1B 4J6
tel: (709) 729-1360
fax: (709) 729-2129

Northwest Territories-1

Community Justice — Northwest Territories

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The purpose of the project is to address the alienation of aboriginal people from the justice system, as exemplified by high crime rates (particularly crimes of violence) and the ineffectiveness of the justice system in addressing the social problems which are the root cause of violent crime. Most offenders are from small and remote aboriginal communities. Processing offenders through courts and correctional institutions has not worked to correct behaviours and offenders are too often returned to the community only to re-offend. The project is designed to encourage community ownership of the problems and responsibility for the search for solutions, by facilitating community participation in the justice system and community-based processes, especially diversion. The approach is largely based on the principles of restorative justice and community development.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

For community justice in the broadest sense, the partners are the communities, the police, the courts, the prosecutors and the Community Justice Division of the Department of Justice. The Community Justice Division consists of a Director and eleven regional Community Justice Workers, each of who has responsibility for working with a number of communities, to facilitate the development of community alternatives. The cooperation and commitment of all partners is essential.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The primary vehicle for facilitating community involvement, and especially diversion, is the Community Justice Committee. This might be a Youth Justice Committee set out under the *Young Offenders Act* or a blended committee, working with both adults and youth.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Best Practices: Community justice, and particularly the community development focus of the

work of the Community Justice Division, serves the objectives of crime prevention and a more focused justice system.

Lessons Learned: The Community Justice Program, when first introduced, lacked focus. The community development approach stresses that communities must identify the action which they propose to take, the community development worker's role is to facilitate and not impose upon the community. However, the community will often be looking for options and some definition to the possible. Moreover, the Department and the other partners to community justice also have interests which must be taken into account. The lack of focus also caused a lack of accountability.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The Community Justice Program began in 1993 when corrections was transferred to the Department of Justice.

Stated Objectives: The objectives are to work with communities to encourage the development of community based alternatives to the justice system. This has recently been redefined to encourage diversion.

Key Deliverables: Contacts with the communities and the motivation of communities are the key deliverables.

Monitored/Evaluated: Success has been mixed. It has tended to depend on the skills and experience of the worker and the presence or absence of key community members who are the catalyst for a community to identify community justice approaches as a solution to their problems.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

Outcomes in the project would be active and involved communities who are increasingly assuming responsibility for their problems. This is a long term project and ultimately would be measured by decreasing crime rates and a higher degree of wellness. However, any short term gain in level of involvement is a success but difficult to measure.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Performance indicators which would help to indicate what measure of success was being achieved are the number of diversion and the number of community justice committees, especially the establishment of committees where previously there were none.

CONTACT(S):

C. Gerald Sutton
Director, Policy and Planning
Government of the Northwest Territories
Box 1320
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9
tel: (403) 920-6418
fax: (403) 873-0307

Northwest Territories-2

Community Wellness

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Contact with the justice system in many communities occurs against a backdrop of severe social dysfunction and profound cultural dislocation. Current government responses are ineffective because they do not respond to community needs. This is attributable to the fact that the responses are centrally designed and because they are not integrated (i.e., they are “stove piped”).

Starting from a community development perspective, the Community Wellness initiative aims at the prevention of social problems by strengthening the ability of communities to respond to problems at the community level in ways that the community defines as appropriate. The role of the territorial government changes from a lead role to a supportive role.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The initiative aspires to be a community-driven process. Key partners from the government are the social envelope Departments of Health and Social Services, Education, Culture and Employment, the Housing Corporation, and Justice, with Health and Social Services in the lead.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Municipal governments and First Nations bands will play an important role at the community end, along with other community groups and women's groups.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

One of the goals of the initiative is for the territorial government to be less directive in social initiatives; that is, to leave more room for the communities to design and implement appropriate responses to problems. In this context, the territorial government is learning that resources will then not always be spent in the way it thinks appropriate. More importantly, it has become clear that a greater level of support must be provided, both to territorial government, front-line staff and to community groups and individuals, for dealing with the new environment.

Because of the serious nature of the social problems and the inadequacy of response, the temptation has been to try to set out to fix everything. From a community development view, it makes more sense to set out more reasonable and achievable goals. It has also become apparent that it is difficult for managers and employees to be seriously involved in major restructuring of the way government does business at the same time as they retain responsibility for program delivery to clients.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: This initiative has been in development for several years. Funding to support Community Wellness projects was first available in 95/96 and has been continued in the current year.

Stated Objectives: General objectives are identified under the five headings of: prevention, treatment and healing; education and training; interagency collaboration; and, community development. Included under the first heading is the objective of promoting treatment and healing for abusers.

Key Deliverables: For the current fiscal year, the key deliverables are community-based action plans for each community laying out how they intend to work towards a healthy community.

Monitored/Evaluated: Results from the first year of funding are not yet available.

CONTACT(S):

C. Gerald Sutton
Director, Policy and Planning
Government of the Northwest Territories
Box 1320
Yellowknife, Northwest Territories
X1A 2L9

tel: (403) 920-6418

fax: (403) 873-0307

Ontario-1

Peer Mediation

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Minimize young people's contact with the youth justice system by:

- ♦ Prevention: peer mediation program ultimately affects the school climate and the attitude of staff and students toward conflict management.
- ♦ Education: mediators and involved staff acquire new skills. The school community learns about positive ways to prevent conflict from escalating.
- ♦ Transformation: disputants work together to restore peace and must be creative in finding solutions to their conflict. Frequently, mediation provides a way to examine the root causes of disputes and results in attitude change.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

While peer mediation programs are widely used across Ontario, this model, which provides an alternative to the youth justice system, has been developed by Justice for Children and Youth. Individual schools set up projects using the model. Each project is led by the school and involves staff and students. Police and Crown attorneys are important partners. Justice for Children and Youth, a Toronto based legal clinic, plays an important coordinating role and an on-going role where required.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The model was developed in consultation with educators, students, police, Crown Attorneys, professional mediators, judges and government officials.

Mediation is only undertaken if there is agreement between the two combatants (victim and perpetrator) to use the process to resolve their conflict. Each school is actively involved in supporting the project and working for its continued success.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what ‘best practices’ are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Best Practices:

- ♦ the most successful projects have a group of mediators who are representative of the entire school population, including those students who have “negative clout.”
- ♦ there must be a strong staff commitment. Staff must be involved in screening incidents that may be mediated, mentoring mediators and problem solving with mediators around difficult issues.
- ♦ students and staff must receive solid initial and refresher training involving lots of simulations and discussion of ethical issues.

Lessons Learned:

- ♦ police and Crown attorneys must be involved from the beginning. Police must know the staff and students and must have confidence in the project if they are to see it as a way to keep young people out of the justice system.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project’s stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Model was first implemented in a secondary school in North York in February 1994. Two secondary schools are fully operating and the model is being introduced in three more secondary schools and one middle school in the Greater Toronto Area.

Stated Objectives: The objectives of the project are:

- ♦ to train young people to deal with school related conflicts in an effective and constructive manner;
- ♦ where conflicts involve young people in the youth justice system, all partners are involved to keep cases out of the youth justice system; and,
- ♦ foster a sense of participation in finding solutions among young people in conflict.

Key Deliverables:

- ♦ successful mediations (i.e., parties reach a voluntary agreement);
- ♦ compliance with agreements;
- ♦ incidents resolved through mediation instead of calling police; and,
- ♦ registration for credit course on peer mediation.

Monitored/Evaluated: The two schools where the model is fully implemented participated in a preliminary evaluation of peer mediation projects in the 1995/96 school year. The evaluation was funded by the Ministry of Education and Training and conducted by Dr. Chuck Cunningham of McMaster University in Hamilton. Evaluation results are not available.

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Ontario-2

Violence Free Schools Policy

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not specifically indicated (see "stated objectives" below).

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Ministry of Education and Training led this project, with involvement from the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services, Ministry of the Attorney General.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Eighteen community summits were held across the province to seek input from all interested parties. School boards are required to develop and maintain partnerships with the community, including professional and community agencies such as police, family and children's services, recreation services and child care facilities.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Best Practices:

- ♦ the integration of violence prevention in the curriculum emphasizes that these skills are essential to learning;
- ♦ involvement of the community in the development of the Ministry of Education and Training (MET) policy and each board policy is important to ensure that community values are reflected. It also encourages a whole community approach to violence prevention.

Lessons Learned:

- ♦ Boards were asked to collect data on the number of serious violent incidents. Categories were provided but boards were advised to develop their own definitions based on discussions with their local police and community agencies. Definitions were to reflect what each community saw as a serious violent incident. This local interpretation has made board comparisons very difficult.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: MET's Violence Free Schools Policy was developed in June 1994 by a Minister's Working Group, in consultation with interested parties across Ontario. School boards were required to develop their board-specific policies by June 1995 for implementation by September 1995. All school boards in Ontario now have a violence free schools policy developed and are implementing programs and procedures to support violence prevention.

MET has developed resources to support school boards, including:

- ♦ Students Safe Schools booklet produced in conjunction with the Safe Schools Task Force
- ♦ video with Ontario Teachers Federation — "a bad case of the meanies"
- ♦ major revision of the Values, Influences and Peers program document with the Ministry of the Solicitor General and Correctional Services

MET has also supported a number of projects in partnership with specific schools boards on the issue of peer mediation, codes of conduct, and evaluation of the impact of "Second Step" violence program. MET has funded, in partnership with the Metropolitan Toronto School Board, a model program that allows students expelled from school for violent behaviour to continue their education. Another model project for students suspended for violent behaviour, has been funded in partnerships with boards in the Ottawa area. The acquisition of the skills, knowledge and values required to prevent violence has been emphasized in the development of all new curriculum policies, standards and resources prepared by MET.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ develop and maintain a safe, welcoming, violence-free school environment;
- ♦ enable students to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to prevent violence, and to deal with violent and potentially violent situations;
- ♦ ensure staff develop skills, confidence and knowledge necessary to recognize and handle violent or potentially violent incidents, and to educate students about violence and violence prevention;
- ♦ assist students and staff in managing their own anger, frustrations and conflicts without resorting to aggression;
- ♦ ensure victims and potential victims, witnesses, perpetrators know schools will act to stop or prevent violence or harassment;
- ♦ help students understand what constitutes acceptable behaviour in school and society at large, behave appropriately and to be aware of consequences of not doing so; and,
- ♦ encourage whole community (including students, parents guardians, staff, community organizations, agencies and services, business and labour and other groups) to support violence prevention initiatives, and to play an active role in promotion of violence prevention.

Key Deliverables: Deliverables from each board include their violence prevention policy,

implementation plans, procedures for reporting and recording violent incidents and information on community involvement in the policy development process. Deliverables were reviewed and approved by MET regional staff. Regional and corporate staff continue to work with school boards to ensure the effective implementation of policies.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Ontario-3

School Based Services

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Long Term Goal: by providing prevention and intervention services to children and young people in schools today, we expect to reduce the impact on child witnesses to woman abuse, decreasing the likelihood that they will become perpetrators or victims in their future relationships.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Findings provided by the Ministry of Education and Training through the Violence Against Women Prevention Initiatives.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

In 1995/96, 84 school boards or French language sections of school boards worked in partnership with 60 agencies serving assaulted women and their children (primarily women's shelters). Involvement in the project may vary across communities, depending upon the resources available. At a minimum, projects involve school board and shelter staff in decision-making.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Best Practices:

- ♦ the limited funding available from the Ministry of Education and Training provides an incentive to both school boards and shelters to work together to provide services. Both the board and shelter contribute additional resources to support the project.
- ♦ the partnerships have resulted in improved community awareness of violence against women and have led to the increased involvement of school boards in community committees to end violence against women.
- ♦ Boards are required to enter into a fee for services agreement with their shelter partner. A limited portion of the funding can be identified for administration, travel and resources. The majority of the funding must go to staff time for direct service.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: School Based Services began in 1991-92 as a project which placed one social worker in eight different school settings across the province. Evaluation results led to the redesign of the project in 1993-94. The new model required school boards or minority language sections to work closely with a local agency serving assaulted women and their children (e.g., a shelter for assaulted women). Projects apply each year for funding. In 1995/96 and again this year \$9,000 is available for each school board or French language section to work with an agency partner. Applications for funding are reviewed by a team of MET staff. MET field staff monitor the projects. Projects submit a final report each year.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ to assist children and young people who are residents of women's shelters and are attending local schools;
- ♦ to encourage collaboration between school and shelter staff in the development of protocols and programs designed to prevent violence against women, and to respond to disclosures of child witnesses;
- ♦ to provide services to children and young people who are witnesses to violence or who are at risk of being a witness to violence against their mothers; and,
- ♦ to provide prevention education to the broader school community on issues of violence against women, and its impact on children.

Key Deliverables: Deliverables correspond to the objectives stated above, but are specific to each local project. Projects identify their expected outcomes in their application and report on the achievement of those outcomes in their final report.

Monitored/Evaluated: Evaluation results led to a redesign of the project in 1993-94.

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Ontario-4

Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated (but see "stated objectives" below).

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The project is co-funded by the Ministry of Education and Training, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Community and Social Service. The latter has the administrative lead for the project. At the demonstration sites the local partners tend to be schools and school boards, community health and public health, child care and child welfare agencies. The local lead agencies are quite varied: one band council, one Children's Aid Society, one Children's Mental Health Agency, three Community Health Centres, and one project has incorporated itself.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

All sites are in relatively high crime areas. All projects involve local community residents in planning and implementing the programs. In collaboration with local service providers, the community residents help write the job descriptions, sit on the hiring committees and determine to a large extent how the funding is allocated. All sites have adopted objectives around improved safety and security of the neighbourhood (e.g., improved lighting, improved police / community relations, neighbourhood watch, *et cetera*).

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Best Practices: The project combines the most effective prevention programs with comprehensive service delivery and community development. The required parts of the model include:

- ♦ regular home-visits to expectant new parents;
- ♦ high quality child care programs; and,
- ♦ in-class assistance for primary school years.

However, the local Better Beginnings models are tailored to the needs and cultures of each individual community, and often include:

- ♦ before and after school programs and playgroups;
- ♦ nutrition components: breakfast, snack and lunch programs; cooperative food purchasing; community kitchens;
- ♦ English as a second language programs; and,
- ♦ parent support groups, parent training, and parent education.

The Better Beginnings model requires significant parental and community participation. Fifty percent of the members on each planning committee or subcommittee must be volunteers from the community. These volunteers pull in others to participate in the programs and planning. In addition, about 90% of the paid staff consist of low income or former social assistance recipients from the communities. The Better beginnings model also requires integration of services for families with young children.

Lessons Learned:

- ♦ These are communities where mistrust of service providers, educators and most professionals is quite high. Under these circumstances, there needs to be a minimum of 50% parents or community residents on every committee or subcommittee in this type of project, to obtain the level of comfort required for meaningful, significant participation of the community members. Service providers and educators must involve parents and community members in planning and implementation from the start of this type of initiative. If there are too few community members involved, or if they are brought into the decision-making process too late, the trust between professionals and community members will be very difficult to establish.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?
Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).*

Project Timeframe: The Project is being implemented in one First Nation and seven low-income neighbourhoods throughout Ontario. Some of the communities are implementing a program for expectant parents and children three years of age and younger. Others are implementing programs for four to eight year olds.

Stated Objectives: The purpose of the Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project is to mitigate the effects of poverty on children, thereby reducing the increased probability of poor health, social behaviour and school performance. The expectation is that effective prevention in early childhood will reduce the need for expensive remedial programs such as welfare, mental health treatment, developmental services, special education and corrections.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: The model took three years of development before the project reached the stage where they could be evaluated. The demonstration period of the project will last a total of four years (and will be complete at the end of 1997), but evaluation will continue until children reach their mid-twenties to determine long-term effects of the model. The research rests with a

consortium of Principle Investigators from 5 Universities, with the lead at Queen's University. Dr. Ray Peters is the Research Director.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

The evaluation of the Better Beginnings, Better Futures Project will be both short-term and long-term. The children involved in the project will be assessed periodically until they reach their mid-twenties to determine whether they did better than children from equally disadvantaged neighbourhoods without the early childhood education and family supports provided through better beginnings. The outcomes to be measured include criminal behaviour, poverty, neighbourhood safety and security, welfare dependency, mental and physical health problems, and poor school performance.

While it is too soon to assess the outcomes, process evaluation showed that the Project has been effectively implemented. Neighbourhoods that were formerly demoralized and cynical about the future of children are now proud of their accomplishments and optimistic about their ability to raise children successfully.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Longitudinal cohort Family:

1) socio-demographic indicators (e.g., employment, social assistance utilization rates); 2) child care; 3) self-help; 4) pre-school behaviour; 5) parent behaviour; 6) diet; 7) marital adjustment; 8) family conflict; 9) family functioning; 10) social contact and neighbourhood interactions; 11) social support; 12) maternal depression; 13) paternal health; 14) stressful life events; 15) income and expenses; 16) home and neighbourhood characteristics; and, 17) service utilizations.

Longitudinal cohort Child:

1) auditory attention and memory; 2) expressive language; 3) visual attention and memory; 4) fine motor skills; 5) gross motor skills; 6) physical growth (height, weight, triceps, skinfold, mid-arm circumference); 7) vocabulary and reading; and, 8) problem-solving.

Teachers:

1) skills and behaviour development in 18 domains; 2) child behaviour; and, 3) teacher absenteeism.

Communities:

1) childhood injuries; 2) social assistance; 3) child welfare; 4) school vandalism; and, 5) neighbourhood vandalism

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Ontario-5

Human Services Implementation Guidelines

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

- ♦ Addresses need to consider social and human services in land use planning decisions.
- ♦ Encourage the linking of social and human service needs with land use planning at the primary stage of community development.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The project was put together by an inter-ministerial committee consisting of the Ministries of Community and Social Services, Municipal Affairs, Health, Housing, Education, Culture, Tourism and Recreation, Citizenship, Solicitor General and Correctional Services, Ontario Women's Directorate, ONAS and the Senior Citizens Secretariat. Consultation with key stakeholders was also a key element.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe:

- ♦ The Sewell Commission on Land Use Reform in Ontario, appointed in 1991, recommended in 1993 that the Province include social and human services in land use planning.
- ♦ Resulted in:
 - ♦ better understanding that these services can contribute to the development of a healthy community;

- ♦ better dialogue between land use planners and human / social service providers and users; and,
- ♦ realization that not all services have land use components.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Ontario-6

Youth Justice Education Partnership (YJEP)⁵

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

To provide youth with the skills and knowledge required to do outreach work with other youth around justice system and related issues, with particular focus on racial minority youth.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Anti-Racism Unit of the Ministry of the Attorney General, the Ontario Women's Directorate, the African Canadian Court Worker Program, the Youth Justice Secretariat, the Ministry of the Solicitor General / Corrections, the Ministry of Citizenship, the Metro Toronto Housing Authority, the Toronto Board of Education, Corrections Canada, Pinnoy Sa, the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and community members.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe:

- ♦ Following the Just Desserts shooting, the Attorney General's Anti-Racism Unit formed a Justice Education Working Group to 1) examine proactive measures to prevent contact with

⁵ This project was also submitted by the Department of Justice.

the law or, where this is not possible, 2) provide information after the fact on rights and responsibilities once contact has occurred.

- ♦ 17 youth spent four weeks training during the summer and then gave presentations to approximately 500 youth across Metro Toronto over the course of a month. Students from the Toronto Board of Education will continue to give presentations.
- ♦ Youth exited the program with a better understanding of the system, of the realities of youth from a variety of communities, of sexual harassment and assault and an ability to communicate this to their peers.

Stated Objectives: Non indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Ontario-7

Criminal Procedure Reform — Ticketing Procedure for Minor Criminal Offences

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

- ♦ Remove many minor cases from the criminal court process.
- ♦ Police have choice of issuing a ticket rather than laying a charge. The ticket would involve payment of a fine rather than a court appearance.
- ♦ Reduce burden of cases and court delay as well as provide an alternative way of dealing with minor offences.

The project would require:

- ♦ an amendment to the *Criminal Code*: provinces could use their own ticketing procedure or the federal Contraventions Act;
- ♦ new police practices and court administration; and,
- ♦ training of relevant officials to implement new practices.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

- ♦ Federal-Provincial-Territorial officials to discuss *Criminal Code* amendments.
- ♦ Police forces to discuss scope of scheme.
- ♦ Court Administrators to work out process.
- ♦ Legal Aid to determine their role.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the projects stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?
Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).*

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Ontario-8

Criminal Procedure Reform — Remands by Administrative Procedure

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

- ♦ Eliminate requirement of a court appearance in order to remand a case.
- ♦ Implement an administrative procedure involving a court clerk or judge in chambers, perhaps using electronic technology.
- ♦ Save costs and court time.

Project would require:

- ♦ amendments to the *Criminal Code*; and,
- ♦ provincial changes in court administration procedures.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

- ♦ Federal-Provincial-Territorial officials to discuss *Criminal Code* amendments.
- ♦ Prosecutors, court administrators, defence counsel and the judiciary to work out the implementation.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the projects stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Ontario-9

Inter-Ministerial Community Safety and Crime Prevention Project Team

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

- ♦ Coordinate the province's program / initiatives linking social development with crime prevention.
- ♦ Develop practical short term initiatives set into a national context.
- ♦ Assist in developing provincial responses and positions on crime prevention issues.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Ministries involved include the Solicitor General & Correctional Services, Attorney General, Housing, Municipal Affairs, Education & Training, Culture, Tourism & Recreation, Citizenship, Health, Agriculture & Food (Rural Affairs), Northern Development and Mines, Community & Social Services, Transportation, Finance, Office of Francophone Affairs, Ontario Women's Directorate, Office for Youth Justice, the Premier's Council, Office of the Premier and the Cabinet Office.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the projects stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Diana Hunt
Counsel
Public Law & Policy Division
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-2531
fax: not indicated

David Connolly
Senior Caseflow Analyst
Program Development Branch
Courts Administration
Ministry of the Attorney General
720 Bay St., 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M5K 2K1
tel: (416) 326-4672
fax: (416) 326-4289

Prince Edward Island-1

2020 Vision — Justice into the 21st Century

(criminal justice / corrections review exercise)

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The purpose of the review was to provide the foundation for further discussion / decisions about the administration of criminal justice in Prince Edward Island.

Objectives of the review were to:

- ◆ provide an opportunity for considering the most effective and efficient use of resources for addressing crime and community safety;
- ◆ provide senior administrators with an overview of criminal justice system program issues and costs;
- ◆ identify areas of collaboration of Justice, Social Services and Health;
- ◆ identify overlapping federal / provincial / municipal domains;
- ◆ include the ideas of staff, community and government organizations; and,
- ◆ consider ideas for addressing citizen input to the review and for ongoing public involvement.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Leadership: Health and Community Services Agency.

Steering Committee Members:

- ◆ Solicitor General Canada & Correctional Services Canada
- ◆ Justice Canada
- ◆ RCMP "L" Division
- ◆ Community Legal Information Association (PEI)
- ◆ Provincial Affairs & Attorney General — Prosecutions
- ◆ Health & Community Services Agency — Provincial Advisor, Corrections & Criminal Justice

Funding to date from the Province, Correctional Services Canada and Solicitor General Canada. Participation / partners will likely expand in the future.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicted.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what ‘best practices’ are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project’s stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Program Description:

- ♦ followed a federal / provincial supported environmental scan on administration of criminal justice in 1993-94.
- ♦ literature review, research, issues identification, public opinion survey, consultations, information sharing.
- ♦ primary focus federal & provincial criminal justice / corrections services in PEI context.
- ♦ recommendations, proposals, further work approved by Executive Council July 1996.
- ♦ justice “Summit” to be held early 1997.
- ♦ leadership team of federal-provincial Deputy level is proposed.

Stated Objectives:⁶ Principles — A criminal justice system:

- ♦ based on fairness and accessibility;
- ♦ with respect for individual and collective rights; and,
- ♦ with respect for the independent, yet interdependent, components of the system.

Goal:

- ♦ increase safety and the feeling of safety by developing an integrated system of justice compatible with a comprehensive health and community services model, involving public participation.

⁶ Taken from the document *2020 Vision - Justice into the 21st Century. A Review of the Criminal Justice System - PEI Summary Reports*, which was attached to PEI’s response. These are the objectives of change, not the objectives of the review itself.

Objectives:

- ♦ develop an efficient and effective integrated system of justice among federal / provincial / municipal governments.;
- ♦ work a part of a comprehensive public system with the community that enables the public to play an important role in the delivery of justice and the shaping of its institutions;
- ♦ promote prevention of crime, conflict solving, and the responsibility of the individual to the larger community;
- ♦ reduce institutionalization of adult and young offenders; and,
- ♦ implement a long-range plan, including funding, in cooperation with the federal government.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Phil Arbing
Provincial Advisor
Corrections and Criminal Justice
Health and Community Services Agency
4 Sydney Street, Box 2000
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8
tel: (902) 368-6619 or 6130
fax: (902) 368-6136

Prince Edward Island-2

Provincial Impaired Driving Strategy — 1995-1999

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Leadership: Health and Community Services agency.

Provincial Coordinating Committee members: RCMP; Chiefs of police; Addictions Services; Highway Safety Division; Department of Education; Community and Correctional Services; victim survivors; SADD (students against drunk driving); Liquor Control Commission; Tourism Industry Association of PEI; Crown Attorney's Office; and, the federal Department of Justice.

Health Canada has provided funding for a special project on repeat impaired drivers.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Yes (apparently), see "stated objectives" below.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Program Description:

- ♦ continuation of selected efforts to deal with impaired driving in the province since late 1980s;
- ♦ examination of recent initiatives / programs, literature review and analysis, survey questionnaire, telephone contact, regional consultations, *et cetera*;
- ♦ supported by a Coordinating Committee; and,

- ♦ approved by Cabinet, August 1995.

Stated Objectives: Program Objectives:

Development of a Provincial Strategy with goals, guiding principles, strategic objectives and targets as well as operational plans for coordinating and implementing activities.

Work toward the reduction / elimination of impaired driving and the resulting accidents in PEI.

Proposed guiding principles or objectives include:

- ♦ impaired driving is never acceptable;
- ♦ impaired driving results in human and financial tragedy to the whole community;
- ♦ impaired drivers must be held accountable for their actions;
- ♦ enforcement and criminal sanctions are necessary;
- ♦ involvement of youth in planning is necessary for youth initiatives;
- ♦ a safe and healthy community is one where impaired driving is absent;
- ♦ stopping impaired driving is the responsibility of individuals, families, communities and governments;
- ♦ people who serve alcoholic beverages (professionally or personally) have a responsibility to intervene to stop impaired driving behaviour;
- ♦ public awareness and attitudes are key to stopping impaired driving; and,
- ♦ treatment is necessary for people who are addicted to alcohol.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

Not indicated.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Not indicated, but:

“The work done to date in the province on the issue of Impaired Driving would be an area worthy of evaluation of a retrospective nature that could include development of a database for on-going research and evaluation.”

CONTACT(S):

Phil Arbing
Provincial Advisor
Corrections and Criminal Justice
Health and Community Services Agency
4 Sydney Street, Box 2000
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8

tel: (902) 368-6619 or 6130

fax: (902) 368-6136

Prince Edward Island-3

Long-Term Provincial Crime Prevention and Community Safety Strategy

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Leadership and support from Health and Community Services Agency.

Provincial Safer Communities Advisory Committee (to government) members: Home and School association; Multi-Cultural Council; Victim Services; Native Council; Community Legal Information Association; Federation of Municipalities; RCMP Community Consultative Committees; Block Parent Association; Women's Institute; Jeunesse Acadienne; Transition House Association; Chiefs of Police Association; Justice Canada; and, Solicitor General Canada.

Funding initially supported by Solicitor General and Justice Canada; some federal project funds; currently primarily provincial funding.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Yes (apparently), see "partners" above.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe:⁷ Program Description:

Following an approximately 10 years of project-related initiatives often supported by federal resources, a Community Safety and Crime Prevention Project with Justice Canada funding was carried out in 1993-95. This included the development of a provincial strategy. The project was guided by a small Advisory Group.

A 10-year provincial strategy was approved by Cabinet in April 1995. It was released publicly in June 1995. It is very compatible with the emphasis on community development / involvement, media communications plan, youth partnerships, training, demonstration. Strong support of government including Premier (Provincial Premier's Crime Prevention Awards have been presented since 1987). November has been crime prevention month since 1987.

Stated Objectives: Program Objectives:

The purpose of the strategy is to involve people in local communities directly in defining the problem, developing solutions, implementing and evaluating programs that increase safety and reduce fear.

It recognizes that communities are the best place for action and people most affected by the problem, in partnership with local, provincial and federal governments and organizations, and should be part of the solution.

The goals of the strategy are:

- ◆ the development of safer communities in Prince Edward Island; and,
- ◆ the elimination of fear of victimization.

Proposed guiding principles of the strategy include:

- ◆ community safety is everyone's responsibility;
- ◆ community safety issues overlap with health, social service, education and other community issues;
- ◆ partnerships require a commitment to common goals; skills in communication through differences, shared leadership and resources, and understanding and acceptance of differences;
- ◆ police and other justice staff have knowledge and experience to contribute to a social development approach to creating safer communities;
- ◆ an understanding of and commitment to non-violence is key to creating safer communities;
- ◆ a commitment from all levels of government is needed;
- ◆ sufficient time and resources are necessary for preparing people to participate in community problem solving; and,
- ◆ activities must address short-term needs and long-term goals, and be evaluated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

⁷ Some of the material throughout this item was taken from the document *Strategies for Safer Communities in Prince Edward Island*, which was attached to PEI's response.

Monitored/Evaluated: An evaluation framework is being developed.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

Not indicated.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Not indicated, but:

“... the one that may best lend itself to an evaluation of a longitudinal nature including the development of an evaluation framework is the Crime Prevention / Community Safety Strategy.”

CONTACT(S):

Phil Arbing
Provincial Advisor
Corrections and Criminal Justice
Health and Community Services Agency
4 Sydney Street, Box 2000
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8
tel: (902) 368-6619 or 6130
fax: (902) 368-6136

Prince Edward Island-4

Family Violence Prevention Strategy

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Principal Advisory / Coordinating Group is the Premier's Action Committee on Family Violence including representation from Aboriginal Women's Association; Transition House Association; RCMP; Chiefs of Police Association; PEI Senior Citizens Federation; Community Legal Information Association, PEI; Medical Society, PEI; Teachers Federation; Brighter Futures Family Resource Centre; Department of Education, Office of Higher Education / Training & Adult Learning-Women's Secretariat; Department of Provincial Affairs & Attorney General; Health & Community Services; Council of the Disabled; Turning Point Program; PEI Rape Crises Centre; Advisory Council on the Status of Women; PEI Multi-Cultural Council; PEI Nurses Association; Summerside Christian Council; Youth Action Council; and, Association des Acadiennes et Francophones de l'Isle du Prince-Edouard.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Yes (apparently), see "partners" above.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: A provincial government initiative approved by Executive Council in the fall of 1995.

Stated Objectives: The Program has many elements in pursuit of the overall goals including:

- ♦ ensure adequate safety resources;
- ♦ legislation;
- ♦ coordination and collaboration;
- ♦ continuum of services;
- ♦ awareness, education and training;
- ♦ development of resources;
- ♦ research and evaluation;
- ♦ multidisciplinary interagency support;
- ♦ leadership with Provincial Health and Community Services Agency; and,
- ♦ coordination — Provincial Family Violence Consultant.

Goals:

- ♦ safety and peace for all people;
- ♦ all children, individuals and families will be valued;
- ♦ respect and dignity for all people; and,
- ♦ personal well being is the core ingredient of healthy families and communities.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: See “stated objectives” above, a research and evaluation component is apparently built in.

CONTACT(S):

Phil Arbing
Provincial Advisor
Corrections and Criminal Justice
Health and Community Services Agency
4 Sydney Street, Box 2000
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 7N8

tel: (902) 368-6619 or 6130

fax: (902) 368-6136

Québec-1

Screening Volunteers

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The partners are the Department of Public Security, the Surcité du Québec, the Montréal Urban Community Police, the Association des Directeurs de Police et Pompiers de Québec, and the Direction des Affaires Policières et de la Sécurité Incendie.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Yes, the project promotes a coordinated response by the community and the justice system, and more effective solutions to specific problems relating to justice.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The Department of Public Security set up a Working Group in the fall of 1995. The project was prompted by a national campaign by the Canadian government to raise awareness among, and increase training in, voluntary organizations providing volunteer services or paid persons to work with children and other vulnerable individuals. The campaign was a reaction to many instances of sexual assault or abuse of children or other vulnerable individuals. The need was felt to standardize certain police practices concerning searches for and disclosure of information concerning the criminal records of individuals. This was due to the independence enjoyed by municipal police forces and specific legal framework in Québec relating to access to

documents held by public organizations and the protection of privacy and individual rights and freedoms.

Québec had already given its consent to the federal campaign to increase awareness and improve training in voluntary organizations. The action undertaken to screen volunteers was designed primarily to promote standardization of the practices in effect in the police forces in question in the region. This was out of a concern for fairness, and to ensure that these operations would be carried out in compliance with the statutes in force in Québec.

A directive was sent out to all police forces in Québec to facilitate the dissemination of the memorandum. The Department of Public Security met with representatives of the Department of Health and Social Services as well as police forces so that the memorandum could be distributed within the health and social services system and the youth movement supported by it. The Department of Public Security should meet with the representatives of the Fédération des Centres d'Action Bénévole on October 2, 1996. This will be a day devoted to training in the screening of volunteers.

Decisive factors that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative concerning infants or vulnerable persons were: repeated scandals; the increasing instance of cases of sexual abuse; and, the desire of the organizations concerned to agree on an effective practice that would increase the security of the clientele that was ultimately affected

The objectives of the initiative have been achieved to the extent that a procedure has been agreed upon. The group must now continue to disseminate the procedure.

Stated Objectives: To agree on a coordinated or even uniform operating procedure. Therefore the various police forces could provide services of similar quality throughout Québec, in terms of checking police records to select volunteers and employees providing direct services to vulnerable individuals. The Department of Public Security set up a working group to ensure that police forces in Québec are able to provide reliable information fairly and efficiently to help volunteer organizations in their screening requests. Due to the second objective and the experience with initiatives such as Block Parents, the members of the working group prepared a draft memorandum of agreement setting out the duties of the police force and the requesting organization. The draft memorandum should also strengthen the commitment of the participating organization, while complying with the requirements of the *Act Respecting Access to the Documents of Public Organizations and the Protection of Privacy* and the *Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms* (section 18.2).

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: The effectiveness of the initiative will be able to be measured on the basis of the number of requests received and the extent of compliance with the procedure established.

CONTACT(S):

Richard Poirier
Ministère de la sécurité publique
Direction des affaires policières et de la sécurité incendie
2525 boul. Laurier, 4e étage
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1V 2L2
tel: (418) 528-5825
fax: not indicated

Québec-2

The Change in Correctional Approaches at Correctional Services Québec

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The project shares in the following justice values:

- ◆ well focused and timely use of the justice system;
- ◆ coordinated response by the community and the justice system;
- ◆ more effective access to justice services;
- ◆ more effective solutions to specific problems relating to justice;
- ◆ long-term solutions to on-going problems relating to justice;
- ◆ use of innovative technology; and,
- ◆ other: a means to promote unity of thinking in the provisions of services by the various correctional authorities.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Various correctional services authorities.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The main elements that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative are:

- ◆ priority given to the management of staff working in the fulfilment of the mission of Correctional Services;
- ◆ increased support and efforts by the parties involved to integrate their organizational values;
- ◆ a contribution that fits within government approaches, including regionalization and increased efficiency, effectiveness and quality of services; and,
- ◆ efforts to review the process of delivering services to clients.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The project was prompted by the challenge of administering court decisions with reduced custodial capacity; the obligation to provide open custody services adjusted to the needs of clients and regional characteristics; the concern to offer clients appropriate, integrated and continuous services that complement those offered in the community; and, consultation strategies designed to have an effect on demand for services may find support in this new structure.

The administrative re-organization in Correctional Services was completed in November 1995. Correctional Services Québec is now divided into six administrative regions. Each regional director is responsible for all correctional activities and also for promoting links with all partners in the court system and the community. Consulting services relating to detention, probation, community services and correctional policies are merged in a single Partnership Directorate and the Correctional Services Council. Administrative services are also merged in a single central directorate.

Stated Objectives: The results to be attained were decompartmentalization, integration of services and an increase in the capacity to interact coherently with the environment. The objective of this new structure was to bring together the places where decisions are made and the communities in which the correctional services are delivered and ensure that those services are better integrated with regional realities.

The objectives appear to have been achieved. The regional directorates have been created and financial resources have been decentralized. Each of the regional directorates has an advisory unit to support relations with all its partners in Correctional Services. In accordance with the wishes of the Correctional Services Branch, advisory council committees will be set up in the regional directorates. These committees made up of members of the community are a manifestation of the desire to have at all levels means to consult and act with its partners in the criminal and social services systems. These are forums in which institutional and public partners will participate and representatives involved in the fulfilment of the mission of Correctional Services.

After less than a year since the implementation of the new structure, the objectives the budget cuts sought to attain are in the process of being achieved.

The closure of five custodial facilities during 1996 and increased use of community resources are among the organization's priorities in implementing the changed approach to corrections. Efforts along these lines are continuing. In addition, consultation strategies designed to have an effect on demand for services may find support in this new structure.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Michel Roberge
2525 boul. Laurier
Tour St-Laurent, 11^{ème} étage
Ste-Foy, Québec
G1V 2L2

tel: (418) 644-7887

fax: (418) 644-5645

Québec-3

Supervision and Guidance in Open Custody Project

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The project shares in the following justice values:

- ◆ well focused and timely use of the justice system;
- ◆ coordinated response by the community and the justice system;
- ◆ more effective access to justice services;
- ◆ more effective solutions to specific problems relating to justice;
- ◆ use of innovative technology; and,
- ◆ other: achieving equivalency between the needs of the offender and those of the community.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Correctional Services Québec.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The main elements that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative are:

- ◆ a rigorous evaluation to select persons eligible for the program;
- ◆ supervision geared to the individual needs of candidates; and,
- ◆ conditions imposed so that the program applies during the transition from the period of custody to the period of parole, if any.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The following problems prompted the initiative:

- ♦ activities developed to promote the reintegration into society of imprisoned persons necessarily led correctional services Québec to implement structured programs in line with their fundamental principles; and,
- ♦ since the reintegration of offenders into society is one of the essentials that must govern the actions of correctional services, supervision and guidance programs in open custody had to be developed.

In 1991, Correctional Services established a supervision and guidance program in open custody. This program has continued since that time and is among the programs relevant to the attainment of objectives and mission of Correctional Services as well as helping to reduce the problem of overcrowded custodial facilities.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ to encourage the offender to maintain and broaden the social skills he/she has acquired;
- ♦ to ensure community involvement in dispute resolution; and,
- ♦ to ensure that society is protected, by means of social control of the offender.

The objectives of the program have been achieved. In 1993-1994, 358,127 days of temporary absence for purposes of reintegration into society were granted to persons sentenced to custody. The success rate for temporary absence during these years was 94.6%.

The initiative is a cost-effective way to invest in justice reforms over the next three years. For example, the average cost per day was \$5.62 for supervision and guidance in open custody in detention, and \$4.95 for the supervision and guidance program in open custody in the community. The average cost of a day in custody is \$103.83.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Michel Roberge
2525 boul. Laurier
Tour St-Laurent, 11^{ième} étage
Ste-Foy, Québec
G1V 2L2
tel: (418) 644-7887
fax: (418) 644-5645

Québec-4

Compensatory Work Program

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The project shares in the following justice values:

- ◆ well focused and timely use of the justice system;
- ◆ coordinated response by the community and the justice system;
- ◆ more effective access to justice services;
- ◆ more effective solutions to specific problems relating to justice;
- ◆ long-term solutions to on-going problems relating to justice;
- ◆ use of innovative technology; and,
- ◆ other: achieving equivalency between the needs of the offender and those of the community.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Department of Public Security and other referral organizations.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The main elements that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative are:

- ◆ enriched contractual-type relationship with community organizations;
- ◆ development of mechanisms for consultation and co-operation between the Department of Public Security and resources; and,
- ◆ assessment and follow-up at the provincial level and at the regional level.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The program was established and has been in effect since in 1989.

The following problems prompted the initiative:

- ♦ overcrowding of custodial facilities led correctional services management to develop other means of following up on sentences to fines;
- ♦ persons who were disadvantaged financially, had to be imprisoned to serve their sentence;
- ♦ a concern for fairness for all offenders; and,
- ♦ a stay in custody should be indicated only for offenders whose delinquent behaviour is a threat to society.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ to promote the collection of fines;
- ♦ to humanize ways of collecting fines;
- ♦ to encourage community participation in the administration of justice;
- ♦ to make persons doing compensatory work more responsible; and,
- ♦ to avoid imprisonment for non-payment of fines.

This program has helped to reduce the rate of imprisonment for non-payment of fines. In 1995-96, 24,000 requests for services were completed.

By developing a service agreement with the community organizations responsible for referring people and ensuring follow-up of the program, the objective of promoting links with the community has been achieved.

The initiative is a cost-effective way to invest in justice reforms over the next three years. However, the Working Group concludes that there is a need to establish province-wide yardsticks for fees in order to eliminate disparities that are likely to result in uncontrollable inflation of the charges paid to the referring organizations.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Michel Roberge
2525 boul. Laurier
Tour St-Laurent, 11^{ième} étage
Ste-Foy, Québec
G1V 2L2

tel: (418) 644-7887
fax: (418) 644-5645

Québec-5

Consultation Team on the Administration of Justice for Young Persons

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The project shares in the following justice values:

- ♦ well focused and timely use of the justice system;
- ♦ coordinated response by the community and the justice system;
- ♦ more effective access to justice services;
- ♦ more effective solutions to specific problems relating to justice;
- ♦ long-term solutions to on-going problems relating to justice; and,
- ♦ use of innovative technology.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The current Deputy Ministers of the Departments of Justice, Health and Social Services, and Public Security form the Consultation Team.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The consensus with respect to the recommendations in the *Jasmin Report*, the desire to act on them, and the need to cooperate in the efforts of the parties concerned with a view to efficiency (i.e., to act on the recommendations in the *Report* effectively and at the lowest possible cost) will certainly contribute to the success of the initiative.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: An Interdepartmental Working Group was established in the early 1990s to assess the application of the *Youth Protection Act* and the *Young Offenders Act*, to note

problems, and to suggest concrete measures to resolve them. A team of Deputy Ministers was created to ensure follow-up on the recommendations.

Stated Objectives: The initiative was designed to:

- ♦ ensure that the working group's recommendations contained in the *Jasmin Report* were acted upon;
- ♦ ensure consultation between and consistency of interventions and messages given to young people by the various parties involved in the judicial, police and social services;
- ♦ implement coherent programs in the administration of justice for young people; and,
- ♦ promote synergy among the organizations involved and better coordination of the efforts of each of them.

The synergy of efforts certainly makes it possible to effect savings in terms of financial and human resources and implementation time.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Mario Lacroix
Direction des affaires policières et de la sécurité incendie
Direction générale de la sécurité et de la prévention
Ministère de la sécurité publique
2525, boul. Laurier, 4e étage
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1V 2L2
tel: (418) 646-6916
fax: (418) 646-3564

Brigitte Tardif
Bureau du Sous-Ministre
Ministère de la sécurité publique
2525, boul. Laurier, 5e étage
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1V 2L2
tel: (418) 643-3500
fax: (418) 643-0275

Québec-6

Consultation Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The project shares in the following justice values:

- ◆ well focused and timely use of the justice system;
- ◆ coordinated response by the community and the justice system;
- ◆ more effective access to justice services;
- ◆ more effective solutions to specific problems relating to justice;
- ◆ long-term solutions to on-going problems relating to justice; and,
- ◆ use of innovative technology.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Not indicated.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The main elements that appear to have contributed to the success or failure of the initiative are:

- ◆ member's desire to promote greater consultation in their efforts toward greater effectiveness; and,
- ◆ efficiency (i.e., to obtain better results in the administration of criminal justice at lower cost).

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: This initiative is the result of a desire on the part of the various parties involved in the administration of criminal justice in Québec to create a permanent and effective partnership that would make it possible to deal with the restructuring of various Departments and

the difficult budgetary context. Meetings have been held over approximately the last two years. Various subjects have been discussed and others are currently being discussed (e.g., disclosure of evidence, use of appearance notices, improvement of the Q.P.I.C., sharing the proceeds of crime, out-of-court treatment of offences, shoplifting, computerization, *et cetera*).

Stated Objectives: The objectives related to the following factors forming part of a search for on-going co-operation and consultation:

- ♦ an attempt to pool resources out of concern for efficiency and synergy;
- ♦ creation of relations geared to common challenges to ensure that all those involved are working toward the same goal;
- ♦ sharing of information and experience;
- ♦ conclusion of joint agreements;
- ♦ discussion of approaches to or implementation of actions by the parties involved;
- ♦ co-ordination of efforts and support for joint projects; and,
- ♦ speedy resolution of problems encountered in the practical approaches to the concrete problems.

The objectives set have been attained. A comparison between the actions planned and to be taken and those taken and completed is an excellent indicator of results. It is certainly a cost-effective exercise.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Mario Lacroix
Direction des affaires policières et de la sécurité incendie
Direction générale de la sécurité et de la prévention
Ministère de la Sécurité publique
2525, boul. Laurier, 4e étage
Sainte-Foy (Québec)
G1V 2L2
tel: (418) 646-6916
fax: (418) 646-3564

Québec-7

Audiovisual Hearings

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The project shares in the justice value of making use of innovative technology. This is a visual, virtual and interactive technology.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Implementation of such an initiative, however, requires cooperation between the legal profession, the courts and the telecommunications industries.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: A pilot project has been under way in Québec Appeal District since August 1994. The results of this project are conclusive. Consequently, it is in the process of being extended to the two main Palais de justice and applies to all the courts sitting there. Where cases meet the criteria established in a memorandum of agreement between the parties involved, video-conferencing will replace travel. This is more than merely visual technology in that it is also virtual and interactive.

The video-conferencing market is currently expanding rapidly and the use of this technology should grow substantially. The judicial system must evolve with this technology, even when it has to be adapted in order to be used adequately. The benefits of video-conferencing will be felt

first of all by litigants and the legal community. Funding of the operation should therefore be the responsibility of the parties concerned.

Stated Objectives: Pilot project designed to make use of video-conferencing technology to promote the exercise of the right to appeal to the Québec Court of Appeal, both for motions and for appeals as such.

The immense area of the province and the distances that have to be traveled in order to exercise a right of appeal involved substantial travel and accommodation costs for lawyers and their clients, not to mention the time wasted in traveling.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: In November 1995, the Department of Justice carried out an assessment of the video-conferencing project in the Court of Appeal and its expansion to other jurisdictions and judicial districts. The criteria for this assessment were qualitative (user satisfaction, technology used, dynamics of participants at hearings, transmission of documents), and quantitative (number of motions heard or likely to be heard by this means, expected level of use, cost and potential savings).

CONTACT(S):

Gaétan Lemoyne
Associate Deputy Minister
Direction générale des services de justice
Ministère de la justice
1200, route de l'Église, 7e étage
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1V 4M1
tel: (418) 643-8654
fax: (418) 643-6639

Québec-8

Simplified Procedure by way of a Declaration in Certain Civil Proceedings

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Not indicated.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: An Act to amend the *Code of Civil Procedure*, the Act respecting the *Regie du logement*, the *Jurors Act* and other legislative provisions, S.Q. c.5, was passed by the National Assembly of Québec on June 13, 1996. It will come into force on January 1, 1997.

Stated Objectives: Given the costs incurred by the parties in a civil case and in order to make this process more accessible and less costly for all citizens, it was felt that a simplified procedure by way of a declaration should be created for certain cases that are not particularly complex so that they will be ready for hearing within a maximum period of six months. This simplified procedure is half way between the regular trial procedure and the procedure used in Small Claims Division.

The costs incurred by the parties in a civil case are often disproportionate to the amounts claimed and even more so to the amounts actually recovered. This factor is particularly marked in cases in which the amount claimed or the value of the object in dispute is relatively modest. Furthermore, the number of possible procedures and the cost thereof as well as the extent of current delays in the regular trial process are sometimes tantamount to a denial of justice for the litigant. The complexity and slowness of the judicial process mean that the possibility of obtaining a satisfactory judgment following lengthy proceedings that were designed for another time, and are now inadequate and inefficient, is illusory. The delays and costs accordingly create a serious problem in terms of access to justice and far too often discourage individuals who are neither wealthy nor eligible for legal aid from asserting their rights in law.

This situation has been criticized many times by litigants in Québec and elsewhere in Canada. This simplified approach, which was adopted as one of a series of measures designed to simplify the judicial process in Québec in order to enhance its equality and accessibility, applies to the following claims generally and irrespective of the amount involved:

- the sale price of movable property;
- the price in a contract for services or of enterprise, a contract of leasing or a contract of carriage;
- claims related to a contract of employment, of lease, of deposit or of loan of money;
- the remuneration of a mandatory, a surety or an office holder for services rendered;
- bills of exchange, cheques, promissory notes or acknowledgments of debt; and,
- taxes, rates and assessments imposed by or under any law of Québec.

This simplified procedure also applies to all other proceedings in which the amount claimed or the value of the object of the dispute does not exceed \$50,000. This monetary threshold for the application of the simplified procedure includes all actions brought in the Court of Québec in civil proceedings, except for those relating to expropriation, adoption and small claims. The \$50,000 threshold also applies to a number of the claims made in the Superior Court, except for family and bankruptcy proceedings, but especially civil liability, contractual and extra-contractual claims.

In other proceedings, when an appropriate case arises and the parties consent, they may request that the simplified process apply; however, the parties involved in the simplified process may make an application for exclusion so that the regular process will apply when the complexity of the case and special circumstances warrant this, especially when there is a major risk that conduct of the case in accordance with the simplified procedure will cause irreparable harm to one of the parties. However, the court has the power to impose a penalty on any parties that improperly evade the simplified process.

All the measures involved in this process, including the creation of a simplified procedure, will result in increased need for staff equivalent to 1.9 FTE and, in budgetary terms, a \$40,200 increase for the Department of Justice as a whole. However, there should be 1,213 fewer hours of hearings for the judges of the Court of Québec and the Superior Court. Moreover, litigants will enjoy substantial savings in terms of court and other costs.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: This initiative will probably be evaluated after it has been in force for a significant period.

CONTACT(S):

Jean K. Samson
Associate Deputy Minister
Direction générale des affaires juridiques et législatives
Ministère de la justice
1200, route de l'Église, 2e étage
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1V 4M1
tel: (418) 643-4228
fax: (418) 646-1696

Québec-9

Computerization of Criminal Procedure

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Not indicated.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The computerization of criminal procedure should become a reality, as opposed to being merely virtual, in 1997. Draft regulations governing the form of statements of offence and offence reports appeared in the *Gazette officielle du Québec* on July 17, 1996.

Stated Objectives: The goals of this project are:

- ♦ the development, within the *Code of Penal Procedure*, of a legal framework allowing for the preparation of proceedings electronically, the admission in evidence of proceedings in electronic form, the conduct of criminal proceedings on the basis of the originating document and evidence submitted electronically and, finally, the entering of judgements directly on electronic media (*An Act amending the Code of Penal Procedure and other legislative provisions*, S.Q. 1995, c. 51);
- ♦ revision of the previously approved form of statements of offence and offence reports by creating electronic equivalents for the paper forms and by including elements from the originals

on electronic media; draft regulations governing the form of statements of offence and draft regulations governing the form of offence reports, pre-published in the *Gazette officielle du Québec*, July 17, 1996, pp. 2783 and 2814; and,

- ♦ security standards for electronic information and documentation in the criminal justice field are currently being drafted.

The problem of computerizing criminal procedure is complex:

- ♦ first, we must take a number of different approaches into account, namely one where the proceeding is prepared directly in electronic form and one where the proceeding is first created partly or wholly in non-electronic form and then digitized and converted to electronic form;
- ♦ second, it is necessary to consider the extent to which the various parties involved in the administration of criminal justice are computerized so that those that are computerized can go ahead and those who are not can continue to use paper or adapt to the electronic medium;
- ♦ third, we must be able to give the public sufficient guarantees of the integrity of electronic documents used as the basis for a charge, the conduct of a prosecution and judgements following such prosecutions;
- ♦ fourth, it is necessary to develop security standards for each approach taken that will allow for the protection of documents from the time the software or the documents to be digitized are prepared, when the pleadings are drafted electronically or digitized, when they are transmitted electronically, when a hard copy of them is created, when they are consulted or used in electronic form, while they are preserved or archived or when they are duplicated electronically;
- ♦ fifth, the possibility of signing a document digitally also requires the development of a procedure for checking the signatory's identity and establishing a network of checks as part of the administration of criminal justice;
- ♦ sixth, the use of electronic means to create documents containing such sensitive information as indictments, evidence of offences and judgements, involves a search for balance between protecting the public aspects of criminal procedure and the protection of privacy; and,
- ♦ finally, the partial gradual computerization of some organizations involved in the criminal justice administration system raises the question of compatibility of the electronic systems of the various organizations and requires us to establish a consensus on the electronic sharing of proceedings in electronic form.

The legislative basis allowing for the admission in evidence of electronic documents containing proceedings are set out in the *Code of Penal Procedure* and should come into force at the same time as the related regulations. Regulations concerning the security of information in electronic documentation relating to criminal cases are being drafted and have been the subject of extensive consultations with various Departments and organizations involved in various aspects of computer security, from both the computing and the legal points of view. The regulations should be pre-published in the fall.

The computerization of criminal procedure may be cost-effective to the extent that the design of the systems ensures that their various components are compatible with one another.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Jeanne Proulx
1200, route de l'Église, bur. 4.03
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1V 4M1
tel: (418) 643-8242
fax: (418) 646-9749

Québec-10

Automatic Collection of Support

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Not indicated.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The Act to facilitate the payment of support was passed by the National Assembly of Québec on May 16, 1995. The scheme came into force in May 1996.

Stated Objectives: The goals of the project are:

- ♦ the establishment of a universal system for the automatic collection of support under the authority of the Department of Revenue;
- ♦ reduced use of the court system;
- ♦ creation of a special fund designed to ensure regular payments; and,
- ♦ use of sums owed to the debtor of support by a government Department or agency to pay off arrears.

Among the most important social changes of the last few years, those relating to the structure of the family have possibly been the most significant. Thus, the breakdown of a marriage has a substantial impact on the socio-economic situation of children and wives. The financial support that these individuals require is a major concern in North America and the question of non-payment of support is an essential part of this problem.

In Québec almost 50% of marriages end in divorce. The need to improve the fate of single-parent families by creating a system for the automatic collection of support is advocated by a substantial majority of Québécois, as was shown by a survey in April 1994 in which three out of four individuals said that they agreed with this approach.

The general objectives are:

- ♦ to reduce delays and increase the collection of support and thus reduce poverty among women and children, in particular by improving the economic situation of single-parent families; and,
- ♦ to create mechanisms that will enable women and children to receive the support to which they are entitled.

The specific objectives are:

- ♦ to increase parental responsibility for the obligation of support;
- ♦ to promote stable and regular payment of support;
- ♦ to respect the independence of those parties, especially debtors, who already make it a habit to pay regularly;
- ♦ to simplify the process to be used by creditors and encourage them to use this process;
- ♦ to minimize the risk of manipulation, bribery and violence by reducing the tension between former spouses through the presence of an intermediary in all cases; and
- ♦ to take the current budgetary situation of the government into account.

The new scheme is based on the systems in effect in Ontario and New Brunswick. As in Ontario, for all new orders made after the legislation takes effect service is provided, whether or not there is a default in payment, and the collector acts as an intermediary in all cases where the debtor is employed. Where judgements have already been rendered, the collection service can be used at the creditor's request when the debtor has defaulted and by mutual consent of the parties if there has been no default. Responsibility for the scheme is shared between the Department of Justice, which keeps a record of support awards and sends the orders to the Department of Revenue, which is responsible for collecting the money and administering the Fonds de pensions alimentaires.

Moreover, as under the New Brunswick model, provision is made for the debtor of support who must discharge his obligation by means of source deductions, to be exempted from such deductions if he deposits security equal to three months' support. An unemployed debtor, for his part, can be included in the scheme by depositing security and making payments to the collector.

Provision is also made in the collection scheme for the debt of support to take priority over any regular debt contracted by the debtor following the judgement ordering him to pay support.

The court may exempt a debtor from the scheme in three cases: if it orders the creation of a trust; if it considers that action by the collector could cause serious harm to one of the parties; or, if payment is sufficiently guaranteed by the security it has asked the debtor to provide or if there is a written agreement between the parties before the court and the debtor has deposited security equivalent to three months' support.

Finally, a Fonds des pensions alimentaires has been created for administrative purposes and to ensure as far as possible that payments are made regularly.

The cost-benefit analysis that may be generated by the collection system covers a ten-year period. The creation of a universal system for the automatic collection of support should make it possible to increase from 45% to 55% the proportion of debts that will be collected without difficulty. It is accordingly estimated that 45% of the debts will require more specific action on the collector's part. This is, at least, what emerges from the experience of New Brunswick. There are a number of reasons for this, especially movements of workers from one company to another, the number of self-employed workers and seasonal workers and changes in the employment status of the debtors. Finally, a certain proportion of support, which it is difficult to quantify, will never be collected, since there will be judgements to quash or reduce support payments and some defaulting debtors will simply drop out of sight or become insolvent.

Experience in New Brunswick suggests that such improvements in the collection system will allow for the collection of at least 10 per cent of the sums paid in support. Thus, the additional amounts of support that may be collected in the tenth year are \$83.2 million and the savings in last-resort assistance will be \$10.4 million. Over a ten-year period, these amounts would total \$729 million, almost \$90 million of which would be last-resort assistance. This estimate of the scheme's performance constitutes a minimum if we consider that the situation in the other provinces differs from that in Québec, especially with respect to manpower mobility, which is greater in the other provinces.

In addition, the collection scheme must allow us to reduce delays in collecting arrears of alimentary pensions and thus enable creditors to obtain the money they need for their children more quickly. Moreover, these benefits do not include those resulting from the reduced need for income security or the reduced demand for last-resort assistance by persons who, having obtained support payments through a universal collection scheme, would have greater incentive to join the labour force. We should also note the benefits that will result from improvements in the standard of living of disadvantaged families.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: This initiative will probably be evaluated after it has been in effect for a significant period.

CONTACT(S):

for the keeping of records of support orders:

Gaétan Lemoyne
Associate Deputy Minister
Direction générale des services de justice
Ministère de la justice
1200, route de l'Église, 7e étage
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1V 4M1
tel: (418) 643-7595
fax: (418) 643-6639

for the collection of support and the
administration of the fund:

Alain Dompierre
Assistant Deputy Minister for Taxpayers
Ministère du revenu
3800, rue de Marly
Secteur 1-2-4
Sainte-Foy, Québec
G1X 4A5
tel: (418) 652-6872
fax: (418) 646-7522

Saskatchewan-1

Regina Aboriginal Human Services Cooperative

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Saskatchewan Justice has been involved with Aboriginal organizations in Regina for several years through community development leading to a current proposal for the delivery of alternative measures in the community including mediation / diversion and family group conferencing.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Various Aboriginal Community Organizations in Regina, Saskatchewan Justice, Saskatchewan Social Services, City of Regina, Regina Police Service, Federal Justice. Justice has had the lead role both in community development aspect and in the development of an approach to delivering alternative measures for adults and youth.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

As indicated above, Aboriginal organizations in the City of Regina serving Aboriginal people are involved in the organization of this project and in the management of the Aboriginal Human Services Coop itself. The organizations are members of the Coop and also serve on various Boards to manage the Coop. This involves the Aboriginal organizations in directly deciding how alternative measures will be delivered and whether they will be delivered through the Coop or through member agencies. Personnel are involved in an advisory capacity.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The project demonstrates the process of community development in the justice context from preplanning, planning development, implementation and evaluation stages. It has taken approximately 2 to 3 years to build this type of consensus through community action so that the organization now has the support to go forward and actually deliver justice alternative measures services.

Best practices illustrated by the project are in terms of building Aboriginal community consensus and community development and justice issues, empowering the community and coordinating inter-agency and inter-governmental response to community needs. The project is unique in that it follows a cooperative model of organization rather than a profit corporate structure. This makes it much more open to the community-at-large to be members of the Coop. Overall it improves accountability of the Coop to its membership as well. The project also demonstrates the importance of being familiar with the dynamics of community organizations in change.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The project has been operating since April 1993.

Stated Objectives: Stated objectives are community development / structure to plan and prioritize Aboriginal justice needs and responses for Regina.

Key Deliverables: Key deliverables are sustainable structure for Aboriginal community justice development in the urban centre of Regina, community accountability and community-based justice responses.

Monitored/Evaluated: There has been one interim evaluation of the structure of the community development phase which has generally indicated that the Coop is proceeding to build understanding of justice issues and of community structure organizational issues appropriately. Further evaluations of the community development aspects as well as the alternative measures service delivery aspects are being planned.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

The project has a research and evaluation component which includes a strategy for monitoring project review and outcome evaluation. The final evaluation will include measurements of objective attainment in four areas:

- ♦ reducing reliance on the formal criminal justice system;
- ♦ increasing the use of alternative measures;
- ♦ building the community's capacity to the needs of offenders and victims; and,
- ♦ developing and maintaining collaboration among community agencies and between government and the community.

Another evaluation issue will be the effectiveness of training police to use the Alternative Measures Program for diversion purposes. All the outcomes are measurable.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

Activities for reaching each of the objectives have been developed and performance indicators attached to each activity. For example, the activities attached to reducing reliance on the formal system are the use of referrals to diversion programs and the performance indicators are the numbers and types of diversions used, reductions in recidivism, and the number of offenders assessed, referred and successfully completing diversion programs.

CONTACT(S):

Betty Ann Pottruff, Q.C.
Director
Policy, Planning and Evaluation Branch
Public Law and Policy Division
Saskatchewan Justice
1874 Scarth Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3V7
tel: (306) 787-8954
fax: (306) 787-5065

Saskatchewan-2

Saskatchewan's Action Plan for Children

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

The activities are broader than the justice system and is aimed at individual and community wellness for children which has a strong justice preventative, restorative and educational component.

The Action Plan is a provincial strategy to enhance the well-being of children, youth and families. It is a collaborative process between all the major Departments of the provincial government and involves Regional Committees and local community organizations and individuals. As well, an Advisory Council on Children's Issues has been formed consisting of 20 Saskatchewan volunteers from various disciplines who meet regularly to monitor and advise on the state of children in Saskatchewan. This Advisory Council has a Justice sub-group. Activities ranging from expansion of community-based school, youth sex offender programming, expansion of Family Law Division and services through to enhancing family violence funding and targeted prevention and support grants for communities, are all dealt with under this umbrella. Key Departments coordinate budget planning and make a joint submission on children's issues through the annual budget exercise. Each project funded under the prevention and support grants has an evaluation component, and the prevention and support grants component has had some evaluation work done. A broader initiative has also had some qualitative evaluation conducted.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Social Services leads the Interdepartmental Steering Committee which reports to Deputies, Ministers and Cabinet. Membership of the Steering Committee includes Social Services, Justice, Health, Municipal Government, Education and Saskatchewan Indian and Métis Affairs Secretariat. As mentioned previously there is also an Advisory Committee on the Child Action Plan consisting of 20 Saskatchewan volunteers as well as Interdepartmental and non-government association sub-groups.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

As indicated above groups in the community are involved both through the Regional Committee structure and the proponents for prevention and support grants. These grants have provided funding for summer activity for youth, promoted youth and family education, prevention, family

violence, anger management, AIDS awareness and other topics. Projects have also been funded on child abuse responses.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

The Steering Committee on the Child Action Plan has developed a workable approach to joint and collaborative government planning on a major social policy area. This has also involved joint budget planning across Departments on a social policy area. As well the initiative has carried out a fairly extensive consultation and community involvement focus including decentralization of authority from the Central committee down to the Regional bodies for providing local grant support. Prevention and support grants summer program, in particular, has been very well received by communities as providing the sort of short-term targeted funding which has helped to significantly decrease crime and disruption in the community.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The Child Action Plan process began with the distribution of the public discussion document in 1993 and following consultations.

Stated Objectives: Goals of the Saskatchewan Action Plan for Children are children must be valued, safe, secure, healthy, culturally connected, socially responsible and knowledgeable and skilled.

Key Deliverables: The key deliverables still need to be defined, and the Steering Committee is working on that, in terms of outcomes for Saskatchewan children.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

The project does have an evaluation component with respect to prevention and support grants and individual projects thereunder. We are also in the process of developing measurable outcomes leading to the well-being of children and have done some development on evaluating the impact of the initiative itself.

With respect to the projects themselves, an evaluation manual has been developed which will be distributed to community organizations to help them develop a common evaluation strategy.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

There are general performance indicators in terms of the number of communities involved, projects underway, regional committees involved, success of the interdepartmental process in policy and budget planning, *et cetera*. However, we do need to continue to work on developing key measures for wellness of children in Saskatchewan, most likely involving measurables such as number of children in poverty, children suffering abuse, number of children injured in various types of activities, average level of school education attainment, *et cetera*.

CONTACT(S):

Betty Ann Pottruff, Q.C.
Director
Policy, Planning and Evaluation Branch
Public Law and Policy Division
Saskatchewan Justice
1874 Scarth Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3V7
tel: (306) 787-8954
fax: (306) 787-5065

Saskatchewan-3

The Family and Youth Plan

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Saskatchewan Social Services is responsible for Young Offenders programs in the province. The Family and Youth Plan is an initiative that Family and Youth Services undertook in direct response to the increasing number of youth in the custody system. The Family and Youth Plan consists of four main programs:

- ♦ Family Preservation: intensive, in-home services to families of youth in custody or to high-risk youth on the verge of a custody disposition.
- ♦ Day Programs: numerous programs throughout the province run by community-based organizations. The programs vary, but offer diversion, education / employment or recreational services.
- ♦ Youth Support Programs: numerous individual contracts with service providers who provide various diversion and supervision services to targeted high-risk youth, primarily in rural communities.
- ♦ Adolescent Treatment Group Homes: three group homes throughout the province that provide treatment for high-risk youth in their home communities.

The initiative was a direct response to the increasing numbers of youth in the traditional custody system. The objectives of the plan are:

- ♦ to broaden the availability of resources to youth;
- ♦ to reduce the admissions to custody and private treatment; and,
- ♦ to prevent youth from becoming more deeply involved in the youth justice system.

Some of the approaches used to reach these objectives are restorative, preventive and educational in nature. In some cases community development is used.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The Family and Youth Plan programs have been developed in partnership with the Saskatchewan Justice, Education, Social Services, Health, Finance, various communities through a community consultation strategy, community-based organizations, Indian bands, and individuals. Social Services has taken the lead role in the development of the programs in various communities.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The project involved extensive community consultations prior to its implementation. The consultations were held at the community level and included a vast number of groups affected by the issue of youth justice. These groups included tribal councils, various community groups representing youth issues, and community associations, in addition to the government and non-government service agencies.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

This project emphasized the necessity of having in-depth consultations with the various stakeholders. It also emphasized the need for an evaluation plan which includes the evaluator's involvement from the outset of planning through implementation and follow-up.

The tracking of the youth and families involved in the programs, the detailed data collection and analysis, the follow-up of the youth in the programs, and the feedback from the consumers of the services have all proven to be invaluable in evaluation of the program. Of equal value is the regular feedback to the agencies and staff who are providing the services. To a large extent, the issue of target drift was avoided because of this.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: A majority of the Family and Youth Plan programs have been operating since October 1994. A number of the day programs and youth support programs began in early 1995.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ to broaden the base of community services available to youth;
- ♦ to reduce the admissions to custody and private treatment;
- ♦ to provide for community placements for earlier release of youth from custody and private treatment; and,
- ♦ to prevent youth from becoming more deeply involved in the youth justice system.

Key Deliverables:

- ♦ a reduction in the use of custody facility spaces and out-of-region private treatment referrals;
- ♦ a continuum of services in targeted regions that meet the needs of high-risk youth and their families; and,
- ♦ a reduction in offending behaviour for youth involved in the programs.

Monitored/Evaluated: The deliverables have been monitored from the outset. Youth in each of the following target groups have been monitored on a daily basis:

- ◆ Primary: youth who are in custody and require the program for early release or for a court review; youth who are before the courts for sentencing and require the community-based program to prevent a custody disposition (e.g., if a repeat offender convicted of several charges of break and enter and theft were diverted from receiving a custody disposition if he/she is accepted into a family preservation program); and, youth who are in private treatment or who are at imminent risk of entering private treatment.
- ◆ Secondary: youth who are in the youth justice system and are at high-risk to re-offend and receive a custody disposition soon if there is not any intervention (e.g., a youth who has had several probation dispositions and is at high-risk to re-offend may receive a custody disposition soon if he/she is not admitted to a day program which provides supervision and an educational program).
- ◆ Tertiary: youth who are at risk to offend or who have just begun to offend and are likely to become more involved in the Young Offenders system and perhaps custody.

From the daily counts, an estimate of the days saved in custody facilities is calculated. This tracking is shared on a monthly basis with the program managers and supervisors in order to maintain the focus on the primary target group.

Intake and outcome data is collected for all youth in Family Preservation and the Treatment Group Homes and for youth in the primary and secondary target groups for Day and Youth Support programs. The data is maintained in a database and is analyzed periodically. The analysis is being shared with the program staff, supervisors and managers in each region.

A client satisfaction survey is being completed by the youth and families involved in the Family Preservation programs. This data will be entered into a database and could be analyzed periodically for program staff, supervisors and managers.

Follow-up data could be collected on youth who have completed the Family Preservation program to assess the impact of the intervention on *Criminal Code* convictions and sentences for youth (CPIC) and on further involvement with Social Services (income security, protection and children in care services) for youth and their families. This data would help to determine the long term impact of the programs in youth and their families.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

Yes, this project does have a research component as described above.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

The performance indicators are:

- ◆ a reduction in the use of custody in the areas where the programs are offered;
- ◆ an increase in reviews and early releases from custody;
- ◆ a reduction in offending behaviour by youth involved in the programs; and,
- ◆ a reduction in the involvement in the criminal justice system by youth involved in the programs.

CONTACT(S):

Jim McIlmoyl
Senior Program Analyst
Research and Evaluation Branch
Saskatchewan Social Services
1920 Broad Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3V6

tel: not indicated
fax: not indicated

Saskatchewan-4

Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

At inception in 1992, the purpose of the project was to determine if partnerships could be established between government Departments, the federal government and community. Prior to the project, the issue of violence in the family in Saskatchewan was dealt with in isolation, with sporadic attempts at consultation and programs and services being developed randomly and inconsistently.

In October 1994, PPCFV held a symposium to present a model of partnership for government and community to work together to address family violence. The evaluations of the symposium showed that the majority of the participants agreed with working in partnership, although some were unsure about the need for a provincial partnership.

The PPCFV provides the framework and support for the development of Local Interagency Groups.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Currently, the PPCFV is funded by Health and Justice with in-kind support from Social Services, Women's Secretariat, Justice, Social Services, Health, Indian and Métis Affairs Secretariat, Agriculture and Food have representatives on PPCFV.

The Inter-Departmental Committee on Family Violence is co-chaired by Justice and Women's Secretariat and is made up of representatives from Social Services, Health, Education, Indian and Métis Affairs Secretariat, Agriculture and Food, Finance, and Housing Division, Municipal Government. This committee shares information regarding programs, services, policy development and budgets across government.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

At the time of the symposium, seven communities were at some stage of working in partnership (Prince Albert, LaRonge, Carrot River and District, Yorkton, Lloydminster, Swift Current, and Regina). As a result of the symposium, Moose Jaw formed a partnership committee. Since that time, several communities have expressed an interest in working in partnership and/or have started partnership committees (Cumberland House, Hudson Bay, Davidson, Weyburn / Estevan,

and Meadow Lake). Throughout the process, the PPCFV has been a partnership between government Departments, interested individuals, and community groups working together.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what ‘best practices’ are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Through the process of establishing a partnership relationship, it was learned that inclusive membership, listening to others, decision making by consensus, trust building, and developing guidelines are essential ingredients to forming a partnership.

There were several barriers to working in a partnership that could have undermined or defeated the partnership process, including:

- ♦ costs to pull people together;
- ♦ determining who should represent the government;
- ♦ determining for whom government representatives spoke (the Department?, themselves?);
- ♦ addressing people’s special needs (e.g., child-care, disability access, honorariums, etc.);
- ♦ defining a workable meaning for “inclusivity”;
- ♦ developing a non-hierarchical structure;
- ♦ establishing a decision making process and criterion;
- ♦ defining partnership criteria; and,
- ♦ ensuring accountability for all members / partners.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project’s stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The Provincial Partnership Committee on Family Violence started with funding from the Family Violence Prevention Initiatives, Health Canada 1992. Following the October 1994 symposium agreements to work in partnerships, in March 1995 federal funding ended and the PPCFV is now jointly funded by the Departments of Health (\$32,000) and Justice (\$25,000) with in-kind support from Social Services.

Stated Objectives: Not indicated.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: The Social Administration Research Unit (SARU) has been involved with the project from its inception, starting as early as 1991. SARU joined with other members of the community to develop the original proposal to Health and Welfare Canada and an evaluation procedure was included in the submission. A midpoint report was undertaken in the late fall of 1993 and the midpoint report was completed in February 1994.

CONTACT(S):

Joyce Reid
Senior Policy Analyst
Family and Youth Services Division
Saskatchewan Social Services
1920 Broad Street
Regina, Saskatchewan
S4P 3V6

tel: (306) 787-3648

fax: not indicated

Yukon-1

Community Based Justice

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

This project minimizes people's contact with the traditional justice system in that it looks toward restorative justice.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The partners are Yukon Justice, federal Department of Justice, First Nations and R.C.M.P.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

The project affects the community as a whole. The communities of Carcross, Watson Lake, Teslin, Haines Junction, Carmacks, Pelly Crossing, Faro, Dawson City and Kwanlin Dun are either participating or at the discussion / formative stage.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Using the Teslin project as an example, a best practice has been to ensure it is the community who offers the suggestions and procedures.

The lesson learned is to provide close monitoring and hence encouragement and advise.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Kwanlin Dun Community Based Justice has been operating for approximately three years.

Stated Objectives: The Kwanlin Dun Community Based Justice project, for example, is based on the following principles:

- ♦ the Kwanlin Dun community should be the first in line of responsibility for prevention and resolution of crime and conflict;
- ♦ a community based justice system requires a meaningful partnership between the community and the formal justice process;
- ♦ community involvement depends primarily upon volunteers and the use of community members trained to replace, on a part-time or full-time basis, as many professional functions as possible;
- ♦ community justice responses must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate the diversity of cases and to maximize resources in preventing and resolving crime;
- ♦ the Circle Sentencing process is available only for offenders with a proven, genuine intent to heal and change their life;
- ♦ holistic healing requires coordination of all services and the input of all community resources to help victims, offenders and the community successfully through the healing journey; and,
- ♦ a community based justice process aspires to reduce processing costs to allow greater emphasis on healing individuals, families and the community.

Components:

- ♦ Talking and Healing Circles: informal Circles established, as required, for special cases and available on a regular basis for special groups such as Talking Circles for men, women, youth, Elders or a Healing Circle for victims, substance abusers, spousal assaults and sexual assaulters.
- ♦ Community Justice Circle: to process most summary and young offender sentencing when the offender has been accepted by the Justice Steering Committee.
- ♦ Court Sentencing Circles: to process serious adult and young offender sentencing when the offender has been accepted by the Kwanlin Dun Justice Steering Committee.
- ♦ Kwanlin Dun Community Court: to process Summary and minor Youth Offender Cases involving offenders who are members of the Kwanlin Dun community.

Key Deliverables: The Key deliverable is community based justice.

Monitored/Evaluated: The Teslin project has been monitored by Martin Suo, federal Department of Justice. It is unknown if Kwanlin Dun is being monitored.

CONTACT(S):

Judy Harting
Group Head
Criminal Prosecutions
B.C. / Yukon Region, Whitehorse Office
Department of Justice Canada
200-300 Main Street
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2B5
tel: (403) 667-3991
fax: (403) 667-3979

Yukon-2

Coordinating Committee on Family Violence

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

This project does not specifically minimize contact with the traditional justice system. It is preventive, restorative and educational in nature. The purpose is to provide a forum for Justice, Health and Social Services, Education, and First Nations to coordinate and evaluate activities toward a comprehensive response to family violence.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

The partners are R.C.M.P., Yukon Justice, Federal Crown, Women's Directorate, local women's transition home, Yukon Department of Health and Social Services, Yukon Family Services, Mental Health Services, the Judiciary, and Council for Yukon Indians.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Groups within the community that are affected include aboriginal women's group, women's transition home, Kwanlin Dun First Nations and Victim Services.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Best Practices: All agencies gather at one place and time and on a regular basis. This keeps communication current.

Lessons Learned: It is cumbersome for a large number of agencies to meet.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?*

What are the project's stated objectives?

What are the key deliverables?

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: The project has existed for three years.

Stated Objectives: Goals, Objectives and Strategies:

1. To share information between organizations:

- ♦ to inform each other of member organizations' family violence services including new initiatives, difficulties and emerging trends
 - ♦ by having a reporting component for members at every meeting, having reports included in the minutes, and broadly distributing the minutes;
 - ♦ by having members who participate on other committees related to particular aspects of family violence report on issues from those groups;
 - ♦ by developing an annual report of the committee's activities which summarizes the issues and activities addressed in the previous year.
- ♦ to examine and develop mutual understanding of each organization's philosophical base for services including conflicts between organizations
 - ♦ by providing a forum for members to question (in a non-threatening manner) the rationale underpinning an organizations approach to a service or client group.

2. To assist one another in the operation and development of services:

- ♦ to identify gaps in services and collaborate toward solutions to be implemented jointly or severally by member organizations
 - ♦ by sharing knowledge and resources;
 - ♦ by identifying information required for service planning and encouraging organizations to collect it in a consistent manner.
- ♦ to identify skill or knowledge needs shared by service delivery personnel across agencies and coordinate appropriate training initiatives
 - ♦ by discussing training needs and sharing resources to meet the needs efficiently and effectively.
- ♦ to develop joint procedure protocols for interagency work with shared clients
 - ♦ by clarifying roles, developing proposals and coordinating internal review and approval processes within members' own organizations.
- ♦ to debate and recommend policy positions on ethical and clinical issues which impact service delivery (e.g., client confidentiality, duty to warn)
 - ♦ by identifying issues, drafting proposals and coordinating internal review and approval processes within members' own organizations.
- ♦ to provide critiques and suggestions on current or proposed initiatives when requested by sponsoring organizations
 - ♦ by meeting with representatives of the sponsoring agency for an open discussion which, at the agency's request, may or may not be minuted.

3. To encourage understanding of the need for and meaning of a comprehensive response to family violence:

- ♦ to contribute to the public understanding of family violence including its social and personal impacts and the scope of interventions for effective treatment prevention
 - ♦ by identifying specific topics on which public understanding is lacking and encouraging member organizations to undertake any initiatives within their mandate to improve public understanding;
 - ♦ by providing information to the media and community groups concerning

- family violence and the committee's activities.
- ♦ to provide input to decision making authorities concerning the committee's consensus perspective on needs or problems
 - ♦ by each member ensuring that planning and decision making authorities within his/her organization are aware of committee concerns;
 - ♦ by the Chair corresponding on behalf of the committee with organization decision makers (Deputy Minister or Board Chair) to express specific committee concerns or recommendations.

Key Deliverables: The deliverables include enhanced care of victims and to prevent family violence.

Monitored/Evaluated: There is no monitoring.

IF TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION:

RESEARCH: *Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in questions 1-3? Please describe briefly.*

There is no such research component.

INDICATORS: *What are the performance indicators in this project?*

A performance indicator is reduced family violence.

CONTACT(S):

Judy Harting
Group Head
Criminal Prosecutions
B.C. / Yukon Region, Whitehorse Office
Department of Justice Canada
200-300 Main Street
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2B5
tel: (403) 667-3991
fax: (403) 667-3979

Yukon-3

Keeping Kids Safe

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

Branches of Yukon Departments of Corrections, Family and Children's Services, Placement and Support Services, Probation Services, Family Violence Prevention Unit and Child Abuse Treatment Services. Other members are from Health and Social Development, Justice Services and Brighter Futures, all within the Council for Yukon Indians; Mental Health Services, Health Canada, and the Kwanlin Dun First Nation.

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?*

Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).

Project Timeframe: Introduced to key stakeholders through discussion meetings and presentations and publicly introduced in October 1994.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ prevention of sexual assaults against children (primary prevention);
- ♦ early identification and effective initial response to disclosures of sexual abuse (secondary prevention);
- ♦ reduction of the risk of repeat offending by known offenders (tertiary prevention); and,

- ♦ the ultimate goal of any offender service is to keep children safe from sexual offenders, both within their families and their communities.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Judy Harting
Group Head
Criminal Prosecutions
B.C. / Yukon Region, Whitehorse Office
Department of Justice Canada
200-300 Main Street
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2B5
tel: (403) 667-3991
fax: (403) 667-3979

Yukon-4

Community-Based Approach to Crime Prevention

OBJECTIVE: *Does this project have an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g., preventive, restorative, educational).*

Not indicated.

PARTNERS: *Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role?*

- ♦ Yukon Justice
- ♦ RCMP
- ♦ Council for Yukon Indians
- ♦ community groups

IN-PUT: *Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g., victims groups as advisors).*

Not indicated.

BEST PRACTICES / *Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated by this project? What lessons were learned*

LESSONS LEARNED: *(i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?*

Not indicated.

PROJECT DETAILS: *How long has the project been operating?
What are the project's stated objectives?
What are the key deliverables?
Have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?).*

Project Timeframe: Not indicated.

Stated Objectives:

- ♦ encouraging community input into developing crime prevention initiatives;
- ♦ creating more effective, better coordinated crime prevention programs;
- ♦ increasing of crime detection; and,
- ♦ decreasing the rates of crime.

Key Deliverables: Not indicated.

Monitored/Evaluated: Not indicated.

CONTACT(S):

Judy Harting
Group Head
Criminal Prosecutions
B.C. / Yukon Region, Whitehorse Office
Department of Justice Canada
200-300 Main Street
Whitehorse, Yukon
Y1A 2B5

tel: (403) 667-3991
fax: (403) 667-3979

Appendix I

Integrated Justice Call-Letter

Letter from Stephen Owen, Deputy Attorney General British Columbia,
to Deputy Ministers Responsible for Justice

dated July 4, 1996

July 4, 1996

Mr. Neil McCrank, Q.C.
Deputy Minister of Justice and
Deputy Attorney General
9833 - 109 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5K 2E8

Dear Mr. McCrank:

As a result of the discussions at the Whitehorse meeting of the Deputy Ministers Responsible for Justice, George Thomson and I met with CCSO in Ottawa on June 20th to discuss the Deputies' ideas on a more integrated justice system. We are now in a position to take the next steps.

There is a recognition of the need for a more integrated response to justice issues, although this must occur within an environment of fiscal restraint and high public expectations. It was clear from our discussions that a common approach is developing across jurisdictions. It was also clear that few of us were aware of the full range of innovative initiatives that are being developed in other jurisdictions. We need to draw on the strengths of what works and avoid the pitfalls of unsuccessful initiatives. Therefore, we agreed that an inventory of what works and what doesn't would be useful at this time.

Our intention is to address this issue in two phases: in the short term, we want to collect examples of initiatives relevant to integrated justice from all jurisdictions, and to compile summaries of these for discussion at the meeting of Deputy Attorneys General on August 25. This will form the basis of a clearinghouse of best practices, so that information can not only be shared between jurisdictions but updated on an ongoing basis. At the same time, work will begin on a longer term policy process: the development of an overall framework that speaks to the role of the justice system, and would address issues such as what needs to go to justice system and what doesn't, why some principles make sense, and what are the underlying themes that lead to successful practices.

To take the first step, we ask that you very quickly identify three or four projects that illustrate some of the values associated with integrated justice practices. From our discussion at Deputies' meetings, we have identified a number of values that tend to be associated with integrated justice:

- ◆ a focused and appropriate use of the justice system
- ◆ a coordinated community and justice system response
- ◆ more efficient access to justice services
- ◆ efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems
- ◆ solutions to ongoing justice problems
- ◆ use of innovative technologies

This list of values is simply intended to assist in identifying relevant initiatives; the values themselves will change as we learn more about this area. To further assist in identifying appropriate projects, please find attached:

- ♦ an overview of strategies for justice reform (a summary of our discussions for presentation to the June CCSO meeting);
- ♦ a one-page list of questions that may help your selection process as well as the analysis of what works and why.

The Executive Director of the Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, Andy Kohut, has kindly volunteered to assist us in compiling this information. This should not be interpreted as an indication that we are focusing only on statistics or technology initiatives, although there are certainly welcome. When you have determined the projects that best illustrate both the successes as well as important lessons learned in pursuing integrated justice initiatives in your jurisdictions, please send documentation describing the projects, along with a contact name, address and telephone number to:

Mr. Andrew Kohut
Executive Director
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics
19th Floor, R.H. Coates Building
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0T6

In order to have a brief report on these projects available for the meeting of Deputies in August, please send your response to Mr. Kohut no later than July 19, 1996.

Thank you for your cooperation on this initiative. I look forward to discussing it further with you in August.

Sincerely,

Stephen Owen
Deputy Attorney General

Attachments

Values	Objectives	Criminal	Family	Civil	Administrative	
Smaller, focused, effective justice	Prevention Community involvement	Block Watch Community policing	Pre-nuptial agreements Parent counseling	Private arbitration Court-annexed mediation	Administrative fairness (notice, hearing, reasons) Structured criteria	Yukon public consultation BC Family Justice Centres Québec juvenile diversion
Multidisciplinary partnerships	Non-court resolution	Pre-charge screening	Family support services	No fault	Managerial review \ Q.A.	Nova Scotia Director of Public Prosecutions
Justice system role in quality of life and well-being of communities	Efficient, affordable, timely courts Remedies	Crown charge approval/ discretion Integrated MIS Video remands	Support / custody guidelines Pre-filing mediation	Paperless registries On-line filing MIS	FDIPP Mediation opportunities Code of administrative procedures	New Brunswick Partnership re-engineering Newfoundland unified family court Ontario court-annexed mediation
Appropriate enduring range of response		Disclosure court Case management Standard jury instruction Victim services Alternatives to incarceration	Administrative options Unified family court Case management Family maintenance enforcement program	Settlement Conference Digital recording Full cost recovery Enforcement bearing on spot	Rationalized / consolidated tribunals Judicial review Ombudsman Ex-gratia payments	NWT sentence circles Saskatchewan restorative justice Manitoba victims' rights PEI electronic monitoring Alberta prison closures Federal criminal law reform

INTEGRATED JUSTICE

BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

Submissions are requested to illustrate both “best practices” and “lessons learned” in projects related to integrated justice within each jurisdiction. If you have had a successful program, we would like to know why it worked. If you tried something that didn't work to your original expectations, we'd like to know why it fell short.

The following is intended to assist in identifying initiatives that are relevant to the goals of integrated justice and provide information for the analysis of the initiatives.

I Identification of Integrated Justice Initiatives

Please identify projects that were designed to address values relevant to integrated justice. The following are values that emerged from discussion with Deputies and officials;

- ◆ a focused and appropriate use of the justice system
- ◆ a coordinated community and justice system response
- ◆ more efficient access to justice services
- ◆ efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems
- ◆ long term solutions to ongoing justice problems
- ◆ use of innovative technologies

II Key Information for Analysis of Submission

Attached is a 'template' of questions to be used to summarize key features of the initiatives. Please fill out one set of questions for each initiative identified. We have included these questions in disk form for your reply (the disk is in DOS format, prepared using WordPerfect 5.1). Submitting this information on disk will expedite our analysis, however if this isn't possible, please simply fill out a set of questions on paper for each initiative.

III Submissions

Submissions should include:

- ◆ answers to attached questions about the initiative (either use attached template of questions on next page or disk included)
- ◆ any relevant documentation describing the initiative
- ◆ name / address / phone / fax of the contact person for the initiative

Please send submissions **by July 19, 1996** to:

Mr. Andrew Kohut
Executive Director
Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics
19th Floor
R.H. Coats Building
Tunney's Pasture
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0T6

INTEGRATED JUSTICE:
BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

Questions

The following questions are intended to elicit information regarding the successes and failures of initiatives. Please provide answers for each submission:

1. This is an example of an initiative relevant to the following integrated justice values (check as many as appropriate and add any other values that you feel are useful):
 - ◆ a focused and appropriate use of the justice system
 - ◆ a coordinated community and justice system response
 - ◆ more efficient access to justice services
 - ◆ efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems
 - ◆ long term solutions to ongoing justice problems
 - ◆ use of innovative technologies

 - ◆ other _____
- 2.a. What issue or problem(s) prompted this initiative?
- 2b. What were the objectives of the initiative? Note any that are relevant (e.g., decreased costs for litigants; increased or decreased court use; keeping youth out of custody, developing partnerships with communities, improved coordination of justice components).
3. What is the status of the initiative (planned, implemented, completed,)? Please give specific dates. Has the initiative been assessed or evaluated? If so, how? If not, is this part of the plan?
4. Did the initiative meet the planned objectives? What were your criteria for determining success or failure?
5. What are the key features that appear to have led to the successes and/or failures of the initiative?
6. Is this a 'portable' initiative? (Could it be used successfully outside your jurisdiction or does it build on factors unique to your area?)
7. What are the budgeting implications of this initiative? What is the business case for investment in justice reform over the next 3 years?
8. Contact person for this initiative:

Name:
Address:

Phone:

Fax:

Appendix II

Multidisciplinary Justice Call-Letter

Letter from the Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group on Multidisciplinary Justice
to Justice officials in all jurisdictions

dated August 13, 1996⁸

⁸ The call-letter notes that there are two attachments: a questionnaire, and a previously prepared list of multidisciplinary justice projects. The previously prepared list is not included in this Appendix, but the questionnaire is attached.



239 Wellington Street
Justice Building
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0H8

Telephone: 941-4166
Facsimile: 957-2491

My File: 7002-3-1

August 13, 1996

re: Framework for a multi-disciplinary approach to justice issues

The FPT Ministers and Deputy Ministers, at their respective meetings, endorsed a broad framework on the development of a multi-disciplinary approach to justice issues. The “framework” recognizes that the justice system must strive to focus resources more effectively, work to integrate and link with other disciplines to find durable solutions to justice problems, and promote the role of the justice system in contributing to an improved quality of life and enhanced community wellness.

Ministers agreed that a multi-disciplinary approach to justice should be embraced and pursued. Deputy Ministers asked that promising and exemplary projects be identified to serve as models of this approach to justice, and that a compendium of “best practices” and “lessons learned” be compiled. Additionally, they asked that a discrete number of existing and emerging projects be evaluated with a view to clearly assessing their impact on the justice system and the community, and toward identifying the characteristics that contribute to the success of these projects.

On behalf of the existing FPT “Framework” Working Group, I am therefore inviting you to recommend projects within your jurisdiction that illustrate a multi-disciplinary approach. I am also asking that you indicate whether any of these projects would be good candidates for the follow-up evaluation.

I have attached a page of questions that should assist you in determining whether the projects you are considering are good examples of the multi-disciplinary approach. Please complete questions 1 through 5 for each project. If you believe that any of your submissions would be good candidates for an evaluation follow-up, please complete questions 6 and 7 for those projects only.

To assist you further, I am also attaching a list of multi-disciplinary projects that were previously identified for the FPT Ministers. Please review your jurisdiction’s submissions to determine if they are still current. You may wish to add to or change the projects which were previously identified.

Please submit your responses to the questions and any accompanying material describing the projects to me by **Friday, September 6, 1996**. My mailing address and facsimile number are noted at the top of this letter. Should you have any questions regarding this project, please telephone me at (613) 941-4166. I thank you for your co-operation.

Yours truly,

George Kiefl
Research Sub-Committee
Federal-Provincial-Territorial Working Group

Enclosures

Questionnaire

Framework for a Multi-Disciplinary Approach to Justice Issues

Multi-Disciplinary Projects \ Best Practices & Lessons Learned \ Projects for Evaluation

For each identified multi-disciplinary projects, please answer the following questions:

1. Does this project have as an objective minimizing people's contact with the traditional justice system? What approach does it use as an alternative? (e.g. preventive, restorative, educational).
2. Who are the partners in this project? (Note specific agencies, such as social service or health ministries, educational institutions, community representatives). Does the justice agency have the lead role? If not, who does?
3. Does the project involve groups within the community which are affected by the particular justice problem to be addressed? If so, what types of groups are involved and how? (e.g. victims groups as advisors).
4. Briefly, what 'best practices' are illustrated in this project? What lessons were learned (i.e., features to be avoided in future projects of this type)?
5. Project details:
 - ♦ how long has the projects been operating?
 - ♦ what are the projects stated objectives?
 - ♦ what are the key deliverables?
 - ♦ have the deliverables been monitored / evaluated? (if so, what was the result?)

For projects to be considered for follow-up evaluation, please answer the following:

6. Does this project have a research component, with measurable outcomes which relate to the criteria outlined above in question 1-3? Please briefly describe.
7. What are the performance indicators in this project?

INTEGRATED JUSTICE:
BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

Questions

The following questions are intended to elicit information regarding the successes and failures of initiatives. Please provide answers for each submission:

1. This is an example of an initiative relevant to the following integrated justice values (check as many as appropriate and add any other values that you feel are useful):
 - ◆ a focused and appropriate use of the justice system
 - ◆ a coordinated community and justice system response
 - ◆ more efficient access to justice services
 - ◆ efficient and effective solutions to specific justice problems
 - ◆ long term solutions to ongoing justice problems
 - ◆ use of innovative technologies

 - ◆ other _____
- 2.a. What issue or problem(s) prompted this initiative?
- 2b. What were the objectives of the initiative? Note any that are relevant (e.g., decreased costs for litigants; increased or decreased court use; keeping youth out of custody, developing partnerships with communities, improved coordination of justice components).
3. What is the status of the initiative (planned, implemented, completed,)? Please give specific dates. Has the initiative been assessed or evaluated? If so, how? If not, is this part of the plan?
4. Did the initiative meet the planned objectives? What were your criteria for determining success or failure?
5. What are the key features that appear to have led to the successes and/or failures of the initiative?
6. Is this a 'portable' initiative? (Could it be used successfully outside your jurisdiction or does it build on factors unique to your area?)
7. What are the budgeting implications of this initiative? What is the business case for investment in justice reform over the next 3 years?
8. Contact person for this initiative:

Name:
Address:

Phone:

Fax: