Abstract: The Center For Evidence Based Crime Policy was tasked with doing an inventory and assessment of Seattle, Washington’s crime prevention programs. They developed an inventory list of crime prevention programs and reviewed them by comparing existing evidence. They also devised a categorical and a classification scheme. This allowed information about the quality of the evidence based, the effectiveness of the program, the amount of resource allocation, the total contracts, and the FTE allocation to be understood clearly. This type of document is vital for all communities undertaking violence reduction strategies because it allows cities to understand the existing programs that are in their community and how to use their resources effectively. Lastly, it allows community violence reduction planning teams to tailor specific programs towards the risks of their community. Rochester, NY would benefit greatly.

1. Describe the Program or Strategy.

The Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy (CEBP) at George Mason University conducted an assessment of the city of Seattle’s crime prevention programs to determine their efficiency and sustainability. The inventory produced had two goals; to provide a list of 72 crime prevention programs that have either a primary or a secondary or indirect focus on violence reduction, and to provide a review of the resources required for operating the programs and to make sure the resources are being allocated effectively. The researchers looked at the crime prevention mechanisms chosen, the number of contractors, the amount of resources, the methodology and the existing evaluation evidence already done to assess the merits of each program.

The Structure:

This particular report is structured in three different sections and three appendices. The first section contains the methodology and the classification scheme used. The second section is a more detailed description of the categorization of the programs and the results of the analysis of the proportion of the evidence based programs and the cities expenditure. The last section is a review the evidence, recommendations, and a section on implications. The three appendices contain
valuable information organized in specific ways to best see the results and the program information.

This sort of document was designed to assist community members of Seattle when trying to implement violence reduction strategies to achieve an overall goal of crime reduction. They also provided a recommendation to city officials about prioritizing evaluations and reducing the list of programs labeled as crime prevention based on a lack of good evidence. The PDF file can be assessed by the following link:

2. What types of crime are it intended to prevent or reduce?

This type of review of evidence-based programs in Seattle, is not trying to prevent or reduce a certain crime in particular, it was designed to assist the strategic planning teams to allocate resources appropriately to sustain violence reduction in the communities. The important aspect of evidence-based assessments is to be confident in the expenditure of resources to make sure you are tackling the issues you want.

3. Is the program or something similar reviewed on Blueprints for Violence Prevention (http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/) or Crime Solutions (www.crimesolutions.gov)?

Crime Solutions and Blueprints review specifically programs of all categories, however they do not evaluate certain cities and their programs. Many cities such as Detroit have come out and produced evidenced based assessments and full-blown violence prevention plans. The team of researchers did use the information about certain programs on Crime Solutions as part of their assessment.

4. Is there a clear theoretical foundation?

There is no theory behind evidenced based practice however the programs that are considered to be evidence based can have a strong theoretical background.
Evidence based practice is more of a concept than a theory. Evidenced based practice is part of the new criminal justice model that is taking shape within the field. Evidence based practice is becoming increasingly popular among criminal justice agencies and most programs are considering the benefits of having evaluations, collecting data, clear-cut goals, proper allocation of resources. The benefits are also the key aspects of evidence-based practice.

5. **Is there a direct, indirect or no clear theoretical link to crime reduction?**

Programs that are considered evidence-based practice can have a direct and an indirect theoretical link to crime reduction. An aspect of evidence-based practice is whether or not it is rooted in good theory and has been reviewed or evaluated by a scientific research team. Many of these programs in the Appendices have been already evaluated by many sources, such as Blueprints and Crime Solutions, and have had statistically significant conclusive results determining its effectiveness.

6. **Describe the logic model. Diagram it. How is it intended to reduce crime?**

Each city that decides to put together a violence reduction plan or an assessment/inventory of their evidence based practices goes about doing so in different ways. The process that Seattle has chosen, would be of value to the
Rochester community because we already have programs established that could benefit from further evaluations. First, they determined a list of programs that would fall under the category of evidence based. Secondly, the research team categorized them into “types” and ranked them on a 5 Point Scale that they created. In the categorization phase the team assessed the programs methodology, theory, and existing evidence, and evaluated their resources and quality of finances. The five point scale can be found in question 10, section A.

7. Does this program or strategy exist in this community? If yes, what agency is it run through? How long has it been in existence here? How is it funded?

Many other cities have gone forward with producing documents; toolkits and working models for violence reduction plans specifically tailored for their community and their communities needs. Seattle’s way of doing so was to assess the programs first, hence why their document contains information regarding the large list of Washington State programs. Cities like Detroit have also done similar work. This project was requested by members of the City Council Public Safety and Education Committee and tasked to the Center for Evidenced-Based Crime Policy at George Mason University.

8. Does it exist in other communities? If yes, where?

Yes, like noted before, many cities have come forward with documents about their violence reduction plan for their communities. Rochester has done so in the past, but would really benefit from this type of evaluation and assessment. These initial planning steps are crucial to the violence reduction planning process because they allow communities to tailor their existing or new programs to be more effective by matching their goals with specific program qualities.


There is research to show that evidence based practice is sound and crucial to a programs effectiveness and a cities ability to sustain violence reduction however,
there is no research done on the effectiveness of Seattle’s evidence-based assessment.

10. Provide a Review of the Research

a. What was the research design of the Seattle Assessment

First, the researchers evaluated the program’s descriptions to determine their connection to violence reduction mechanisms and then they compared them against the evidence for each program. It is important to note that this assessment is not a full evaluation of each program and their relationship to evidenced based practice.

Secondly, the research staff used a classification and rating scheme to help group the programs appropriately and to determine their effectiveness. The program categories are:

1. Families/Early Intervention
2. School-Based Prevention
3. Community-Based Prevention
4. Labor Markets
5. Places
6. Corrections & Treatment
7. Victimization Prevention
8. Indirect (programs that do not have clear crime prevention objectives)

Thirdly, the research team devised a rating scheme based on the potential effectiveness of each program and the merits of the methodology of the evidence. This is the five-point scale that is shown below.

1. Strong Potential for effectiveness
2. Moderate potential for effectiveness
   a. Promising
   b. Lower-quality positive evaluations
   c. Similar to rigorously-evaluated effective
3. Inconclusive
   a. Low-quality positive
   b. Mixed results
   c. Similar to less rigorously-evaluated programs
   d. No evidence but grounded in theory
4. Potential for backfire
5. Unable to match
   a. No support
b. Not crime prevention

The report concludes with a findings section on what they concluded when evaluating programs in Seattle, Washington and three appendices that include specific details regarding the programs effectiveness and the implications for crime prevention policy.

Below is a “snap shot” of what Appendix B of the document looks like. It contains detailed information of each of the programs with the following information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name:</th>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Evidence Rating:</th>
<th>City’s FTE</th>
<th>Contracts:</th>
<th>Mechanisms:</th>
<th>Theoretical Base:</th>
<th>Evidence Base:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b. Describe the Data

The research team was able to find relevant evidence, positive or negative, regarding 43 of the 63 (68%) programs and twelve of the programs were grounded in theory. A snap shot of Appendix A is below. The table shows the number of programs that fall under each category for evidence-based practice. Be aware that under each category there were sub-categories and they are seen on page 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>(55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Backfire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable To Match</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Evidence-Base for Crime Prevention Programs (Total=63)
The second set of data was the cities staffing allocation. The chart below shows the cities full time equivalent (FTE) allocation for each of the five categorical groups of evidence-based practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FTE Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>22.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>70.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Backfire</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable To Match</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: City FTE Allocation*

The final data set is the Total Contract Value and that information is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Contract Value ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>$1,282,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>$1,686,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconclusive</td>
<td>$3,798,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential to Backfire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Match</td>
<td>$4,793,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Total Contract Value ($)*

c. **Summarize the Findings**

As the numbers in Table 1 show, the 8% of the programs evaluated have a strong potential for effectiveness. One of the programs in this category is Nurse Family Partnerships, which is an early family intervention strategy. Often times treatment programs and health programs have stronger evidence to the more funding and evaluations done for social science programs.

According to Table 2, the city of Seattle spends a highly concentrated amount of funds towards inconclusive programs. Also, it was concluded that 11 full time police officers were currently allocated to programs that may have a potential to backfire.

Lastly, there is a positive relationship between the programs with a strong evidence based structure are well funded. However, there is a hefty amount of money-spent programs that have little evidence on their effectiveness.

In conclusion, the research team includes six recommendations for future planning groups to keep in mind.
1. Create a list of programs in your city
2. Implementation is crucial and should include a research team in the development and evaluation stages
3. Follow protocols
4. Make sure programs are clearly matched with risk factors/problems for each particular city
5. Programs should be required to develop and measure outcomes
6. Sustainability develops a strategy that continues to work after research stops.

11. How would you rate this program or strategy?
   a. Generally recognized as effective
   b. Good likelihood that it is effective
   c. Inconclusive
   d. Probably not effective
   e. Generally recognized as not effective
   f. Harmful or likely to be harmful

12. Explain your Rating

I rated this assessment of evidence based practice in Seattle as “good likelihood that it is effective” because documents such as these are important for the violence planning process. It assists people involved in the “Resource Intake” and “Asset Intake” part in understanding what is out there, what is needed and how well these programs operate. It aids in the strategic violence reduction planning teams in tailoring specific plans to use already existing resources. Documents such as these for the Rochester community would be ideal given our sustainable amount of resources already existing in the community. The value a document or a project like this to the City of Rochester is immeasurable and will likely be of a huge benefit for planning teams, community members, non-for profits, and service agencies. It’s a learning tool and a database at the same time.

13. One paragraph summary of the program, the findings and your recommendation.

The Center For Evidence Based Crime Policy was tasked with doing an inventory and assessment of Seattle, Washington’s crime prevention programs. They
developed an inventory list of program and reviewed them compared to the existing evidence and devised a categorical and classification scheme. This allowed information about the quality of the evidence based, the effectiveness of the program, the amount of resource allocation, the total contracts, and the FTE allocation to be understood clearly. This type of document is vital for all communities undertaking violence reduction strategies because it allows cities to understand the existing programs that are in their community and how to use their resources effectively. Lastly, it allows community violence reduction planning teams to tailor specific programs towards the risks of their community. Rochester, NY would benefit greatly.