

INTRODUCTION

Welcome to the Community-Based Violence Prevention Partnership Toolkit. This Toolkit is a promising practices guide for faith-based and community organizations (FBCOs) that seek to reduce violence in Indianapolis through outreach activities, mentorship approaches, and case management techniques. The Toolkit is designed to serve as a resource to assist the development and implementation of violence prevention and intervention efforts. A collection of strategies is reported and promising practices are identified. Available monitoring or measurement tools affiliated with these strategies are inventoried and shared. Details on the lessons learned from these types of interventions – those that are deemed effective, as well as those that have been found to be ineffective – are also presented.

The Partnership’s purpose is to continue to build the capacity of and support existing anti-violence efforts of FBCOs to address violence and increase safety, especially in those areas of Indianapolis that have experienced recent increases in violent crime. The most promising violence reduction strategies include active and sustained contributions of local community organizations that work in collaboration with or in parallel to law enforcement and other justice system partners. Although the exclusive reliance on justice system actions can and does reduce violence, community partnerships can enhance these approaches and transform short-term reductions in crime into sustained declines.

USING THE TOOLKIT

The Toolkit consists of three sections. **Section One provides an Intervention Snapshot.** Sixteen violence prevention and intervention strategies were identified for review. Table 1 reports the name and location of the synthesized strategy. In general, these efforts were selected for review for two reasons. First, these interventions involved active roles of FBCOs in service delivery. Second, many of the interventions incorporated outreach activities, mentorship approaches, case management techniques, or some combination of these service delivery elements that were led by FBCOs.

Table 1: Violence Prevention and Intervention Strategies Reviewed





Intervention	Location
Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence [CIRV]	Cincinnati, Ohio
Consent-to-Search	St. Louis, Missouri
Cure Violence <i>(formerly known as Chicago CeaseFire)</i>	Chicago, Illinois
Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership [IVRP]	Indianapolis, Indiana
Michigan Youth Violence Prevention Center [MI-YVPC]	Flint, Michigan

Intervention (Continued)	Location
One Vision One Life	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Operation Ceasefire	Boston, Massachusetts
Operation Peacekeeper	Stockton, California
Phoenix TRUCE	Phoenix, Arizona
Project Safe Neighborhoods [PSN]	Chicago, Illinois
Project Safe Neighborhoods [PSN]	Lowell, Massachusetts
Safe Streets	Baltimore, Maryland
Save Our Streets [S.O.S.]	Brooklyn, New York
Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative [SYVPI]	Seattle, Washington
Wells-Goodfellow Police-Led Community Initiative	St. Louis, Missouri
Youth Violence Reduction Partnership [YVRP]	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

At the outset, it is critical to note that the evidence on violence reduction efforts with a dominant service delivery focus on outreach, mentorship, and case management are mixed. Some strategies are able to achieve goals of reducing violent crime, while other strategies are unable to change crime rates and may even increase crime. The lack of a strong consensus in the research literature on these violence prevention and intervention efforts may be due to a number of factors. The most prominent explanations involve the models that are used, the adherence of service delivery plans to those that are delivered in practice, and the research evaluation procedures that are used to collect and analyze data.

The review of violence reduction and prevention literature presented here differentiated between those efforts that were more effective than others. A four-tier classification system was adopted to make distinctions. Table 2 provides an overview of how each intervention was classified.

Table 2: Differentiating Reviewed Strategies

	Effective intervention	Reduced violence by at least 10%
	Inconclusive intervention	No conclusion can be drawn from the results; Mixed results
	Potentially harmful intervention	Increased violence by at least 10%
	Not applicable	No available research to assess effectiveness

In addition to providing a rating for each of the 16 violence prevention and intervention strategies reviewed in Section One, the snapshots will include the following information:

- A short description of the intervention,
- Details of the core components of the intervention as designed,
- A summary of key findings,
- Listings of relevant references and resources associated with the intervention. References will be made available as PDF files. Resources can be found in Section Three.

Section Two presents the Core Program Components of the 16 violence prevention and intervention strategies identified for review. This section provides additional details on the inputs and activities that are common to violence reduction strategies that emphasize outreach activities, mentorship approaches, and/or case management techniques. Insights gathered from this section can be used to help identify target populations, specify a program theory of prevention or intervention, and design a logic model that will guide self-assessment and performance measurement activities.

Section Three delivers a series of Appendices that inventory the organizational structure, program theory or logic model, and performance measures that have been integrated into the operations of violence prevention and intervention strategies. Resources offered in this section provide insights on how these type of strategies can be structured. A number of data collection tools are also shared to demonstrate the various approaches that are used to generate and share data.