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Plan

• Emergence of evidence based and informed violence reduction strategies
  – What do we mean by evidence based?
  – The problem solving approach

• Review of strategies

• How do we select and implement the strategies?
Takeaway

• We have learned a lot about crime and violence reduction strategies
• We have learned a lot about strategies that can reduce violent gun crime
• No single “magic bullet”
• Deciding on specific strategies occurs best at community level taking into account problems, resources, and values
Foundations – Evidence Based Practice (EBP)

• Crime and violence reduction/prevention strategies that have been subject to systematic evaluation and have demonstrated violence reduction effect
  – Single study = promising
  – Replicated in multiple studies = evidence based
Foundations – Evidence Informed Practice

• Innovative crime and violence reduction/prevention strategies that are based on evidence based strategies but that are being adapted or modified to different contexts
Foundations – Theory Informed Practice

• Innovative crime and violence reduction/prevention strategies that are based on theoretical principles but that have not yet been demonstrated in systematic research to have the desired effect
Questions to be Posed in Considering Strategies

• What type of violence are we trying to reduce?
• What factors are generating high risk for violence in our community?
• What is the evidence base?
• Do we anticipate short- or long-term impact?
• Do we have the commitment & resources to effectively implement?
• Do we want to do this strategy?
Thinking about risk – what does criminology tell us about firearms violence?

- Young men
  - Life course persistent vs. age limited
- Gang and group component
- Contagion effect – lifestyle, disputes, retaliatory violence
- Neighborhoods characterized by economic disadvantage and low collective efficacy
  - Micro-places
High Risk

• People
• Groups/networks
• Places
Situational Crime Prevention

Leads to interventions to disrupt connections motivated offenders, vulnerable victims, and risky contexts
High Risk People

• Victim-Offender Overlap
# People involved in Gun Violence – Examples Stockton, CA; Milwaukee, WI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stockton – 1997-99</th>
<th>Milwaukee - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homicide Victims</td>
<td>Homicide Suspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Arrest %</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Arrest – average #</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Weapons Arrest %</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Violent Crime Arrest %</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation/Parole Ever</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation/Parole Time of Incident</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Braga, 2008; Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission, 2013
High Risk People

Primary Prevention
• Positive Youth Development (see Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development: https://www.blueprintsprograms.org/)

Strength: EBP; cost efficient

Limitation: Long-term impact; not responsive to high rates of gun violence today
High Risk People

- Focused deterrence (EBP at community level; more limited evidence individual level)
- Risk & Responsivity Based Interventions
- Incapacitation/System tightening (EIP; translating to efficient practice challenging)
- Re-entry (promising)
People Focused Violence Reduction

High Risk People

Primary prevention; Focused deterrence, System tightening/Incapacitation, Re-entry (see combined people & place strategies)

Mixed evidence
High Risk Groups

• Gang Involvement
• Groups and Networks
High Risk People & Groups

• Being in a “co-offending shooting network” tremendously increases risk for future shootings
• 800 to 1200% increase in risk

(first uncovered in research in Chicago, Newark; Papachristos et al.)
Detroit Police Department Car Wash Incident Network

Number of lines – 117 edges, Density – 0.066, Average degree – 3.9

*Data source: DPD Crisnet RMS*
Group Focused Violence Reduction

Gangs & Group Violence

Focused deterrence

EBP
Group Based Focused Deterrence

• Identify shooting incidents involving gangs, groups, networks

• Communicate a focused deterrence message (call-ins; custom notifications)
  – We do not tolerate violence
  – We know who you are
  – We don’t want you to be the next victim or shooter
  – If there is more violence, we will do everything we can to get you off the streets (pulling levers)
  – We hold you and all your associates accountable
  – Community voice
  – Offer of social support
Responding to High Risk Individuals & Groups

Emergence of Evidence-Based & Evidence-Informed Practice

Enforcement
- Incapacitation/System Tightening
- See people and place based strategies

Intervention
- Focused deterrence
- Re-entry

Prevention
- Positive youth development (varied strategies)
High Risk Places
Concentration at Micro-Places

Boston*, Detroit, Seattle*:

- 5% street segments generate over $\frac{2}{3}$rd of robberies
- 3% street segments generate $\frac{3}{4}$ths of shootings

*Braga; Weisburd et al.
## Micro Places – Street Segment Analysis (Indianapolis; Magee 2018)

Number of firearm violence incidents per street segment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Firearm Violence Incidents 2014-16 (n=1,142)</th>
<th># of street segments</th>
<th>Total % of Street segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>52,993</td>
<td>98.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53,922</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Risk Terrain Modeling*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Feature</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Relative Risk (IRR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gas Stations</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>2.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar/Liquor</td>
<td>0.987</td>
<td>2.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug House/Drug Selling</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>2.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>1.883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*RTM see, Kennedy & Caplan; Detroit analysis see Circo, De Biasi, McGarrell, & Magee
Responding to Neighborhood & Micro-Place Concentration of Violence

Emergence of Evidence-Based & Evidence-Informed Practice

- Enforcement
- Intervention
- Neighborhood Development
Emergence of Evidence-Based & Evidence-Informed Practice

Enforcement

• Directed Police Patrol in Gun Crime Hotspots (Sherman & Rogan, 1995; McGarrell et al. 2001; Cohen & Ludwig, 2003)

• Group-Based Violence Reduction (see review Braga, Weisburd, Turchan, 2018)

• Drug Market Intervention (Corsaro et al., 2012; but see RAND Report)

• Hot People in Hot Places (Uchida & Swatt, 2013; Groff et al., 2015)

• Data-Driven Approaches to Crime and Traffic Safety (promising – see Crime Solutions.gov)
Emergence of Evidence-Based & Evidence-Informed Practice

Intervention

• **Hotspots Policing** (see review Braga, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2012)

• **Disorder Policing** (see review Braga, Welsh, & Schnell, 2015)

• **Problem Solving at Micro-Places** (see [www.popcenter.org](http://www.popcenter.org))

• **Situational Crime Prevention** (see Clarke, Eck)

• **Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design** (see specific techniques [crimesolutions.gov](http://crimesolutions.gov))

• **CCTV** (see reviews Welsh & Farrington, 2009; Alexandrie, 2017)
Emergence of Evidence-Based & Evidence-Informed Practice

Community Development

• **Greening/Blight Elimination** (promising; Branas et al., 2011, Sadler et al., 2017)

• **Business Improvement Districts** (promising; Cook & MacDonald, 2011)

• **Building Collective Efficacy** (current work – Gill & Weisburd; Uchida & Solomon)
Research Directions & Lingering Questions

- Impact on crime generally vs. violent crime specifically
- Non-fatal Shootings & Homicides
  - NFS as a risk factor
  - Low clearance rates, retaliation, cynicism
- Neighborhood & Micro-place Outliers
- Can We Build Collective Efficacy?
- Challenge of Neighborhood Development – the places most in need, most difficult …
Research Directions & Lingering Questions

• Repeat Victimization (burglary, arson, violent disputes, IPV)
• Role of Technology & Analytics (DNA, NIBIN, SAKI, CCTV, Shotspotter, Social Media, SNA)
• Leveraging Strategies
  – People & Places
  – Enforcement, Intervention, & Development
• Congruency – Contradiction Strategies
• Challenge of implementation
Bringing it Together
Examples evidence-based and evidence-informed strategies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enforcement</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Prevention/ Neighborhood Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>People-Based</strong></td>
<td>Violent impact players; Offender focused policing</td>
<td>Focused deterrence; Re-entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place-Based</strong></td>
<td>Code enforcement</td>
<td>Problem Solving; Situational Crime Prevention; CPTED; CCTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined</strong></td>
<td>Hot people in hot zones (e.g., LASER, Philadelphia)</td>
<td>Drug Market Intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ideally these strategies become linked to particular crime and safety issues (i.e., a specific crime type and/or a specific location*
Evidence-Based Strategies for Crime Reduction/Prevention

General principles:

• Typically build upon the concentration of crime and violence among a small number of individuals (as both victim and suspect), groups and networks, in a small number of hotspots and micro-places.

• Include people-based, place-based, and combined people- and place-based strategies.

• Range from enforcement through intervention through primary prevention and neighborhood development.

• Are most effective when the strategy is linked to specific problems (e.g., residential burglary; youth violence; intimate partner violence; a problematic location such as business, park, street segment).
# Strategy Decision-Making Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Problem &amp; Strategies</th>
<th>Is this an evidence-based practice? An evidence-informed innovation?</th>
<th>Does this strategy emphasize enforcement, prevention, intervention, re-entry, community/neighborhood development?</th>
<th>Do we think it will have a short-term impact? Why?</th>
<th>Do we think it will have a long-term impact? Why?</th>
<th>Can we do this? (leadership support, resources, etc.)</th>
<th>Do we want to do this? (norms, values)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specify Problem 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specify Problem 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy 2 ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of Evidence-Based and Evidence-Informed Strategies

- Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development: https://www.blueprintsprograms.org/
- Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy: www.cebcp.org
- Campbell Collaboration: www.campbellcollaboration.org
- What Works Toolkit (UK): whatworks.college.police.uk
- Evidence-Based Policing App: www.policefoundation.org
Takeaway

• We have learned a lot about crime and violence reduction strategies
• We have learned a lot about strategies that can reduce violent gun crime
• No single “magic bullet”
• Deciding on specific strategies occurs best at community level taking into account problems, resources, and values
Questions and Comments