



SECTION TWO: CORE PROGRAM COMPONENTS

This section of the Partnership Toolkit focuses on the core program components that have been integrated into violence prevention and intervention strategies. The information shared in this section also seeks to make sense of and define some of the more common terminology used in the body of literature on these types of strategies (e.g., “street outreach,” “mentorship,” “case management,” “community mobilization,” etc.). The reality is that, while these programs may report similar program models and integrate similar language, there are nuanced differences between program models that must be considered. These insights can be used to design new strategies or modify existing activities to be more closely aligned to effective practices.

The section is divided into seven subsections. Each subsection is to be considered a sole component of a broader, multi-component strategy. Most of the available evidence on effective violence prevention and intervention will combine these core components into a unified effort. Where applicable, the lessons learned about the implementation of a given program component will be discussed.

IDENTIFYING A TARGET POPULATION

Nearly all of the available strategies have narrowly focused on a well-defined population of individuals at greatest risk for violence within an area. Defining a target population provides clarity and builds consensus across organizations involved in this work about the fundamental issues that contribute to violence. This initial work also directs the development of a program model that may change behaviors and reduce violence.

Different techniques have been used to identify a target population. For instance, “focused deterrence” strategies target “very specific behaviors by a relatively small number of chronic offenders who are highly vulnerable to criminal justice sanction” (Braga & Weisburd, 2012, p. 329). Criminal justice system professionals lead the identification of possible target populations, with advisement from community organizations. Alternatively, some strategies employ “violence interrupters,” who are outreach workers tasked with the responsibility to build relationships with a small group of violent-prone individuals. In these models, community organizations lead the identification of a target population and work with criminal justice system professionals to provide alternatives to violence and exit strategies from criminal activities. Regardless of the approach,

The Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV) exemplifies a targeting strategy with a criminal justice lead. CIRV targeted individuals most at-risk to be victims or suspects in firearm-related violence. Law enforcement gathered and shared non-sensitive intelligence to identify individual members of known violent groups. Initially, the intervention’s service delivery component struggled to focus its efforts to the defined target population. Given the difficulty of reaching the target population as identified by law enforcement, the intervention evolved in two ways. First, individuals who desired to receive referrals to the network of service providers made available to program participants were encouraged to contact CIRV staff to engage in activities. This decision also introduced a new problem – CIRV services were less able to engage members of known violence-prone groups. The second evolution of the program was to institute a system for screening potential participants.

A screening tool was designed and used by CIRV Service Team members to provide tailored services to individuals who (a) were identified by criminal justice professionals and opted-in to the program, (b) were recruited through direct outreach efforts, or (c) self-selected into the program (see Section Three: Appendices, Target Population Screening Tools or Assessments, CIRV Screening Tool). If individuals scored low (0-1) on the screening tool, they were connected with appropriate wraparound services in the community or participated in informal therapeutic activities with CIRV Service Team members. If they scored a high (2-4) on CIRV's instrument, individuals were provided additional opportunities to participate intensive social services and job readiness training. CIRV Service Team members reviewed participants who received services across a 2.5-year period of program operation. Of the 622 clients who participated in the program, 20% had been listed as a potential participant by criminal justice professionals. This finding suggests that CIRV's more liberal definition of a target population is better able to reach a target population motivated to change group membership and reduce their risk of being a victim of firearm-related violence (Engel, Skubak-Tillyer, & Corsaro, 2011).

In Cure Violence's (CV) outreach approach, CV staff approached potential participants on the street, avoiding recruitment through institutions. CV staff used wide degrees of discretion on which individuals to approach (e.g., a "likely-looking candidate," standing on a corner, hanging out in a CV target location, etc.). During the interaction, CV staff would attempt to gather enough information to assess whether the potential participant could be classified as being at high-risk for being involved in firearm violence as a perpetrator or a victim. An individual was classed as high-risk and subsequently referred to services if s/he matched at least four of seven client selection requirements. These include:

1. Gang involvement,
2. Key role in a gang,
3. Prior criminal history,
4. Involved in high-risk street activity (e.g., drug markets),
5. Recent victim of a shooting,
6. Between the ages of 16 and 25, or
7. Recently released from prison

CV did enroll candidates who were classified as moderate-risk (met three of the seven criteria) and low-risk (met two or fewer of the seven criteria) for violent victimization. However, these enrollments required additional explanations to justify why these individuals should be in the program (Skogan, Hartnett, Bumb, Dubois, 2009). Other initiatives have replicated this organic, client selection approach as described above and have utilized similar if not identical client selection requirements. While Phoenix TRUCE staff used the same seven criteria in identifying clients that were found in CV's targeting strategy, Save Our Streets (S.O.S.) deviated slightly from the CV model (Picard-Fritsche, & Cerniglia, 2013). S.O.S. designated individuals as high-risk if they met four or more the following criteria:

1. Active in a violent street organization,
2. Major player in a street organization,
3. History of violence/crimes against persons,
4. A weapons carrier,

5. Recent victim of a shooting,
6. Between the ages of 16 and 25 years old, or
7. Recently released from prison

Not all interventions design such rigid or organic participant recruitment processes to form a target population. Indeed, some of the successful initiatives discussed in this Toolkit developed targeting strategies that, while a target population was defined, attempted to address neighborhoods, gangs, and communities more broadly. For example, Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) Lowell focused anti-violence efforts on violent gang members engaged in ongoing disputes within the community, but its recruitment efforts did not integrate a screening tool. Although gang-affiliated individuals who were the focus of aggressive enforcement efforts were identified through street-level intelligence gathered by police, in general, determining the areas, groups, and individuals to target was a community-wide, collaborative effort (Braga, Pierce, McDevitt, Bond, & Cronin, 2008).

In all, some learning pains and subjectivity is to be expected in the early phases of the client recruitment process. Although some level of discretion is necessary for FBCOs involved in anti-violence outreach work to identify potential participants, it is important to not lose sight of the target population who should be engaged in the program. Drifting away from a specified target population without commensurate changes to program activities can minimize the potential of a violence prevention or intervention effort. For instance, the evaluation of One Vision One Life indicated that a contributing factor to why the program might not have achieved its goal of reducing violence was its deviation away from its target population. One Vision One Life staff focused efforts more on individuals in need than on those who are most at-risk to be involved in gun violence (Wilson, Chermak, & McGarrell, 2011).

OUTREACH

Outreach activities are critical program components of many of the violence reduction and prevention interventions discussed in this Toolkit. The outreach worker, sometimes referred to as a “community coordinator”, “street advocate”, “credible messenger”, or “street worker”, is a key staff member who identifies, contacts, and engages target populations in program services. In the more effective initiatives, outreach workers manage participants over time by linking participants to social services and providing exit strategies from criminal activities through one-on-one coaching, mentoring, and relationship building. Additionally, outreach workers take on roles to serve as a liaison between participants and local service providers, institutions, neighborhood leaders, community coalitions, and residents. CIRV, CV, Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership (IVRP), Michigan Youth Violence Prevention Center (MI-YVPC), One Vision One Life, Operation Ceasefire, Operation Peacekeeper, Phoenix TRUCE, PSN Lowell, Safe Streets, S.O.S., Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI), and Youth Violence Reduction Partnership (YVRP) approaches were notable for including an outreach component in its model. The following are select examples of effective outreach strategies.

CIRV made use of 14 “street advocates.” CIRV street advocates’ responsibilities were diverse, ranging from social work and case management duties to violence intervention tasks. Specifically, street advocates were tasked with the responsibility to:

- Provide direct linkages to immediate and tailored wraparound services for individuals trying to escape a life of violence,
- Assist in conflict mediation on the streets,
- Spread non-violence messages to the community, and
- Offer support for victims' and participants' families.

CIRV outreach activities were viewed as being a vehicle that transports clients from violence and failure to a violence free life and success (Engel et al., 2011). CIRV administrators recruited and hired street advocates with past experiences in common with the target population, including formerly incarcerated individuals and those maintaining residence in low income, high crime CIRV target areas.

Outreach workers, similarly, played a key role in CV. Outreach workers provided or identified counseling and services to participants, which was viewed by program administrators as being one of the most important components of the program. CV utilizes outreach workers who have street experience and local ties to the community, which enables safe navigation of target area streets. As seen in CIRV, CV outreach workers were hired based on their similar background to the target population. Similarities of narratives and experiences allow outreach workers to deliver a credible message to participants and local residents. However, the reliance on personal experiences rather than professional backgrounds in the hiring process for outreach workers is not without criticism. The lack of formal training and/or certification coupled with the presence of a criminal history record were significant hurdles for CV to overcome. More than 150 formerly incarcerated individuals were employed as outreach workers or violence interrupters across the evaluation of the program.

CV outreach workers were expected to build and maintain a caseload of 15 high-risk clients. After completing an initial assessment to determine if potential participants were at-risk for violent victimization, outreach workers provided access to available social services that involved job readiness training, employment referrals or placements, GED programs and alternative schools, and the acquisition of identification documents. The vast majority (76%) of participants interviewed during the CV evaluation reported that joblessness was their biggest problem. Moreover, of those who requested help in improving their education, 30% had completed high school, some college, or trade school training. CV outreach workers also had the responsibility to address clients' personal and interpersonal needs on-site. For example, 92% of participants who reported anger management issues discussed these problems with their outreach worker.

Unique to some programs are violence interrupters, which are a specialized form of outreach that originated from the CV program. Violence interrupters identify and mediate potentially violent conflicts on the street between individuals and gangs. The violence interruption process typically includes working the street at night or in high crime areas alone or in pairs and talking one-on-one to associates and family of recent shooting victims who may perpetuate a cycle of retaliatory violence. Violence interrupters also work closely with known key gang members following a shooting. It is necessary for violence interrupters to be present immediately following a shooting to intervene and prevent additional firearm-violence from occurring.

However, not all violence prevention and reduction initiatives hire staff to solely engage in violence interruption activities. CIRV street advocates serve multiple purposes; one of them being conflict mediation. One Vision One Life, Operation Ceasefire Phoenix TRUCE, Safe Streets, and S.O.S approaches also task their outreach workers with multi-purpose job responsibilities. It is not clear if violence interruption activities should be a sole focus or if they should be one out of an assortment of responsibilities. Research on street outreach work details a work environment that consists of high staff turnover, little work experience related to job tasks, problems with supervision and accountability, inadequate training, and unsystematic approaches to conflict mediation (Engel et al., 2011; Skogan et al., 2009; Wilson et al., 2011).

One evaluation is critical of a structure that integrates outreach and violence interruption activities into one staff position. One Vision One Life was found to be ineffective (Wilson et al., 2011). Among the lessons learned for improving the model, the evaluators indicated that One Vision One Life's community coordinators (their term for outreach worker) may have been one of the causes for the suboptimal outcomes. One Vision One Life employed 40 community coordinators who worked 20 to 30 hours per week and built a caseload size of at least participants. Primary job responsibilities allocated to community coordinators involved a range of activities; from intervening in violent events, to counseling clients and connecting them to a range of services, to participating in outreach events. However, a lack of a single focus made caseload management difficult. Each of these responsibilities required a unique skillset, and as such, the potential for community coordinators to overemphasize one responsibility to the detriment of others was common. These dynamics contributed to the delivery of services.

CV experienced similar issues and made adjustments to adopt the work styles of staff members. CV staff who were more qualified to mentor clients and connect them to services or were given the option to serve as an outreach worker. Those who were more comfortable with responding to gang conflicts had the option to take on violence interrupter positions.

MENTORSHIP

Mentorship activities can facilitate client engagement, build relationships, establish connections to wraparound services, and create pathways to avoid dangerous situations (Tierney, Grossman, & Resch, 1995). While outreach workers are commonly asked to take a role in mentoring in violence reduction and prevention efforts, more formal mentorship programming models exist that are specifically focused on the mentorship of at-risk youth. Many of the violence prevention and reduction initiatives included in the Toolkit did not provide sufficient detail on (a) the mentorship approach or program model being used, or (b) the elements of mentorship approaches that worked best for which type of target population. CIRV, CV, IVRP, MI-YVPC, One Vision One Life, SYVPI, and YVRP made mention of mentorship activities, with most of the actions taking place informally through outreach workers.

SYVPI is the only violence prevention and intervention effort that offers a formal mentorship component to its program. The initiative integrated two mentoring programs: Big Brothers and Big Sisters of America; and the Clergy Community Children Youth Coalition (4C Coalition). Big Brothers Big Sisters of Puget Sound (BBSPS), which follows the national model, focuses

mentoring services on middle school youth while the 4C, which utilizes the Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration mentor model, concentrates its mentoring services to criminal justice-involved youth. These mentorship programs aim to match clients with positive role models in the community. Adult mentors are paired up with a mentee for a least one year to instill prosocial behaviors that will help them succeed in school, consider alternatives to violence, and make overall positive life decisions.

The national Big Brothers and Big Sisters of America model has generated evidence of being an effective strategy to improve the prosocial behaviors of youth. The national model consists of the following principles:

- Screen potential mentors through personal interviews, home visits, and criminal background and reference checks
- Match a mentee to a vetted mentor based on preferences – e.g., religion, language, sexual orientation – and other pertinent factors – e.g., demeanor, interests, and geographic proximity
- Seek approval from mentee and parents in regards to the potential mentor match
- Schedule times for mentor-mentee matches to meet (usually three to four per month)

SYVPI deviates from the national Big Brothers Big Sisters model in regards to the mentee referral process. While national model requires a youth's parents to begin the mentor-mentee matching process, the SYVPI model will start the enrollment process when the referral source or SYVPI staff believe mentoring is appropriate for a participant. Once the mentoring agency receives a referral, its staff uses SYVPI's database to find family contact information and to obtain consent from the parent/guardian. It was noted that since the parent or guardian are not requesting mentoring services, this referral process can present difficulties in agency staff being able to connect with the youth or the youth's family, which is a required step.

Although the 4C Coalition utilizes a different mentor model, it is almost identical to the Big Brothers Big Sisters' model. Two differences were noted: 1) the expectation for 4C Coalition mentors is to meet with their mentees once a week and 2) 4C Coalition has established a partnership with the local Parks and Recreation Department to offer structured events and activities for mentors, mentees, and youth's families. Moreover, the 4C Coalition made an explicit effort to recruit more African American mentors to provide mentoring services to the disproportionate number of African American, criminal justice-involved youth (Jones & Shader, 2014).

Since SYVPI's violence reduction and prevention model is still awaiting evaluation, it is not clear whether this more formal mentoring structure is more or less effective than other informal mentoring activities. There is little guidance available on how mentorship should be delivered. The SYVPI assessment did discuss in detail though the mentoring components incorporated into their program model. This work can serve as a starting point to inform the build-out or incorporation of a mentorship component to a violence prevention and intervention effort.

CASE MANAGEMENT

Similar to the mentorship components of violence reduction and prevention interventions, case management was not discussed in detail. Yet, this component was offered as being a foundational piece of each initiative. One of the potential explanations for why this component tends to be overlooked is due to the role of case management techniques in outreach and mentorship activities from program entry to program exit. It is difficult to separate these actions into mutually exclusive groups. Since the Toolkit is meant to provide insights that may assist FBCOs in establishing case management components similar to those found in available initiatives, some salient themes found in the research literature are discussed.

Case management techniques have been used in violence prevention and intervention programs to identify participants, connect participants to timely and tailored activities or services, provide alternatives for high-risk individuals choosing to leave the life of violence, coordinate follow-up service delivery efforts, monitor progress, and capture performance outcomes. Jannetta and colleagues (2010) detail the importance of comprehensive and individualized case management strategies. CIRV Street Advocates strived to connect its target population to wrap-around services and to document engagement in outreach activities or violence interruption incidents (Engel et al., 2011). The 40 One Vision One Life Community Coordinators used a variety of case management approaches that involved the identification of agreed-upon and measurable goals, documentation of successes and barriers, and the continuous modification of case plans to meet individualized goals and objectives (Wilson et al., 2011). Outreach workers in the CV model were required to case plan and manage with individuals on their caseloads, collectively case plan with other outreach workers on potentially problematic participants, and were also mandated to detail and monitor their relationships with community organizations, leaders, and members.

While case management strategies are most visibly connected to outreach workers and violence interrupters, case management responsibilities are not limited to these staff members. SYVPI created Network Hubs, geographically located in the center of specific target locations, to connect participants to local resources. Street outreach workers were responsible for participant recruitment, enrollment, and initial case plans, which were then shared with Network Hubs. Network Hubs further refined these initial case plans, made referrals, monitored progress, instituted new plans, and shared this information with outreach workers (Jones & Shader, 2014).

The type of referrals being made by staff with case management responsibilities depend, in part, on the violence prevention and intervention initiative and its setting. Some similarities exist across initiatives. Referrals tend to be made to the following types of services:

- Housing,
- Individualized treatment (e.g., substance use treatment, physical and mental health treatment)
- Family therapy or counseling,
- Educational,
- Vocational training and job placement,
- Legal advocacy,
- Financial management,

- Mentorship or social, and
- Recreational

To facilitate access to services, some violence prevention and reduction interventions centralize and perform case management in a single location. Other initiatives are decentralized; participants interact with multiple case managers in different locations who are to work together to collectively case plan and monitor participants. Coordinated assessment and case planning, such as those associated with SYVPI, are thought to provide participants with broader access to an array of programs and services. Alternatively, centralized case management is recommended as one way to enable participants and their families to navigate through available resources with less strain. For example, the TRUCE program utilized a prominent local non-profit to coordinate and provide a variety of social services to participants. The agency was well respected in the community and had the capacity to connect clients to appropriate support services. However, the evaluation indicated that the nonprofit was unable to engage other available community partners who may have more appropriately met the needs of participants (Fox et al., 2015).

COMMUNITY MOBILIZATION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

Community mobilization is a public health strategy for addressing social problems. The basic tenant of this approach is to increase the community's ability to state collective standards and exert informal social control over its members (Engel et al., 2011). The idea is that visible community responses can reinforce norms against violence and give individuals the sense that they can take collective action against crime in their neighborhoods. These efforts are similar to public health campaigns to reduce smoking or promote seat belt use, where the goal is to change how residents view behavior. Community mobilization activities associated with violence prevention and intervention initiatives include rallies and marches in response to violent incidents or shootings, community trainings, outreach events, community picnics, and other forms of social gatherings by residents or community leaders.

For example, a hallmark of Brooklyn's S.O.S. initiative was "shooting responses", or vigils that typically occurred within 72 hours of a shooting in a targeted neighborhood. Over two years, S.O.S. facilitated 50 shooting responses involving over 1000 community members. Similarly, the centerpiece of CV's community mobilization was the rallies, marches, and prayer vigils held to reinforce the "Stop Killing People" message to the target community's residents and leaders (Skogan et al., 2009).

Community mobilization also encompasses public education campaigns. In effective violence interventions, public education aims to change norms about violence and increase awareness of the costs of violence to individuals and the community. The message presented in these campaigns is always short and to the point. For instance, "Stop the Killing", "No More Shooting", and "Stop Killing People" have been used. The goal of this approach is to use widespread and repetitive messaging to change how residents see view firearm-involved violence (Skogan et al., 2009). Typical public education activities that aim to deliver a unified message of no shooting include door-to-door canvassing; the distribution of program literature, posters, and clothing; billboard and television advertisements; and signage in commercial establishment windows. All of these

activities have common goal of sending a message that violence will not be tolerated in a community.

For example, the public education efforts of Brooklyn's S.O.S. program involved the distribution of more than 5,000 materials aimed at changing norms about gun violence, including posters, resources fliers, and buttons (Picard-Fritsche & Cerniglia, 2013). The CV program partnered with an advertising firm (who worked *pro bono*) to develop a "Stop Killing People" campaign complete with signs and bumper stickers (Skogan et al., 2009).

Many intervention components discussed in this Toolkit are targeted to participants and the staff who will be tasked with the responsibility of delivering services. Community mobilization, however, relies on the broader community. Mobilization is driven by outreach workers, community residents and clergy, and even individuals targeted by the intervention itself. Targets of mobilization efforts include neighborhood residents, local business owners, community leaders, faith-based groups, and elected officials. For example, an evaluation of the CV project found that the program targeted residents, local business operators, community groups, and elected officials for community mobilization efforts to change neighborhood norms (Skogan et al., 2009).

The overall effect of community mobilization or public education efforts are not well understood. For example, after only one year of S.O.S. program implementation, more than half of the male residents surveyed had seen at least one public education message (on a poster, button, or sign) around the target neighborhood. Despite the prominence of the campaign, residents did not experience improvements in their sense of safety or change their views about the necessity of carrying a gun illegally or joining a gang for self-protection (Delgado et al., 2017).

INVOLVEMENT OF LOCAL FAITH COMMUNITY

Nearly all of the initiatives discussed in this Toolkit involved an influential group of local faith communities. Generally, the efforts of local faith communities were primarily aimed at changing norms on violence, making known the perceived costs of violence, and delivering services to participants and their associates or friends. Consent-to-Search, CV, Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership (IVRP), One Vision One Life, Operation Ceasefire, Operation Peacekeeper, Phoenix TRUCE, and Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiatives (SYVPI) incorporated an active partnership with their local faith community.

As one example, a key programmatic component of the CV model involved clergy leaders and faith-based community coalitions against violence (Skogan et al., 2009). Researchers noted that the local clergy was one of CV's most influential partnerships. CV administrators noted that the cultivation of clergy partnerships fulfilled three prominent roles that were central to the model's theory of violence reduction. Clergy partnerships reinforced community messages that violence would not be tolerated, enhanced community mobilization activities, and improved outreach efforts to recruit participants and educate the community. Mobilizing the community by participating in shooting responses was the clergy's most visible role. Collective responses to shootings and killings ranged from clergy members offering prayers during vigils after shootings

to organizing marches. In addition to these public events, clergy members involved in CV activities reported:

- Preaching a “no shooting” message in their sermons,
- Hosting “safe heaven” programs where high-risk youth could gather in safety,
- Delivering pastoral counseling, mentoring, and support to program clients,
- Assisting a victim’s family, or
- Linking high-risk youth to legitimate services

Although the faith community has been involved in most of the reviewed initiatives and have served similar roles as the clergy did in CV, the level of faith community involvement varies program to program and may change over time. For example, after an organization of clergy withdrew from Operation Ceasefire, the initiative perceived to be less effective. The loss of a credible community messenger may have tempered the program’s ability to deliver street outreach. Similarly, Phoenix TRUCE passively involved the local faith community. The lack of a strong partnership with the faith community was offered as a potential explanation for why the program did not achieve its goals. These findings are met by other research suggesting that clergy involvement can generate community buy-in for a violence prevention and intervention initiative. Operation Peacekeeper included notable members of the clergy to gain support from marginalized members of the community and advocate for program transparency and accountability.

COMMUNITY NOTIFICATION MEETINGS

Another key component of effective violence prevention and reduction interventions is community notification meetings (also known as “call-ins” or “forums”). In a community notification meeting, individuals involved with criminal markets or gangs are called together by criminal justice agencies and community organizations. During this meeting, group members are warned that if any member of the group engages in violence, the entire group will become a priority for law enforcement. The thought is that groups prone to violence will “police” themselves to avoid becoming the priority of criminal justice agencies at the federal, state, and local level.

To create a community notification meeting, multiple criminal justice agencies collaborate to collect and share intelligence to identify individual members of criminal markets or gangs. Those individuals are then invited to a series of community notification meetings with criminal justice and community agencies. The CIRV initiative held 32 community notification meetings over three years, including four notification meetings in prison settings for individuals scheduled to be released into the community over the next 6-months (Engel et al., 2011). Attendees of community notification meetings will vary by initiative. Approximately 20% of identified CIRV clients were under community supervision and could be directed to attend notification meetings. In other initiatives, individuals were invited to attend meetings at schools and recreation centers or were accompanied to meetings by outreach workers, members of the clergy, or family members. CIRV found that 32% of individuals previously identified for recruitment through criminal justice intelligence sharing activities attended at least one community notification meeting (Engel et al., 2011).

A typical community notification meeting lasts approximately an hour and a half and has three parts. First, law enforcement makes it clear that violence prevention has been made a priority by multiple agencies, and that one individual's engagement in violence and crime will result in the entire market or gang becoming a criminal justice priority by using whatever legal means necessary to bring criminal charges against all group members. Individuals are told to share the message with group members who were unable to attend the meetings.

Second, criminal justice agencies summarize the targeted group enforcements that have occurred since the last notification meeting. For example, during the 42-month evaluation of CIRV, 17 groups were targeted for enhanced criminal penalties as a result of the groups' involvement in gun violence, resulting in 318 arrests of 223 individuals on various felony (some of which were federal) and misdemeanor charges (Engel et al., 2011). Those arrests and charges were discussed at subsequent CIRV notification meetings, establishing the credibility of law enforcement's promise.

Third, the meeting concludes with local community organizations presenting opportunities for participants to change their pathway and transition to a different lifestyle. Participants often take advantage of the opportunities that are presented. Among CIRV participants, the most commonly requested types of assistance requested are those related to housing, employment, education, and parenting (Engel et al., 2008). Service providers involved in PSN Chicago made direct referrals to job-training classes, employment opportunities, and wraparound services for individuals participating in the notification meetings (Papachristos, Meares, & Fagan, 2007).

In tandem, these three elements of community notification meetings send an individualized and direct message to participants. It is critical for these messages to be heard, but also to be legitimate. Continued criminal activity without a sanction will damage the integrity of the enforcement message. Perhaps more importantly, the promise of alternatives to criminal behavior without opportunity to enroll in services will harm participants' motivations to change.

CLOSING SUMMARY

As is clear from the review of core components of available violence prevention and intervention strategies that emphasize outreach activities, mentorship approaches, or case management approaches, it is difficult to differentiate components of those interventions that have been found to be effective and those that have not been found effective. A core component found in a successful intervention (e.g., CV violence interrupters) can also be found in interventions that were unable to reduce violent crime or may have even contributed to an *increase* in violence (e.g., One Vision One Life street outreach). This reality makes it difficult to advise the combination of core components that must be in place to meet objectives of reducing violent crime. However, the current state of knowledge on these efforts creates opportunities to replicate strategies that have been found to be effective in other locations or at other times in Indianapolis. The current landscape also enables opportunities to innovate and create new strategies that will be implemented and assessed in order to contribute to the knowledge-base of violence prevention and intervention efforts.

Regardless of the approach being used (adoption or innovation), there are a number of specific questions that must be addressed prior to initiating a violence prevention and intervention initiative. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (2009) recommends responses to the following items:

- What is the size or scope of the problem that needs to be remedied? What factors are driving these problems?
- What is the purpose of the program or intervention? What are the goals and objectives? Are these statements clear, relevant, and measurable?
- What is the target population to be served by the program or intervention?
- How is outreach conducted? By whom? At what frequency and duration?
- How is mentorship conducted? By whom? At what frequency and duration?
- How is case management conducted? By whom? At what frequency and duration?
- How is the program or intervention staffed? What are the desired qualifications for each position? What are the job responsibilities of each position? How will job performance be assessed?
- Which partnerships or collaborations are essential? How can they be developed and maintained?
- How will the program or intervention partner with law enforcement or other justice system agencies? What boundaries will be put in place to build mutually beneficial relationships?
- What data collections will be conducted? How will they guide assessments of program or intervention performance? How will they guide evaluations of program or intervention outcomes? How will they be shared or reported?

In short, it is the combination of understanding the problem at hand, demonstrating how the program or intervention can reduce the problem, and instituting data collections to monitor fidelity to the program model and outcomes that form the foundation for evidence-based practices. Programs or interventions that are found to be successful can be implemented in a larger scale. Those that have been found to be ineffective can look to make significant modifications to program models and implementation procedures, and begin the self-assessment process anew.