

4-2022

What is Working to Reduce Violent Crime? Evidence-Based Solutions

Elizabeth Winchester

Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, eatkins@lsu.edu

Timothy T. Reling

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, trelin2@lsu.edu

Kristina Little

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, klittle1@lsu.edu

Leanna Cupit

lcupit1@lsu.edu

Melanie Fields

Louisiana State University Law Center, melanie.fields@ebrda.org

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/srec_reports



Part of the [Law Enforcement and Corrections Commons](#), [Social Justice Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Winchester, E. A., Reling, T. T., Little, K., Cupit, L. B., Fields, M., & Rhodes, J. L. F. (2022). What is working to reduce violent crime? Evidence-based solutions. Baton Rouge, LA: LSU Social Research and Evaluation Center.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Research and Evaluation Center at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reports by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact ir@lsu.edu.

Authors

Elizabeth Winchester, Timothy T. Reling, Kristina Little, Leanna Cupit, Melanie Fields, and Judith F. Rhodes

What is Working to Reduce Violent Crime? Evidence-Based Solutions

April 2022

LSU

**Social Research &
Evaluation Center**

Author Affiliations:

Elizabeth A. Winchester, PhD, Research Associate
Timothy T. Reling, PhD, Research Associate
Kristina Little, MSW, LCSW, Research Associate
Leanna B. Cupit, PhD, Research Associate
Judith L. F. Rhodes, PhD, LMSW, SREC Director and Professor of Research

Social Research and Evaluation Center (SREC)
Louisiana State University
College of Human Sciences and Education
319 Hatcher Hall
Baton Rouge Louisiana 70803
SREC@lsu.edu

Melanie Fields, MA, JD,
Assistant District Attorney, Adjunct Clinical Professor
The Office of the District Attorney for the 19th Judicial District, Parish of East Baton Rouge
222 Saint Louis St.
Baton Rouge, LA 70802

LSU Paul M. Hebert Law Center
1 East Campus Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

Land Acknowledgment Statement: As a land, sea, and space-grant institution, Louisiana State University and A&M College (LSU) has a responsibility to acknowledge, honor, and affirm Indigenous culture, history, and experiences. LSU is a community of higher learning built upon the traditional, ancestral, and contemporary lands of Indigenous peoples. At the heart of LSU's campus are two earthen mounds, architectural remnants created by Native Americans and predating the pyramids in Egypt. These mounds are believed to be the oldest edifices in North America. Built by a people who were egalitarian fisher-hunter-gathers, the LSU Indian Mounds were built as a place of gathering over the course of 200 years. LSU recognizes the communities Native to this region including the Biloxi Chitimacha Confederation, Chitimacha Tribe of Louisiana, Caddo Adai Indians of Louisiana, Choctaw Nation, Coushatta Tribe, FourWinds Cherokee Tribe, Muscogee (Creek), Point au Chien Tribe, Tunica-Biloxi Tribe, United Houma Nation, and others whose memories may have been erased by violence, displacement, migration, and settlement. As a university, we thank them for their strength and resilience as stewards of this land and are committed to creating and maintaining a living and learning environment that embraces individual difference, including the Indigenous peoples of our region (LSU, 2021).

About SREC: The Social Research and Evaluation Center is a research unit within the Louisiana State University College of Human Sciences and Education that advances healthy social systems by facilitating the development, implementation, and evaluation of social programs; conducting research; and providing consultation and expertise to higher education institutions, communities, policy makers, and partners.

Suggested citation: Winchester, E. A., Reling, T. T., Little, K., Cupit, L. B., Fields, M., & Rhodes, J. L. F. (2022). What is working to reduce violent crime? Evidence-based solutions. Baton Rouge, LA: Social Research and Evaluation Center.

Table of Contents

Law Enforcement Interventions..... 4
Interventions with Children and Youth..... 8
Community-Oriented Crime Reduction 12
Programmatic Considerations 14
Bibliography 16

The purpose of this review is to examine and evaluate current approaches to reduce violent crime. The review reports on supportive techniques, strategies, programs, and practices that are evidence-informed to combat criminal activity, delinquency, and community disorder. Ineffective techniques, strategies, and programs are also included. The review provides potential strategies and programs that require additional empirical research to show whether they work. This review includes the integration of education, employment, social services, and public health services into efforts to reduce crime and ease the burden on law-enforcement and justice systems.

Law Enforcement Interventions

This section includes a discussion of law enforcement techniques, strategies, and programs in determining the efficacy of interventions, it is critical to consider the following:

1. Which existing techniques, strategies, and programs have demonstrated empirical evidence for the effective reduction of violent crime?
2. Which techniques, strategies, and programs have been utilized to support investigative and prosecutorial efforts in cases of violent crime?
3. Which existing techniques, strategies, and programs have failed to demonstrate empirical evidence for the effective reduction of violent crime?

Table 1 summarizes existing interventions employed by law enforcement for the purpose of reducing violent crime.

Summary of Interventions Employed by Law Enforcement			
Program/Technique	Effective	Ineffective	Support
Disorder Policing	✓		
Focused Deterrence	✓		
Hotspot Mapping/Risk Terrain Modeling	✓		
Restorative Justice	✓		
Risk/Need/Responsivity Assessments	✓		
Data Mining/Predictive Analytics			✓
Gunshot Detection Technology			✓
Real-time Crime Centers			✓
Social Network Analysis			✓
Boot Camps		✓	
Day Reporting Center		✓	
Scared Straight		✓	

Note: This list is not inclusive of all policing efforts. This paper does not focus on technology efforts, such as body worn cameras. For example, other modes of evidence-based policing can assist in reducing incidents and successful prosecution of domestic/dating violence.

Effective Techniques, Strategies, and Programs

Programs, techniques, and strategies were considered effective based on peer-reviewed meta-analyses, systematic reviews, and empirical studies that demonstrated a consistent pattern of reduction in violent crime; therefore, programs, techniques, and strategies without adequate empirical evidence are not featured here.

Disorder Policing. Based upon the broken windows approach, disorder policing addresses neighborhood social and physical disorder which serve as a precursor to more serious forms of delinquent and criminal behavior, fear of crime, and neighborhood decline (Braga, Welsh, & Schnell, 2019). Disorder policing has been demonstrated as an effective mechanism to significantly reduce violent and property crime when utilized in conjunction with broader community-oriented policing efforts (Braga et al., 2015, 2019).

Focus Deterrence. The focus deterrence model maintains a disproportionately small group of individuals is responsible for the majority of criminal activity. Focus deterrence intervention programs emphasize the accurate identification of prolific criminal actors, as well as utilizing the support of community, law enforcement, and social services to offer a pathway to law-abiding behavior. Criminal actors are offered social service assistance and notified of the consequences for any additional criminal activity (Braga Weisburd, & Turchan, 2019).

Broadly, focus deterrence interventions demonstrate small-to-moderate reductions of violent crime, though evidence suggests such benefits typically remain concentrated through the first few years of implementation due to rapid program expansion coupled with an exhaustion of adequate resources (Braga et al., 2018, 2019; Braga, Zimmerman, Barao, Farrell, Brunson, & Papachristos, 2019; Grunwald & Papachristos, 2017). Though applicable to individuals and groups, evidence suggests the largest reductions in crime are achieved through focus deterrence interventions targeting criminal gangs/groups, followed by interventions targeting individual chronic offenders and drug market interventions (Braga et al., 2019).

Hotspot Mapping/Risk Terrain Modeling. Utilizing geographic information systems to analyze temporal and spatial trends in crime, hotspot mapping and risk terrain modeling identify geographic regions which experience significant clustering of criminal activity for the purpose of targeted resource allocation (Braga, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2014; Braga, Turchan, Papachristos, & Hureau, 2019; Kennedy, Caplan, & Piza, 2011). Furthermore, such techniques denote trends and patterns regarding crime displacement and crime diffusion resulting from law enforcement crime control efforts (Braga et al., 2019; Perry, McInnis, Price, Smith, & Hollywood, 2013).

Utilization of hotspot mapping and risk terrain modelling for resource allocation and deployment has consistently been demonstrated to yield small-to-moderate reductions across crime categories and citizen calls for service (Braga, 2005; Braga et al., 2014; Braga et al., 2019; Sherman & Weisburd, 1995). Importantly, such targeted resource allocation has been noted to often contribute to crime diffusion rather than crime displacement (Braga, 2005; Braga et al., 2019). Such techniques should be incorporated into broader community-oriented approaches to crime prevention, as community members frequently exhibit positive reactions to such targeted police actions (Braga et al., 2014; Braga et al., 2019).

Restorative Justice. Rather than seeking punitive harm against the offender, restorative justice approaches aim to repair the harm caused by the offender (Mayo-Wilson, Woods, & Ariel, 2013). Specifically, face-to-face restorative justice conferences in which the offender meets the victims/survivors of the crime to discuss the consequences by criminal activity (Sherman, Strang, Mayo-Wilson, Woods, & Ariel, 2015; Strang, Shermaof the offense and how harm may be repaired have demonstrated a modest, but highly cost-effective reduction in crime (Ptacek, 2017; Sherman et al., 2015; Strang et al., 2013).

Risk-Needs-Responsivity Assessments. Many efforts seeking to reduce violent crime rates have sought to combat recidivism by utilizing screening and assessment procedures calibrated for local populations during the earliest stages of offender contact with the criminal justice system. Such efforts have been critical in successfully identifying individual propensity to recidivate and informing appropriate levels of treatment and intervention which correspond to that risk (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Ehrhard-Dietzel, Barton, & Hickey, 2016; Mulvey & Iselin, 2008).

The Risk-Needs- Responsivity model (RNR) is founded on three core principles: 1) intensive levels of treatment should be reserved for higher risk offenders; 2) programs should focus on offender needs which are functionally related to criminal behavior; and 3) styles and modes of intervention should match an offender's learning style and ability (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990; Assink et al., 2015). The RNR model also suggests that professionals consider each individual's current circumstances when determining the most appropriate course of treatment (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews et al., 1990). Evidence demonstrates correctional agencies which actively employed standardized risk and needs assessments alongside treatment adhering to the RNR principles had a greater impact on recidivism across crime categories than those using traditional incarceration alone (Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2006; Hanson, Bourgon, Helmus, & Hodgson, 2009; Lowenkamp, 2004; Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2002).

Supportive Techniques, Strategies, and Programs

Programs, techniques, and strategies were considered supportive based on empirical studies, books, and articles that indicate the potential to assist law enforcement in their work to reduce violent crime.

Data Mining/Predictive Analytics. Data mining and predictive analytics are powerful investigative tools which allow large amounts of information to be derived from cell phones/mobile devices, as well as social media accounts (McCue, 2007). Such information can be extracted and analyzed for detail regarding social networks, geographic locations, and patterns of offending (McCue, 2007).

Gunshot Detection Technology. Gunshot detection technology (GDT) (e.g., ShotSpotter) accurately detects the number and location of gunshots when tested (Watkins, Mazerolle, Rogan & Frank, 2002; Irvin-Erickson, LaVigne, Tiry & Bieler, 2017). Irvin-Erickson et. al. (2017) found GDT is especially sensitive at night more so than during the day. These findings indicate GDT may be an asset to law enforcement and investigators in locating the source of gunfire locations, improved response time to the scene, and improved community relations (Lawrence, LaVigne, Goff & Thompson (2018). Recommendations from one previous study recommends law enforcement should be trained in response protocols and accountability mechanisms to generate trust and confidence in the police by residents, engage residents in the GDT program, integrate data gathered through the use of GDT into other data systems (e.g., NIBIN, CAD, hotspot mapping) (Lawrence, LaVigne, Goff, & Thompson, 2018).

Real-Time Crime Centers. Real-time Crime Centers (RTCC) provide analysts and investigators with data from a variety of sources such as crime incidents, warrants, vehicle records as well as video camera access in real-time. This information provides analysts with resources to make quick decisions and deploy resources (Gardiner, 2013). RTCCs can be scaled up to include more data sources and expanded to provide investigators with predictive analytics (Ghosh, Chun, Shafiq, & Adam, 2016).

Social Network Analysis. Social networks are an important structure that can explain criminal relationships, behaviors and patterns that may exist. Social Network Analysis reveals these links and allows researchers to understand criminal relationships, networks, and influences (Gravel & Tita, 2017).

Ineffective Techniques, Strategies, and Programs

Programs, techniques, and strategies were considered effective based on peer-reviewed meta-analyses, systematic reviews, and empirical studies that demonstrated a consistent pattern of no reduction in violent crime.

Boot Camps. Military-style boot camps are highly structured, punitive, and require a great deal of discipline for participants (MacKenzie and Farrington, 2015). Evidence does not support military-style boot camps or discipline-based approaches that do not offer rehabilitative support to reduce offending behaviors (Barnett & Howard, 2018).

Day Reporting Centers. Day Reporting Centers (DRC) are considered an alternative to incarceration that offer rehabilitative programming and daily supervision (Boyle, Ragusa-Salerno, Lanterman, & Marcus (2013). Findings of multiple evaluations indicate that parolees have the same or worse outcomes after attending DRCs than parolees that have other forms of supervision (Barnett & Howard, 2018; Boyle, 2013; Hyatt & Ostermann, 2019).

Scared Straight Program. Scared Straight programs organize groups of juvenile delinquents to visit and interact with inmates in prisons. The promise of the program is to deter those at risk for delinquency or criminal behavior, the outcomes of the program indicate that participants of scared straight programs had higher levels of criminality than individuals who received no treatment. Researchers indicate these programs do more harm than doing nothing at all. (Petrosino, Petrosino, & Buehler 2005).

Potential Techniques, Strategies, and Programs Requiring Empirical Research

The following brief summaries include some current practices; however, little to no empirical evidence exists in the scientific literature. Rigorous research is needed to better understand effectiveness across various settings.

The Crime Strategies Unit is comprised of senior prosecuting attorneys and analysts. The unit gathers, verifies, and analyzes intelligence and data from numerous sources, including law enforcement agencies, in order to identify those individuals most intensely involved in criminal activity, especially shootings. The unit maps those areas of concentrated criminal conduct so as to more effectively and efficiently deploy law enforcement resources to reduce violence and improve public safety. Lastly, the unit delivers targeted information to law enforcement and prosecutors, in order to assist them in making data-driven decisions regarding investigations, prosecutions, and defendants' participation in alternative-to-incarceration programs.

Coordinated Community Response and/or Domestic Violence Response teams. Violence against women, including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, is a serious problem across the nation. The Violence Against Women Act of 2005 included a provision stating that grant funds could be used to support improved coordination among local law enforcement, prosecutors, and community service providers to reduce domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Coordinated community response (CCR) programs engage the entire community in efforts to develop a common understanding of violence against women and to change social norms and attitudes that contribute to violence against women. Law enforcement, civil society, health care providers, child protection services, educators, local businesses, the media, employers, and faith leaders are involved in a coordinated community response.

Evidenced Based Policing is a conscientious, problem-solving approach to law enforcement that incorporates the best evidence. This strategy offers a framework for developing a coherent approach through the application of sound scientific concepts and standards. Evidence-based practice includes the use of body cameras to gather victim and witness statements and document injuries and damage. It includes cognitive interviewing techniques, or asking open-ended questions, reinstating the context by eliciting memory retrieval cues and focusing on sensory details. This practice is most effective in domestic and dating violence calls.

Interventions with Children and Youth

Youth violence, which includes fighting, bullying, gang activity, and dating violence, has been described by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) as a significant public health problem (David-Ferdon et al., 2016). Many risk factors for violence in adolescence and young adulthood are present in early childhood. By addressing these risk factors and buffering high-risk youth with protective factors against violence, interventions with children and youth provide early opportunities to change behavior and alter patterns that propagate violent behavior.

This section discusses interventions targeting children and youth. Interventions are listed by the domains in which they are implemented. Violence prevention programs with children and youth address several of the following risk and protective factors for youth violence (David-Ferdon et al.):

Youth Violence Risk Factors:	Youth Violence Protective Factors:
Low academic performance Exposure to violence (including domestic and child abuse) Exposure to substance use Cognitive or mental health impairments Exclusionary discipline practices (suspension/expulsion) History of trauma/exposure to chronic stress Peer influence Authoritarian parenting attitudes/practices Low parental involvement	Competent social-emotional skills Educational aspirations Academic achievement Relationship with caring adult Positive and supportive relationship with teachers Access to and involvement in prosocial activities

Early Childhood

Long-term, comprehensive interventions for children with conduct and behavioral problems can reduce violent crime in adulthood (Dodge, Bierman, Coie, Greenberg, Lochman, McMahon, Pinderhughes, 2015).

Active participatory learning environments that engage and support children and parents over a child's educational career are associated with significantly less arrests by ages 27 and 40 (Heckman, Pinto, & Savelyev, 2013).

Head start programs followed by effective and well-funded K-12 schools are related to positive outcomes including reduced adult incarceration (Johnson & Jackson, 2019).

School-based programs

Academic performance, school climate, and violence on school grounds are interconnected (Benbenishty et al., 2016). School programs that promote prosocial interactions with others may contribute to prosocial development throughout childhood and adolescence (Kim, Oesterle, Catalano, & Hawkins, 2015). Programs to improve academic achievement and keep students at grade level are important to future success.

Literacy Programs. Incarcerated adults scored significantly lower in literacy and numeracy compared to adults in the average U.S. household (Rampey, Keiper, Mohadjer, Krenzke, Li, Thornton, & Hogan, 2016). Improving literacy throughout the K-12 years sets students up for success beyond high school.

Success for All (SFA). SFA is a whole-school reform program for students in grades K- 8 that integrates literacy, social-emotional development, tutoring, family support, and training for teachers. SFA is shown to have positive impacts on alphabetic and reading fluency (What Works Clearinghouse, 2017).

Read 180. Read 180 is designed for students in grade 4-12 who are 2 or more years behind in reading. Read 180 combines traditional instruction with digital media and has demonstrated positive effects in comprehension and general literacy (What Works Clearinghouse, 2016).

Social-Emotional Learning, Life Skills, & Delinquency Prevention Programs

LifeSkills Training (LST). LST is a curriculum-based program for middle schoolers (ages 12-14) aiming to prevent teen drug, alcohol, and tobacco use; violence; and other problem behaviors as well as build social skills, drug resistance skills, and self-management. Additional violence prevention lessons are available for each grade level. Evaluations of LST programs show a reduction in fighting, delinquency, physical and verbal aggression (Botvin et al., 2006).

Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.) (Chicago). GREAT is a curriculum-based program for middle-schoolers aimed at reducing gang membership and activity. While evaluations of the program have found little to no effect on delinquency and gang membership shortly after completing the curriculum, longitudinal studies performed 1-5 years later found significant reductions in youth gang membership and victimization, and improved attitudes toward police. Reductions in violent offenses were not found in the one-year longitudinal study (Ebensson et al., 2012).

Positive Action. Positive Action is a curriculum-based program for students K-12 covering social learning, the Self Circle of Thoughts-Actions-Feelings, and effective communication with the aim to increase students' self-worth and positive behavior choices as well as improve school climate. Research on program outcomes has been conducted in several community settings including urban, suburban, and rural. Evaluations of the program found reductions in substance abuse behavior, violent behavior, and acceptance of social norms supporting aggression, bullying, violence, and other problem behaviors (Beets et al., 2009; Li et al., 2011).

Project Towards No Drug Abuse (PTND). PTND is a curriculum-based program for high school youth with an emphasis on student-student and student-teacher interaction. The curriculum covers self-control and communication skills, decision-making strategies, and information regarding the harm of drug use. While this program has been evidenced to reduce drug use, its effects on violence-related behavior have only been shown for male participants and victimization (not perpetration of violence) (Simon et al., 2002).

Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS). PATHS is a curriculum-based program for children grades K-6 promoting social-emotional skills and reducing aggression and behavior problems. Studies found participants experienced a reduction in aggression, violent behavior, and developmental risk factors for violent behavior; reduction in depressive symptoms; increase in reading and math proficiency (Crean & Johnson, 2013).

Safe Dates. Safe Dates has been labeled "Promising" by Blueprints Programs. It consists of a prevention component (a curriculum for middle and high school students focusing on information related to dating abuse and healthy relationships), as well as a community resource component (support groups and activities for youth and education for parents). A four-year follow up study of program implementation in 14 schools found a 56-92% reduction in rates of weapon carrying, physical and sexual dating violence perpetration, and victimization. The program was also successful in decreasing adolescents' acceptance of dating violence and gender-role norms (Foshee et al., 2014).

Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs (GEAR UP). A US DOE (Department of Education) discretionary grant program designed to increase the number of low-income students who are prepared to succeed in post-secondary education. Cohort approach that follows students from 6/7 grades to high school graduation. An impact study showed GEAR UP students had increased levels of college enrollment, but it did not improve college persistence. Findings were similar for SES, race/ethnicity, and K-12 special education status (Bowan et. al, 2018).

School Responder Model (SRM). SRM is a diversion initiative for youth with behavioral health needs. It addresses behavioral health needs and reduces the likelihood of juvenile justice involvement. Steps: 1) form a cross-systems collaborative team, 2) engage family and youth, 3) implement a behavioral health response, and 4) create formal structures. This model utilizes universal mental health screening with more in-depth assessments by mental health professionals. School Resource Officers are integrated within the model. SRM aims to reduce exclusionary discipline practices. The SRM integrates multiple evidence-based practices for schools, such as universal screening, mental health services, tailored interventions for students (Dowdy et al., 2013).

Programs that Build Connections with Caring Adults

After school programs or out of school time programs: These programs provide structured activity and supervision during the times during the day that youth violence is at its peak - between 3pm-6pm. Programs with trained staff, coordinated and connected activities focused on social/personal skill building, and active forms of learning have shown to reduce problem behaviors and increase positive social behaviors, increase academic achievement, and increase self-perception and bonding to school (Durlak et al., 2010). After school programs are particularly effective at curbing delinquent behavior when focusing on social skills and character development that help students resist negative influences (Gottfredson, Gerstenblith, Soule, Womer, & Lu, 2004).

After School Programs

Los Angeles' Better Education Students for Tomorrow (LA's BEST) program. The BEST program has been found to reduce violence- and youth crime-related arrests and improve academic achievement, especially among children who attended 10 days a month or more (Goldschmidt et al., 2007).

After School Matters (ASM) program. ASM is an after-school program that was implemented in Chicago. Participants had increased self-regulation, lower school dropout rates, missed fewer days of school, and were less likely to participate in gang activity or sell drugs than youth in a control group (Hirsch et al., 2011).

Mentoring Programs Promoting Positive Relationships with Caring Adults

Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (BBBS). Evaluations of BBBS programs have shown that participating youth experience a decrease in behaviors that are risk factors for violence including drug use, alcohol use; participating youth less likely to participate in a physical fight (Chan et al., 2013).

Mentoring programs for at-risk youth. While there are few studies of mentor programs about specific intervention program elements that can be implemented with fidelity, studies on the outcomes of mentoring programs for at-risk youth find that they reduce delinquency and aggression in participants (Tolan et al., 2008).

Individual- and Family-Level Interventions

Functional Family Therapy (FFT). FFT is a short-term family therapy and juvenile diversion program for youth who are at risk for incarceration. Several program evaluations have shown little to no effect; however, several others, including a 2018 study utilizing recently expanded public funding for prevention services under the Affordable Care Act, found that participants experienced reduced recidivism rates and risk behaviors compared to a control group (Gottfredson et al., 2018).

Multisystemic Therapy (MST). MST is intensive therapy for youth with delinquency assessing and addressing the strengths and weaknesses present in family and community systems. Studies of implementation in multiple states and countries find that it reduces re-arrest rates, aggressive crimes, conduct problems (Ogden et al., 2004).

Truancy Intervention Programs. The reduction of chronic absenteeism in the early years includes dealing with family issues. Truancy intervention experts demonstrate practices and policies that ensure good school attendance. Juvenile justice stakeholders can play a key role in promoting school attendance (Stutphen, Ford, & Flaherty, 2010).

Potential Family and Youth Program Requiring Empirical Research

The following brief summary includes newer intervention with little to no empirical evidence in the scientific literature. Rigorous research is needed to better understand effectiveness across various settings.

Family Justice Centers and Multi-Agency Centers are victim centered, trauma informed, multi-agency, multi-disciplinary co-located service centers that provide services to victims of interpersonal violence including, intimate partner violence, sexual assault, child abuse, elder or dependent adult abuse, and human trafficking. Both public and private partner agencies assign staff on a full-time or part-time basis to provide services from one location. Centers focus on reducing the number of times victims tell their story, the number of places victims must go for help, and look to increase access to services and support for victims and their children. The first Family Justice Center was founded in San Diego in 2002. Due to its success the model has been replicated over 120 times internationally. Documented outcomes of Family Justice Centers include significantly reduced domestic violence-related homicides, increased victim safety, helping to break the cycle of violence for children, increased efficiency in collaborative services to victims among service providers, and increased prosecution of offenders.

Community-Oriented Crime Reduction

This review also focused on the integration of education, employment, social services, and public health services into efforts to reduce crime and ease the burden on law-enforcement and corrections systems.

As the causes of violent crime are multifaceted, intertwined, and chronic, the solutions must be multi-sectional, interwoven, and sustained. Applicable theories to frame these problems include: Social Disorganizational Theory (Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Sampson, 1993; Shaw & McKay, 1942), Social Ecological Model (Bronfenbrenner, 1977), Social Development (Catalano & Hawkins, 1996).

Due to the multi-system causes of violence risk factors, many community-level interventions have a multi-faceted approach even if they target one type of violence (e.g., intimate partner violence, alcohol- or drug-related violence, gang violence, and violent extremism).

The interventions noted in this section are listed under the type of approach used in the program. These approaches are 1) modification of the physical and social environment; 2) reduction in violence risk factors in the community; and 3) focused deterrence and street outreach programs.

Modification of the Physical and Social Environment

Violence prevention interventions focusing on physical and social environmental changes addresses violence risk factors such as low lighting, lack of green spaces, low levels of community participation and connectedness, and blight. Interventions include making changes to current physical infrastructure and including these factors in future planning, and sponsoring community events and public spaces which foster social interaction and connectedness.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) - is based in Routine Activities Theory/Routine Lifestyles Activity Theory. CPTED is a multidimensional approach to prevent crime by designing a physical environment that positively influences human behavior. Examples include parks and public spaces, lighting, multifamily housing, new housing, and development (Cozen & Love, 2015).

Reduction in exposure to community-level risks

Community-level risk reduction interventions address violence risk factors such as concentrated poverty in a certain area, housing instability, lack of economic opportunity. Interventions include ensuring social and community services are accessible; engaging with non-profit organizations or other private partners to meet community-driven needs; and enforcing or changing policies, laws, and regulations which improve financial security and access to safe and affordable housing.

Hospital-based violence intervention programs (HVIP) (Baltimore, San Francisco): HVIP is a community- or hospital-based program providing case management to victims of intentional violence who present to the emergency room. Intervention Specialists follow patients post-discharge to provide support in accessing resources. The aim of the program is to address violence risk factors, interrupt the cycle of intentional violence injury-reinjury, reduce numbers of violent injuries, and therefore reduce the related economic and societal costs. Evaluating these programs to document their effectiveness is difficult due to several factors including the variety of HVIP models, limited resources of hospitals, communities, and participants. Therefore, research does not exist to label HVIP as evidence based. However, there is enough evidence that HVIPs can reduce hospital costs and interpersonal violence to name it as an emerging practice, and trauma centers around the country are partnering with their communities to implement new models of HVIP and gather more evidence of its effectiveness (Dicker et al., 2017; NNHVIP, 2019; Zun et al., 2006).

Place-centric Crime Reduction. A number of nonprofit agencies have tackled social disorganization through comprehensive, multimodal approaches to transforming communities. Crime reduction is a byproduct of the initiatives. Groups have leveraged federal investment to meet goals (for example HUD's Choice Neighborhoods and BJA's Community Based Crime Reduction [CBCR] initiatives). Notable groups with a track record of place-centric initiatives include: Purpose Built Communities (founders Tom Cousins, Warren Buffett, Julian Robertson), Harlem Children's Zones (founder Geoffrey Canada), and Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC, founded originally by the Ford Foundation).

Community Based Crime Reduction (CBCR): target persistently distressed neighborhoods with significant violent crime challenges. CBCR requires creation of a consortium of criminal justice, community, and human services partners. These cross-sector partnerships implement community specific violent crime reduction strategies. By focusing on concentrated "hot spots", the cross-sector partnership aims to reduce violent crime, dismantle gang activity, and assist communities to transform their communities into vibrant neighborhoods. Approaches may include: drug abuse prevention, youth programs, education, CPTED, land use, code enforcement, employment initiative, and public housing management. Re-Entry strategies, building social cohesion and partnerships with law enforcement, prosecutors, defense counsel.

Community developers and partners (police, schools, faith-based, community residents, etc.) work in joint strategies to reduce crime in low-income neighborhoods. Participatory approach. Results showed reductions in crime for 3 communities (namely Olneyville neighborhood of Providence, RI; Washington Park near Milwaukee, WI; Eastern North Philadelphia) using place-centric crime reduction strategies (Walker & Winston, 2017).

Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN): is a national initiative that creates partnerships among federal, state, local, and tribal law enforcement officials as well as prosecutors and community leaders to develop community-based, comprehensive, targeted solutions to violent crime in communities. PSN are

coordinated by U S Attorney's Offices. A national-level study examined 82 treatment cities and 170 non-treatment cities as well as dosage levels. Hierarchical General Linear Models (HGLM) controlled for other factors that may have affected violent crime levels across the sample cities. Results suggested that PSN treatment cities, in higher dosage contexts, experienced statistically significant, though modest, declines in violent crime compared to non-treatment cities (McGarrell, Corsaro, Hipple, & Bynum, 2010).

Change in Community Norms and Street Outreach

Interventions that include street outreach address violence risk factors such as community-level trauma and cultural/society norms which normalize violence as a way to resolve problems. Interventions include trained personnel reaching out to community residents known to have engaged in or are at increased risk for violence, promoting nonviolence norms and non-violent conflict mediation, and connecting community members to available social supports and services. The effectiveness of programs depends upon the expertise of staff, community resources available, and the model used.

Cure Violence (South Bronx, Philadelphia). Cure Violence utilizes a public health approach to violence reduction at the neighborhood level. It has been found to reduce residents' social norms favoring violence as a solution to both petty and serious conflicts, as well as their propensity to use violence. Several models are being implemented in cities across the country, and evaluations of these programs continue to be done to find which models are more effective. An evaluation of Chicago's model, CeaseFire, found 17-24% reductions in the number of actual and attempted shootings. Safe Streets is a model that has recently been growing more popular in large cities (Delgado et al., 2017; Milam et al., 2016; Skogan et al., 2008; Webster et al., 2012).

Programmatic Considerations

The interventions mentioned in this report are not an exhaustive list of evidence-based programs in existence for violence prevention. When describing recommended programs and interventions, decision makers should also consider factors such as community type (urban, suburban, rural, and tribal) and the demographic populations with whom programs were shown to be effective.

It is always important to implement evidence-based programs with fidelity. Any strategy should be researched for compatibility with population, resources, and scalability. Neglecting implementation fidelity could have detrimental impacts to the community, reduce law enforcement legitimacy, trust in law enforcement by the community, and possibly negative outcomes for the treatment group (Patterson, 2018).

Communities must pay special attention to the requirements needed to properly implement community justice interventions. For example, are special education or training requirements necessary, is the treatment only appropriate in certain size communities (i.e., rural versus urban), age groups, sex, racial groups? Before selecting a program, communities and organizations should consider the resources, time, and commitment necessary to fully implement the program. Even if program aims align the goals of the community, partial implementation of evidence-based programs due to limited budget or resources should not be expected to achieve the outcomes of a program implemented fully with fidelity. In fact, programs implemented without fidelity may cause harm to the treatment group or to the community by reducing trust in the law enforcement agency or organization implementing the program.

This paper is not inclusive of all tactical and community interventions that may reduce violent crime. The researchers focused on the body of evidence and other interventions in wide use may

not have had sufficient information to include at this writing. Other areas for future investigation include violence interrupters within community policing, reentry programs in the criminal justice system, investigation around non-fatal shootings, and other intimate partner intervention.

Recommendations for Practitioners

Upon review of empirical peer-reviewed meta-analyses and scholarly articles regarding violent crime prevention, our recommendations are as follows:

1. Law enforcement should utilize programs emphasizing disorder policing, focus deterrence, and restorative justice frameworks. Such programs may be enhanced using hotspot mapping/risk terrain modeling and validated risk-needs-responsivity assessments to direct patrol assignments, resource allocation, and supplemental initiatives which benefit the mission of violent crime reduction.
2. When incorporating strategic initiatives and programs, it is imperative that law enforcement maintain fidelity to all elements of the original program model for outcome consistency. Furthermore, fidelity to an evidence-based program model ensures similar ethical considerations are undertaken throughout implementation, therefore limiting the potential for external bias.
3. Law enforcement should engage in continuous efforts to foster perceptions of police legitimacy among the communities served to promote cooperation between law enforcement and community stakeholders. Such efforts are critical for successful program implementation and should be prioritized.
4. Law enforcement should utilize promising technology-based investigative tools for the purpose of enhancing response capacity:
 - a. Real-Time Crime Centers allow investigators to use multiple and often diverse sources of data to connect criminal incidents to criminal actors, as well as managing data repositories and developing predictive models based upon historical administrative data.
 - b. Data mining and predictive analytic techniques (i.e., machine learning) are flexible tools which can be used to enhance hot-spot mapping, and real-time crime centers by incorporating information derived from cell phone/mobile devices and social media. In addition, such techniques may be used to norm risk-needs-responsivity assessments upon the specific populations served by each jurisdiction.
 - c. Gunshot Detection Technologies (GDT) accurately provide the real-time location of gunshots for investigative purposes, decreasing response times of calls for service. Furthermore, historical data derived from GDTs may be utilized in conjunction with hotspot mapping for the purpose of determining effective resource allocation.
 - d. Social Network Analysis (SNA) provides an analytical assessment of the connections among individuals, allowing identification of gang structures and drug market networks, and identifying key individuals to investigate.
5. Communities and schools should incorporate interventions that increase protective factors that can reduce crime for children, youth, and families; such as quality early childhood programs (e.g., early Head Start and Head Start), good school attendance programs (e.g., Check and Connect, Positive Action), after school and youth development programs (e.g., GEAR UP), literacy programs (e.g., READ 180), social-emotional interventions, mentoring programs.

6. More mental health and substance abuse prevention, treatment, and recovery programs should be available. This may include school-based behavioral health interventions and support conducted by licensed mental health professionals (e.g., school social workers, school psychologists).
7. Place-centric crime reduction community driven strategies: build trust and collaboration between communities, law enforcement, and other key stakeholders to develop vibrant and safe places where people can live, grow, work, and learn.

Bibliography

- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 16(1), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018362>
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17(1), 19–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854890017001004>
- Assink, M., van der Put, C. E., Hoeve, M., de Vries, S. L., Stams, G. J. J., & Oort, F. J. (2015). Risk factors for persistent delinquent behavior among juveniles: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical psychology review*, 42, 47-61.
- Barnett, G. D., & Howard, F. F. (2018). What Doesn't Work to Reduce Reoffending? *European Psychologist*.
- Beets, M. W., Flay, B. R., Vuchinich, S., Snyder, F., Acock, A., Burns, K., & Durlak, J. (2009). Use of a social and character development program to prevent substance use, violent behaviors, and sexual activity among elementary-school students in Hawaii. *American Journal of Public Health*, 99(8), 1-8.
- Botvin, G. J., Griffin, K. W., & Nichols, T. D. (2006). Preventing youth violence and delinquency through a universal school-based prevention approach. *Prevention Science*, 7(4), 403-408.
- Bowan, N. A., Kim, S., Ingle, L. Ford, D. C., & Sibaouih, C. (2018). Improving college access at low income high schools? The impact of Gear Up Iowa on postsecondary enrollment and persistence. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analyses*, 44(3). Doi: 10.3102/0162373718778133
- Boyle, D. J., Ragusa-Salerno, L. M., Lanterman, J. L., & Marcus, A. F. (2013). An evaluation of day reporting centers for parolees: Outcomes of a randomized trial. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 12(1), 119-143.
- Braga, A. A. (2005). Hot spots policing and crime prevention: A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Journal of experimental criminology*, 1(3), 317-342.
- Braga, A. A., Papachristos, A. V., & Hureau, D. M. (2014). The effects of hot spots policing on crime: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Justice quarterly*, 31(4), 633- 663.
- Braga, A. A., Turchan, B. S., Papachristos, A. V., & Hureau, D. M. (2019). Hot spots policing and crime reduction: an update of an ongoing systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of experimental criminology*, 15(3), 289-311.
- Braga, A. A., Turchan, B., Papachristos, A. V., & Hureau, D. M. (2019). Hot spots policing of small geographic areas effects on crime. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3), e1046.
- Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2018). Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 17(1), 205-250.

- Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies effects on crime: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3).
- Braga, A. A., Welsh, B. C., & Schnell, C. (2015). Can policing disorder reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 52(4), 567-588.
- Braga, A. A., Welsh, B. C., & Schnell, C. (2019). Disorder policing to reduce crime: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 15(3), e1050.
- Braga, A. A., Zimmerman, G., Barao, L., Farrell, C., Brunson, R. K., & Papachristos, A. V. (2019). Street Gangs, Gun Violence, and Focused Deterrence: Comparing Place-based and Group-based Evaluation Methods to Estimate Direct and Spillover Deterrent Effects. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 56(4), 524–562. <https://doi-org.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/10.1177/0022427818821716>
- Chan C. S., Rhodes, J. E., Howard W. J., Lowe, S. R., Schwartz, S. E. O., & Herrera C. (2013). Pathways of influence in school-based mentoring: The mediating role of parent and teacher relationships. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51(1), 129-142.
- Cozen, P. & Love, T. (2015). A review and current status of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). *Journal of Planning Literature*, 1-20. Doi: 10.1177/0885412215595440
- Crean, H. F., & Johnson, D. B. (2013). Promoting Alternative THinking Strategies (PATHS) and elementary school aged children’s aggression: Results from a cluster randomized trial. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 52(1-2), 56-72.
- David-Ferdon, C., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Dahlberg, L. L., Marshall, K. J., Rainford, N. & Hall, J. E. (2016). *A Comprehensive Technical Package for the Prevention of Youth Violence and Associated Risk Behaviors*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Delgado, S., Alsabahi, L., Wolff, K., Alexander, N., Cobar, C., & Butts, J. (2017). The effects of Cure Violence in the South Bronx and East New York, Brooklyn. In *Denormalizing Violence: A Series of Reports from the John Jay College Evaluation of Cure Violence Programs in New York City*. New York, NY: Research and Evaluation Center, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York.
- Dicker, R., Gaines, B., Bonne, S., Duncan, T., Violano, P.... Stewart, R. (2017). Violence intervention programs: A primer for developing a comprehensive program for trauma centers. *Bulletin of the American College of Surgeons*, 102(10), 20-29.
- Dodgel, K., Bierman, K., Coie, J., Greenberg, M., Lochman, J., McMahon, R., Pinderhighes, E. (2015). Impact of early intervention on psychopathology, crime, and well-being at age 25. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 172(1), 59-70.
- Dowdy, E., Furlong, M., Raines, T.C., Boverly, B., Kauffman, B., Kamphaus, R. W., Dever, B., Price, M., & Murdock, J. (2013). Enhancing school-based mental health services with a preventive and promotive approach to universal screening for complete mental health. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 25(2-3), 178-197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10474412.2014.929951>
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., & Pachan, M. (2010). A meta-analysis of after-school programs that seek to promote personal and social skills in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(3–4), 294–309. <https://doi-org.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/10.1007/s10464-010-9300-6>
- Ehrhard-Dietzel, S., Barton, M. S., & Hickey, D. A. (2017). Implementation and outcomes of an innovative front end juvenile justice reform initiative. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 34(3), 223-234.

- Esbensen, F. A., Peterson, D., Taylor, T. J., & Osgood, D. W. (2012). Results from a multi-site evaluation of the GREAT program. *Justice Quarterly*, 29(1), 125-151. DOI: 10.1080/07418825.2011.585995
- Foshee, V., Reyes, L., Agnew-Brune, C., Simon, T., Vagi, K., Lee, R.D., & Suchindran, C. (2014). The Effects of the Evidence-Based Safe Dates Dating Abuse Prevention Program on Other Youth Violence Outcomes. *Prevention Science*, 15, 907-916. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-014-0472-4>
- Gardiner, S. (2013). Data Will Show Crime-Solving Rates --- NYPD to Resume Sending Figures on Number of 'Cleared' Felonies to FBI; About 75% of Murders Are Closed in 2012. *Wall Street Journal*, Eastern edition; New York, N.Y. Page A.17. Publication date: Feb 15, 2013. New York, N.Y.
- Ghosh, D., Chun, S. A., Shafiq, B., & Adam, N. R. (2016, June). Big data-based smart city platform: Real-time crime analysis. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Digital Government Research Conference on Digital Government Research* (pp. 58-66).
- Goldschmidt, P., Huang, D., & Chinen, M. (2007). The long-term effects of after-school programming on educational adjustment and juvenile crime: A study of the LA's BEST after-school program. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing and University of California Los Angeles. Retrieved from <http://www.chapinhall.org/research/brief/after-school-programs-and-academic-impact>.
- Gottfredson, D., Gerstenblith, S., Soule, D., Womer, S., & Lu, S. (2004). Do after school programs reduce delinquency? *Prevention Science*, 5(4), 253-266.
- Gottfredson, D., Kearly, B., Thornberry, T., Slothower, M., Devlin, D., & Fader, J. (2018). Scaling-Up Evidence-Based Programs Using a Public Funding Stream: A Randomized Trial of Functional Family Therapy for Court-Involved Youth. *Prevention Science* 19, 939–953. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-018-0936-z>
- Gravel J, & Tita, GE. (2017). Network perspectives on crime. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology*, ed. S Messner, H Pontel. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press
- Grunwald, B., & Papachristos, A. V. (2017). Project Safe Neighborhoods in Chicago: Looking Back a Decade Later. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 107(1), 131–159.
- Hanson, R. K., Bourgon, G., Helmus, L., & Hodgson, S. (2009). A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of treatment for sexual offenders: Risk, need, and responsivity. User Report, 1.
- Heckman, J., Pinto, R., & Savelyev, P. (2013). Understanding the mechanisms through which an influential early childhood program boosted adult outcomes. *American Economic Review*, 103(6), 2025-2086. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1257/aer.103.6.2052>
- Hirsch, B. J., Hedges, L. V., Stawicki, J. A., & Mekinda, M. A. (2011). After-school programs for high school students: an evaluation of After School Matters. Technical report. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University. Retrieved from <http://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/docs/publications/1070224029553e7f678c09f.pdf>.
- Hyatt, J. M., & Ostermann, M. (2019). Better to stay home: evaluating the impact of day reporting centers on offending. *Crime & Delinquency*, 65(1), 94-121.
- Irvin-Erikson, Y., La Vigne, N., Tiry, E., & Bieler, S. (2017). What does gunshot detection tell us about gun violence? *Applied Geography*, 86, 262-273.
- Johnson, R. & Jackon, C. (2019). Reducing inequality through dynamic complementarity: Evidence from head start and public school spending. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 2019, 11(4), 310-349.

- Kennedy, L., Caplan, J., & Piza, E. (2011). Risk Clusters, Hotspots, and Spatial Intelligence: Risk Terrain Modeling as an Algorithm for Police Resource Allocation Strategies. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 27(3), 339-362. Retrieved April 3, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/23883826
- Kim, B., Oesterle, S., Catalano, R., & Hawkins, J. (2015). Change in protective factors across adolescent development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 40, 26-37.
- Lawrence, D. S., La Vigne, N. G., Goff, M., & Thompson, P. S. (2018). Lessons learned implementing gunshot detection technology: Results of a process evaluation in three major cities. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, 1(2), 109-129.
- Lawrence, D. S., La Vigne, N. G., Goff, M., & Thompson, P. S. (2018). Lessons learned implementing gunshot detection technology: Results of a process evaluation in three major cities. *Justice Evaluation Journal*, 1(2), 109-129.
- Li, K. K., Washburn, I., DuBois, D. L., Vuchinich, S., Ji, P., Brechling, V., . . . Flay, B. R. (2011). Effects of the Positive Action program on problem behaviors in elementary school students: A matched-pair randomized control trial in Chicago. *Psychology & Health*, 26, 187- 204.
- Lowenkamp, C. T. (2004). Correctional program integrity and treatment effectiveness: A multi-site, program-level analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati.
- Lowenkamp, C. T., & Latessa, E. J. (2002). Evaluation of Ohio's community based correctional facilities and halfway house programs [Technical report]. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati.
- McCue, C. (2007). Data mining and predictive analysis: intelligence gathering and crime analysis. Butterworth-Heinemann.
- McGarrell, E. F., Corsaro, N., Hipple, N. K., & Bynum, T. (2010). Project Safe Neighborhoods and violent crime trends in U S cities: Assessing violent crime impact. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 26(2): 165-190. DOI: 10.1007/s10940-010-9091-9
- Milam, A., Buggs, S., Furr-Holden, C., Leaf, P., Bradshaw, C., & Webster, D. (2016). Changes in attitudes toward guns and shootings following implementation of the Baltimore Safe Streets Intervention. *Journal of Urban Health*, 93(4), 609-629. doi: 10.1007/s11524-016- 0060-y
- Molgaard V., Spoth R., & Redmond, C. (2000). Competency training the Strengthening Families Program: for parents and youth 10–14. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/182208.pdf>
- Mulvey, E., & Iselin, A. (2008). Improving Professional Judgments of Risk and Amenability in Juvenile Justice. *The Future of Children*, 18(2), 35-57. Retrieved March 26, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/20179978
- National Network of Hospital-based Violence Intervention Programs. (2019). Hospital-based violence intervention: Practices and policies to end the cycle of violence. [White paper]. Retrieved from <https://www.thehavi.org/>.
- Ogden, T. and Halliday-Boykins, C.A. (2004), Multisystemic Treatment of Antisocial Adolescents in Norway: Replication of Clinical Outcomes Outside of the US. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 9: 77-83. doi:10.1111/j.1475-3588.2004.00085.x
- Papachristos, A.V. and Kirk, D.S. (2015), Changing the Street Dynamic. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 14: 525-558. doi:10.1111/1745-9133.12139

- Perry, W., McInnis, B., Price, C., Smith, S., & Hollywood, J. (2013). Using Predictions to Support Police Operations. In *Predictive Policing: The Role of Crime Forecasting in Law Enforcement Operations* (pp. 57-80). RAND Corporation. Retrieved April 3, 2020, from www.jstor.org/stable/10.7249/j.ctt4cgdcz.11
- Petrosino, A., Petrosino, C. T., & Buehler, J. (2005). "Scared Straight" and other juvenile awareness programs for preventing juvenile delinquency. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 1(1), 1-62.
- Ptacek, J. (2017). Research on Restorative Justice in Cases of Intimate Partner Violence. In Renzetti C., Follingstad D., & Coker A. (Eds.), *Preventing intimate partner violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 159-184). Bristol: Bristol University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctt1t89gf6.12
- Rampey, B., Keiper, S., Mohadjer, L., Krenzke, T., Li, J., Thornton, N., & Hogan, J. (2016). Highlights from the U.S. PIAAC Survey of Incarcerated Adults: Their Skills, Work Experience, Education, and Training: Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies: 2014 (NCES 2016-040). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved [04/07/2020] from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2016/2016040.pdf>.
- Sherman, L. W., & Weisburd, D. (1995). General deterrent effects of police patrol in crime "hot spots": A randomized, controlled trial. *Justice quarterly*, 12(4), 625-648.
- Sherman, L. W., Strang, H., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D. J., & Ariel, B. (2015). Are restorative justice conferences effective in reducing repeat offending? Findings from a Campbell systematic review. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 31(1), 1-24.
- Simon, T. R., Sussman, S., Dahlberg, L. L., & Dent C. W. (2002). Influence of a substance- abuse-prevention curriculum on violence-related behavior. *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 25, 103-110.
- Skogan, W., Hartnett, S., Bump, N., & Dubois, J. (2008). *Evaluation of CeaseFire-Chicago*. Chicago, IL: Northwestern University. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/227181.pdf>
- Spoth, R., Redmond, C., & Shin, C. (2000) Reducing adolescents' aggressive and hostile behaviors: randomized trial effects of a brief family intervention 4 years past baseline. *Arch Pediatric Adolescent Med* 2000;154(12):1248-57
- Strang, H., Sherman, L. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D., & Ariel, B. (2013). Restorative justice conferencing (RJC) using face-to-face meetings of offenders and victims: Effects on offender recidivism and victim satisfaction. A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 9(1), 1-59.
- Sutphen, R. D., Ford, J. P., & Flaherty, C. (2010). Truancy interventions: A review of the research literature. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 1-11. doi:10.1177/1049731509347861
- Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., & Bass, A. (2008). Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 4(1), 1-112.
- Walker, C., & Winston, F. (2017). Place, people, police: The effects of place-centric crime reduction efforts in three neighborhoods. Retrieved from https://www.lisc.org/media/filer_public/c1/a4/c1a4621b-c18a-4170-84f3-6eb84c868f34/030117_resource_place_people_police.pdf
- Watkins, C., Mazerolle, L. G., Rogan, D., & Frank, J. (2002). Technological approaches to controlling random gunfire. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*.
- Watkins, C., Mazerolle, L. G., Rogan, D., & Frank, J. (2002). Technological approaches to controlling random gunfire. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*.
- Webster, D.W., Whitehill, J.M., Vernick, J.S., & Parker, E.M. (2012). Evaluation of Baltimore's Safe Streets Program: Effects on Attitudes, Participants' Experiences, and Gun Violence. *John Hopkins Bloomberg*

School of Public Health. Retrieved from <https://www.rwjf.org/en/library/research/2012/01/evaluation-of-baltimore-s-safe-streets-program.html>

What Works Clearinghouse (2017). Read 180. WWC Intervention Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/InterventionReports/wwc_read180_112916.pdf

What Works Clearinghouse (2017). Success for All. WWC Intervention Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/InterventionReports/wwc_sfa_032817.pdf

Zun, L., Downey, L., & Rosen, J. (2006). The effectiveness of an ED-based violence prevention program. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 24(1), 8-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2005.05.009>