

interest in applying for the classification, Eastern Michigan University was one of the select few institutions to receive this high distinction.

As an institution receiving this Carnegie classification, EMU is recognized as a national model for community engaged campuses. Eastern Michigan University has always promoted and supported involvement in the community and this is evident in their mission, as they seek to “extend our commitment beyond our campus boundaries to the wider community through service initiatives and partnerships of mutual interest addressing local, regional, national, and international opportunities and challenges.”

Eastern Michigan University and its students reach out a helping hand to the community in so many different ways, from fundraising for Habitat for Humanity, Relay for Life, and St. Jude’s Hospital to the students’ partnerships with Ypsilanti Meals on Wheels, S.O.S. community services, and Upward Bound. Even with all their academic commitments, students at EMU still managed to provide over 38,000 volunteer hours in the community through VISION and student organizations. This is a testament to the great students and community outreach programs at Eastern Michigan University.

Madam Speaker, the Carnegie Foundation of Advancement of Teaching has bestowed its 2008 Community Engagement Classification upon Eastern Michigan University because of its remarkable work to interact with, aid and improve its surrounding community. This is a tremendous honor and it speaks to the fine character and great dedication of the university’s faculty, administration, and students. EMU truly serves as a model for community engagement between this nation’s higher education institutes and their respective communities. I ask that you and all of my colleagues join me in congratulating EMU on this remarkable accomplishment.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE
YOUTH PROMISE ACT

HON. ROBERT C. “BOBBY” SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 13, 2009

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today, along with the gentleman from Delaware, Mr. CASTLE, to introduce the “Youth Prison Reduction through Mentoring, Intervention, Support and Education Act”, or “Youth PROMISE Act,” a bill we believe will greatly reduce crime and its associated costs and losses. Companion legislation to this bill is also being filed today in the Senate by Senator CASEY of Pennsylvania, and Senator SNOWE of Maine.

The Youth PROMISE Act implements the best policy recommendations from crime policy makers, researchers, practitioners, analysts, and law enforcement officials from across the political spectrum concerning evidence- and research-based strategies to reduce gang violence and crime. Under the Youth PROMISE Act, communities facing the greatest youth gang and crime challenges will be able to enact a comprehensive response to prevention and intervention of youth violence through a coordinated response that includes the active involvement of representatives from

law enforcement, court services, schools, social services, health and mental health providers, foster care providers, Boys and Girls Clubs and other community-based service organizations, including faith-based organizations. These key players will form a council to develop a comprehensive plan for implementing evidence-based prevention and intervention strategies. These strategies will be targeted at young people who are involved, or at risk of becoming involved, in gangs or the juvenile or criminal justice system to redirect them toward productive and law-abiding alternatives. The Youth PROMISE Act will also enhance state and local law enforcement efforts regarding youth and gang violence.

Title I: Federal Coordination of Local and Tribal Juvenile Justice Information and Efforts. Sec. 101 creates a PROMISE Advisory Panel. This Panel will assist the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in selecting PROMISE community grantees. The Panel will also develop standards for the evaluation of juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention approaches carried out under the PROMISE Act. Sec. 102 provides for specific data collection in each designated geographic area to assess the needs and existing resources for juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity prevention and intervention. This data will then facilitate the strategic geographic allocation of resources provided under the Act to areas of greatest need for assistance.

Title II: PROMISE Grants. Sec. 201 establishes grants to enable local and tribal communities, via PROMISE Coordinating Councils, PCCs, Sec. 202, to conduct an objective assessment, Sec. 203, regarding juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity and resource needs and strengths in the community. Based upon the assessment, the PCCs then will develop plans that include a broad array of evidence-based prevention and intervention programs. These programs will be responsive to the needs and strengths of the community, account for the community’s cultural and linguistic needs, and utilize approaches that have been proven to be effective in reducing involvement in or continuing involvement in delinquent conduct or criminal street gang activity. The PCCs can then apply for federal funds, on the basis of greatest need, to implement their PROMISE plans, Sec. 211–213. Title II also provides for national evaluation of PROMISE programs and activities, Sec. 222, based on performance standards developed by the PROMISE Advisory Panel.

Title III: PROMISE Research Center. Sec. 301 establishes a National Research Center for Proven Juvenile Justice Practices. This Center will collect and disseminate information to PROMISE Coordinating Councils and the public on current research and other information about evidence-based and promising practices related to juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity and intervention. Sec. 302 provides for regional academic research partners to assist PCCs in developing their assessments and plans.

Title IV: Youth-Oriented Policing Services. Sec. 402 provides, within the office of Community Oriented Policing Services, for the hiring and training of Youth Oriented Policing, YOPS, officers to address juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity in coordination with PCCs and other local youth

services organizations. Sec. 403 also establishes a Center for Youth Oriented Policing, which will be responsible for identification, development and dissemination of information related to strategic policing practices and technologies to law enforcement agencies related to youth.

Title V: Enhancing Federal Support of Local Law Enforcement—Mynisha’s Law. Mynisha’s Law provides appropriate federal coordination and collaboration by requiring the placement of an interagency task force—consisting of representatives from the Departments of Justice, Labor, Education, HUD and HHS—to prevent and address gang activity in specific designated high intensity gang areas. The interagency task force would be responsible for identifying and coordinating access to federal gang prevention resources, such as after-school programs, Job Corp programs, and low income affordable housing.

Sec. 511 authorizes the COPS Office to make grants to local and tribal governments with a PROMISE Council to develop community-based programs that provide crime prevention, research, and intervention services designed for gang members and at-risk youth. Sec. 522 authorizes the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to partnerships between a state mental health authority and one or more local public or private entities to prevent or alleviate the effects of youth violence in urban communities with a high or increasing incidence of such violence by providing violence-prevention education, mentoring, counseling, and mental health services to children and adolescents. Priority is given to grant applicants that agree to use the grant in communities that lack the resources to address youth violence.

Title VI: Precaution Act. To coordinate the volumes of data and research on crime prevention and intervention, this Title creates a national commission on crime prevention and intervention strategies to identify those programs that are most ready for replication around the country, and to provide guidance in a direct and accessible format to state and local law enforcement on how to implement those strategies. The commission also would identify those promising areas of crime prevention and intervention programming that would benefit from further research and development, and would report to federal, state, and local law enforcement on the outcomes of a grant program administered by the National Institute of Justice to pilot programs in these areas and test their effectiveness. The use of this information would ensure that the criminal justice community is investing its limited resources in the most cost-effective way possible.

Title VII: Additional Improvements to Juvenile Justice. Sec. 701 provides additional improvements to current laws affecting juvenile delinquency and criminal street gang activity, including support for youth victim and witness protection programs. Sec. 702 provides for an expansion of the Mentoring Initiatives program for system-involved youth. And Sec. 703 calls for a study on adolescent development and the effectiveness of juvenile sentences in the Federal system.

During my more than 30 years of public service, I have learned that when it comes to crime policy, we have a choice—we can reduce crime or we can play politics. For far too

long, Congress has chosen to play politics by enacting so-called “tough on crime” slogans such as “three strikes and you’re out”, “mandatory minimum sentencing”, “life without parole”, “abolish parole” or “you do the adult crime, you do the adult time”. My personal favorite is “no cable TV.” You can imagine the cable guy disconnecting the cable and then waiting for the crime rate to drop. As appealing as these policies may sound, their impacts range from a negligible reduction in crime to an increase in crime.

However, over the past two decades, we continued to enact slogan-based sentencing policies. As a result, the United States now has the highest average incarceration rate of any nation in the world. At over 700 persons incarcerated for every 100,000 in the population, the U.S. far exceeds the world average incarceration rate of about 100 per 100,000. Russia is the next closest in rate of incarceration with about 600 per 100,000 citizens. Every other major incarcerator is much below that. Among countries most comparable to the U.S., Great Britain is 146 per 100,000, Australia is 126, Canada is 107, Germany is 95, France is 85, and Japan is 62. India, the world’s largest Democracy, is 36 per 100,000 and China, the world’s largest country by population, is 118 per 100,000. Since 1970, the number of individuals incarcerated in the U.S. has risen from approximately 300,000 to over 2 million.

All this increase in incarceration does not come for free. Since 1982, the cost of incarceration in this country has risen from \$9 billion annually to over \$65 billion a year.

And the U.S. has some of the world’s most severe punishments for crime, including for juveniles. Of the more than 2400 juveniles now serving sentences of life without parole, all are in the U.S. Some were given their sentence as first-time offenders under circumstances such as being a passenger in a car from which there was a drive-by shooting.

The impact of all this focus on tough law enforcement approaches falls disproportionately on minorities, particularly Blacks and Hispanics. While the average incarceration rate in the United States is 7 times the international average, for Blacks the average rate is over 2200 per 100,000, and the rate in some jurisdictions exceeds 4,000 per 100,000 Blacks, a rate 40 times the international average. For Black boys being born today, the Sentencing Project estimates that one in every three will end up incarcerated in their lifetime without an appropriate intervention. These children are on what the Children’s Defense Fund has described as a “cradle-to-prison pipeline.”

Despite all of our concentration on being tough on crime, the problem persists and reports suggest that it is growing in some jurisdictions. While nothing in the Youth PROMISE Act eliminates any of the current tough on crime laws, and while it is understood that law enforcement will still continue to enforce those laws, research and analysis, as well as common sense, tells us that no matter how tough we are on the people we prosecute today, unless we are addressing the underlying reasons for their developing into serious criminals, nothing will change. The next wave of offenders will simply replace the ones we take out and the crimes continue. So, just continuing to be “tough” will have little long term impact on crime.

There is now overwhelming evidence to show that it is entirely feasible to move chil-

dren from a cradle to prison pipeline to a cradle to college, or jobs, pipeline. All the credible research and evidence shows that a continuum of evidenced-based prevention and intervention programs for youth identified as being at risk of involvement in delinquent behavior, and those already involved, will greatly reduce crime and save much more than they cost when compared to the avoided law enforcement and social welfare expenditures. There are programs for teen pregnancy prevention, pre-natal care, new parent training, nurse home visits, Head Start, quality education, after-school programs, Summer recreation and jobs, guaranteed college scholarships, and job-training that have been scientifically proven to cost-effectively reduce crime. And the research reveals that these programs are most effective when provided in the context of a coordinated, collaborative local strategy involving law enforcement, social services and other local public and private entities working with children identified as at risk of involvement in the criminal justice system. This is what the Youth PROMISE Act provides for.

Aside from reducing crime and providing better results in the lives of our youth, many of these programs funded under the Youth PROMISE Act will save more money than they cost. The state of Pennsylvania implemented in 100 communities across the state a process very similar to the one provided for in the Youth PROMISE Act. The state found that it saved, on average, \$5 for every \$1 spent during the study period.

The bill is supported by 69 original co-sponsors. A coalition of over 200 national, state and local organizations, listed below, supported the Youth PROMISE Act last Congress, and we expect that list to continue to grow this Congress. We know how to reduce crime and we know that we can do it in a way that saves much more money than it costs. Our children, victims of crime, taxpayers and our economy can no longer afford for us to delay adoption of the Youth PROMISE Act. So, I ask my colleagues to join me in passing and this bill and seeing to it that it is quickly enacted into law.

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE YOUTH PROMISE ACT

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Alliance for Children and Families
American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)
American Correctional Association
American Council of Chief Defenders
American Federation of School Administrators, AFL-CIO
American Federation of Teachers (AFT)
American Jewish Congress
American Psychological Association
Asian American Justice Center
ASPIRA, Inc.
Bazon Center for Mental Health Law
Campaign for Youth Justice
Catholic Charities USA
Center for Children’s Law and Policy
Child Welfare League of America
Children’s Defense Fund
Citizens United for the Rehabilitation of Errants (CURE), International
Coalition for Juvenile Justice
Coalition on Human Needs
Correctional Education Association
Council for Educators of At-Risk and Delinquent Youth
Council for Opportunity in Education
Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators (CJCA)
Covenant House International Headquarters
Federal CURE

Fight Crime: Invest in Kids
Girls Inc.
Human Rights Watch
Immigrant Justice Network
Institute for Community Peace
International Community Corrections Association
Justice Policy Institute
Juvenile Justice Trainers Association
Legal Action Center
Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service
Mennonite Central Committee Washington Office
Mental Health America
Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund (MALDEF)
National Advocacy Center of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd
National African-American Drug Policy Coalition, Inc.
National Alliance to End Homelessness
National Alliance for Faith and Justice
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
National Association of Blacks in Criminal Justice
National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers
National Association of Juvenile Correctional Agencies
National Association of Secondary School Principals
National Black Caucus of Local Elected Officials (NBC-LEO)
National Black Police Association
National Center for Youth Law
National Consortium of TASC (Treatment Accountability for Safer Communities) Programs
National Council for Community Behavioral Health
National Council of La Raza
National Council on Crime and Delinquency
National Council on Educating Black Children
National Council for Urban (Gang) Peace, Justice and Empowerment
National Education Association
National Federation of Families for Children’s Mental Health
National Head Start Association
National Hire Network
National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild
National Juvenile Defender Center
National Juvenile Detention Association
National Juvenile Justice Network
National Network for Youth
National Organization of Concerned Black Men, Inc.
National Partnership for Juvenile Services
National Parent Teacher Association (PTA)
National Trust for the Development of African-American Men
National Urban League
National Women’s Law Center
Penal Reform International
Presbyterian Church (USA), Washington Office
Prison Legal News
Prisons Foundation
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center
Southern Poverty Law Center
The Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Public Policy Section
The Rebecca Project for Human Rights
The School Social Work Association of America
The Sentencing Project
Therapeutic Communities of America (TCA)
Time Dollar Youth Court
TimeBanks USA
Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations

United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries
 United Methodist Church, General Board of Church and Society
 United Neighborhood Centers of America
 VOICES for America's Children
 W. Haywood Burns Institute
 Washington Office on Latin America
 World Vision
 Youth Law Center
 Youth Matter America

STATE ORGANIZATIONS

ACLU of Illinois (IL)
 ACLU of North Carolina (NC)
 ACLU of Ohio (OH)
 Action for Children North Carolina (NC)
 Advocates for Children and Youth (MD)
 Alabama Youth Justice Coalition
 Alston Wilkes Society (SC)
 Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Office of Restorative Justice (CA)
 Asian Law Caucus (CA)
 ATTC Correctional Services, Inc. (WI)
 Barrios Unidos—Santa Cruz Chapter (CA)
 Barrios Unidos—Virginia Chapter (VA)
 CASA of Maryland, Inc. (MD)
 Center for Community Alternatives (NY)
 Central American Legal Assistance (NY)
 Chicago Area Project (IL)
 Children's Action Alliance (AZ)
 Children's Campaign, Inc. (FL)
 Citizens for Juvenile Justice (MA)
 Columbia Heights Shaw Family Collaborative (DC)
 Connecticut Juvenile Justice Alliance (CT)
 Contra Costa County Public Defender's Office (CA)
 Correctional Association of New York (NY)
 Council for Children's Rights (NC)
 DC Alliance of Youth Advocates (DC)
 DC NAACP Youth Council (DC)
 Delaware Center for Justice (DE)
 Equal Justice Initiative (AL)
 Facilitating Leadership in Youth (FLY) (DC)
 Faith Communities for Families and Children (CA)
 Families & Allies of Virginia's Youth (VA)
 Families & Friends of La.'s Incarcerated Children (LA)
 Families Moving Forward (CT)
 Florida Public Defender Association, Inc. (FL)
 Florida Public Defender, Fourth Judicial Circuit (FL)
 Florida Families for Fair Sentences (FL)
 Franklin County Public Defender (OH)
 Fusion Partnerships, Inc. (MD)
 Hispanic Urban Minority Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Outreach Program (OH)
 Homies Unidos (CA)
 H.O.P.E., Inc (KS)
 Identity, Inc. (MD)
 John Howard Association of Illinois (IL)
 JustChildren (VA)
 Justice for DC Youth (DC)
 Juvenile Justice Center of Suffolk University Law School (NY)
 Juvenile Justice Coalition (OH)
 Juvenile Justice Initiative of Illinois (IL)
 Juvenile Justice Project of Louisiana (LA)
 Kansas CURE (KS)
 L.A. Youth Justice Coalition (CA)
 Latin American Youth Center (DC)
 Leaders in Community Alternatives, Inc. (CA)
 Life Pieces to Masterpieces, Inc. (DC)
 Law Office of Anthony J. Keber (MA)
 Maryland Juvenile Justice Coalition (MD)
 Maryland Office of the Public Defender (MD)
 Mental Health Association in Pennsylvania (PA)
 Michigan Council on Crime and Delinquency (MI)
 Mid-Atlantic Juvenile Defender Center, Juvenile Law and Policy Clinic, University of Richmond School of Law (VA)

Midwest Juvenile Defender Center (IL)
 Minnesota Juvenile Justice Coalition (MN)
 Mississippi CURE (MS)
 Mississippi Youth Justice Project (MS)
 New Hampshire Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NH)
 New Jersey Association on Correction (NJ)
 New Mexico Council on Crime and Delinquency (NM)
 New Mexico Criminal Defense Lawyers Association (NM)
 Pacific Juvenile Defender Center (CA)
 Parents Who Care Coalition (SD)
 Parents, Youth, Children and Family Training Institute (AL)
 Partnership for Safety and Justice (OR)
 Puerto Rico Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (PR)
 Public Justice Center (MD)
 PTA of Illinois (IL)
 Southern Juvenile Defender Center (AL)
 Texas Criminal Justice Coalition (TX)
 The Fortune Society (NY)
 The Law Offices of Public Defender Bennett H. Brummer (Miami-Dade Public Defender's Office) (FL)
 The Pendulum Foundation (CO)
 The Poor People's Alliance, Connecticut Chapter (CT)
 The S.T.O.P. Family Investment Center at Oakmont North (VA)
 Southern Poverty Law Center (AL)
 Tennessee Commission on Children and Youth (TN)
 UNC Juvenile Justice Clinic, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill School of Law (NC)
 United Church of Christ, Justice and Witness Ministries (OH)
 Virginia Coalition for Juvenile Justice (VA)
 Virginia Commonwealth University School of Education (VA)
 Virginia Commonwealth University Center for School-Community Collaboration (VA)
 Virginia C.U.R.E. (VA)
 VOICES for Alabama's Children (AL)
 VOICES for Children in Nebraska (NE)
 VOICES for Ohio's Children (OH)
 Washington Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (WA)
 Washington Defender Association (WA)
 Washington Defender Association's Immigration Project (WA)
 Youth Advocate Programs, Inc. (PA)
 Youth Advocacy Project of the Committee for Public Counsel Services (MA)
 Young America Works Public Charter School (DC)

ELECTED OFFICIALS AND ACADEMICS

Donna M. Bishop, Northeastern University (MA)
 Susan J. Carstens, Psy.D., L.P. Juvenile Specialist, Crystal Police Dept. (MN)
 The Honorable Toni Harp, Connecticut State Senator
 The Honorable Alice L. Bordsen, North Carolina State Representatives
 Jolanta Juskiewicz, Ph.D., American University (D.C.)
 The Honorable Kelvin Roldán, Connecticut State Representative
 Tony Roshan Samara, George Mason University (VA)
 Earle Williams, Psy.D. Hampton University (VA)
 Aaron Kupchik, Ph.D., University of Delaware

HONORING THE LIFE AND MEMORY OF CHIRICAHUA APACHE LEADER GOYATHLAY, ALSO KNOWN AS GERONIMO, ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS DEATH

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 13, 2009

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, as the Republican Co-Chair of the Native American Caucus and as the only enrolled tribal member in Congress, I rise today in recognition of the 100th Anniversary of the passing of a Native American hero, Goyathlay, more commonly known as Geronimo.

Born into one of the most dangerous eras in Native American history in 1829, this Apache leader devoted his life to leading his people both spiritually and militarily. Though outnumbered and less armed, Goyathlay valiantly and successfully fought both Mexican and American troops in order to maintain the independence of his own people for decades. Even when his own wife and children were killed by attacking soldiers, his resolve never ended to keep his people free and safe.

In 1886, when the United States government launched an expedition to capture Goyathlay, he never rested. Constantly moving, and exhausted, he demonstrated true leadership and resolve by and preventing his band of Apaches from resigning their sovereignty to the United States government. When Goyathlay and his band were finally captured, they were moved as prisoners of war to several different bases in Florida, Alabama and Oklahoma. Finally, Goyathlay was transferred to Ft. Sill in Lawton, Oklahoma where he is buried today.

On this 100th Anniversary of his death, it is my sincerest hope, that his descendants might find healing and peace as they heal from the tragedies suffered by their ancestors. Today, Goyathlay can serve as an example for all of Indian Country. Though the United States policy toward Indian Country has drastically improved since the time of Goyathlay, the fight for tribal sovereignty is far from over. His strong dedication to this principle as well as his determined leadership is truly inspirational for all those fighting for Native Americans today.

Again, Madam Speaker, I am proud to speak today to honor one of the greatest Native American heroes in history. As the San Carlos Apache Tribe and others throughout Indian Country gather to honor the life of this great leader, I wish them all the best and hope that this anniversary is a marker of healing for the Apaches and all Native peoples.

202ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE WESTERN STAR

HON. JEAN SCHMIDT

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, February 13, 2009

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the oldest weekly newspaper in Ohio. The Western Star, published in Lebanon, Ohio is celebrating its 202nd anniversary today. This newspaper also holds the