



Senator Charles E. Shannon, Jr. Community Safety Initiative
2006 Grant Program

Resource Guide: A Systematic Approach to Improving Community Safety

**Executive Office of Public Safety
Research and Policy Analysis Unit
February 27, 2006**

Authored by:

**Asheley Van Ness
Robert Fallon
Sarah Lawrence**

Table of Contents

Introduction 3

Section I: Defining the Problem..... 4

Section II: Comprehensive Gang Model 6

 Resources Available 6

 Table 1: Overview of OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model 7

Section III: Partnerships 8

 Table 2: OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, Selected Partner Activities 9

 OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, Selected Partner Activities for Applicant Matrix 15

 Resources Available 16

Section IV: Lessons Learned from the Research: Evidence Based and Less Effective Approaches 17

Sources 33

Introduction

The goal of this Resource Guide is to help applicants develop the best possible proposals for the Senator Charles E. Shannon, Jr. Community Safety Initiative competitive grant program. This initiative is a new \$11 million grant program created to “support regional and multi-disciplinary approaches to combat gang violence through coordinated programs for prevention and intervention.” These multi-disciplinary prevention and intervention approaches may include, but are not limited to, law enforcement approaches such as anti-gang task forces and targeting of enforcement resources through the use of crime mapping; focused prosecution efforts; and programs aimed at successful reintegration of released prisoners.

This Resource Guide seeks to encourage solid decision-making and planning processes, foster the development of innovative partnerships while strengthening existing ones, and identify effective approaches to addressing youth violence, specifically gang violence. The purpose of this Resource Guide is not to present an absolute review of the research or to provide a specific prescriptive approach to developing a proposal. Rather, the intent is to give guidance on frameworks and processes that will help improve the likelihood of success for a proposed approach, as well as introduce applicants to some programs that have already been implemented and evaluated.

To help applicants, the contents of this document are presented in a logical, step-wise progression of activities. Section I outlines the importance of identifying a target problem. Section II presents a programmatic framework which will be used as a part of the evaluation of the grant proposals – the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) Comprehensive Gang Model. Section III describes the importance of a successful partnership and outlines some of the key partners needed to develop a successful strategy to curb violence. Section IV presents selected evidence based approaches to reduce youth violence as well as lessons learned from several programs shown to be less effective by research and evaluation.

Section I: Defining the Problem

Developing a specific and narrowly-defined problem is one of the most critical steps in achieving measurable success. In order to design strategies that focus on local problems, it is important to thoroughly understand the youth violence issues facing communities. Several steps can help with the process of defining a problem including relying on data, focusing on specifics, and building consensus.

Using data

Quantitative data can help to better understand the nature and location of a youth violence problem, specifically gang violence. Project partners should draw from several data sources to help them learn about the nature of youth violence which can then help with the development of targeted strategies. Potential data sources include crime data by type of offense or location of crime, data on substance abuse, and data on returning prisoners.

Other, more qualitative, data sources can also help with understanding the problem in more detail. This could include interviews or focus groups with youth in the community, community leaders, outreach workers or law enforcement officers. Any crime prevention or crime fighting strategy should be based, in part, on the opinions of local stakeholders. The quantitative data analyses may support their opinions. However, data may indicate that the nature of the problem does not exactly align with the perceptions of the stakeholders. Project partners should be open to refining the problem based both on hard numbers and input from local stakeholders.

Research partners can be valuable contributors in the problem definition process. They can compile and analyze data and present it in ways that helps to better understand the nature of youth violence, and they can facilitate meetings where project partners work together to refine the problem and build consensus.

Focusing on specifics

Defining problems that are narrow in scope is one way to increase the likelihood of an intervention being successful. The problem of “youth violence” is large and complex. Crime problems are often caused by several underlying factors, involve several groups, and affect several locations. Youth violence can take many different forms in different places. In one community it may be retaliatory homicides among known gang-members. In another it may be burglary related to drug dealing or violent crimes related to turf disputes. Identifying specific areas of focus early in the development process will help to get all of the project partners on the same page and will help decide the types of interventions to implement.

Building consensus

Past experience has shown that when a single agency or organization takes on the task of defining the problem, programs are seldom effective at reducing youth violence, specifically gang violence. Instead, when input is provided from many perspectives, the outcomes are usually more successful. Successful collaboration requires buy-in from all of the project partners. Building consensus around the targeted problem will help when it comes to developing and implementing effective interventions. Examples from other parts of the country have shown that limited input on problem definition (e.g., input from law enforcement only) resulted in difficulty when it came time to design strategies or begin implementation.

Questions to consider when defining the problem:

- Have a group of people been identified to work on the problem definition?
- Does this group represent a variety of perspectives?
- Is there a research partner who can help with data analysis, meeting facilitation, and building consensus?
- Have several data sources been identified to assist with the process?
- Are project partners willing to share data?
- Do the data suggest that a particular type of crime is the most common or on the rise?
- Do the data suggest that the problem is concentrated in certain areas?
- Do the data suggest that certain individuals are involved?
- Are the data reliable and collected in a consistent manner?
- Is there consensus among project partners on the specific problems that will be addressed?
- Would the community stakeholders be satisfied if the problem was addressed?
- Do the project plans allow for refinement or reexamination of the problem as the project progresses?

Resources Available

Below is an additional resource that is available on-line for applicants interested in further reading on defining the problem.

- Dalton, Erin. 2003. "Lessons Learned in Preventing Homicide." East Lansing, M.I.: Michigan State University, School of Criminal Justice.
http://www.cj.msu.edu/~outreach/psn/erins_report_jan_2004.pdf

Section II: Comprehensive Gang Model

National research studies have shown that there is no “one size fits all” solution to gang problems and that successful approaches incorporate comprehensive, multi-disciplinary tactics. Recognizing the importance of multi-disciplinary approaches, the enabling legislation for the Charles E. Shannon, Jr. Community Safety Initiative encourages this collaborative approach. The Executive Office of Public Safety will give funding priority to those grant applications that demonstrate a collaborative, multi-disciplinary approach. This section is designed to help applicants understand the framework of a comprehensive model and how they can use this framework to strengthen current practices and formulate innovative methods to tackle youth violence, specifically gang violence in their community.

In response to youth and gang violence problems in the 1990s, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) sought to pull together what could be learned from various approaches across the country. Researchers from the University of Chicago conducted a survey of law enforcement and social service personnel in 65 cities across the nation (Decker 2001; OJJDP 2002a). The researchers categorized efforts to combat gang violence into five broad categories. The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) developed a multi-dimensional model to curb gang violence based upon these five strategies, called the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model. The OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model includes:

- Community mobilization;
- Provision of opportunities;
- Social intervention;
- Suppression; and
- Organizational change and development.

In assessing the degree to which grantees are embracing a collaborative and multi-disciplinary approach, the Executive Office of Public Safety will use the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model as a framework. Grant applications should reference each of the five strategies when outlining their proposed program. Not all strategies are required, however, grantees should describe how they have considered each strategy in the development of their proposal.

Table 1 describes each of the five strategies to help applicants understand why each approach is important and how they can incorporate these strategies into their proposal. For example, Table 1 defines community mobilization as the involvement of community members, including former gang members, and the coordination of agencies, programs, and services. Table 1 also illustrates why this strategy is important for applicants to think about, as buy-in of key stakeholders can remove barriers to project success. Table 1 further shows applicants that community mobilization can be incorporated into their proposal through a formal advisory structure, such as a steering committee. Finally, an example of an effective approach is provided and further details on this example and others are discussed in Section IV.

Resources Available

Below are additional resources that are available on-line for applicants interested in further readings on the OJJDP Comprehensive Model.

OJJDP provides two guides to assist communities in planning for implementation and assessing community gang problems:

- A Guide to Assessing Your Community’s Youth Gang Problem
<http://www.iir.com/nygc/acgp/assessment/assessment.pdf>
- Planning for Implementation
<http://www.iir.com/nygc/acgp/implementation/implementation.pdf>

For a more thorough explanation of the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model see chapters 11 to 17 from

- Spergel, Irving A. 1995. *The Youth Gang Problem: A Community Approach*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Table 1: Overview of OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model

Strategy	What does this strategy mean?	Why is this strategy important?	How can this strategy be incorporated into our proposal?	What are effective approaches?
Community Mobilization	Involve community members, including former gang members, and the coordination of agencies, programs, and services	Introducing key stakeholders can remove barriers to project success, and leadership can be a catalyst for success	Implement a formal advisory structure (e.g., a steering committee) that involves multiple stakeholders (including, but not limited to community-based organizations, substance abuse agencies, criminal justice agencies and schools) to guide the project	Philadelphia Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP)
Provision of Opportunities	Develop education, training, and job opportunities	Providing access to educational, training, and job opportunities creates hope and alternative opportunities for gang members and youth at risk for gang membership	Leverage education, vocational, faith-based, and private sector stakeholders to include gang interventions (e.g., jobs, job training, and educational opportunities)	Broader Urban Involvement and Leadership Development Detention Program (BUILD)
Social Intervention	Provide crisis intervention, treatment for youth and their families, and referrals to social services	Reaching out to gang involved youth and youth at risk for gang membership will provide youth with needed capabilities and skills, and may prevent or lessen gang involvement	Employ community-based or in school and after-school prevention and education programs (e.g., mentoring, anti-bullying, tutoring, counseling, and other outreach programs). Also can include outreach workers meeting with youth gang members while in detention centers to plan for services upon release	Boys and Girls Club of America (BGCA): Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach (GPTTO)
Suppression	Target gang involved youth through criminal justice interventions	Targeting of gang involved youth by agencies of the criminal justice system, as well as community-based agencies and schools, assists in reducing gang activities	Target tactical operations (e.g., gang units) at specific locations or individuals, but incorporate an expanded role of criminal justice agencies to include informal contacts with target youth, their families, and other members in the community	Baton Rouge Partnership for the Prevention of Juvenile Gun Violence
Organizational Change and Development	Establish agreement among stakeholders about the gang problem	Developing and implementing policies and procedures within and across stakeholders to address the gang problem will result in the most effective use of available and potential resources	Strive to adapt the policies and procedures of involved organizations to conform to the goals and objectives of the overall project (e.g., police take some responsibility for social services delivery and youth outreach workers take some responsibility for suppression)	Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Team (TARGET)

Section III: Partnerships

Effective partnerships are vital to addressing gang violence in a community. The Charles E. Shannon, Jr. Community Safety Initiative grant program requires a multi-disciplinary approach and successful approaches are built on a foundation of solid partnerships.

When forging new relationships, it takes time to build and establish group norms. In many cases, enhancing or improving existing partnerships and relationships is a more effective approach. Below is a sample of potential partners that applicants should consider including in the development process. This list is not exhaustive and applicants are encouraged to include partners that are most appropriate to their specific situation.

- ü Community-based organizations
- ü Community youth-based organizations
- ü Employment and training services (public and private)
- ü Schools
- ü Police
- ü Prosecution
- ü Judiciary
- ü Corrections
- ü Parole/ After-care
- ü Probation

Table 2 presents an array of activities to which each member of a partnership could contribute. This table is meant to help applicants think about the various roles that each potential partner could play in reducing youth violence, specifically gang violence. Applicants should use this sample of activities as a guide to demonstrate how they plan to coordinate and collaborate with a variety of partners and resources to combat youth violence, specifically gang violence. Specifically, applicants are required to submit a matrix of project partners and the roles and responsibilities of each in their proposal. Using the format provided in the Resource Guide (See page 15), applicants should complete the matrix of project partners, identifying the planned roles and responsibilities of each for achieving project success.

Questions to ask each member of the partnership:

- Can they bring a fresh perspective or new point of view?
- Do they have a valuable relationship to the youth gang population?
- Do they have an understanding of gang activity or youth violence in the community?
- What existing (Local, State, and Federal) resources can they bring or add to the partnership?
- Can the role be documented in a Memorandum of Understanding or letter of support?

Table 2: OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, Selected Partner Activities

Example Key Partner	Community Mobilization	Opportunities Provision	Social Intervention	Suppression	Organizational Change and Development
Community-based organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsor local interagency and community gang task forces • Advocate for improved agency services • Support parent patrols especially in the school areas • Social action for greater official attention to, control of, and better use of resources directed to gang problems • Organization of block clubs and parent support groups, both to prevent and intervene in the problem 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsoring special training, educational, and job development programs for gang youth • Stimulating local business development focused on job opportunities for gang youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counseling, tutoring, referral of youth for services • Parent education (re: gang problem) • Sponsor youth activities • Crisis intervention and mediation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with police, probation, and other justice agencies • Organizing parent patrol • Advocate of improved law enforcement supervision of youth activities in the neighborhood • Supporting more victim involvement at court in prosecution of gang cases 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach programs to youth, including gang youth • Use of specialist gang workers in conjunction with social agency outreach workers • Use of court watchers for gang cases
Community youth-based organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsor of neighborhood gang prevention and control programs • Member of interagency task forces • Advocate for additional services and resources on behalf of gang youth • Organizer of parent patrols in collaboration with schools and police 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutoring and remedial education • Job training, job development and placement • Provision of small business opportunities • Close collaboration with schools • Re-involvement of gang youth and their families in the education process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach efforts to gang youth on streets • Extensive mentoring • Limited use of supervised recreation and group work activities • Focus on individual, group, family counseling • Parent education (re: gangs) • Referral for service • Job support • Crisis intervention, mediation • Home visits • Victim assistance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setting clear, fair rules and implementing them • Monitoring and supervising youth in agency and community hot-spots • Appropriate collaboration with police, probation, parole, and other justice system officers • Contracting with justice system to provide services for adjudicated youth under prescribed conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case management outreach • Decentralized centers • Use of paraprofessional and professional teams of workers • Joint case management with police and probation

This table was taken from: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 2002b. *OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model: Planning for Implementation*. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Adapted from: Spergel, Irving A. 1995. *The Youth Gang Problem: A Community Approach*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Table 2 (cont'd): OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, Selected Partner Activities

Example Key Partner	Community Mobilization	Opportunities Provision	Social Intervention	Suppression	Organizational Change and Development
Employment and training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with various agencies (re: recruitment of gang youth and development of support services) • Staff participation as member of interagency and community task forces on job training and development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intake screening and assessment • Tutoring • Work acclimation training • Job placement and follow-up • Academic and job skills training and/or referral 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Career counseling • Peer workers support arrangements • Collaboration with mentors • Referral for services • Social support for parents and family • Crisis management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liaison with probation and parole • Awareness of gang culture and potential problems • Clear rules (re: proscribed behavior) in training and on job 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated school/job training • Multifunctional staffing • Use of neighborhood mentors • Monetary incentives for youth to participate in education, training, and special job preparation programs
Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School-community advisory groups • Participation in anti-gang community task forces • Development of policies and procedures for sharing certain kinds of student information with other agencies • Development and use of parent patrols and volunteers to assist with gang intervention, control, and prevention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remedial and enriched educational programs for gang youth with academic problems • Vocational and apprentice training • Joint school-work experiences and related tutorial and mentoring • Field visits to business/industrial settings 	<p><i>For students:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anti-gang as part of social/educational development programs • Conflict resolution instruction • Peer group counseling (re: gang problems) • Crisis intervention • Provision of school-based social and health services • After-school recreation programs <p><i>For parents:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach • Referral for services • Parent education regarding gangs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-school monitoring • Use of metal detectors • Uniform discipline code (including gang offenses) • Communication and application of fair rules re: gang symbols, dress, activities • Use of in-school suspension • No tolerance of gang behavior (but inclusion of gang youth) in school • "Outreach" parent contacts • Street patrols • Collaboration with criminal justice agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gang security units • Outreach school-social service • Community agency teams focused on gang problems • Special system-wide curricula • Social and academic development coordinating structures • Incentives to teachers to "work with" gang youth and those at high-risk • Use of alternative schools to mainstream gang youth back to regular school • Training and jobs

Table 2 (cont'd): OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, Selected Partner Activities

Example Key Partner	Community Mobilization	Opportunities Provision	Social Intervention	Suppression	Organizational Change and Development
Police	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in interagency community task force • Collaboration with grass-roots patrols, community agencies, and businesses, as well as school and job development programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct placement and referral of youth for jobs, training, education, job development • Supervision of youth in special training and job projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentoring of at-risk and gang-involved youth • Brief counseling • Referral for social services • Gang conflict mediation • Case conferences around specific youth • Conduct anti-gang programs at school and community (e.g., GREAT) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigation • Intelligence, analysis and appropriate information sharing • Gang problem surveillance with other police units • Enforcement • Education of criminal justice, community-based agencies and grass-roots groups as to the scope and seriousness of problem • Close collaboration with prosecution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of specialist gang officers and gang units, law enforcement task forces • Development of computerized information systems, and improved crime analysis procedures; e.g., definitions of crime incidents, gangs, gang members • Internal agency coordination of policies and procedures • Increasing emphasis on community involvement around gang problem solving
Prosecution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordination with other criminal justice and community organizations • Leading and assisting in the formation of task forces • Communication with media re: nature of problem and potential social solutions that are community based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with business groups and chambers of commerce in job development for gang youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of community service resource manuals for gang offenders and parents • Focus on sentences directed to rehabilitation and use of community-based treatments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigation • Case selection • Knowledge of gang-applicable law and development of recommendations for new gang laws • Collaboration with police, development of case strategies (re: bail, detention, waivers, use of witnesses, witness protection, disposition recommendations) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special unit vertical prosecution • Development of policy and procedure re: gang processing • Collaborative information sharing across law enforcement agencies and jurisdictions

Table 2 (cont'd): OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, Selected Partner Activities

Example Key Partner	Community Mobilization	Opportunities Provision	Social Intervention	Suppression	Organizational Change and Development
Judiciary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of community leadership on gang problems and focus on need for more resources • Sitting on community boards in advisory capacity • Avoiding conflict of interests situations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommendation of special programs • Pressures on schools, agencies • Advising businesses to provide appropriate education and training opportunities for gang youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Court orders to facilitate rehabilitations (e.g., diagnostic testing, psychiatric treatment, compulsory school attendance) • Recommendations of family services to gang youth and parents • Pretrial services for chronic offenders • Emphasis on community-based corrections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that gang member obtains a fair hearing • Protection of community and youth from violent gang activities • Pretrial supervision for chronic offenders • Appropriate sentencing, especially to community-based institutions • Limited use of waivers of juveniles to adult court 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular supervisory meetings with probation officers • Meetings with groups of probationers • Access to computerized information on gang youth history and social adjustment

Table 2 (cont'd): OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, Selected Partner Activities

Example Key Partner	Community Mobilization	Opportunities Provision	Social Intervention	Suppression	Organizational Change and Development
Corrections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community groups involved in institutional living programs • Participation by staff in interagency and community task forces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remedial and advanced educational programs, training, and job opportunities within institution and outside facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Values change programs • Conflict resolution instruction • Drug/alcohol programs • Personal group counseling • Use of volunteer mentors • Referral for services, including psychological, medical, and dental 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification and close supervision of gang youth • Application of clear policy (re: participation in gang activity in institutions) • Dispersion of gang members throughout institution, if feasible • Collaboration with police, prosecution, parole (re: information sharing and joint approaches) • Transfer of selected hard-core gang youth to other institutions, as appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special staffing/team arrangements institutions with serious gang problems • Development of information systems on gang members/incidents • Risk/needs assessments
Parole/After-care	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaboration with various agencies (re: recruitment of gang youth and development of support services) • Staff participation as member of interagency and community task forces on job training and development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of training and remedial education opportunities • Direct job referrals • Job development • Close collaboration with schools and employers to sustain youth in programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual/group counseling • Referral for social, medical, psychological services • Development of parent support groups • Developing housing arrangements • Family counseling • Crisis intervention • Teaching conflict resolution skills • Close case collaboration with institution prior to youth release 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close supervision of gang youth • Enforcement of parole orders • Appropriate use of detention and revocation of parole • Collaboration with probation, police, and other justice system officials • Home, social agencies, and neighborhood visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing risk/needs assessments • Use of case managers, trainers, specialized gang parole officers • Use of halfway homes, special residence facilities, sometimes out of area

Table 2 (cont'd): OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, Selected Partner Activities

Example Key Partner	Community Mobilization	Opportunities Provision	Social Intervention	Suppression	Organizational Change and Development
Probation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stimulation of community groups, including parents and former gang members, to form community anti-gang patrols • Sponsorship and coordination of community agency and grass-roots collaborative programs, including job development • Participation in interagency community task forces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision to youth of court-sponsored vocational assessment, training, and job opportunities • Special remedial academic programs • Placement and referrals for jobs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counseling, referral for individual, family, mental health, medical and dental services • Teaching of conflict resolution skills, mediation, and crisis intervention • Organization of parent support groups of probationers • Parent education as to gang problem • Development of special programs for younger and older offenders, in collaboration with schools and youth agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of range of intermediate and flexible control procedures • Close supervision of gang youth • Enforcing court orders • Appropriate use of detention and home confinement • Collaboration with police (joint patrols), parole, and prosecution • Home and neighborhood visits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of risk/needs assessments • Development of computer information systems (re: gangs and gang members, and available community resources) • Intensive supervision • Vertical case management • Outreach to employers, schools, youth agencies, neighborhood groups re: control of, and collaborative services to, gang youth

Please complete this matrix and include it with your proposal, as directed on page 5 of the Program Overview and Applicant Instructions. A writeable template will also be provided on the EOPS website.

Selected Partner Activities for Applicant					
Applicant Name: _____					
Key Partner	Suppression	Social Intervention	Opportunities Provision	Organizational Change and Development	Community Mobilization
Example: Police Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overtime for beat officers for directed patrols • Intelligence-gathering by gang unit • "Hot spot analyses" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mediation of gang conflict • Accompanying street workers on outreach in gang neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referrals to job services or employment for youth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing of intelligence with street workers and probation/parole • Greater emphasis on community outreach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation on steering committee • Direct or participate in neighborhood watch

Resources Available

Below is an additional resource that is available on-line for applicants interested in further reading on establishing or maintaining effective partnerships.

- The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) prepared a toolkit on establishing and maintaining partnerships. The toolkit provides information on selecting partners and anticipating potential problems. <http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org/resources/files/toolkit1final.pdf>

Section IV: Lessons Learned from the Research: Evidence Based and Less Effective Approaches

Programs highlighted in this section represent significant findings from the research literature on anti-crime programs. Selected evidence based approaches provide solid examples of organizations and agencies that have incorporated comprehensive gang strategies for addressing the gang problem in their community. Lessons learned from less effective approaches are also included to illustrate the importance of defining the target problem, implementing a multi-dimensional approach, and strengthening partnerships in the community.

Grant applicants are encouraged to review the Key Program Elements of the evidence based programs when developing their own proposals.

Evidence Based Approaches

- Philadelphia Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP)
- Building Resources for the Intervention and Deterrence of Gang Engagement (BRIDGE)
- Operation Ceasefire (Boston)
- Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Team (TARGET)
- Chicago Ceasefire
- Baton Rouge Partnership for Prevention of Juvenile Gun Violence
- Boys and Girls Club of America (BGCA): Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach (GPTTO)
- Winston-Salem Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI)
- Gang Resistance is Paramount (GRIP)
- Broader Urban Involvement and Leadership Development Detention Program (BUILD)
- Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT)

Less Effective Approaches

- San Antonio Gang Rehabilitation, Assessment, and Services Program (GRAASP)
- Bloomington-Normal Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression
- Adolescent Female Gang Prevention and Intervention Project
- Seattle Gun Buy-Back Program

Philadelphia Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP)

City/State: Philadelphia, PA

Date Started: 1999

Lead Agency: Public/Private Ventures

- ✓ Community mobilization
- ✓ Suppression
- ✓ Social intervention
- ✓ Opportunities provision
- ✓ Organizational change and development

Program Goals:

- Reduce Philadelphia's homicide rate
- Help youthful offenders pursue a path to a productive adulthood

Program Description:

YVRP is a truly collaborative program; no single source of funding exists. Partners take on additional, new roles and coordinate with partner agencies to manage violent, youthful offenders in the community.

Key Program Elements:

- A steering committee, made up of leadership from key project partners, sets the project's direction and resolves issues between partners
- A management committee meets monthly to review data and manage progress
- An operations committee meets weekly to manage outreach and field operations
- Probation officers, street workers, and police share the responsibility of offender supervision, leading to increased contact (at least 24 contacts per month) with target youth
- Targeted field patrols are made by police and probation officers at "hot spots," such as notorious street corners or parks
- Street workers build mentoring relationships with probationers and refer probationers and their families to job training, employment, drug/alcohol treatment, organized recreation, community service, and counseling
- Street workers and probation officers collaborate to refer youth and their families to employment, health care, and housing

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Philadelphia Juvenile Probation
- Philadelphia Adult Probation
- Philadelphia Anti-Drug, Anti-Violence Network
- Philadelphia Police Department
- Public/Private Ventures
- University of Pennsylvania
- Philadelphia Housing Authority
- Philadelphia Coordinating Office of Drug and Alcohol Abuse Programs
- Philadelphia School District
- Philadelphia Youth Homicide Review Team
- Philadelphia Department of Human Services
- Philadelphia District Attorney's Office

Outcomes:

- Youth homicides in YVRP target sites decreased between 1999 and 2004, from 4.0 to 2.7 per quarter in the 24th District and 15.0 to 8.5 per quarter in the 25th District
- 75% of YVRP youth were involved in positive social activities for three months or more

Further Reading:

- Public/Private Ventures, Youth Violence Reduction Partnership website, http://www.ppv.org/ppv/youth/youth_major_projects.asp?section_id=9&initiative_id=17.
- McLanahan, Wendy S. 2004. "Alive at 25: Reducing Youth Violence Through Monitoring and Support." Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Building Resources for the Intervention and Deterrence of Gang Engagement (BRIDGE)

City/State: Riverside, CA

Date Started: 1995

Lead Agency: Riverside Police Department

- ✓ Community mobilization
- ✓ Suppression
- ✓ Social intervention
- ✓ Opportunities provision
- ✓ Organizational change and development

Program Goals:

- Improve community capacity to address youth gang crime
- Reduce gang violence and other violent crime

Program Description:

The BRIDGE program coordinates a multi-dimensional and multi-agency response along five core strategies: community mobilization, opportunities provision, social intervention, suppression, and organizational change and development. The program targets gang-involved juvenile probationers, with a focus on intervention and close supervision of individuals.

Key Program Elements:

- Police and probation officers work together to implement intensive supervision, targeted police suppression, home visits, and confinement when necessary
- Outreach workers and social service agencies make daily contact with involved youth
- Social interventions by outreach workers and social service agencies included crisis counseling, drug/alcohol counseling, and school-based outreach
- Outreach workers operate closely with police and probationers to coordinate case management
- Social opportunities are provided, including employment, 40-hour a week job training (covering resume writing, leadership skills, proper attitudes, etc.) with a paid stipend, educational assistance, and referrals to anger management and cultural diversity classes

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Riverside Police Department
- Riverside County Probation
- Riverside Youth Service Center
- City of Riverside Human Resources Department
- Riverside County and Alford Unified School Districts
- University of California at Riverside
- Riverside County Juvenile Court
- Riverside County District Attorney's Office

Outcomes:

- Youth involved in the BRIDGE program were three times more likely to have fewer number of serious and violent arrests compared to non-participants
- Violence arrests for youth 18 and older were decreased by 83% and violence arrests for 17 and younger were decreased by 73%

Further Reading:

- Riverside BRIDGE website. <http://www.riversideca.gov/PDF/PB-June-2002.pdf>.
- Spergel, Irving A., Kwai Ming Wa, Rolando Villarreal Sosa, Jaesok Son, Elisa Barrios, and Annot M. Spergel. 2003. "Evaluation of the Riverside Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression." Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Operation Ceasefire

City/State: Boston, MA

Date Started: 1996

Lead Agency: Boston Police Department

- ✓ Community mobilization
- ✓ Suppression
- ✓ Social intervention
- ✓ Opportunities provision

Program Goals:

- Reduce illegal gun possession and gun violence
- Direct law enforcement actions to suppress illicit firearms traffickers
- Generate a strong deterrent to gang violence

Project Description:

Operation Ceasefire is a multi-dimensional, problem-oriented response to youth violence. Suppression is pursued through the “pulling levers” strategy. Under this strategy, street workers and clergy communicate to gang members that violence will not be tolerated and that any violence on their part will lead to increased police patrols. This message is buttressed by the use of all possible legal actions in response to violence, including limiting illegal firearms trafficking, serving outstanding warrants, disrupting drug markets, concentrating special prosecutorial attention on violent offenders, and drastically increasing police presence in violent neighborhoods.

Key Program Elements:

- Boston police worked with street workers, youth services case workers, probation officers, and clergy
- Social interventions and recreational opportunities are provided to pair suppression tactics with critical social services
- Street workers collaborated with Department of Youth Services case workers and probation and parole officers to offer health and school services, education, recreational opportunities, drug and alcohol counseling, food, and shelter
- Street workers worked directly with gangs to prevent future outbreaks of violence
- Neighborhood clergy, known as the Ten Point Coalition, worked closely with street workers and Boston police officers to organize community members in response to gang violence
- Coalition members made home visits to troubled youth, distributed anti-violence fliers, and held forums on gang violence

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Boston Police Department Massachusetts Department of Probation
- Massachusetts Parole Board
- Suffolk County District Attorney
- Office of the US Attorney
- US Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms
- Ten Point Coalition
- Massachusetts Department of Youth Services
- Boston Community Center Street Workers program
- Boston School Police

Outcomes:

- Decrease in youth homicides from an average of 44 during 1991 to 1995, to 26 in 1996, and 15 in 1997
- Statistically significant decrease (63%) in the monthly number of youth homicides

Further Reading:

- Braga, Anthony and David Kennedy. 2002. “Reducing Gang Violence in Boston.” In *Responding to Gangs*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Team (TARGET)

City/State: Orange County, CA Date Started: 1992 Lead Agency: Orange County District Attorney	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Community mobilization✓ Suppression✓ Organizational change and development
--	--

Program Goal:

- Reduce gang crime by selectively incarcerating the most violent and repeat gang offenders

Program Description:

TARGET was first developed in Westminster, California and has since been extended to six additional police departments and to the Orange County Sheriff. This program employs a multi-jurisdictional model of suppression and prosecution that uses highly collaborative efforts between law enforcement, prosecution, and probation to reduce gang activity.

Key Program Elements:

- Violent and repeat offenders are identified and monitored by the team and a working list of at-risk individuals is developed through the collaborative analyses of criminal records and reliable police intelligence
- If an offender is arrested, he or she is prosecuted by the district attorney assigned to the team. Violent and repeat gang offenders are incarcerated, but graduated probation sanctions are enforced on younger, less violent offenders. Any offenders placed on probation are monitored by TARGET probation officers
- The highly collaborative nature of the program is further enhanced by centralization of TARGET team members who do not work from their “home” agency offices, but share office space with other agency partners
- Centralization of TARGET personnel affords maximum communication and information-sharing

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Orange County District Attorney
- Orange County Sheriff’s Department
- Orange County Probation Department
- Anaheim Police Department
- La Habra Police Department
- Orange Police Department
- Santa Ana Police Department
- Tustin Police Department
- Buena Park Police Department
- Costa Mesa Police Department
- Fullerton Police Department
- Garden Grove Police Department
- Westminster Police Department
- Yorba Linda Police Department

Outcomes:

- During the first two years of operation, TARGET teams identified 647 gang members, 77 of whom were classified as gang leaders and high-rate offenders
- 472 gang members and 1,738 gang associates were arrested in 2000
- Between 1998 and 2000 gang homicides decreased by 50% in Orange County

Further Reading:

- Kent, Douglas R., and Peggy J. Smith. 1995. “The Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Team: A selective approach to reduce gang crime.” In *The Modern Gang Reader*, edited by M.W. Klein, C.L. Maxson, and J. Miller. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury, pp. 292–296. Cited in OJJDP 2000.
- Rackauckas, Tony. 2001. “2000 Annual Gang Cases Report, Including the Gang Unit, the Regional Enforcement Team, and the Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Teams.” Orange County, CA: Office of the Orange County District Attorney.

Chicago Ceasefire

City/State: Chicago, IL

Date Started: 1995

Lead Agency: Chicago Project for Violence Prevention

- ✓ Community mobilization
- ✓ Social intervention
- ✓ Opportunities provision

Program Goals:

- Work with Chicago communities and city government to reduce the number of youth homicides
- Help define a model violence prevention program

Program Description:

The Chicago Ceasefire project utilizes a comprehensive, multi-dimensional approach that involves five core components – community mobilization, public education, social outreach, faith-based leader involvement, and criminal justice participation. Ceasefire relies on a collaborative network of outreach workers, faith leaders, community leaders, police, and community members to achieve its goals.

Key Program Elements:

- Coalitions between police, youth organizations, faith leaders, and residents hold regular meetings, review current data and trends, and discuss strategy
- Coalition members create a violence prevention plan for their neighborhood that details goals, objectives, and activities necessary for curtailing violence in their neighborhood
- Street workers directly engage at-risk youth during high-risk hours (evening, late night) and work to redirect the youth to positive social pursuits such as jobs, job training, and school
- Faith-based leaders complement the actions of street workers by opening “safe havens” in their churches and counseling high-risk individuals
- A collaborative relationship is built between police and community coalition members. Police notify community partners and neighborhood coalitions of shootings and killings in their area and help in mobilizing community responses

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Chicago Project for Violence Prevention
- Chicago Police Department
- Target Area Development Corporation
- Office of State Rep. Linda Chapa LaVia
- Northwest Neighborhood Federation
- Brighton Park Neighborhood Council
- Agape Youth Development Services
- East St. Louis Township, Chicago
- Bethel New Life, Inc.
- The Chicago Project
- Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN)
- Alliance of Logan Square Organizations
- Vision of Restoration, Inc.
- Hands that Help, Inc.
- Organization of the Northeast
- Developing Communities Project
- Southwest Organizing Project

Outcomes:

- 71% average decrease in shootings in Ceasefire sites between 2000 and 2004
- 49% decrease in homicides in Ceasefire sites in 2004

Further Reading:

- Operation Ceasefire website. <http://www.ceasefirechicago.org/>.
- The Chicago Project for Violence Prevention. 2005. “Ceasefire: The Campaign to Stop the Shooting.” 2004 Annual Report. Chicago, IL: The Chicago Project for Violence Prevention.

Baton Rouge Partnership for Prevention of Juvenile Gun Violence

City/State: Baton Rouge, LA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Community mobilization✓ Suppression✓ Social Intervention
Date Started: 1997	
Lead Agency: Office of the Mayor	

Program Goals:

- Reduce youth access to illegal guns
- Decrease gun violence and other violent crimes by youth
- Mobilize community participation in addressing gun violence by youth
- Coordinate and identify social services for youth at risk for gun violence

Program Description:

The Baton Rouge Partnership targets the most serious violent youth in two high-crime areas in the community. The Partnership strives to develop multi-dimensional programs for youth through prevention, intervention, and suppression strategies and by strengthening ties between the community and criminal justice agencies.

Key Program Elements:

- Three community task forces (Enforcement, Intervention, and Prevention) are responsible for implementing the Partnership's strategy and goals
- Developed a problem-solving approach called Operation Eiger (Eiger is a mountain in Switzerland that is extremely challenging)
- Three-member police-probation teams supervise and implement the conditions of probation for participants
- A comprehensive treatment plan is developed for each Eiger participant and the teams make regular home visits with the participants and family members
- Eiger participants receive education, training, and rehabilitation services

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Office of the Mayor
- Local, State, and Federal law enforcement agencies
- US Attorney's Office
- East Baton Rouge District Attorney
- Courts
- Juvenile and adult probation agencies
- Public and private service providers
- Faith community
- Community-based organizations

Outcomes:

- The percentage of probation violations decreased from 44% at the inception of the program (1997) to 26% in 1999
- Firearm-related homicides in the program's target areas decreased from 91% in 1996 to 63% in 1999

Further Reading:

- Bilchick, Shay. 1999. "Promising Strategies to Reduce Gun Violence." Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Boys and Girls Club of America (BGCA): Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach (GPTTO)

City/State: National

Date Started: 1991

Lead Agency: Local Boys & Girls Clubs

- ✓ Community mobilization
- ✓ Social Intervention

Program Goals:

- Provide a support system for at-risk and delinquent youth
- Offer alternative activities that enhance developmental and life skills of youth

Program Description:

GPTTO is a community-wide, comprehensive initiative that targets youth six to 18 years of age. Local Boys & Girls Clubs work with police departments, schools, social service agencies, and other organizations to recruit youth and to implement the program's goals. The program incorporates four key components: community mobilization, recruitment, programming, and case management.

Key Program Elements:

- Mobilizes the community to decrease gang involvement
- Recruits at-risk youth and/or youth involved in gangs
- Promotes positive experiences for youth by providing programming on education and career development, health and life skills, the arts, and sports, fitness, and recreation
- Provides case management to curb gang-related behaviors, decrease involvement with the criminal justice system, and to increase school attendance and academic success
- Each month Boys & Girls Club staff track youth progress in academic performance, involvement in the criminal justice system, program participation, and family involvement

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention
- Police departments
- Probation departments
- Schools
- Courts
- Corrections
- Social services
- Employers
- Counseling services

Outcomes:

- A review of 21 Boys & Girls Clubs found that active participants of GPTTO experienced less delinquent behavior, higher grades, more positive relationships with others, and productive use of out-of-school time

Further Reading:

- Boys & Girls Club website. <http://www.bgca.org/>.
- Arbreton, Amy J.A. and Wendy S. McClanahan. 2002. "Targeted Outreach: Boys and Girls Clubs of America's Approach to Gang Prevention and Intervention." Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

Winston-Salem Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI)

City/State: Winston-Salem, NC	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Community mobilization✓ Suppression✓ Social intervention✓ Opportunities provision
Date Started: 2000	
Lead Agency: US Attorney's Office, Middle District of North Carolina	

Program Goals:

- Reduce the level of juvenile violence in Winston-Salem to below state and national levels

Program Description:

The Winston-Salem SACSI is a multi-agency, data-driven effort to reduce serious juvenile violence by repeat offenders in Winston-Salem that involves law enforcement and criminal justice agencies, community groups, faith-based groups, and local researchers. This partnership uses the SACSI model, which involves developing interagency strategic partnerships, targeting a specific problem, using research to understand and develop interventions to the problem, and implementing solutions based on this research and data.

Key Program Elements:

- Researchers collected and reviewed crime data in conjunction with criminal justice and community partners
- Three interagency "action teams," built on existing collaborative relationships, implement the main strategies of the program
- Juveniles with a history of violent offending and adults who involve juveniles in crime are "called in" to the Winston-Salem Police Department for "notification sessions," where law enforcement and community leaders convey the serious consequences of violent crime and offer social services
- Teams comprised of police, probation officers, clergy, and outreach workers make home visits to youth and offer access to counseling, family support, substance abuse treatment, educational and job training, and mentoring
- Interagency teams visit "hot spots" identified by researchers to extend social intervention and services, particularly job training and employment opportunities
- A team of law enforcement professionals and outreach workers reviews all major acts of violence and uses consensus to determine the best law enforcement and legal actions to be taken

Partnering & Collaboration:

- US Attorney, Middle District
- Winston-Salem Police Department
- Winston-Salem/Forsyth School District
- Office of Juvenile Justice
- Department of Community Corrections
- Forsyth County District Attorney
- Winston-Salem Urban League
- Department of Social Services
- Forsyth County Sheriff
- CenterPoint Human Services

Outcomes:

- 10% of individuals targeted by the program through notifications and home visits were arrested for a SACSI-defined violent crime between September 1999 and January 2001 (compared to 16% of non-targeted individuals)
- Juvenile violent crime overall fell by 19% between September 1999 and January 2001
- Robberies decreased overall by 58% between September 1999 and January 2001

Further Reading:

- Easterling, Doug, Lynn Harvey, Donald Mac-Thompson, and Marcus Allen. 2002. "Evaluation of SACSI in Winston-Salem: Engaging the Community in a Strategic Analysis of Youth Violence." Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Gang Resistance is Paramount (GRIP)

<p>City/State: Paramount, CA</p> <p>Date Started: 1982</p> <p>Lead Agency: City of Paramount Recreation Department</p>	<p>✓ Community mobilization</p> <p>✓ Social Intervention</p>
---	--

Program Goals:

- Educate students about the dangers of gangs and gang involvement
- Discourage youth from joining gangs
- Educate parents about potential warning signs of gang involvement
- Provide parents with resources that will help them reduce gang activity in their homes and neighborhoods

Program Description:

Social interventions are targeted at both students and parents. Students are administered a school-based curriculum and parents are educated on the nature of gang membership, warning signs, and tools for eliminating gang activity in their neighborhoods during intensive community meetings.

Key Program Elements:

- The school-based curriculum ranges from 26 to 29 lessons during the second, fifth, and ninth grades
- Curriculum topics range from basic discussions of the negative impacts of gang membership to drugs and alcohol, and dropping out of school
- GRIP offers counseling of students who show initial signs of gang membership, as well as to their parents
- Recreational programs such as sports and dances are offered through the Recreation Department

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Paramount Recreation Department
- City of Paramount
- Paramount Unified School District

Outcomes:

- 52,000 students and 11,000 parents participated between 1982 and 2002
- Significant decrease in the ratio of gang members to residents between 1982 and 2002 (1 gang member for every 24 citizens in 1982 and 1 gang member for every 63 residents in 2002)
- Significant decrease in the number of active gangs, from six in 1982 to three in 2002

Further Reading:

- City of Paramount, Recreation Department website. <http://www.paramountcity.com/docs/recreation.php>.
- Solis, A., W. Schwartz, and T. Hinton. 2003. "Gang Resistance is Paramount (GRIP) Program Evaluation: Final Report, October 1, 2003." Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California, USC Center for Economic Development.

Broader Urban Involvement and Leadership Development Detention Program (BUILD)

City/State: Chicago, IL

Date Started: 1969

Lead Agency: BUILD (non-profit agency)

- ✓ Community mobilization
- ✓ Social Intervention

Program Goals:

- Help youth develop life skills
- Create alternative opportunities for youth
- Leverage community resources through partnerships

Program Description:

The BUILD model uses a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary approach to reduce youth violence. Four programs are incorporated into the BUILD model – the Prevention Program, the Intervention Program, the Rehabilitation Program, and the Community Resource Development Program. The model relies on a collaborative network of public and private partners to achieve its goals.

Key Program Elements:

- Offers a 10-week violence prevention curriculum delivered in schools that works to deter youth from gang membership
- Provides social opportunities such as after-school sports programs and recreational activities for at-risk youth and gang members
- Offers drug abuse education, referrals, and counseling
- Provides mentoring relationships between gang members and volunteer mentors
- Delivers a violence prevention curriculum to youth in the Cook County Juvenile Temporary Detention Center

Partnering & Collaboration:

- Chicago Park Districts
- Chicago Public Schools
- Chicago Council on Urban Affairs
- Chicago Department of Children and Youth Services
- Chicago Jobs Council

Outcomes:

- 33% of BUILD youth recidivated within one year compared to 57% of non-BUILD participants
- BUILD participants who did recidivate spent significantly fewer days in the BUILD classroom than students who did not recidivate

Further Reading:

- BUILD website. <http://www.buildchicago.org/home/index.htm>.
- Lurigio, Arthur, G. Bensiger, and S.R. Thompson. 2000. "A Process and Outcome Evaluation of Project BUILD: Year 5 and 6." Unpublished Report. Chicago, IL: Loyola University, Department of Criminal Justice.

Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT)

City/State: National program with training centers in Phoenix, AZ, Orlando, FL, Philadelphia, PA, Portland, OR, and La Crosse, WI

Date Started: 1991

Lead Agency: US Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives and the Phoenix Police Department

✓ Community mobilization
✓ Social Intervention

Program Goals:

- Reduce gang activity
- Teach students about the consequences of joining a gang
- Develop positive relationships between students and law enforcement

Program Description:

The GREAT program strives to deter youth from delinquent behavior through life-skills instruction, discussion, and role-playing. Five regional centers in AZ, FL, PA, OR, and WI provide training to law enforcement officers across the country on how to implement the GREAT curriculum.

Key Program Elements:

- The GREAT program offers a standardized nine-hour curriculum taught in schools by law enforcement officers
- Students are educated on setting positive goals, resisting negative pressures and behaviors, resolving conflicts, and understanding the negative impact of gang membership on their lives
- The GREAT Program offers a 13-week middle school curriculum, an elementary school curriculum, a summer program, and families training

Partnering & Collaboration:

- US Bureau of Justice Assistance
- US Department of Homeland Security, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center
- US Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms
- Phoenix Police Department, Phoenix, AZ
- Orange County Sheriff's Office, Orlando, FL
- Portland Police Bureau, Portland, OR
- Philadelphia Police Department, Philadelphia, PA
- La Crosse Police Department, La Crosse, WI

Outcomes:

- GREAT had modest effects on the development of positive attitudes toward police, and on the knowledge of the negative impacts of being involved in a gang

Further Reading:

- GREAT website. <http://www.great-online.org/>.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage. 2004. "Evaluating G.R.E.A.T: A School-Based Gang Prevention Program: Research for Policy." Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

San Antonio Gang Rehabilitation, Assessment, and Services Program (GRAASP)

City/State: San Antonio, TX

Date Started: 1995

Lead Agency: San Antonio Police Department

Program Description/Goals:

GRAASP involves coordinating a multi-dimensional and multi-agency response along five core strategies: community mobilization, opportunities provision, social intervention, suppression, and organizational change and development. The program targets gang-involved youth and attempts to reduce gang problems in San Antonio through the creation of a community-based task force, a collaborative anti-gang program, social outreach and opportunities for target youth, and suppression strategies for controlling and limiting gang activity. The program strives to improve the cooperation between neighborhood citizens and police.

Outcomes:

- The GRAASP program was not effective in reducing arrests for program-involved youth; both program-involved and comparison group youths' total arrests increased during the evaluation period

Lesson Learned:

- Only seven of the OJJDP recommended 11 agency types participated in the program
- The program was characterized by poor structure, an inability to focus on a specific target area/population, inconsistent definition of the problem, and lack of focus and solid goals
- The lead agency, San Antonio Police Department, did not invest adequate time and staff resources
- Collaboration and coordinated planning between partner agencies was weak and at times non-existent

Further Reading:

- Spergel, Irving A., Kwai Ming Wa, Rolando Villarreal Sosa, Elisa Barrios, and Annot M. Spergel. 2003. "Evaluation of the San Antonio Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression Program." Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Bloomington-Normal Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression

City/State: Bloomington-Normal, IL

Date Started: 1995

Lead Agency: Project OZ

Program Description/Goals:

The Bloomington-Normal program incorporates the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model, or Spergel Model, to improve community capacity to address youth crime and to reduce gang crime. However, difficulties implementing the strategies of community mobilization, social intervention, and suppression led to no effect on gang or delinquency problems in the area.

Gang suppression was the dominant strategy of the project. Police officials did not initially view themselves as part of the comprehensive plan and so suppression activities were not always coordinated with other criminal justice or project partners, leading to an “us-versus-them” mentality. Suppression activities by police consisted of increased officer discretion around minor violations and status offenses, and targeted patrols. Probation officials stepped up curfew checks, drug testing, and school and job accountability. Arrest and incarceration were used as the primary sanctions against gang activity.

Community mobilization included the mobilization of and collaboration between most criminal justice agencies in the Bloomington-Normal area, as well as several social service agencies. Neighborhood, grassroots, and faith-based organizations were largely absent. Social intervention was achieved through the use of street outreach workers, who engaged project youth and offered opportunities such as job training, counseling, tutoring, alternative schooling, and mediation; however, outreach workers did not have contact with youth during evening hours or on weekends. Job opportunities were provided via a vocational training center.

Outcomes:

- Program youth were more likely to join gangs; program-involved youth increased their gang membership by 11%, while non-program youth decreased gang membership by 9%

Lessons Learned:

- Reliance on suppression tactics with little coordination with other areas of the comprehensive model led to “us-versus-them” mentality
- Lack of consensus on goals led to different interpretations of key project values, which led to friction between group members, poor collaboration, and lack of a consistent vision
- Few community-based, grassroots, and faith-based organizations were involved
- Outreach workers did not engage youth during weekends or evening hours

Further Reading:

- Spergel, Irving A., Kwai Ming Wa, and Rolando Villarreal Sosa. 2001. “Evaluation of the Bloomington-Normal Comprehensive Gang Program.” Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Adolescent Female Gang Prevention and Intervention Project

City/State: Seattle, WA

Date Started: 1992

Lead Agency: Seattle Department of Housing and Human Services

Program Description/Goals:

The Adolescent Female Gang Prevention and Intervention Project is a multi-agency and multi-dimensional gang prevention and intervention program initiated by the Seattle Team for Youth, which is a consortium of several key social service providers in Seattle (City of Seattle Housing and Human Services, Seattle School District, Public Health Seattle, etc.) dedicated to case management of at-risk youth. This program addresses gang violence through several dimensions, including social intervention, opportunities provision, and some suppression/monitoring.

Social intervention and opportunities provision were the key aspects of this project. Social interventions were carried out through the Seattle Department of Housing and Human Services, Sisters in Common, and the Atlantic Street Center. Through these avenues, youth were afforded various social support opportunities, including substance abuse education and intervention, mentoring, self-esteem counseling, social skills training, and teenage pregnancy education. Additionally, a subset of the program youth was targeted for intensive case management and supervision; management was provided via contract through three separate service providers. Project partners coordinated largely through the existing network provided by Seattle Team for Youth, allowing some collaboration in service provision.

Outcomes:

- No outcome data was available

Lessons Learned:

- Poor collaboration on case management, as different recordkeeping protocols and poor communication led to an inability to track all project youth effectively
- No collaboration with schools to address reform, advocacy, or policy development

Further Reading:

- Williams, Catherine, G. David Curry, Marcia I. Cohen. 2002. "Gang Prevention Programs for Female Adolescents: An Evaluation." In *Responding to Gangs*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Seattle Gun Buy-Back Program

City/State: Seattle, WA

Date Started: 1992

Lead Agency: Seattle Police Department

Project Description/Goals:

The Seattle Gun Buy-Back Program was formed in response to a violent weekend in 1992, when three shootings (two fatal) occurred in a single Seattle neighborhood. The buy-back program was created with the goal of preventing injury and death by firearms by reducing the number of guns in the community. The community was mobilized by a coalition of state and local leaders, community representatives, financial institutions, small business owners, and law enforcement professionals, which created and implemented this program. The Seattle Police Department served as the collector of firearms, as well as a temporary repository. This program was not multi-dimensional, in that it did not offer social intervention or opportunities within troubled neighborhoods, nor did law enforcement step up suppression.

Outcomes:

- The buy-back did not significantly reduce the frequency of firearm injuries, nor did it decrease the average number of crimes involving firearms, or the average number of firearm-related deaths
- Firearm-related homicides increased from 2.1 to 3.5 deaths per month after the buy-back
- 66% of participants retained at least one other gun in addition to the forfeited gun

Lessons Learned:

- Participation was high (1,172 firearms were collected), but most participants were older (average participant age was 44 years, 5% under 21, 12% over 69)
- The 1,172 firearms collected are estimated to represent less than 1% of the total number of firearms in Seattle homes
- Buy-backs were held between 9am and 5pm during working days, limiting the access of juveniles and working professionals
- The funds expended (\$100,000) as payback for turned-in guns was not sufficient for significantly reducing handgun prevalence; researchers estimate that a 30% reduction in handgun prevalence would require more than \$1 million in funding
- Researchers estimate that the risk of firearm death extends beyond personal ownership and to the easy availability of firearms in the community; the program did not address this factor

Further Reading:

- Callahan, Charles M., Frederick P. Rivara, and Thomas P. Koepsell. 1994. "Evaluation of the Seattle Gun Buy-Back Program." *Public Health Reporter*. 109: 472-477.

Sources

- Arbreton, Amy J.A. and Wendy S. McClanahan. 2002. "Targeted Outreach: Boys and Girls Clubs of America's Approach to Gang Prevention and Intervention." Philadelphia, P.A.: Public/Private Ventures.
- Bilchick, Shay. 1999. "Promising Strategies to Reduce Gun Violence." Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Braga, Anthony and David Kennedy. 2002. "Reducing Gang Violence in Boston." In *Responding to Gangs*, edited by Winfred L. Reed and Scott H. Decker (265-288). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Burch, Jim H., and Candice M. Kane. 1999. *Implementing the OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model. Fact Sheet #122*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Callahan, Charles M., Frederick P. Rivara, and Thomas P. Koepsell. 1994. "Evaluation of the Seattle Gun Buy-Back Program." *Public Health Reporter*. 109: 472-477.
- Dalton, Erin. 2003. "Lessons Learned in Preventing Homicide." East Lansing, M.I.: Michigan State University, School of Criminal Justice.
- Decker, Scott, H. and G. David Curry. 2000. "Responding to Gangs: Does the Dose Match the Problem?" In *Criminology*, edited by Joseph Shelley. Belmont, C.A.: Wadsworth.
- Easterling, Doug, Lynn Harvey, Donald Mac-Thompson, and Marcus Allen. 2002. "Evaluation of SACS in Winston-Salem: Engaging the Community in a Strategic Analysis of Youth Violence." Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Esbensen, Finn-Aage. 2004. "Evaluating G.R.E.A.T: A School-Based Gang Prevention Program: Research for Policy." Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. 2004. *Building Effective Community Partnerships. System Improvement Training and Technical Assistance Project, Toolkit Number 1*. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Kent, Douglas R., and Peggy J. Smith. 1995. "The Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Team: A Selective Approach to Reduce Gang Crime." In *The Modern Gang Reader*, edited by M.W. Klein, C.L. Maxson, and J. Miller (292-296). Los Angeles, C.A.: Roxbury. Cited in OJJDP 2000.
- Lurigio, Arthur, G. Bensiger, and S.R. Thompson. 2000. "A Process and Outcome Evaluation of Project BUILD: Year 5 and 6." Unpublished Report. Chicago, I.L.: Loyola University, Department of Criminal Justice.
- McLanahan, Wendy S. 2004. "Alive at 25: Reducing Youth Violence Through Monitoring and Support." Philadelphia, P.A.: Public/Private Ventures.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 2002a. *OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model: A Guide to Assessing Your Community's Youth gang Problem*. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 2002b. *OJJDP Comprehensive Gang Model: Planning for Implementation*. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 2000. *Youth Gang Programs and Strategies: A Summary*. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Justice, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Rackauckas, Tony. 2001. "2000 Annual Gang Cases Report, Including the Gang Unit, the Regional Enforcement Team, and the Tri-Agency Resource Gang Enforcement Teams." Orange County, C.A.: Office of the Orange County District Attorney.

Solis, A., W. Schwartz, and T. Hinton. 2003. "Gang Resistance is Paramount (GRIP) Program Evaluation: Final Report, October 1, 2003." Los Angeles, C.A.: University of Southern California, USC Center for Economic Development.

Spergel, Irving A., Kwai Ming Wa, Rolando Villarreal Sosa, Jaesok Son, Elisa Barrios, and Annot M. Spergel. 2003. "Evaluation of the Riverside Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression." Chicago, I.L.: University of Chicago.

Spergel, Irving A., Kwai Ming Wa, Rolando Villarreal Sosa, Elisa Barrios, and Annot M. Spergel. 2003. "Evaluation of the San Antonio Comprehensive Community-Wide Approach to Gang Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression Program." Chicago, I.L.: University of Chicago.

Spergel, Irving A., Kwai Ming Wa, and Rolando Villarreal Sosa. 2001. "Evaluation of the Bloomington-Normal Comprehensive Gang Program." Chicago, I.L.: University of Chicago.

Spergel, Irving A. 1995. *The Youth Gang Problem: A Community Approach*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

The Chicago Project for Violence Prevention. 2005. "Ceasefire: The Campaign to Stop the Shooting: 2004 Annual Report." Chicago, I.L.: The Chicago Project for Violence Prevention.

Williams, Catherine, G. David Curry, Marcia I. Cohen. 2002. "Gang Prevention Programs for Female Adolescents: An Evaluation." In *Responding to Gangs*, edited by Winfred L. Reed and Scott H. Decker (67-106). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.