

Project Safe Neighborhoods Case Study Report: Middle District of North Carolina

Natalie Kroovand Hipple, Ph.D.
Research Specialist
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

James M. Frabutt, Ph.D.
Associate Professional Specialist, Alliance for Catholic Education
Concurrent Associate Professor, Psychology
University of Notre Dame

Nicholas Corsaro
Ph.D. Candidate
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

Edmund F. McGarrell, Ph.D.
Director and Professor
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

With

M. J. Gathings, Ph.D. Student
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
North Carolina State University

September 2007

PSN Case Study Report #11

School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
560 Baker Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824

DRAFT

U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs
810 Seventh Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20531

??????
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice

This project was supported by Grant #2002GP CX1003 awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Project Safe Neighborhoods Case Study Series has benefited from the support, assistance, and comments of Jennifer Lowery, Lois Felson Mock, Robyn Thiemann, Natalie Voris and members of the Firearms Enforcement Assistance Team (FEAT) of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Foreword

In 2001 the Bush Administration made the reduction of gun crime one of the two major priorities of the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), along with defeating terrorism and enhancing homeland security. The vehicle for translating this goal into action is Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN). PSN represents a **commitment** to gun crime reduction through a **network** of local partnerships coordinated through the nation's 94 United States Attorneys Offices. These local partnerships are supported by a **strategy** to provide them with the resources that they need to be successful.

The PSN initiative integrates five essential elements from successful gun crime reduction programs such as Richmond's Project Exile, the Boston Ceasefire Program and DOJ's Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI). Those elements are: partnerships, strategic problem solving, outreach, training and accountability.ⁱ

The strategic problem-solving component of PSN was enhanced through grants to local researchers to work in partnership with the PSN task force to analyze local gun crime patterns, to inform strategic interventions, and to provide feedback to the task force about program implementation and impact. At the national level, PSN included a grant to a research team at the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University (MSU) to provide support to the strategic problem-solving component as well as to conduct research on PSN implementation and impact. As part of its research role, MSU has produced a series of strategic case studies of PSN interventions that have emerged in a number of jurisdictions across the country.ⁱⁱ The current report is part of a second series of studies focused on implementation of PSN in particular districts.

These site-specific case studies are intended to provide information about how PSN has been structured and implemented in different jurisdictions. PSN is a national program tailored to address varying gun crime patterns in local jurisdictions. One of the key roles of the research partner is to analyze these patterns to help inform the PSN task force. The local nature of PSN, however, makes it important to examine implementation and impact at the local level. Consequently, this series of site-specific cases studies addresses these issues.

The local nature of the national PSN program also creates challenging evaluation issues. Whereas some components of PSN (e.g., coordination through U.S. Attorney's Office; national media campaign; inclusion of research partners and community engagement partners) are common across the country, other components are locally driven (e.g., specific target areas, intervention strategies). Additionally, there is significant variation across the various PSN districts in terms of the timing of PSN implementation. It appears that in districts with existing federal-state-local programs focused on gun crime, the implementation of PSN often occurred at a quicker pace than was the case in districts where new relationships focused on gun crime had to be forged. Similarly, where research partners had established relationships with local criminal justice agencies the integration of research tended to occur more rapidly.

These characteristics raise a number of thorny evaluation issues. For example, the national dimensions of PSN make it difficult to identify comparison sites to assess the impact of PSN. Similarly, the multiple components of PSN make it difficult to generalize across all PSN districts in terms of the nature and intensity of PSN intervention strategies. For example, in some districts, PSN has meant a significant increase in federal prosecution of gun crime cases coupled with a communication strategy of a deterrence-based message. This reflects a Project Exile-type strategy. In other districts, research helped isolate particular target areas and

dimensions of gun violence (e.g., gangs, drug market locations) and resulted in focused interventions targeted at these dimensions. This reflects a SACSI-type strategy.

Given this variation across districts, as a first step in the national research program, a series of site-specific case studies is being conducted. Having decided on this approach, the first challenge was on choosing districts for study. The main criterion for selection was a sense that key components of the PSN strategy had been implemented in a meaningful fashion and had been in operation for a sufficient period to potentially affect levels of gun crime. The MSU research team has reviewed multiple indicators in an effort to identify districts meeting these criteria. These include district reports to the Department of Justice (DOJ), interviews with PSN project coordinators and PSN research partners, and review of data and project reports submitted to DOJ. From these sources, districts have been nominated for a possible case study based on:

- Evidence of implementation of PSN strategies (e.g., increased federal prosecution, joint prosecution case review processes, incident reviews, offender notification meetings, chronic violent offender programs, targeted patrol, probation/parole strategies, gang strategies, prevention, supply-side strategies, etc.)
- Evidence of new and enhanced partnerships (local, state, federal; community, etc.)
- Integration of research partners and/or evidence of research-based strategies
- Meaningful implementation for a sufficient time period to allow assessment of impact
- Sufficient base-rate levels of gun crime to allow assessment of impact

In effect, we employ these dimensions to ask: Is gun crime being addressed differently in this district based on one or several of the PSN core components?

For districts meeting these criteria, we then sought districts representing different regional and demographic dimensions (e.g., region of country, large city, medium city, rural jurisdictions) and with different local histories of federal, state, local relationships and involvement of researchers. The initial three case studies reflect these criteria. The Middle District of Alabama reflects a small U.S. Attorney's Office whose largest city is relatively small.

It is also a district where prior to PSN there was minimal federal-state-local coordinated gun crime reduction efforts and little involvement of local researchers. In other words, PSN was “starting from scratch” in terms of coordinated, multi-agency, gun crime reduction. The Eastern District of Missouri (EDMO), in contrast, had a long history of coordinated violence reduction initiatives, including SACSI. It focused on a major urban jurisdiction (St. Louis) that consistently ranks among the nation’s leaders in levels of gun crime. The district also had a long history of working with the local research partner. The district of Massachusetts, like EDMO, also had a long history of multi-agency violence reduction efforts, particularly through the Boston Gun Project that served as the foundation for SACSI and as one of the foundations of PSN. In this case, however, we focused on PSN implementation in Lowell. Here the interest was driven by the question of whether PSN could facilitate the transfer of multi-agency, strategic problem solving from one jurisdiction (Boston) to another (Lowell). Lowell also represents an opportunity to examine PSN in a small city. The common ingredient in each site is that evidence suggests that gun crime is being addressed in a new and serious fashion through PSN.

The current study, focused on the Middle District of North Carolina, is similar to the situation in the District of Massachusetts. The PSN effort built on lessons learned through Winston-Salem’s experience in the Strategic Approaches to Crime Initiative (SACSI), and expanded the program through PSN task forces in Durham, Greensboro, High Point, and Salisbury, as well as in Winston-Salem. The task forces adapted the national PSN strategy to each community and followed a data-driven, strategic problem solving model to address gun crime.

Once sites were identified, the MSU research team conducted site visits to learn more about PSN structure, implementation, and impact. Cooperative relationships between the local

research partners and the MSU research team were established for the purpose of generating the case studies. This provided the benefit of the “deep knowledge” of the local research partners with the “independent eyes” of the national research team. This approach will continue to be employed through an ongoing series of case studies in additional PSN sites.

Given this strategy, in effect a purposive sampling approach, the case studies cannot be considered representative of PSN in all 94 judicial districts. Rather, these are studies of PSN within specific sites. Through these studies, particularly as more and more case studies are completed, complemented by evaluations conducted by local research partners, we hope to generate new knowledge about the adaptation of the national PSN program to local contexts as well as about the impact of PSN on levels of gun crime in specific jurisdictions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Context: The Middle District of North Carolina is one of three federal districts covering the state of North Carolina. The U.S. Attorney in the middle district took an ambitious approach in implementing PSN by working with state and local officials in five communities to develop PSN task forces. The task forces focused on Durham, Greensboro, High Point, Winston-Salem, and Salisbury.

Task Force: The U.S. Attorney's Office coordinated the overall PSN initiative through a Middle District Advisory Team that oversees the task forces in the five cities mentioned above. Although adapted to the local context, the five task forces included strong partnerships with local and federal law enforcement, local prosecutors, probation and parole, as well as strong community collaboration with neighborhood groups, the faith community, social services, and the business sector. In addition, the task force worked very closely with a team of researchers from several universities and utilized PSN funds to support the role of service coordinator. Both the research partners and the service providers were integral members of the PSN task forces.

Problem Analysis: Gun crime problem analyses were conducted in each of the five cities. These included analysis of police crime information systems and GIS crime mapping. In four of the communities, the analyses also included systematic incident reviews. The reviews linked formal crime incident data with street-level knowledge about the offenders, victims, group connections, and locations of homicides and shootings. Although there was some variation across the communities, the general patterns indicated that homicides and gun violence were largely being driven by chronically offending youth and young adults, often linked to illegal drug activity and gang or group-related involvement. Offenders returning from prison were another source of gun crime.

Strategies: The Middle District committed to a "lever pulling" strategy that included both a deterrence-based focus and an attempt to develop prevention and intervention components aimed at linking youth to prosocial environments and providing both youthful and adult offenders access to services and resources. Offender notification or "call-in" meetings were heavily utilized. There was a significant increase in federal gun crime prosecutions to incapacitate violent chronic offenders and increase the credibility of the deterrent message. Police-probation home visits were another common strategy and similar home visits linking police and faith leaders with at-risk youth were also utilized. Joint federal-local gun case reviews involving the U.S. Attorneys Office, the county district attorney, ATF, and local law enforcement were conducted by several of the task forces. Additional strategies implemented in several of the communities included neighborhood canvasses following shootings, re-entry, most violent offender programs, sports-based youth prevention, a public education campaign, and an innovative drug market intervention program.

Outcomes: The local research partner provided gun-crime data for a number of offenses across all five cities. For the purpose of this case study, the focus was on the impact of the PSN initiative on total gun crimes (homicides with a firearm, robberies with a firearm, and aggravated assaults with a firearm) in three of the five cities. In these three cities (Durham, Greensboro, and Winston-Salem), total gun crime declined following the implementation of PSN. In

Greensboro and Winston-Salem the decline was statistically significant. Salisbury also experienced a decline in gun crime although it was not statistically significant. Given the small population of Salisbury and the low base rate of gun crime, it is difficult to assess the impact of PSN. High Point was not included in the present analysis because the city relied on a very specific drug market intervention that is subject of a separate NIJ evaluation. The preliminary results from the analysis are very encouraging.

Contents

Project Safe Neighborhoods in the Middle District of North Carolina	1
The Development and Initial Implementation of PSN	3
<i>Winston-Salem as a SACSI site</i>	3
<i>What’s a District to do?</i>	4
The Structure of PSN in the Middle District	4
<i>PSN within the United States Attorney’s Office</i>	5
<i>Task Force Structure</i>	5
Middle District Advisory Team	5
Violent Crimes Task Force	6
<i>Community Engagement and Media Campaign</i>	7
<i>Research Partners</i>	10
The Nature of the Gun Crime in the Middle District of North Carolina	12
Gun Crime Reduction Strategies	13
<i>Focusing on Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression</i>	13
Prevention	13
Intervention	17
Suppression	21
Results	24
<i>Evidence of Implementation- Outputs</i>	24
<i>Evidence of Impact- Outcomes</i>	24
<i>Findings: ARIMA Analysis</i>	26
Summary	29
<i>Leadership</i>	29
<i>Task Force Structure</i>	29
<i>Partnerships</i>	29
<i>Challenges</i>	30
Conclusion	31
References	32
Appendix A	
Appendix B	
Endnotes	

List of Figures

Figure 1: Middle District of North Carolina	3
Figure 2: Gun Crime Problem and PSN Strategies	23

List of Tables

Table 1: Aggravated Assault and Murder Rates, 2001	2
Table 2: Middle District of North Carolina research partner efforts and description	11
Table 3: Gun crime trend data- target sites in the Middle District of North Carolina	25
Table 4: Firearm offense averages, pre-PSN and post-PSN intervention for five target cities	26

Project Safe Neighborhoods in the Middle District of North Carolina

The state of North Carolina is served by three federal judicial districts with corresponding United States Attorney's Offices. These include the Western, Middle, and Eastern Districts. The Middle District of North Carolina's main office is located in Greensboro with a smaller satellite office in Winston-Salem.

Middle District of North Carolina

The Middle District of North Carolina is an average federal judicial district in terms of population size. The district ranks 44th out of the 90 U.S. districtsⁱⁱⁱ with an aggregate of 2,450,992 total inhabitants.^{iv} The Middle District of North Carolina encompasses 24 counties. Three counties make up nearly forty percent of the overall district population: Guilford, Forsyth, and Durham. Guilford County has over 430,000 inhabitants, mostly residing in the cities of Greensboro and High Point. Forsyth County houses a population over 317,000 inhabitants, mostly residing in the city of Winston-Salem. Durham County residents (over 236,000 people) also mainly reside in the city of Durham.

The district houses an average number of people (24%) who are non-white, which is comparable to the U.S. percentage of non-white residents (24.9%). Additionally, the district ranks in the upper range (third quartile) when examining population density. The Middle District of North Carolina has about 227 people per square mile, which is much higher than the U.S. average of 79.6 people per square mile.

The Middle District of North Carolina suffers from modest violent crime rates, as evidenced by Uniform Crime Report data from 2001 at the outset of PSN. Specifically, the district ranks 30th (third quartile) overall among federal judicial districts when analyzing murder rates, with an average rate of 0.60 murders per 10,000 inhabitants. Additionally, it ranks 44th

(third quartile) in aggravated assaults with 26.57 assaults per 10,000 inhabitants. Table 1 displays the murder and aggravated assault rates for the overall district, comparably sized U.S. districts,^v and the U.S. average. As Table 1 indicates, the Middle District of North Carolina has a lower violent crime rate than the U.S. average. However, the District has higher murder and aggravated assault rates when compared to other similar sized U.S. federal districts.

Table 1: Aggravated Assault and Murder Rates, 2001

Site	Aggravated Assault Rate (Per 10,000)	Murder Rate (Per 10,000)
United State's Average*	30.65	0.65
Middle District of North Carolina	26.57	0.60
U.S. Districts of Comparable Size**	25.10	0.47

*90 federal judicial districts

** Districts ranging from 1,838,242 to 3,063,742 population

As noted earlier, the U.S. Attorney's Office in the Middle District of North Carolina is located in Greensboro with a smaller, satellite office in Winston-Salem. Over the last four to five years the number of criminal lawyers in the Middle District Office has remained steady at 13.

Prior to the inception of PSN, the Middle District prosecuted 104 gun crime cases in FY2000 and 108 gun crime cases in FY2001. As will be discussed subsequently, the Middle District has experienced an increase in the federal prosecution of gun crimes over the course of PSN.

Figure 1: Middle District of North Carolina



The Development and Initial Implementation of PSN

Winston-Salem as a SACSI site

As previously mentioned in the Foreword of this document, the Project Safe Neighborhoods initiative builds on several previously successful gun crime reduction programs. The city of Winston-Salem, located within the Middle District of North Carolina, participated in one such program, the Strategic Approaches for Community Safety Initiative (SACSI). SACSI was launched by the Department of Justice as a test of sorts to determine if Boston’s collaborative, data-driven problem-solving process could be replicated by other cities fighting high violent crime rates (Roehl, Rosenbaum, Costello, Coldren, Jr., Schuck, Kunard, and Forde, 2006).

During SACSI, Winston-Salem developed its own strategy led by the United States Attorney’s Office for the Middle District of North Carolina and guided by multi-agency, multi-disciplinary task forces. Research partners and actionable research were key parts of the strategy. In the end, Winston-Salem showed a 58 percent decrease in juvenile robberies and 19

percent decrease in juvenile incidents in target neighborhoods after the introduction of SACSI (Easterling, Harvey, Mac-Thompson, and Allen, 2002). Nine other cities were designated SACSI cities between 1998 and 2000 which served as a foundation for Project Safe Neighborhoods.

What's a District to do?

The Middle District of North Carolina faced some considerable implementation challenges with Project Safe Neighborhoods. First, the district was simply geographically too large to focus the PSN initiative on the entire district. And, unlike some other geographically large districts, the Middle District of North Carolina did not have just one major metropolitan city that stood out above the others as a city that needed attention. Instead, there were four to five relatively similar sized cities that needed attention. And, the issues facing each city were similar yet each city was unique. How could the initiative show measurable success if there was not some focus?

The Structure of PSN in the Middle District

PSN in the Middle District of North Carolina is led by a strong United State's Attorney (USA), Ms. Anna Mills Wagoner, who was appointed in late 2001, and an Assistant U.S. Attorney who serves as Project Coordinator. Additionally, a Law Enforcement Community Coordinator (LECC) supports both the USA and the Project Coordinator.

The Middle District of North Carolina initially focused their efforts on four cities: Durham, Greensboro, High Point, and Winston-Salem. A fifth city, Salisbury, was added later. Each site was encouraged to use the PSN model and to tailor it to their own specific needs.

PSN within the United States Attorney's Office

Task Force Structure

Middle District Advisory Team

The Middle District of North Carolina formed its PSN task force, the Middle District Advisory Team (MDAT), during the infancy of PSN. Prior to PSN, the five cities that would eventually become the PSN target areas were already involved in PSN-like initiatives, some even having established Violent Crimes Task Forces. With the announcement of PSN in early 2001, the USAO requested that each city send two representatives to be part of the MDAT and this informally formed the skeleton of their task force. As time passed, MDAT moved towards a more formal structure with a Chair and Co-Chair and each city appointed three representatives to MDAT, one of which had to be from law enforcement. Non-law enforcement task force members included representatives from social services and local religious groups in addition to others. Additionally, the PSN Project Coordinator served as a MDAT member although he recused himself on any issues having to do with funding. The North Carolina Governor's Crime Commission (the fiscal agent), the research partner, probation and parole, and the community engagement partner all attended every MDAT meeting.

The MDAT met every 2 months early on and now continues to meet on a quarterly basis. The meeting location rotates across the five target sites. The meetings are opened by the USA and include a working lunch. Permanent discussion topics include a funding update from the fiscal agent, site updates from the five target areas, a research partner update, and a community engagement partner update.

Many key stakeholders from the Middle District of North Carolina have confirmed the importance of the MDAT meetings. In the beginning, these meetings were used to determine

how to use the limited PSN resources across five target areas, each of which could have used all the PSN funds. The research partner (RP) found that these meetings were the most fruitful place to get ideas as to where to offer research support. For example, the RP would present the results of an offender notification meeting evaluation in one site and another site might request the same thing. Again, the challenge was to find a way to best use limited resources and MDAT worked hard to make this happen. Additionally, ideas for district wide meetings as well as training topics, and how to link training with available funding, surfaced at MDAT meetings with sub-committees formed to see them through to completion. In essence, this group was able to communicate well with one another. Task force members reported that although there were bumps along the road, communication through the MDAT was key to PSN coordination and implementation.

A MDAT team member, also a detective with the Winston-Salem Police Department, created an email listserv early on to help facilitate communication among MDAT members. In the beginning it was used to distribute the minutes from the MDAT meetings. It quickly morphed into a more “traditional” listserv with 60-plus members. It proved to be a fast way to communicate anything from upcoming events to research briefs to all the MDAT members. This listserv is hosted out of the Winston-Salem Police Department and is still moderated by the detective. Membership is not limited to MDAT members.

Violent Crimes Task Force

A separate law enforcement only Task Force meets monthly in the Middle District. The Middle District Violent Crime Task Force is an off-shoot of the old Triggerlock Task Force that existed in the Middle District in the 1990s. This Task Force is used by its law enforcement members to discuss cases and information related to any number of anti-violence topics (i.e.,

anti- gun violence, anti-terrorism, anti-gang). These meetings are hosted by and held at the USAO in Greensboro. Four of the five target cities have local police officers that have been cross-designated with ATF, known as Task Force Officers. Most gun cases come to the USAO through a local Task Force Officer and the Violent Crimes Task Force meeting is a common place for cases to be brought up and discussed. Additionally, the Section 922 and 924 cases are spread across 5-6 of the criminal lawyers as each lawyer prosecutes cases that fall within his or her assigned county or counties.

The USAO took the lead in creating a system that allows for the many PSN sites to work towards reducing gun crime in their areas. The Violent Crime Task Force facilitated the development of an offender database that enables PSN cities to track and monitor chronic offenders across jurisdictional boundaries. The database tracks resource requests and delivery. The database is funded by the five PSN cities and the Outreach and Research partners. (R. Lang, personal communication, August 2006).

Community Engagement and Media Campaign

The Middle District Advisory Team selected the Center for Community Safety at Winston-Salem State University as its community engagement partner (CEP). The Center for Community Safety (CSS) performed traditional CEP duties such as helping to develop a district-wide billboard campaign and working directly with local television and media outlets for airtime. This approach also consisted of updating media contact lists, sending press releases prior to new media campaign “drops”, follow-up phone calls and emails to confirm receipts of these campaigns, and in some cases, task force members signed letters of support for the campaigns that were sent to their local media to request air time.

In order to meet the training needs of each PSN site, CCS attended the regular site meetings for each PSN task force to identify common themes of training needs as well as site specific needs and worked with the research partners at University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) and the USAO to develop a framework for addressing these needs. Focused efforts by CCS to work closely with each site and understand the dynamics of their leadership and their various initiatives established a comprehensive framework for outreach and research to service the District.

CCS developed a nine minute video for offender notification meetings as well as an 18 minute PSN education video that was used throughout the district. However, they spent considerable time working with each site to ensure that the media campaign fit their specific needs. For example, when the Ad Council would develop a radio or television ad and push it out to the PSN Districts, the CCS would meet individually with PSN site Task Force members from each city and let them decide whether or not the PSN advertisements fit their needs and community.

CCS also worked with sites as they developed PSN marketing brochures. Salisbury developed what was deemed as a highly effective brochure and CCS helped to redesign it for each of the other four sites. These brochures would be handed out at community events or placed in stores, etc. Each site approved each piece of media tailored to their area, followed by approval from the USAO and the Department of Justice.

Many key stakeholders speak very highly of the Speakers Bureau developed by the Training and Outreach consultant assigned to PSN at the CCS. The Speakers Bureau is a toolkit of sorts and includes a basic PowerPoint presentation on Project Safe Neighborhoods. CCS tailored a toolkit for each of the five sites. CCS did extensive research with target audience

members in order to develop talking points for each different kind of audience. The toolkit includes site specific literature as well as information about PSN strategies that were being employed in that area and suggestions about how to adapt presentations for different audiences. It also includes tips sheets taken from the “main PSN toolkit” on what different leaders could do to help reduce gun violence in their community (e.g., What can business leaders do? What can faith leaders do? What can education leaders do?). The Research Partner for the MDNC also developed “Fact Sheets” pertaining to gun related violence in each locale. These were updated regularly to be included as handouts in outreach presentations. The Speakers Bureau committee members volunteered to be representatives in their city. It became their responsibility to schedule and deliver presentations in their respective target area. CCS trained each PSN Task Force outreach team individually and created a suggested timeline as to when certain groups should be approached.

The role of CCS was largely focused on organizing local trainings. This served well in the outreach and education capacity. In November of 2005, CCS worked with the USAO from the Eastern and Western Districts to coordinate a statewide training hosting then USAG Alberto Gonzalez as the keynote speaker. In November 2006, CCS worked with a team from the MDAT and the North Carolina Department of Correction to coordinate a Reentry Summit that was well received and successful in engaging many important new partners and strengthening existing relationships with the Department of Correction.

Finally, CCS also played a critical role in the development of new PSN sites by providing training and site support with the Research Partner to establish the framework for the comprehensive task force formation and collaboration. They did this by evaluation existing partnerships and determining plans for enhancing those partnerships with the necessary partners

for comprehensive approach. In this capacity, CCS and UNCG have worked with the USAO to expand the MDNC PSN sites from 5 in 2003 to 8 in 2007, including modeling county-wide, multi-agency task forces in the most recent three sites.

Research Partners

When the research partner grants became available and PSN was in the launching phase across the Middle District, the Center for Youth, Family, and Community Partnerships (CYFCP; formerly the Center for the Study of Social Issues) at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro submitted an application. The application was a natural fit on two important levels. First, the opportunity to engage in research that moved beyond outreach and service and into the realm of university-community engagement (Boyer, 1990; Kellogg Commission, 1999; Lerner & Simon, 1998) was in line with the philosophical orientation of CYFCP (MacKinnon-Lewis & Frabutt, 2001a). Importantly, there was a direct synergy between the purpose and goals of the PSN research solicitation (i.e., featuring a partnership approach to applied inquiry) and the mission and vision of CYFCP.^{vi} Second, the PSN research partner solicitation offered a formal mechanism to solidify and deepen an already existing track record of research and partnership with local criminal justice partners (Frabutt, Easterling, and MacKinnon-Lewis, 2001; Quijas, MacKinnon-Lewis, and Frabutt, 2001).

CYFCP began to serve as Project Safe Neighborhoods Research Partner for the Middle District of North Carolina on October 1, 2002. The interdisciplinary Research Partner team consisted of a principal investigator, two co-investigators, and a graduate research assistant. CYFCP partnered with and drew on the expertise of the Center for Community Safety (CCS) at Winston-Salem State University, a community-based center designed to help shape the way local communities respond to violence. As a hub for decision-making on violence prevention, the

Center spearheads the use of new approaches, and draws upon new partners, in addressing significant local public safety issues in Winston-Salem and Forsyth County.

The United States Attorney’s Office of the Middle District of North Carolina, in consultation with the Middle District PSN Task Force, selected four target localities as the focus of PSN efforts and later added a fifth site. Research partner efforts were therefore dedicated to those five cities across four counties (both Greensboro and High Point are located in Guilford County).

Research activities centered on these target localities can be classified into four general domains that emerged based on local need, federal reporting requirements, and ongoing input from the Middle District PSN Task Force. The major research foci were: (a) overall cross-city data collection; (b) initiating the crime incident review process (see Klofas et al., 2006); (c) evaluation and consultation on existing and new crime reduction strategies; and (d) city-specific or event-specific research questions. These efforts are briefly summarized in Table 2 and are articulated more fully in the paragraphs that follow.

Table 2: Middle District of North Carolina research partner efforts and description

Research Effort	Description
1. Overall, Cross-city Data Collection	Data collection and compilation to meet PSN reporting requirements
2. Initiating Crime Incident Review Process	Timely and operationally meaningful descriptions of gun violence in target cities, crime incident review process was initiated in Salisbury, Durham, Greensboro, and Winston-Salem
3. Evaluation / Consultation on Existing and New Crime Reduction Strategies	After sites defined their gun violence problem, the RP provided assistance in selecting and evaluating strategic interventions
4. City-specific or Event-specific Research Questions	Responding to sites’ needs for tailored data or responses to specific questions; engaging in “mini-projects” to address local questions

The MDAT meeting and individual meetings with the PSN Coordinator have been the appropriate forum to develop and prioritize the research plan. Essentially, this was a research triage of sorts: Durham really needs to be engaged in the crime incident review process over the next two months, then try focus on the roll-out of the street-drug initiative in Winston-Salem, and after that observe and describe the juvenile notification in Salisbury. From a research point of view, breadth of coverage should not come to replace depth of research insight (Lang et al., 2004). The research partners found that the best course was to select research questions, identify data sets, and highlight findings that have the potential to inform policy and practice not only in the selected site, but in other target sites as well. For example, the research team devoted research resources to the process evaluation of High Point and Winston-Salem's street-drug strategy, with the hope that the model will ultimately be applicable for other cities.

The Nature of the Gun Crime in the Middle District of North Carolina

Common to districts as large as the Middle District of North Carolina, there was no universal gun crime issue common across the five target areas let alone the entire district. However, two heavily traveled highways, Interstate 40 and Interstate 85, dissect the district and invite the movement of gangs and drugs from city to city along this route. Homicide reviews in several sites confirmed the assumption that gun crime was related to gangs and drugs. Salisbury, a much smaller city, has fewer homicides but had problems with aggravated assaults. Crime seemed to be inter-generational.

The findings that gun crime seemed to be largely driven by chronic offending offenders and victims, to involve drug and gang activity, and to include group associations of gangs, groups of chronic offenders, and inter-generational links, suggested to task force members that a "lever-pulling" strategy such as that developed in the Boston Gun Project (see Kennedy et al.,

2001) and in the SACSI initiative (see McGarrell et al., 2006) might logically be applied to the dynamics driving gun crime in the Middle District. The lever-pulling strategy seeks to link a deterrence-based intervention with a communication strategy and with prevention and intervention components. Key ingredients include an increase in federal prosecution for illegal gun possession and use, identification of chronic violent offenders for targeted enforcement (see Bynum et al., 2006), direct communication to at-risk juvenile and adult offenders (see McDevitt et al., 2006), broader public education, joint gun case screening (see Decker et al. 2007), and various strategies to link potential offenders to legitimate opportunities and services. This broad strategy was then adapted to each of the five communities based on their analysis of local gun crime and their available resources.

Gun Crime Reduction Strategies

Focusing on Prevention, Intervention, and Suppression

To say that there were many PSN efforts occurring in the Middle District of North Carolina would be an understatement. Multiple PSN strategies were being tried in all five sites and the USAO continued to head initiatives that spanned across all sites. To cover everything that occurred in each site in the Middle District of North Carolina would be a difficult task. Instead, we have chosen to highlight what task force members and the RP believed each site did particularly well. More detailed information is available in a series of reports and briefing papers developed by the RP (visit <http://www.uncg.edu/csr/pubsafeneighborhoods.htm>).

Prevention

Hoops and Hope in Durham

Gang and group related activity, especially violence and drug related crime, were a growing concern in the Middle District of North Carolina (MDNC). The district had identified

group behavior in various forms throughout the district and in various stages of development. MDNC jurisdictions have seen many gang or group related incidents over the past four years and nationally known gangs were present throughout the district (e.g., Crips, Bloods, MS-13, Brown Pride, etc.) and appeared to be a mix between imports and home grown residents. The dynamic involved all races, but to differing degrees in each geographic area. In Durham, NC, in particular, there existed a relatively mature gang dynamic contributing to much of the violent and drug related crime.

One PSN strategy for addressing gang problems from a prevention stand point was the Hoops and Hope Program. Hoops and Hope was an existing program in North Carolina and the Middle District of North Carolina replicated and expanded it. Hoops and Hope is designed to prevent gang involvement and juvenile delinquency while promoting pro-social development through athletic competition, life skills training, and mentoring. The program began in Durham in 2005 with a district-wide basketball tournament involving teams from PSN sites. In addition to engaging in athletic competition in a positive atmosphere, the team members participated in a series of workshops related to issues of guns and gang violence.

Five goals were identified for the event: (a) Effectively communicate an anti-violence message with an emphasis on gangs and gun violence; (b) Raise the self-esteem of participants; (c) Expose youth to a college environment and the possibility of higher education; (d) Provide a setting for youth to interact with law enforcement officers outside of an official encounter; and (e) Engage in healthy, positive athletic competition.

Following the tournament, members of the PSN Middle District Advisory Team began discussing expanding the program to a series of tournaments across the state. During these discussions, the organizers made contact with representatives of the Public Housing Authority

State Athletic Conference (PHASAC). PHASAC has been administering a public housing basketball league in North Carolina for several years, utilizing similar strategies for drug and dropout prevention. Realizing the opportunity to extend the outreach of both programs, officials made the decision to partner and combine forces under the Project Safe Neighborhoods umbrella, with support from the Middle District. From this partnership, the Hoops and Hope/PHASAC Basketball League was formed.

There are eight primary elements of the program in which all teams participate:

(a) homework assistance and tutoring, provided by each agency for students in need of academic help; (b) pre-season workouts, to bring all teams and coaches together for workshops, training, scrimmages and a mixer; (c) 90 regular season games to played between January and May; (d) life skills and education workshops on regular season game days; (e) enrichment day field trips for all teams to a site of educational, historical, or cultural relevance; (f) a state cheerleading competition at the end of the season; (g) an awards program, dinner, and gala with keynote speaker and workshop during state tournament; and (h) a State Championship Tournament to be held in late May or early June.

Partners in the planning and implementation of the program included: PSN Middle District Advisory Team, United States Attorney's Office, Hoops and Hope/PHASAC Committee, Durham Police Department, City of Salisbury, and Housing Authorities from the cities of Concord, Greensboro, Lexington, Statesville, and Winston-Salem.

Juvenile Notifications in Salisbury

For over six years, jurisdictions in the Middle District have employed the lever pulling strategy known as violent crime notifications. Violent offenders are targeted for this bilateral strategy that features law enforcement officials and community representatives delivering the

message that violence will no longer be tolerated (see McDevitt et al., 2006). The law enforcement component of this program educates the offender on which types of behavior is expected of them, as well as the consequences of further violent behavior. They are also told which behaviors need to be changed, and are provided with a list of prior attendees who continued criminal behavior and were prosecuted accordingly. The community component of the program offers support and resources to offenders wishing to make a positive change. Volunteers offer an atmosphere of warmth and encouragement to offenders while also offering linkages to vital resources such as employment, housing, job training, and counseling.

Based on the Middle District's success conducting adult notification sessions with violent offenders (Frabutt, Easterling, and MacKinnon-Lewis, 2001; Frabutt and Gathings, 2004), a few cities began to explore methods of extending the notification model to juveniles. For example, in the city of Salisbury, juveniles with previous violent history (and parents/guardians) were asked to attend—as observers—an adult violent crime notification, where they are shown and specifically told the consequences of repeat offending, both as a juvenile and as an adult, should the deviant behavior continue.

First, an Assistant U.S. Attorney gave a brief overview message to teens and parents, stressing that one purpose of the evening was for juveniles to see what happens if their offending continues. The juveniles were then brought into the main law enforcement room and seated in the middle of the room facing the U-shaped arrangement of law enforcement tables. The session opened with an introduction and an overview by the Salisbury Deputy Chief of Police. The juveniles were told to open their minds and have respect. Speakers included the Department of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF), Salisbury Gang Unit Officer, Salisbury Violent Crimes Detective, Chief Probation Officer, Durham Police Department PSN Coordinator, Greensboro

Police Department, High Point Police Department, Rowan County District Attorney, and AUSA. It was explained how sentences can be stiffer if the judge knows the offender is gang validated and stressed the linkage between agencies and how well they communicated with each other. The session lasted about 30 minutes. The juveniles remained seated in the room and the adult call in session immediately began.

A follow-up meeting revealed the apparent positive impact the session had on the youth and the parents. Overall, youth said the sessions “helps criminals...it is to prevent gun crime and a program that helps people get back on track.” Youth expressed the need to make changes in their lives before they end up in the shoes of the adult offenders that they observed being notified. Since the notification one youth said that he had “stopped using drugs” while another mentioned that “he saw that the consequences were serious and long-term.” The youth particularly mentioned the Assistant United States Attorney and the Rowan County District Attorney as memorable speakers. Parents noted that each speaker was sincere and had good intentions. Although the youth attending the session were under court supervision for drug violations and not gun offenses, the youth still felt that their experiences of attending the adult notification session were positive. In particular, one participant said the adult offenders “probably started out like us.” In addition, the youth “didn’t feel threatened or scared,” but believed that “everybody up there was trying to be helpful.” However, one young person expressed that the information “would have been better to hear before I got in juvenile justice.”

Intervention

Neighborhood Response to Violent Acts in Greensboro

The neighborhood response to violent acts is a tactic employed for violent events or any crimes when a retaliation effect among those involved is probable. The Response consists of a

door-to-door canvassing of the neighborhood(s) where the crime happened, the victim(s) live(d), and/or the suspect/arrestee lives(d). PSN efforts in the City of Greensboro include neighborhood responses spearheaded by the Greensboro Police Department, joined by partnering agencies and organizations, clergy, and concerned citizens. The neighborhood canvass is designed to foster the development of four specific outcomes: (a) To develop investigative leads in the case by asking neighbors to come forward with information that may assist investigators in solving and prosecuting the case; (b) To provide information to the community about the violent act that occurred and to reassure them that law enforcement is doing everything it can to solve the case to protect the citizens of the community; (c) To support the involved community in its efforts to recover from the violent act by letting the community know that law enforcement cares and is there to prevent future acts of violence or retaliation, and; (d) To visibly demonstrate the Project Safe Neighborhoods partnership by having law enforcement and community representatives conducting the response (R. Faggart, personal communication, July 10, 2006).

Partners are notified via e-mail of the time, date, location, and reason for a Response when one has been scheduled. Participants convene at the Response site, where the Response coordinator conducts a short briefing and responders will sign in. Participants are then divided into teams; each team consisting of both community members and law enforcement officers. The teams disperse to assigned sections of the neighborhood, hand out flyers door-to-door and talk with residents about the violent incident that precipitated the response, as well as any other concerns the residents may have. Once the canvass is complete, responders reconvene, participate in a short debriefing if necessary, and sign out. Most responses last no more than one hour. Often police officers from other PSN sites attend the response to show their support for the PSN strategy in that site.

Street Drug Initiatives in High Point

The High Point West End Drug Market Intervention involved a joint police-community partnership that attempted to identify individual offenders, notify them of the consequences of continued illegal activity, and provide supportive services through a community-based resource coordinator. The effort used crime-mapping information to target drug dealers, drug suppliers, and street level drug sales that impact community safety (Frabutt, Gathings, Jackson, & Buford, 2006).

The initiative involved a number of key components that were described as the “truths” about the intervention. First, it involved extensive efforts to build community support and police-community collaboration. The community partners and police worked jointly, along with ongoing consultation from Professor David Kennedy of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, to plan, implement, and carry out the multiple phases of the Initiative. Second, the task force utilized the incident mapping capability within the High Point Police Department to identify the West End area as a drug-crime “hot-spot” that was responsible for much of the city’s gun crime. The analysis was complemented by extensive intelligence gathering that identified active drug sellers and dealers in the West End neighborhood. Third, the intelligence was used to develop criminal cases on those individuals. Fourth, having developed the criminal cases, community and police teams identified and personally visited family members and/or friends in the offenders’ lives and invited them to a notification session. Fifth, a call-in meeting involving these individuals facing drug offense charges and their family members (or other social support individuals) occurred. Examples were made of the federal prosecution of several ringleaders believed to be responsible for violent offenses. The individuals were informed that federal charges were being held over them and that if any violence or continued drug activity continued

that the federal indictments would be served. They were also informed of a plethora of services that were available and direct contact was made with a Resource Coordinator.^{vii}

Project Reentry in Winston-Salem

Project Reentry provides an opportunity for police to address recidivism of individuals returning to the community from prison. As in many communities, officials in Winston-Salem noted that returning ex-offenders are increasingly concentrated in communities that are often crime-ridden and lacking in services and support systems. Prisoners are also less prepared for reentry than in the past, with a smaller share of prisoners receiving educational programming and substance abuse treatment. Their limited program involvement is particularly problematic given that the majority have serious histories of alcohol and drug addiction, and many lack the training and life skills to find and keep a job after their release. The primary goal of Project Reentry is to facilitate successful reentry through focused release planning, structured support services, and intensive case management. Program participants are also provided with linkages to important services including employment training, counseling, and job placement, as well as provided with notification sessions which fully explain the consequences of reoffending.

The role of the police currently draws on the support provided through numerous strategies directed toward individuals under active community supervision such as communicating a strong message against future offending via notification sessions (call-ins). In addition, police provide enhanced supervision and outreach support for both program participants and high-risk individuals released without conditions of probation or parole residing in high-crime areas. One of the key program elements is reentry planning. Approximately three months prior to release, program participants enroll in a 12-week program and meet with Project Re-Entry staff to identify individual reentry needs and available support services. Notification

sessions provide police and other criminal justice and community stakeholders with an opportunity to address probationers and parolees of the risks of reoffending. The police organize and lead quarterly notification sessions. Program participants are also provided with linkages to important services including employment training, counseling, and job placement.

Juvenile offenders are also included in this initiative. In North Carolina, the CORE (Collaborative for Offender Reentry Enhancement) initiative works with juveniles returning from youth development centers to Forsyth, Guilford, Davidson, and Davie counties. The work starts with development centers, with individual educational and treatment plans being developed. Upon release, the youth are assigned to community support coordinators, who work with the juvenile court counselors to ensure that the young people get the educational, employment, and health-related services that they and their family need to succeed.

Suppression

Gun Case Screening in Winston-Salem

Zero Armed Perpetrators (ZAP) is a program initiated by the Forsyth County District Attorney in July 2000. The program is designed to review all firearm cases that come to the attention of the DA's office, with the ultimate purpose of reducing gun violence in Winston-Salem and Forsyth County. The program seeks to identify the most dangerous offenders and develop prosecution strategies that can lead to the removal of those individuals from the streets of the city and the county. ZAP is coordinated by an individual within the DA's office, with help from an assistant. A meeting to review all recent gun cases is held weekly. Invited to the meeting are representatives of state and federal prosecutors' offices; city, county, state and federal law enforcement agencies; state adult and juvenile probation offices; the city/county school system; the county attorney's office; and a university-based community outreach center.

Participants share information about each case and the individuals involved, and a decision is made about what charges to pursue and whether the case should be taken to the state or federal court (Harvey, 2005).

The ZAP program is intended to serve several key objectives. ZAP works to identify and insure that the most chronic violent offenders do not “slip through the cracks” for subsequent gun crimes (see Bynum et al., 2006). The intent is to use federal sanctions as a way of removing and incapacitating the most serious violent offenders. The related component is to make credible the threat of sanctions for felons caught possessing or using a gun.

Figure 2: Gun Crime Problem and PSN Strategies

Problem	Overall Strategy	Specific Components	
How to focus limited resources	Middle District Advisory Team	Selection of five target sites	Each site determined its priority and implemented strategies accordingly
	Crime Incident Reviews	Conducted in four sites	Evaluated by Research Partner
Chronic offenders	Incapacitation and deterrence	USAO commitment to federal prosecution	AUSAs prosecute guns cases that fall in their assigned county or counties
	Case reviews	ZAP	Increase flow of cases and improve quality
Gangs and groups of offenders	Prevention	Hoops and Hope	Prevent gang involvement and juvenile delinquency while promoting pro-social development through athletic competition, life skills training, and mentoring
Juvenile offenders	Prevention/Intervention	Juvenile notifications	Communicate deterrence-based message and increase linkage to legitimate to prosocial support and services
Returning ex-offenders	Intervention	Facilitate successful re-entry	Focused release planning, structured support services, and intensive case management.
Open air drug markets	Intervention	Close down open air markets through targeted enforcement and call-ins	Build prosecution cases; prosecute most violent; call-ins with associates; linkage to services
Violent retaliation to violent acts	Intervention	Neighborhood Response to Violent Acts	Door-to-door canvassing of the neighborhood(s) where the crime happened, the victim(s) live(d), and/or the suspect/arrestee lives(d)
Lack of district-wide gun crime prevention efforts	Prevention of illegal possession & use of guns	PSN funds used to support community-based prevention strategies	TV, radio, billboard, poster, etc. campaign Speaker's Bureau

Results

Evidence of Implementation- Outputs

As mentioned previously, the Middle District of North Carolina population falls just about in the middle of the 90 federal districts where population data are available. The number of cases filed under U.S. Code 922 and 924 has increased steadily since the inception of PSN. From FY2000 to FY2004, the number of cases increased from 104 to 187, an increase of almost 80 percentage points. The number of cases decreased slightly in FY2005 to 161. Similarly, the number of defendants increased from 5.8 defendants per 10,000 population in FY2000 to 8.1 defendants per 10,000 population in FY2004. This places the Middle District of North Carolina at the top of the second quartile when comparing defendants per 10,000 population for the 90 federal districts (see endnote iii and iv).

The research partner has also cited several major outputs that resulted directly from Project Safe Neighborhoods. First, four of the five sites completed crime incident reviews. These were done one at a time and were based on the Strategic Problem Solving Training delivered by Michigan State University. Second, each site wanted to train their focus on notifications requesting both process and outcome evaluations from the research partner (at least five such evaluations have been done by the research partner). The sites learned from each other and wanted to evaluate the strategy. Third, while two sites had chronic offender lists prior to PSN, the remaining three created those lists and all are maintained to this day.

Evidence of Impact- Outcomes

The ultimate goal of PSN both nationally and in each federal district is to reduce the level of gun crime. As noted, the Middle District of North Carolina focused resources on five cities in their efforts to reduce gun crime: Durham, Greensboro, High Point, Salisbury, and Winston-

Salem. In order to provide a preliminary assessment of violent crime and firearm patterns, we provide a description of the different offense types over time by comparing pre- and post-intervention averages for a number of different crimes across these cities. Given that High Point is currently the subject of an NIJ evaluation, we do not include it in the analysis that follows (see Endnote vii).

As an initial step in the outcome analysis, we reviewed the annual trends in homicide, armed robbery, and assault with a firearm. Table 3 displays the change in all firearm offenses between 2000 and 2005 for each of the four target cities within the district. The most obvious and consistent decline occurs for most target cities between 2000 (the base-line year prior to the intervention) and 2002 (the year of the intervention), although this is not true for all the cities.

Table 3: Gun crime trend data- target sites in the Middle District of North Carolina

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Homicide with a firearm						
Durham	20	19	28	12	23	28
Greensboro	17	15	19	20	9	22
Salisbury	3	1	4	0	1	2
Winston-Salem	16	6	11	11	18	11
Aggravated assault with a firearm						
Durham	271	248	257	285	265	286
Greensboro	271	263	291	227	230	264
Salisbury	28	20	15	25	21	28
Winston-Salem	370	346	225	211	224	205
Robbery with a firearm						
Durham	584	691	638	560	534	390
Greensboro	570	595	383	392	433	478
Salisbury	42	41	40	34	35	34
Winston-Salem	341	234	206	262	254	276
Overall Gun offenses						
Durham	875	958	923	830	822	704
Greensboro	858	873	693	639	672	764
Salisbury	73	62	59	59	57	64
Winston-Salem	727	586	442	484	496	492

To extend the analysis beyond the simple trend assessment, the research team treated each site independent of one another for the analysis (as opposed to aggregating the data for all five sites). This was done for two main reasons. First, each of the sites implemented PSN in a way that was tailored to the identified problems in their city. That is, none of the sites implemented PSN in the same way; the interventions for each city, as described earlier, were different and somewhat independent of each other. Second, each site implemented PSN at different times and therefore each site had a different intervention date. In Durham, Greensboro, and Winston-Salem the intervention date is May 2002; In Salisbury, the intervention date is July 2003.

Given the small to medium population base for these cities, the base rate of gun crime is relatively low. Consequently, we focus on total firearms offenses, that is, a composite measure of homicides, assaults, and robberies committed with a firearm. Table 4 shows the average number of monthly firearm offenses for each site pre-intervention and post-intervention. As indicated, the total number of firearm offenses declined in all four of the sites between pre-PSN intervention and post-PSN intervention.

Table 4: Total monthly firearm offenses, pre-PSN and post-PSN intervention for four target cities

City	Pre-intervention Average	Post-Intervention Average
<i>Durham</i>	76.75	68.90
<i>Greensboro</i>	70.42	57.43*
<i>Salisbury</i>	5.38	4.93
<i>Winston-Salem</i>	50.46	41.23*

*Independent samples *t*-test^{viii} $t p < .001$

Findings: ARIMA Analysis

In the next step of the analysis, we utilized time series analysis for each of the four sites. Time series analysis provides an opportunity to assess whether a change in crime is statistically significant (e.g., not due to chance) accounting for a number of factors such as trends, heterogeneity, and magnitude. Time series analysis is one of the most widely adopted statistical procedures in econometrics and criminal justice used to determine the impact of programs and public policies. This type of procedure is also referred to as “impact assessment” (McCleary and Hay, 1980). McCleary and Hay state “the widest use of the time series design has clearly been in the area of legal impact assessment” (1980: p.141).

Time series analysis, in this illustration, is the analysis of violent crime trends over time using Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) models. The “series” of trends must conform to a number of statistical rules, or assumptions. The most important is the assumption of mean and variance stability, or stationarity, over time. For example, if a law enforcement team were to implement a program at an ideal time when crime rates were already on the decline, they could inaccurately claim success because the trend was already on a decline at the start of their intervention. However, if the series conform to these critical assumptions,^{ix} then the full impact assessment in the model can be attributed to the intervention component (McCleary and Hay, 1980), if the component meets a level of statistical significance,^x or level of confidence, that fulfills the criteria required within the social sciences.

Here, the intervention component is a dichotomous (dummy) variable (0 for pre-intervention and 1 for post-intervention). Again, each site has its own individualized intervention date, as described earlier. Selected results are described below (e.g., those sites that

had a statistically significant decline across a number of offenses). For an in-depth review of all statistical time series analyses for each site, please refer to Appendices A and B.

Results from the time series analysis suggest a statistically significant decline in firearm offenses in three of the five sites. Winston-Salem showed a statistically significant decline between pre- and post-PSN intervention with total firearm crimes declining by just over 9 per month. Greensboro had a statistically significant decline in total firearm offenses of approximately 13 per month, between pre and post-PSN intervention. Durham and Salisbury also experienced declines in total firearms though they did not attain statistical significance and thus could reflect chance variation.^{xi}

Summary

Leadership

One of the distinctive features of PSN in the Middle District was the consistent leadership provided by the U.S. Attorney and the Assistant U.S. Attorney who served as PSN project coordinator. Officials from throughout the district repeatedly talked about the commitment of the USA, Project Coordinator and the entire U.S. Attorney Office. This was manifest in the participation of these key officials in the MDAT and task force meetings, despite the numerous demands on their time. At the same time, these officials recognized the need to work collaboratively with other officials in all five sites and talk about the leadership provided by local law enforcement executives and their command staffs, local district attorneys, probation and parole officials, community leaders, and line level personnel from throughout these agencies.

Task Force Structure

Due to its size, the number of target sites, and the number of participating agencies, the Middle District of North Carolina maintained a more formal Task Force structure. They carefully considered how to keep all the partners informed as well as keep the bureaucracy at a minimum by having the all inclusive MDAT as well as a separate law enforcement only task force.

Partnerships

Implementing PSN in 5 cities across the geographically large Middle District of North Carolina could not have been possible without partnerships. ALL partners are valued and contribute to the success of PSN. In the Middle District, one essential element of their

productivity and focus is a clear message—expressed from various levels—that the research partner efforts are valued and supported.

There is also a concerted effort to show appreciation for those partners who are not at the regular MDAT meetings, the law enforcement officers of the street. The Task Force officers took it upon themselves to provide feedback to local officer and his/her supervisor. This specific partnership element has proven very effective in other PSN districts.

Challenges

One major challenge in the Middle District of North Carolina has been finding the appropriate balance of extending finite, limited resources to a broad target area. It has been challenging for those involved to decide where and how to focus (i.e., what projects and in which cities). Moreover, multiple target cities and intervention sites often translated into a full schedule of meetings—PSN Advisory, local violence reduction groups, and community and law enforcement sub-committees—for key players who carried other responsibilities in addition to PSN. And, attendance at these was sometimes critical to maintaining a District-wide overview.

A common challenge faced by many districts has been difficulty reaching out to Hispanic Community. The Middle District is still working on breaking down this barrier and is making progress. In addition to the Spanish material provided by the Department of Justice, the CEP is having all their printed materials translated into Spanish.

The Middle District also experienced obstacles when trying to get the North Carolina state probation and parole office (i.e. The Division of Community Corrections within the North Carolina Department of Correction) involved. Probation and parole were mistrustful. The MDAT spent a year getting them engaged mainly by building trust incrementally—starting with

the line probation officer. Now, probation and parole are very engaged so much so that the head of probation and parole asks them what he can do for them?

Another challenge not uncommon to other districts and projects relates to turnover. The Middle District of North Carolina experienced the loss of two major players within PSN. Both the major project contributors from the RP and CEP left their positions. However, new contributors from both institutions stepped up and there seems to be no negative effects on the day to day operations of PSN in the Middle District.

Conclusion

The Middle District of North Carolina represents a district that utilized a data-driven, strategic problem solving model to address gun crime throughout the district and in five communities in particular. The task force utilized a comprehensive lever pulling strategy that emphasized focused deterrence along with a serious commitment to linking at-risk youths and offenders to services and legitimate opportunities.

References

- Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, N.J.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Bynum, T., S.H. Decker, J. Klofas, N.K. Hipple, E.F. McGarrell, and J. McDevitt. 2006. *Chronic Violent Offender Strategies: A Project Safe Neighborhood Strategic Intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Cook, T.D. and D. Campbell. 1979. *Quasi-Experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co
- Decker, S.H., J. McDevitt, E.F. McGarrell, T. Bynum, J. Klofas, and N.K. Hipple. 2006. *Gun Prosecution Case Screening: A Project Safe Neighborhood Strategic Intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Frabutt, J.M., D.V. Easterling, and C. MacKinnon-Lewis. 2001. *A preliminary evaluation of the High Point Notification Program*. Greensboro, NC: Center for the Study of Social Issues, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Frabutt, J.M., and M.J. Gathings. 2004. *An evaluation of the Greensboro Police Department's Notification Program*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Youth, Family, and Community Partnerships, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Easterling, D., L. Harvey, D. Mac-Thompson, and M. Allen. 2002. *Evaluation of SACSI in Winston-Salem: Engaging the community in a strategic analysis of youth violence*. University of North Carolina, Greensboro, NC.
- Frabutt, J. M., M. J. Gathings, D.T. Jackson, and A.P. Buford. 2006. *High Point Daniel Brooks Initiative: Project description and preliminary impact analysis*. Greensboro, NC: Center for Youth, Family, and Community Partnerships, University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
- Harvey, L. K. (2005). *Qualitative evaluation of Zero Armed Perpetrators (ZAP): A summary report*. Winston-Salem, NC: Center for Community Safety, Winston-Salem State University.
- Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. (1999). *Returning to Our Roots: Executive Summaries*. National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.
- Kennedy, D.M., Braga, A.A., Piehl, A.M., & Waring, E.J. (2001). *Reducing gun violence: The Boston gun project's operation ceasefire*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

- Klofas, J., N.K. Hipple, J. McDevitt, T. Bynum, E.F. McGarrell, and S.H. Decker. 2006. *Crime Incident Reviews: A Project Safe Neighborhood Strategic Intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Lang, R. A. J., L. Canary, J.M. Cloud, J.M. Frabutt, S.D. Haynes, and B. Whisler. 2004, June. *Expanding Project Safe Neighborhoods into new cities: A research partner perspective on the multi-site approach*. Panel discussant, Project Safe Neighborhoods National Conference, Kansas City, MO.
- Lerner, R. M., and L.A.K. Simon. (1998). The new American outreach university. In R.M. Lerner and L.A.K. Simon (eds.), *Michigan State University series on children, youth, and families: University-community collaborations for the twenty-first century--Outreach scholarship for youth and families* (pp. 3-23). New York: Garland Publishing.
- MacKinnon-Lewis, C., and J.M. Frabutt. 2001a. A bridge to healthier families and children: The collaborative process of a university-community partnership. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 6(3), 65-76.
- MacKinnon-Lewis, C., and J.M. Frabutt. 2001b. Family focus on youth violence prevention: Preventing youth violence through a community-based, family centered approach. *National Council on Family Relations Report: Linking Family Research, Education, and Practice*, 46(3), F11-F12.
- McCleary, R. and R. Haley. *Applied Time Series analysis for the Social Sciences*. 1980. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications
- McDevitt, J., S.H. Decker, N.K. Hipple, E.F. McGarrell, J. Klofas, and T. Bynum. 2006. *Offender Notification Meetings: A Project Safe Neighborhood Strategic Intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- McGarrell, E.F., S. Chermak, J. Wilson, and N. Corsaro. 2006. "Reducing Homicide through a 'Lever-Pulling' Strategy." *Justice Quarterly* 23,2:214-231.
- McGarrell, E.F. 2005. *Strategic Problem Solving and Project Safe Neighborhoods*. PSN Case Study Report #1. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University. www.cj.msu.edu/%7Eoutreach/psn/Strategic_Problem_Solving_PSN_wp1%5B1%5D.pdf (Accessed 3/2/06).
- McGarrell, E.F., N.K. Hipple, N. Corsaro, E. Pappanastos, E. Stevens, and J. Albritton. Forthcoming. *Project Safe Neighborhoods Case Study Report: Middle District of Alabama*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. 1999. *Promising Strategies to Reduce Gun Violence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Quijas, L. F., C.MacKinnon-Lewis, and J.M. Frabutt. 2001, November. *Youth violence prevention and intervention: A community-based, family-centered approach*. Presented at Family Re-Union 10: Back to the Future, Accomplishments and Next Steps, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.
- Roehl, J., D.P Rosenbaum, S.K. Costello, J.R. Coldren, Jr., A.M. Schuck, L. Kunard, and D.R.Forde. 2006. *Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI) in 10 U.S. Cities: The Building Blocks for Project Safe Neighborhoods*. Final Report submitted to the Department of Justice.
- Rosenfeld, R., R. Fornango, and E. Baumer. 2005. "Did Ceasefire, Compstat, and Exile Reduce Homicide?" *Criminology and Public Policy* 4:4190449.
- Shelton, T.L., Frabutt, J.M., Harvery, L.K., DiLuca, K.L., Hefner, M.K., Kennedy, D.M., Sumner, M., & Hunt, E.D. (2007, July). *Street drug market intervention in High Point, North Carolina*. Paper presented as part of symposium, Project Safe Neighborhoods: Reducing Gun Violence through Drug Market Intervention and Gang Member Reentry Strategies (L.F. Mock, Moderator) at the annual National Institute of Justice conference, Washington, DC.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance. 2004. *Project Safe Neighborhoods: America's Network Against Gun Violence*. Bureau of Justice Assistance Program Brief. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Appendix A

Estimated ARIMA models for cities that showed significant decline

Offense	Model			Coefficient	Standard error	P-Value
	p	d	q			
<i>Durham</i>						
Homicide	-	-	-	.201	.431	.64
Homicide with a firearm	-	-	-	.149	.403	.71
Assaults**	1	-	-	-	-	-
Assaults with a firearm	1	-	-	1.98	1.64	.22
Robberies	1	-	-	-12.71	6.39	.04
Robberies with a firearm	1	-	-	-11.44	5.80	.04
Total gun offenses (Ln)	1	-	-	-.110	.072	.128
Total non-gun offenses	1	-	-	-16.0	6.56	.014
<i>Greensboro</i>						
Homicide	-	-	-	.58	.38	.12
Homicide with a firearm	-	-	-	.27	.36	.36
Assaults	1	-	-	.01	.05	.97
Assaults with a firearm	-	-	-	-2.09	1.9	.28
Robberies**	-	-	-	-	-	-
Robberies with a firearm (Ln)	1	-	-	-.247	.10	.02
Total gun offenses (Ln)	1	-	-	-.203	.07	.01
Total non-gun offenses	1	-	-	-7.15	8.2	.38
<i>Winston-Salem</i>						
Homicide	-	-	-	.70	.23	.10
Homicide with a firearm	-	-	-	.19	.23	.40
Assaults (Ln)	-	1	-	.04	.07	.53
Assaults with a firearm (Ln)	1	-	-	.31	.11	<.01
Robberies	1	-	-	10.91	4.07	<.01
Robberies with a firearm	1	-	-	.76	2.01	.7
Total gun offenses	1	-	-	8.99	.01	.01
Total non-gun offenses	1	-	-	.02	.03	.43

**Model would not converge

Appendix B

Estimated ARIMA models for cities that did not show significant decline

Offense	Model			Coefficient	Standard error	P-Value
	p	d	q			
<i>Salisbury</i>						
Homicide	1	-	-	-.12	.11	.24
Homicide with a firearm	-	-	-	-.09	.09	.34
Assaults (Ln)	-	-	-	1.13	.92	.21
Assaults with a firearm (Ln)	-	-	-	.22	.36	.53
Robberies	-	-	-	.29	.68	.67
Robberies with a firearm	1	-	-	-.63	.51	.21
Total gun offenses	-	-	-	-.44	.56	.42
Total non-gun offenses	-	-	-	1.29	1.05	.22

**Model would not converge

Endnotes

ⁱ Background on PSN is available through U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2004; McGarrell, 2005; and at the Department of Justice's PSN website, www.psn.gov.

ⁱⁱ See Decker et al., 2005; McDevitt et al., 2005; Klofas et al., 2005; and Bynum et al., 2005.

ⁱⁱⁱ Comparable demographic and crime statistics were unavailable for the federal districts of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Marianas Islands. All comparisons are based on the 90 remaining federal districts.

^{iv} All population data are based on the 2000 U.S. Census.

^v In order to create a comparison to other U.S. districts, we only select districts that have a population between +/- 25 percent of the Middle District of North Carolina's population. In this case we select districts whose population is between 1,838,242 and 3,063,742.

^{vi} The Center for Youth, Family, and Community Partnerships builds the capacity of families, service providers, researchers, teachers, and communities to ensure the health and well-being of children, bridging research, policy, and practice. The primary purpose of the Center is to partner with key stakeholders from the community and the University to: carry out basic, applied, and action research; infuse community perspectives into university research and teaching; translate research into effective programs and practice; and facilitate quality programs, practices, and policies that yield positive outcomes for children and their families.

^{vii} The High Point Drug Market Intervention is currently the subject of an NIJ evaluation. Preliminary findings from the research are very promising. In terms of the initial West End Intervention, the RP reports that a significant number of the call-in attendees have since made contact with the Resource Coordinator to receive assistance with employment, housing, and/or drug abuse issues. Burglary, drug sales, assault, and robbery all declined in the West End neighborhood after notification. Prior to notification, these four crimes accounted for two-thirds of the total number of crimes in High Point. After the notification they accounted for less than one-fifth of the city's crimes. Community residents reported an improved quality of life in the West End neighborhood since the notification (see Shelton, et al., 2007)

^{viii} Due to a difference in the number of pre- and post-intervention months we used an independent samples t-test.

^{ix} There are a number of highly accepted procedures for ensuring that a series conforms to the rules of variance and mean stationarity. These include differencing a series (subtracting the monthly observation minus the previous month's observation) and using the natural logarithm as a standardization technique for each observation in the series to compress the variability across time. For a more detailed discussion of these procedures, see McCleary and Hay, 1980.

^x Following the argument of Sherman and colleagues (2000) and Hayes and Daly (2003) in the case of evaluation research, the researchers employed a less restrictive significance level ($p < .15$) to assess statistical significance. This means that researchers considered a decline to be significant if it would be unlikely to occur by chance less than 15 out of 100 times.

^{xi} Given the low base rates of gun crime in Salisbury it is not surprising that the decline did not attain statistical significance.