



SECTION ONE: INTERVENTION SNAPSHOT

This section summarizes the violence prevention and intervention strategies used throughout the *Toolkit*. Strategies in general, and those detailed here, can differ in breadth of issues they attempt to address, their approach to targeting participants, the type of model implemented, and the definition of success. This section provides a brief summary of each strategy.

Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence [CIRV]	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Cincinnati, Ohio	
Description	
<p>The Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV), created in April 2007, is a multi-agency and community collaborative effort that adopted a focused deterrence violence reduction intervention. Its aim is to create and communicate meaningful consequences for gang-related homicides to group members. CIRV’s objective was the reduction of homicides and gun-related violence perpetrated by gang involved offenders. In addition to the traditional law enforcement-based intervention and community notifications, initiative stakeholders developed an enhanced social service to address criminogenic needs and community mobilization components. Two out of the four strategy teams – services and community engagement strategy teams – provided alternatives to violence for group members and attempted to change community norms towards violence.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive organizational structure • Target high-risk individuals using valid risk assessment tools • Aggressive enforcement strategies • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates • Outreach workers (“street advocates”) offer enhanced social services and mediate conflicts • Community mobilization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38% reduction in gang-related homicides at 24 months and 41% decline at 42 months; this decline was not observed in non-gang-related homicide incidents over the same time period • Violent firearm offenses declined by 22% after both 24 and 42 month post-intervention intervals
Reference(s)	
<p>Engel, R. S., Skubak-Tillyer, M., & Corsaro, N. (2011). Reducing gang violence using focused deterrence: Evaluating the Cincinnati Initiative to Reduce Violence (CIRV). <i>Justice Quarterly</i>, 1-37.</p>	
Resources(s)	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) CIRV Organizational Structure 2) CIRV Strategy Teams Overview 3) CIRV Screening Tool 4) CIRV Services Intake Process 5) CIRV Violence Mediation Tool 	

Consent-to-Search

Location	Effectiveness Status
St. Louis, Missouri	
Description	
<p>In 1994, St. Louis created a strategic problem-solving approach – Consent-to-Search program – to reduce gun crime among youth high-risk for firearm violence. This problem-solving policing initiative involved police officers knocking on doors in targeted areas and obtaining consent from parents of youth who were involved in gun violence to search their homes for guns. Although law enforcement confiscated guns if found, officers did not pursue any further criminal justice sanctions. Consent-to-Search started and stopped twice and evolved into three different program models. Each model contained different components and set of objectives.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Target high-risk youth• Community mobilization and public education• Model I – problem solving and aggressive order maintenance tactics• Model II – crime control and suppression strategies• Model III – community policing and community mobilization initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 510 firearms seized during Model I over an 18-month period• 31 firearms seized during Model II over a 9-month period• 29 firearms seized during Model III over a 9-month period
Reference(s)	
<p>Office of Justice Programs. (2004). <i>Reducing gun violence: The St. Louis consent-to-search program</i>. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.</p>	

Cure Violence [CV]
(formerly known as Chicago CeaseFire)

Location	Effectiveness Status
Chicago, Illinois	

Description

Cure Violence (CV) (formerly known as Chicago CeaseFire) seeks to create individual-level and community-level change in communities where it is a norm for youth to carry a gun and to use a gun to resolve personal conflicts and disputes. The CV model relies on three key elements to stop the transmission of violent behavior. It aims at changing norms regarding violence, to provide on-the-spot alternatives to violence that are more acceptable and less harmful, and to increase the perceived risks and costs of involvement in violence among high-risk youth. The CV model does not involve the use of force or the threat of punishment. It is designed to introduce at-risk individuals to alternative models of conflict resolution that, in turn, may spread to the larger community.

Components	Key Findings
------------	--------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive organizational structure • Target high-risk youth (ages 16-25) • Violence interrupters (usually prior involvement in criminal justice system or former gang members) build relationships, mediate conflicts, and offer non-violent alternatives to rival gang members • Outreach workers offer social services • Community mobilization and public education • Clergy involvement • Aggressive enforcement strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Declines in actual and attempted shootings in 4 of the 7 sites studied were observed that ranged from 17-24% • Shooting “hotspots” declined; 6 of the 7 sites grew noticeably safer with the introduction of the CV model • Proportion of killings declined in two areas attributable to gangs • Retaliatory gang killings decreased more across treatment sites than in comparison areas
---	--

Reference(s)

Skogan, W. G., Hartnett, S. M., Bump, N., & Dubois, J. (2009). *Evaluation of CeaseFire-Chicago*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Resource(s)

1) CV Logic Model
 2) CV Theory and Principal Causal Levers
 3) CV Survey Questionnaires

Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership [IVRP]

Location	Effectiveness Status
Indianapolis, Indiana	

Description

The Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership (IVRP), created in 1998, was a multi-agency, collaborative effort to reduce homicide and serious violence in Indianapolis. The IVRP is a coalition of criminal justice agencies, working with a variety of community partners, and committed to employing a strategic problem-solving approach – “pulling levers” – to address homicide and serious firearms-related violence. Pulling levers is a violence reduction strategy that combines problem solving and focused deterrence with linkages to services and opportunity in order to provide positive alternatives to gangs, drugs, and violence. Groups of probationers and parolees, selected because of current or prior involvement in firearms crime and/or drug offenses, from high violence areas of the city, attended lever-pulling meetings. Attendees were presented with community resources and opportunities to change behaviors as well as direct messages about potential sanctions should involvement in firearm-related activities continue.

Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive organizational structure • Target high-risk youth • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates • Community mobilization and public education • Clergy involvement • Aggressive enforcement strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 34% decline in homicides following the pulling lever intervention, no similar drop in comparison cities • 38% drop in gang-involved homicides, only 8% drop in non-gang homicides • Homicide dropped for youth ages 15–24 from 28.8 to 12.8 per 10,000 at-risk population

Reference(s)

McGarrell, E. F., Chermak, S., Wilson, J. M., Corsaro, N. (2006). Reducing homicide through “lever-pulling” strategy. *Justice Quarterly*, 23(2), 214-231.

Corsaro, N., & McGarrell, E. F. (2009). Testing a promising homicide reduction strategy: Re-assessing the impact of the Indianapolis “pulling levers” intervention. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 5(1), 63-82.

Corsaro, N., & McGarrell, E. F. (2010). Reducing homicide risk in Indianapolis between 1997 and 2000. *Journal of Urban Health*, 87(5), 851-864.

Michigan Youth Violence Prevention Center [MI-YVPC]	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Flint, Michigan	
Description	
<p>In an effort to reduce Flint’s high rates of violent crime and to create safe and healthy communities, the Michigan Youth Violence Prevention Center (MI-YVPC) was created to achieve these objectives through a multi-level strategy. By partnering with youth, families, neighborhood groups, law enforcement, child-serving organizations, and health care providers, MI-YVPC employs a comprehensive prevention approach to reducing youth violence based on public health principles. The Center was designed to provide meaningful alternatives to violence and collaborate with external organizations to provide high-risk youth with opportunities to pursue another way of life. The Center supports local programs that strengthen family and peer relationships, increase community cohesion and participation, and improve physical conditions of neighborhoods.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high-risk youth • Community mobilization and public education • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates • Physical improvement efforts in community • Outreach workers offer social services 	<p><i>Evaluation forthcoming</i></p>
Reference(s)	
<p>Morrel-Samuels, S., Zimmerman, M. A., & Reischl, T. M. (2013). Creating safe and healthy futures: Michigan youth violence prevention center. <i>Reclaiming Children And Youth</i>, 22(3), 31-36.</p>	
Resource(s)	
<p>1) MI-YVPC Logic Model</p>	

One Vision One Life	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	
Description	
<p>One Vision One Life (or One Vision) is a Pittsburgh-based violence-prevention strategy that was created in 2003 to address a citywide concern about its growing homicide rate. One Vision seeks to reduce homicides and shootings within the target communities by employing a problem-solving model to inform how community organizations and outreach teams respond to homicide incidents. Through the use of street-level intelligence, community coordinators –i.e., street outreach workers – become aware of and then intervene in potentially violent disputes among those persons most at risk of committing or being a victim of violence in high-crime neighborhoods. Moreover, One Vision strives to secure community-based organization resources, link individuals to these resources, and thereby stabilize or change neighborhood norms.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high-risk individuals • Comprehensive organizational structure • Outreach workers (“community coordinators”) offer social services and mediate conflicts • Community mobilization and public education • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No significant reductions in homicide • Significant increase in aggravated assault and gun assault rates in targeted neighborhoods
Reference(s)	
Wilson, J., Chermak, S., & McGarrell, E. F. (2011). <i>Community-based violence prevention: An assessments of Pittsburgh’s one vision one life program</i> . Pittsburgh, PA: RAND Corporation.	
Resource(s)	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) One Vision One Life Logic Model 2) Organizational Structure of One Vision One Life 	

Operation Ceasefire	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Boston, Massachusetts	
Description	
<p>The Boston Gun Project is a problem-oriented policing initiative aimed at reducing homicide victimization among young people in Boston. The project began in 1995 and developed an intervention in 1996 that was designed to have an impact on a small number of youth who commit majority of gang-related, gun violence. The intervention focused its efforts to firearms traffickers supplying youth with guns and generated a strong deterrent message from the community that violence would no longer be tolerated. The intervention was not designed to eliminate gangs or stop every aspect of gang activity but to control and deter serious violence. The pulling-levers approach intended to prevent gang violence by directly reaching out to gangs to deliver a message that gang-related violence will not be tolerated by the community and if violent behavior did occur, Ceasefire agencies will address it with an immediate and intense response. Moreover, Ceasefire agencies and community groups offered gang members wraparound services and access to resources that attempted to end the cycle of violence.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high-risk youth (ages 24 and younger) • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates • Aggressive enforcement strategies • Outreach workers offer social services and mediate conflicts • Community mobilization and public education • Clergy involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 63% reduction in youth homicides following the intervention • 32% decrease in calls for service about gunshots • 25% decline in monthly citywide gun assault incidents • 44% fall in youth gun assaults in District B-2 • Comparisons to other U.S. cities and other MA cities converge; Boston's drop does not appear to be part of regional or national trends
Reference(s)	
<p>Braga, A., Kennedy, D., Waring, E., & Piehl, A. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Ceasefire. <i>Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency</i>, 38(3), 195-225.</p>	

Operation Peacekeeper

Operation Peacekeeper	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Stockton, California	
Description	
<p>Operation Peacekeeper was implemented as a pulling levers focused deterrence strategy that aims to prevent gun homicides among active gang youth who had ongoing disputes with rival gang members. Modeled after Boston’s Operation Ceasefire intervention, Operation Peacekeeper organize existing financial resources and programs into a strategy that drew on what seemed to have worked in Boston. The Operation Peacekeeper pulling levers focused deterrence strategy involved deterring violent behavior by chronic gang offenders by reaching out directly to gangs, saying explicitly that gun violence would no longer be tolerated, and backing that message by “pulling every lever” legally available when violence occurred. This message, most commonly delivered through group meeting with gang members, was always balanced with a genuine offer for services provided by gang outreach workers, social service agencies, and the faith community.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high-risk youth (ages 14-24) • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates • Aggressive enforcement strategies • Outreach workers offer social services • Community mobilization and public education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 42% reduction in monthly homicides due to gun violence • Comparison to other CA cities indicates that Stockton's decrease does not appear to be part of statewide or regional trend
Reference(s)	
<p>Braga, A. A. (2008). Pulling levers focused deterrence strategies and the prevention of gun homicide. <i>Journal of Criminal Justice</i>, 332-343.</p> <p>Wakeling, S. (2003). <i>Ending gang homicide: Deterrence can work</i>. Sacramento, CA: California Attorney General's Office, California Health and Human Services Agency.</p>	

Phoenix TRUCE

Phoenix TRUCE	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Phoenix, Arizona	
Description	
<p>Phoenix TRUCE Project, sought to replicate Chicago's Cure Violence project, a public health strategy for reducing firearm violence. The TRUCE Project's goal was to reduce shootings in its target area of South Mountain, well-known for its intergenerational gang involvement. In TRUCE, outreach workers and violence interrupters who had ties to the community used a set of seven criteria to select clients who were at risk of being a perpetrator or victim of gun violence for inclusion in the program. Individuals who had four or more of the seven criteria were deemed high-risk and recruited into the program. The lead agency of the Phoenix TRUCE project was Chicanos Por La Causa, Inc. (CPLC), a not-for-profit that serves the Hispanic/Latino community. CPLC, which received training and support on street outreach and violence interruption from the Cure Violence project, provided street outreach and violence interruption skills to the TRUCE team. Since CPLC had the capacity to provide a majority of the resources related to social services and was well integrated into the community, the initiative did not reach out to other community organizations for these services.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Target high-risk individuals• Outreach workers offer social services and mediate conflicts• Violence interrupters build relationships, mediate conflicts and offer non-violent alternatives to at-risk individuals• Community mobilization and public education• Clergy involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increase of 3.2 shootings per month• Although the effects were small, as the number of clients and contacts by outreach workers increased, so did shootings.• Decrease of more than 16 assaults per month• Overall decrease of more than 16 violent incidents per month over 19 months
Reference(s)	
Fox, A., Katz, C., Choate, D. & Hedberg, E.C. (2015). Evaluation of the Phoenix TRUCE Project: A replication of Chicago CeaseFire. <i>Justice Quarterly</i> 32(1), 85-115.	

Project Safe Neighborhoods [PSN]	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Chicago, Illinois	
Description	
<p>Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) is a federally-funded anti-violence program that is operated across the nation. The key findings reported below originate from one site (Chicago, IL). PSN tactics to reduce gun violence in urban areas include supply-side gun policing tactics, enhanced federal prosecution of gun crimes, federal prison sentences, and notification forums warning offenders of PSN's enhanced criminal punishments. Notification meetings represent the PSN's major community effort, while the others constitute coordinated law enforcement efforts. Notification forums are PSN's most unique component and are consistent with its goals of changing community norms of gun violence.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high-risk youth • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates • Community mobilization and public education • Aggressive enforcement strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 37% drop in quarterly reports of homicides in treatment districts • No significant effect on aggravated battery or assaults • A decade after PSN began, programmatic effects can still be seen in the original treatment communities, at least in the first three years of PSN operation • Districts served when the PSN program expanded have not seen similar decreases in homicides; may be a result of program dilution since there was a lack of funding and resources when expanded
Reference(s)	
<p>Papachristos, A. V., Meares, T. L., & Fagan, J. (2007). Attention felons: Evaluating project safe neighborhoods in Chicago. <i>Journal Of Empirical Legal Studies</i>, 4(2), 223-272.</p> <p>Grunwald, B., & Papachristos, A. V. (2017). Project safe neighborhoods in Chicago: Looking back a decade later. <i>Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology</i>, 107(1), 131-159.</p>	

Project Safe Neighborhoods [PSN]	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Lowell, Massachusetts	
Description	
<p>Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) Lowell is a problem-oriented policing strategy based on “pulling levers” deterrence. It focuses criminal justice and social resources on a small number of chronically-offending gang members in the Lowell area responsible for the majority of urban gun violence. The initiative implemented a “pulling levers” strategy that was tailored to the characteristics and dynamics of local gangs and operational capacities of local agencies and community organization to prevent gang-related firearm violence in the area. While enhanced enforcement efforts were pursued and direct and explicit deterrence messages were delivered to gang members that violent behavior would no longer be tolerated, street workers offered services and alternatives to violence. Moreover, PSN held gang summit meetings that brought together a broad array of agencies, community members, and at-risk gang-involved individuals.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high-risk individuals • Aggressive enforcement strategies • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates • Outreach workers offer social services • Community mobilization and public education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 43% reduction in monthly assaultive gun violence incidents. • Comparison to other 7 MA cities seems to confirm that Lowell's drop was not part of a statewide or regional trend. • Pre-implementation, 61.1% of homicides were gang-related. Post-implementation, only 33.3% of homicides were gang-related.
Reference(s)	
<p>Braga, A. A., Pierce, G. L., McDevitt, J., Bond, B. J., & Cronin, S. (2008). The strategic prevention of gun violence among gang- involved offenders. <i>Justice Quarterly</i>, 25(1), 132-162.</p>	

Safe Streets	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Baltimore, Maryland	
Description	
<p>A replication of Chicago’s Cure Violence program, Safe Streets was launched in 2007 in four of Baltimore’s most violent neighborhoods. The program engaged high-risk youth, promoting nonviolence through mediation between high-risk individuals and community events. An important component of Safe Streets is the use of street outreach workers who would mediate conflicts as well as work with clients.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high-risk youth (ages 14-25) • Community notification meetings with known gang affiliates • Outreach workers offer social services and mediate conflicts • Community mobilization and public education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry Hill site specifically saw reductions in homicide incidents (56%) and nonfatal shootings (34%). • 26% reduction in homicides and 22% reduction in non-fatal shootings in a second police post (McElderry Park). • No significant difference in monthly homicide counts, 34% reduction in non-fatal shootings (Elwood Park) • 2.7 times increase in homicides (Madison-Eastend) than comparison areas, 44% decrease in non-fatal shootings
Reference(s)	
<p>Webster, D. W., Whitehill, J. M., Vernick, J. S., & Curriero, F. C. (2013). Effects of Baltimore’s Safe Streets program on gun violence: A replication of Chicago’s CeaseFire program. <i>Journal of Urban Health</i>, 90(1), 27-40.</p>	

Save Our Streets [S.O.S.]

Location

New York City, New York

Effectiveness Status



Description

Save Our Streets (S.O.S.) was modeled after the Chicago Cure Violence project. S.O.S. is a public health-driven strategy to reducing gun violence through outreach and community mobilization. In particular, S.O.S. delegates outreach to “credible messengers”—often former gang members who have been incarcerated in the past. Moreover, S.O.S. adopts a public health perspective to modify community norms regarding gun violence.

Components

- Targeted high-risk individuals
- Outreach workers (“credible messengers”) offer social services and mediate conflicts
- Community mobilization and public education

Key Findings

- Average monthly shooting rates in S.O.S. Crown Heights decreased by 6% post-implementation. However, Gun violence in S.O.S. Crown Heights was 20% lower than what it would have been had gun violence trends mirrored those of similar, adjacent precincts.
- The target area of S.O.S. South Bronx had large reductions in both measures of gun violence: 37% decline in gun injuries and a 63% decline in shooting victimizations (compared to 29% and 17% reductions in comparison area, respectively).
- The presence of S.O.S. in a neighborhood was associated with greater reductions in social norms that support violence when compared with similar neighborhoods without the program.

Reference(s)

Delgado, S.A., Laila Alsabahi, K.W., Alexander, N.P.C., and Butts, J.A. (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.

Picard-Fritsche, S., & Cerniglia, L. (2013). *Testing a public health approach to gun violence: An evaluation of Crown Heights Save Our Streets, a replication of the Cure Violence Model*. New York, NY: Center for Court Innovation.

Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative [SYVPI]

Location	Effectiveness Status
Seattle, Washington	
Description	
<p>The Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI) was established in response to a series of youth homicides in Seattle. SYVPI's goal is to reduce youth violence through a neighborhood-centered approach. SYVPI utilizes "Neighborhood Networks" run by community-based organization to engage at-risk individuals and connect them to available services. These "Neighborhood Networks" serve as hubs located in the center of the three SYVPI neighborhoods and represent the nucleus of SYVPI's anti-violence efforts. When youth violence occurs, these hubs are charged with engaging and mobilizing the community to respond to the event. Moreover, through street outreach and intensive service coordination, clients are navigated through service systems to access appropriate wraparound services and/or relevant programs.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive organizational structure • Target high-risk youth (ages 12-17) • Community-based network hubs link clients to appropriate services/programs whether within or outside the initiative • Outreach workers build relationships with community and engage clients who are less comfortable engaging with the service delivery approach • Community mobilization and public education 	<p><i>Evaluation forthcoming</i></p>
Reference(s) Jones, D.G. & Shader, C.G. (2014). <i>Supporting a future evaluation of the Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI)</i> . Seattle, WA: Office of City Auditor.	
Resource(s) 1) SYVPI Performance Measures	

Wells-Goodfellow Police-Led Community Initiative	
Location	Effectiveness Status
St. Louis, Missouri	
Description	
<p>The Wells-Goodfellow (WGF) Police-Led Community Initiative was a police-led community program that combines various law enforcement and prevention efforts to reduce gun violence in a St. Louis neighborhood. Program tactics included increased enforcement and prosecution, improved monitoring of high-risk probationers, nuisance abatement, physical improvement efforts, and community outreach. Although many of these activities were not entirely new or unique to WGF, the intensity placed on each one was increased during the project period. What was most unique about the initiative was the buy-in from stakeholders to simultaneously commit to the program tactics.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive organizational structure • Target high-risk individuals • Aggressive enforcement strategies • Physical improvement efforts in community • Community mobilization and public education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relative to trends in comparison areas, violence in the Wells-Goodfellow neighborhood declined between 18% and 19%. • Violent crimes with guns dropped between 28% and 32%. • Based on the findings, the program may have prevented upward of 50 violent crimes and 30 gun crimes from April to December 2008.
Reference(s)	
<p>Koper, C. S., Woods, D. J., & Isom, D. (2016). Evaluating a police-led community initiative to reduce gun violence in St. Louis. <i>Police Quarterly</i>, 19(2), 115-149.</p>	

Youth Violence Reduction Partnership [YVRP]	
Location	Effectiveness Status
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	
Description	
<p>Philadelphia’s Youth Violence Reduction Partnership [YVRP] aims to reduce violence among young offenders on active probation who are deemed at highest risk of being a victim or perpetrator of homicide. YVRP began in one Philadelphia district and has been replicated across the city, expanding into five additional police districts. The program has two key components: (1) Providing emotional/practical supports via “street workers” to address root causes of crime and (2) Reducing opportunity to engage in crime through enhanced supervision by probation officers and police. Central to YVRP’s efforts is its broad array of agencies actively involved in the partnership and invested in clients.</p>	
Components	Key Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high-risk youth (ages 14-24) • Outreach workers (“street workers”) offer social services • Aggressive enforcement strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four of the five police districts experienced a decline in the quarterly average number of youth homicides after the start of YVRP, but this decline was statistically dependable in only one police district (5.59 to 3.15 quarterly, or 44% reduction). • While 5 of every 20 comparison youth were arrested for a violent crime, only about 3 of every 20 YVRP youth partners were (40% difference). • Youth partners who had more contact with their street workers were significantly less likely to have been arrested for a violent crime.
Reference(s)	
<p>McClanahan, W. S., Kauh, T. J., Manning, A. E., Campos, P., & Farley, C. (2012). <i>Illuminating solutions: The youth violence reduction partnership</i>. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.</p>	

