

Federal Actions to Engage Communities in Reducing Gun Violence

Recommendations from the *Engaging Communities Report*

Ellen Paddock and Julie Samuels

URBAN INSTITUTE

Nina Vinik

JOYCE FOUNDATION

Spencer Overton

JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

January 2017

Decades of research confirm that urban gun violence has devastating effects on the physical health, mental health, economic vitality, and future growth of US communities (Wilson et al. 1998; Buka et al. 2001; Irvin-Erickson et al. 2016; Schwartz and Gorman 2003). Furthermore, these effects fall disproportionately on neighborhoods already highly disadvantaged because of several factors, including limited employment opportunities, poor infrastructure, underinvestment, and structural and racial inequality (Krivo and Peterson 1996). Many responses to gun violence have relied on sweeping tactics with the potential to label entire neighborhoods as “violent.” However, such generalizations can be counterproductive, undercutting community members’ potential to become essential allies in reducing gun violence and failing to recognize that gun violence and victimization are typically concentrated within a very small subset of people and places (Tyler and Fagan 2008; Papachristos and Wildeman 2014; Braga, Papachristos, and Hureau 2010). In other words, whole communities are not “violent,” and those most likely to be involved in firearm violence are also more likely to be victims (Braga 2010; Flannery, Singer, and Wester 2001).

In the past five years, a growing body of research has supported a move away from aggressive, sweeping enforcement strategies such as New York City’s stop-and-frisk policy. These enforcement strategies have contributed to mass incarceration and racial and socioeconomic disparities in the justice system and in communities (New York State Office of the Attorney General 2013; Mauer 2001;



TheJoyceFoundation



Sampson and Raudenbush 2004; Fagan and Davies 2000; DeFina and Hannon 2009). Even if these strategies reduce violence in the short term, they can have devastating long-term effects on trust, legitimacy, and cooperation with law enforcement in the very communities where cooperation is most essential (La Vigne et al. 2014; Weitzer and Tuch 2004; Fagan and Tyler 2008). Research shows that the best strategies to reduce gun violence carefully identify and focus on people at highest risk of violence and combine enforcement with social supports such as behavioral health, housing, and employment services (Braga, Apel, and Welsh 2013). For gun violence reduction efforts to achieve lasting success, it is clear that trust building and investment in communities most affected by violence must be a priority strategic goal.

This brief presents a series of concrete actions the federal executive branch can take to reduce urban gun violence through a holistic approach. The most direct gun violence reduction work happens locally, but the federal government can complement these activities by supporting and promoting four key objectives:

- Reduce easy access to firearms for people at high risk of engaging in violence.
- Improve trust between police and communities of color.
- Increase investment in families and communities at greatest risk of violence.
- Incorporate community engagement into prevention efforts.

These goals and the recommendations that follow are based on the 2016 *Engaging Communities in Reducing Gun Violence* report, which was produced through a partnership between the Joyce Foundation, the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, and the Urban Institute (see Bieler et al. 2016). The report grounds research and current policy in the day-to-day experiences and perspectives of over 100 people from communities affected by gun violence and the justice system, including community and religious leaders, social services providers, law enforcement, and people with previous justice involvement. The 2016 report presents several key legislative priorities, including universal background checks, more comprehensive regulation of firearms dealers, expanded categories of people federally prohibited from owning guns, and an increase in funding (in terms of social services, etc.) for communities most affected by gun violence (Bieler et al. 2016). This brief, however, does not recommend legislative changes and instead concentrates on federal executive branch actions.

Recommended actions are organized according to the policy “levers” available to the executive branch:

- **Coordination:** aligning federal efforts to improve effectiveness and elevate issues and solutions.
- **Funding:** investing federal dollars in programs known to work and encouraging effective state and local action.

- **Enforcement:** focusing federal enforcement on reducing gun violence and engaging with state and local enforcement agencies on similar efforts.
- **Research:** supporting efforts to improve public and scholarly understanding of gun violence and identify cost-effective solutions that work.

Recommended Actions

Improve Coordination

ESTABLISH AN INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP TO COORDINATE EFFORTS

Recent administrations have implemented numerous gun violence reduction efforts and initiatives to improve police-community relations.¹ For the most part, however, these efforts have operated separately, with little coordination across agencies, funding streams, expertise, or priorities. A standing interagency working group with **concrete goals** and a **dedicated coordinator** would help ensure continued progress and bring all players who have some stake in reducing gun violence to the table. Critically, membership should **extend beyond public safety agencies**² and include actors involved in **mental health, substance abuse, and other key social services**³ as well as the White House Domestic Policy Council. The Federal Interagency Reentry Council is a successful example of this model (GAO 2014). Since 2011, more than 20 federal agencies have worked together on various initiatives to reduce recidivism and improve other outcomes associated with successful reintegration (e.g., education, housing, health, and child welfare) for people returning to the community from incarceration. For example, the council developed the Veterans Re-Entry Search Service, a resource reentry planners can use to identify incarcerated people with a record of military service and connect them to services offered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

To start, the interagency working group should perform several key tasks:

- **Designate a staff point person to champion efforts and ensure progress.** This may be someone from the Department of Justice or another agency, such as the Department of Health and Human Services. This person should demonstrate commitment to addressing gun violence as a complex issue with solutions that extend beyond justice agencies.
- **Map and connect existing federal efforts** related to gun violence reduction and police-community trust to identify overlaps, gaps, contradictions, and opportunities.
- **Identify how each agency's role and responsibilities intersect** with gun violence and consider creative ways to support gun violence prevention and reduction in the future.
- **Identify the specific neighborhoods and populations most affected by gun violence** using datasets available to member agencies and direct agencies to target combined resources, interventions, and social services to these areas and groups.

- **Develop a strategic plan with a time line and performance measures** and identify staff to spearhead, coordinate, and monitor efforts across agencies.
- **Create a public presence** through a dedicated website and coordinate across agencies to elevate public awareness and understanding through traditional and social media outlets.
- **Oversee ongoing implementation, coordination, and monitoring** of interagency gun violence prevention and reduction efforts to ensure progress.

CHALLENGE PUBLIC, PRIVATE, AND NONPROFIT ACTORS TO DEVELOP CREATIVE EDUCATION CAMPAIGNS THAT ADDRESS GUN RISK BEHAVIORS THROUGH SEVERAL CHANNELS

These campaigns should reach out to individuals and communities about specific behaviors related to gun violence, such as straw purchasing⁴ and reporting stolen guns. These campaigns might use an array of communication methods and technologies, from conventional neighborhood meetings to social media and mobile apps, to have the greatest impact. For example, in many cities, women (e.g., girlfriends, sisters) are often asked to be straw purchasers (Wright, Wintemute, and Webster 2010). Programs such as Operation LIPSTICK focus on outreach to women at risk of engaging in straw purchasing. Education campaigns designed to reduce gun violence in cities may also need to conduct outreach in suburbs, particularly those near cities such as Chicago that have significant asymmetry between the strength of gun regulations within and outside city limits (City of Chicago 2014).

Leverage Federal Resources to Support State and Local Actors

The following section proposes priority areas for federal resources, including funding and training and technical assistance, that could help reduce gun violence while supporting communities, consistent with the *Engaging Communities* report.

INCENTIVIZE EFFORTS TO SOLICIT MEANINGFUL COMMUNITY INPUT THROUGH EXISTING PROGRAMS

Finding effective ways to amplify the voices of the people most affected by gun violence and law enforcement is critical to addressing this problem. Soliciting community input—and responding to the feedback—is essential to building the trust needed to reduce gun violence through evidence-based strategies, such as the National Network for Safe Communities’ Group Violence Intervention. Police departments often rely on community forums or other mechanisms to interact with residents. But these convenings may not represent many people, families, and communities affected by gun violence. Federal agencies can help strengthen local gun violence reduction efforts by supporting more innovative and effective ways for jurisdictions to solicit community input:

- **Support rigorous, targeted, face-to-face community surveys through funding and training and technical assistance.** The idea of conducting community surveys is not new, and efforts have typically focused on collecting perspectives across entire jurisdictions (Weisel 1999). However, such wide surveys are expensive and can obscure the experiences of neighborhoods most affected by violence if results are not broken down by neighborhood. This is especially

true for phone and mail surveys, which tend to receive lower response rates from black and Latinx⁵ residents and people with lower incomes or educational attainment (Krysan et al. 1994; Brown 2015; Blumberg and Luke 2007; Holbrook, Krosnick, and Pfent 2008). Departments can save money and gain more relevant feedback by concentrating survey resources on neighborhoods experiencing the highest rates of gun crime and gun-related arrests. Successful examples include surveys conducted as part of evaluations of the Chicago Violence Reduction Strategy and the ongoing National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice.

- » **Task Violence Reduction Network leadership to create community survey tools** that cities can use to understand local perceptions and behaviors related to gun violence reduction. The Violence Reduction Network is an interagency effort to develop best practices and innovative strategies for violence reduction through training and technical assistance, research, and information exchange through the Violence Reduction Clearinghouse. Potential survey topics might include police legitimacy, neighborhood efficacy, willingness to assist police, and norms that may affect this willingness, such as concerns about physical safety or social reputation (e.g., “snitching”). Surveys might also explore respondents’ perceptions about guns in their neighborhoods, such as why someone might choose to purchase a gun or the likelihood that a person might be asked to purchase a gun for someone else (straw purchasing).
 - » **Provide training and technical assistance to help jurisdictions effectively administer surveys.** This support might include identifying local partners, researchers, and volunteers; seeking field interviewers from the neighborhoods being surveyed; and analyzing and strategically using survey results.
- **Fund demonstration projects to identify the most effective ways to reach people at highest risk of involvement in gun violence and their immediate social networks and broader communities.** Finding effective ways for police to communicate with people most exposed to violence is essential to providing preventive services and education where they will be most effective and for purposes of focused deterrence.⁶ Demonstration projects should encourage jurisdictions to test different ways of reaching the groups essential to violence reduction strategies. Social media, for example, may be a powerful tool for reaching some people, but in-person engagement may be better for others.

SUPPORT PROCEDURAL JUSTICE, IMPLICIT BIAS, AND DE-ESCALATION TRAINING FOR LOCAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE AGENCIES THROUGH FUNDING AND TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Research shows that procedural justice and de-escalation trainings support officer safety and promote resident satisfaction and willingness to cooperate with police (Wells 2007; Oliva, Morgan, and Compton 2010). Procedural justice training emphasizes the importance of treating residents with respect, giving them a voice, and conveying neutral decisionmaking and trustworthy motives. De-escalation training teaches officers to slow down and diffuse crisis situations to allow them to think through their response options and minimize the likelihood of using force. More recently, growing public criticism of the

historically negative effects of policing on communities of color⁷ has generated pressure to develop, test, and implement law enforcement trainings on implicit bias—automatic biases that all people have but that can have especially devastating consequences in policing (Eberhardt et al. 2004; Payne 2001). In light of these concerns, the Department of Justice in 2014 funded the National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice, a six-site demonstration project to build trust between police and communities through a comprehensive package of interventions, including procedural justice and implicit bias trainings for police.⁸

Continuing to support such trainings is essential, as police are the entry point to the criminal justice system and a common presence in many communities. However, it is equally important to extend procedural justice and implicit bias trainings to other criminal justice entities, including courts, pretrial services, public defenders and prosecutors, and jail and prison staff, which also contribute to the disparity in the quantity and quality of interactions with the justice system (Richardson and Goff 2013; Hartney and Vuong 2009).

- **Expand opportunities for federally funded procedural justice, de-escalation, and implicit bias trainings**, providing special consideration for jurisdictions that face particularly high rates of violent crime or poor police-community relations.
- **Identify and elevate best practices for reinforcing and sustaining** these trainings so they become integral to operations rather than a one-time event. Consider the role of agency climate and incentives structures. The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services can be a valuable resource, as it already provides training and technical assistance and is connected with a wide network of police departments seeking to implement these trainings and strategies (Office of Community Oriented Policing Services 2016).
- **Support peer exchange** among sites implementing these trainings to troubleshoot and share lessons learned. This exchange might take the form of in-person convenings of local law enforcement agencies, interactive webinars, web-based forums, teleconferences, and so on.

TARGET PREVENTIVE SOCIAL SERVICES TO PEOPLE AND FAMILIES AT GREATEST RISK OF EXPOSURE TO OR INVOLVEMENT WITH GUN VIOLENCE

Many of the people and places most affected by violence often experience high levels of poverty and limited opportunities, among other forms of disadvantage. Ensuring that essential services and opportunities are available for people at high risk of gun violence involvement is a critical prevention strategy. However, local jurisdictions must be able to identify who is at risk and where this risk is concentrated to apply existing resources effectively. The federal government can help jurisdictions apply preventive service resources to reduce gun violence in several ways:

- Help state and local jurisdictions implement a public health approach to gun violence prevention. This approach begins by **integrating data** across multiple systems, including data from hospitals and social services, firearms and violent crime and arrest data, and gunfire detection technology data, to define and monitor what gun violence looks like locally.

Jurisdictions can use these data to **identify who is most exposed** to gun violence and the **characteristics that increase risk or protect from exposure**. This information can then be used to point out **opportunities for intervention** to disrupt any trajectory toward involvement in or exposure to violence.⁹

- **Focus on services addressing factors linked with violence prevention** more generally, including individual, family, peer, and community risk factors. Research shows that violent victimization and early exposure to violence are major risk factors for later involvement (Buka et al. 2001).¹⁰ Ensuring that mental health services, family support, and any necessary substance abuse treatments are available, particularly to victims and youth exposed to violence, is an essential prevention strategy (World Health Organization 2010; Buka et al. 2001). Federal health insurance policy and funding for social services should promote continued access to services that work, such as cognitive-behavioral therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder and cost-effective youth outreach interventions like Chicago's Becoming a Man program.¹¹ Providing tailored social services to those at highest risk of gun violence involvement is also a core component of evidence-based focused deterrence strategies.¹²

PROVIDE FUNDING AND TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT HOMICIDE AND NONFATAL SHOOTING INCIDENT REVIEW SYSTEMS

Homicide incident review systems, such as the one implemented in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, are an evidence-based way to reduce homicide through a multistage, interagency review process.¹³ The system has four key components:

- A real-time police review of past homicide incidents, including immediate law enforcement response and investigation of incidents.
- A monthly criminal justice panel, including federal and local law enforcement, investigators, prosecutors, department of corrections staff, and court staff, that reviews shootings to share information on each case and develop descriptions of incidents by district.
- A service provider review, which identifies community factors that may have contributed to an incident.
- A community review, which informs and invites public questioning or comment on homicides in their district.

The Department of Justice should expand financial support and technical assistance for effective approaches to urban gun violence provided through the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (Project Safe Neighborhoods), the National Institute of Justice, and others.¹⁴

Modify Federal Enforcement Priorities

The federal government can influence enforcement priorities at both the federal and local levels. Federal investigators and prosecutors have broad criminal jurisdiction but finite resources and must exercise discretion in determining which cases become federal cases. Although much of this discretion is context specific, decisions are guided by overall national priorities, policies set by the attorney general, and the federal Principles of Prosecution. Locally, the federal government can influence enforcement priorities by funding key law enforcement activities, identifying best practices, and leveraging the unique authority of the US Attorneys—the chief federal law enforcement officers in their districts—to convene stakeholders and develop coordinated strategies to address issues of local concern.

Based on this structure, the executive branch can more effectively reduce gun violence by focusing federal enforcement priorities and resources on the **most serious gun crimes and bolstering the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives' (ATF) regulatory capacity.**

FOCUS ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS ON TRAFFICKERS

Gun trafficking is illegal and often commercial in nature and entails diverting firearms to or within the illegal market through corrupt dealers, falsified documents, interstate transfers, or other means (Police Executive Research Forum 2000; Wachtel 1998). Illustrating this point, a recent study shows that from 1991 to 2014, most crime guns in Boston traced back to legal dealers in other states (Braga 2016). However, addressing trafficking requires the development of specific intelligence and law enforcement strategies as well as cooperation across states and jurisdictions. As a result, the federal government is particularly well positioned to help reduce this source of crime guns, beginning with two specific actions:

- Call on the Attorney General's Advisory Committee of US Attorneys to work with ATF to develop a national strategy to address gun trafficking.
- Direct US Attorneys to coordinate their antiviolence initiatives with state and local partners, consistent with the principles of the *Engaging Communities* report.

BOLSTER ATF'S REGULATORY OVERSIGHT AND ENFORCEMENT CAPABILITY

ATF plays a critical role in regulating firearms commerce and enforcing federal firearms laws, which helps federal and local agencies address gun crime. To bolster this role, the federal government should

- support funding increases to hire more ATF examiners and strengthen capacity,
- engage Congress to address appropriations riders preventing ATF from operating effectively (see Stachelberg, Gerney, and Parsons 2013), and
- increase FBI funding to support the National Instant Criminal Background Check System and continue supporting programs (e.g., the NICS Act Record Improvement Program) to improve data quality and reporting consistency at the local level.

DEVELOP AND PROMOTE PERFORMANCE MEASURES TO HOLD STATE AND LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES ACCOUNTABLE

Police officers and departments are evaluated primarily on crime reduction, clearance rates, response times, arrests, citations, and other quantitative measures of enforcement activity (Sparrow 2015). These are important benchmarks, but police departments are also public-serving agencies whose effectiveness and professionalism require a positive relationship with their communities (Bennett 1982). Although most police officers recognize the importance of respectful and procedurally fair encounters, they are rarely rewarded for these or other efforts that seek to build community trust. Supplementing crime control measures with measures that capture the quality of resident interactions is an important way to promote the critical organizational changes needed to encourage enforcement that is respectful and fair and that lends itself to future resident cooperation with police (Tyler 2005; Tyler and Fagan 2008).

Making these data public is an essential next step to increasing transparency and building trust while opening the door to new knowledge and crowdsourced analysis. Finally, publishing both traditional performance measures and those that capture the quality of community engagement provides greater public recognition of the full range of services and interactions that police perform.

- Task the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services with identifying and developing guidelines for departments to integrate resident perceptions and procedural justice practices into departments' accountability structures. This may include departmental reporting to the city and public, officer performance evaluations, revised recruitment and hiring processes and promotion criteria, and so on. This review should also present data or other information sources that support these efforts, such as Chicago's RespectStat or, at the agency level, resident surveys.¹⁵
- At the national level, strengthen data sources to better track police shooting data, including information about the race of the victim. This involves
 - » strengthening conventional data sources that directly measure such shootings, such as the Bureau of Justice Statistics' Arrest-Related Deaths program or the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting program, scheduled to begin in 2017;¹⁶
 - » monitoring, assessing, and comparing more innovative data collection strategies, such as the crowdsourced Fatal Encounters database; and
 - » exploring the use of public health systems data, which is already being done through a National Institute of Justice-funded study at Harvard.¹⁷

The executive branch should also promote the collection of data tracking use of force, traffic and pedestrian stops, and other police activity as well as the race of the people involved in each case.

- Continue to support efforts to democratize police data, such as the Police Data Initiative and the Center for Policing Equity's National Justice Database. In addition to promoting

transparency, publishing data provides valuable opportunities to crowdsource analysis, allowing researchers to mine data for patterns that could help inform police operations but that departments may have limited capacity to analyze themselves.

Build Research and Knowledge

BOLSTER PROGRAMS TO INCREASE LOCAL DATA CAPACITY AND TRANSPARENCY

Good data are the foundation for research, and much of the information essential to better understand and address gun violence is captured at the local level. The executive branch should support programs such as the Police Data Initiative, Smart Suite, NICS Act Record Improvement Program, Project Comport, and others that aim to increase local capacity to collect and use consistent, high-quality data. In addition, making this data transparent is critical to both research and building public trust.

CONVENE DIVERSE AGENCIES TO IDENTIFY CRITICAL KNOWLEDGE GAPS, DEVELOP A STRATEGIC RESEARCH AGENDA, AND COORDINATE FUNDING STREAMS

Federal funding for research on the causes, characteristics, and effects of gun violence has been restricted in the past, which has limited knowledge about how to most effectively reduce gun violence while minimizing collateral damage to communities. Although additional funding is desirable, the executive branch can begin by convening existing agencies that fund research both directly and indirectly related to gun violence, including the National Institute of Justice, the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Office of Justice Programs, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Education, and the National Science Foundation, to identify research gaps, establish a coordinated research agenda, and leverage their existing funding streams to meet the highest-priority research and evaluation needs. The 2013 research priorities released by the Health and Medicine Division of the National Academies provide a strong starting point for this effort, which should also aim to identify best practices (Institute of Medicine of the National Academies 2013).

Conclusion

The federal government has a number of tools at its disposal to support local gun violence reduction efforts that seek to engage the communities most affected by gun violence, target resources effectively, and minimize unintentional harms caused by broad-brush criminal justice responses. Coordinating federal efforts is an essential first step to ensure that priorities align and that funding for programs and research is spent effectively. To help engage communities in gun violence reduction, the executive branch should focus on key priority areas, including gathering community input, providing critical law enforcement training, targeting preventive social services, and promoting homicide incident review systems. At the same time, the government should ensure that federal enforcement is aimed at the most serious gun crimes, that agencies have the resources to carry out their regulatory and enforcement functions, and that performance measures for local agencies address the quality and full range of activities in which officers engage, including interactions with the community. Moving forward,

continuing to improve data capacity and investing in research are essential steps to ensure that cities have the best knowledge and tools available to reduce gun violence and keep their residents safe.

About the Authors

Ellen Paddock is a research associate at the Urban Institute's Justice Policy Center. Her work focuses on the overlap between public health and criminal justice and on public safety strategies that effectively reduce crime while minimizing collateral damage to vulnerable communities.

Julie Samuels is a senior fellow in the Justice Policy Center with extensive knowledge of the federal criminal justice system. At Urban, she examines issues related to growth in the federal prison system, federal justice case processing trends, justice reinvestment, and offender DNA collection.

Nina Vinik is program director for the Gun Violence Prevention Program at the Joyce Foundation in Chicago, where she manages the foundation's grantmaking to support evidence-based policies and practices that reduce gun death and injury in the United States.

Spencer Overton is a tenured professor of law at the George Washington University and the president of the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, a public policy organization founded in 1970 that focuses on innovative elected and appointed officials who serve communities of color.

Notes

1. Examples of violence reduction initiatives include the Violence Reduction Network, Project Safe Neighborhoods, the National Forum on Youth Violence Prevention, and President Obama's 2013 and 2016 executive actions to reduce gun violence. Operating separately, yet critical to the goal of gun violence reduction, are initiatives to support community engagement and build trust with law enforcement, such as the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.
2. Including, from the Department of Justice, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives; the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services; the Office of Justice Programs; the Executive Office for the United States Attorneys; the Office of the Attorney General; the Community Relations Service; the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.
3. Examples include the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Labor, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Department of Education.
4. Straw purchasing occurs when a person who is legally restricted from buying a gun obtains one illegally by way of an alternate buyer (straw purchaser) who is able to pass background checks. This gun is then transferred to the person who was legally unable to purchase a gun.
5. Latinx is a gender-neutral term for people of Latin American descent.
6. Focused deterrence seeks to reduce specific types of offenses—most commonly, shootings—by providing clear *incentives* for compliance and more certain and severe *consequences* for this specific activity. In practice, this involves identifying those at highest risk for violence and reaching out to them to offer both community supports and informing them that they will be subject to heightened enforcement if they continue to engage in gun violence. The strategy has successfully reduced gun violence in several cities and is rated as promising on CrimeSolutions.gov. "Practice Profile: Focused Deterrence Strategies," National Institute of Justice, accessed January 26, 2017, <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=11>.

7. T. Jackman, "U.S. Police Chiefs Group Apologizes for 'Historical Mistreatment' of Minorities," *Washington Post*, October 17, 2016, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/true-crime/wp/2016/10/17/head-of-u-s-police-chiefs-apologizes-for-historic-mistreatment-of-minorities/?utm_term=.136cd0851a9a.
8. The National Initiative's three core focus areas, or "pillars," are procedural justice, implicit bias, and reconciliation. Cutting across these areas, the initiative also emphasizes concentrated outreach to and engagement with groups that have historically strained relations with police. For more information, visit <https://trustandjustice.org/>.
9. "The Public Health Approach to Violence Prevention," Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, last modified March 25, 2015, <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/overview/publichealthapproach.html>.
10. "Youth Violence: Risk and Protective Factors," Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, last modified May 11, 2016, <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/youthviolence/riskprotectivefactors.html>.
11. W. Harms, "Study: Chicago Counseling Program Reduces Youth Violence, Improves School Engagement," *UChicagoNews*, July 13, 2012, <https://news.uchicago.edu/article/2012/07/13/study-chicago-counseling-program-reduces-youth-violence-improves-school-engagemen>; "Reducing Violence and Increasing Graduation," University of Chicago Urban Labs, accessed January 27, 2016, <https://urbanlabs.uchicago.edu/projects/becoming-a-man>. Run by the Chicago-based organization Youth Guidance, *Becoming a Man* uses cognitive behavioral-therapy and weekly group sessions in public schools to provide social and emotional support for young men at high risk of justice involvement or leaving school. Two randomized controlled trials conducted by the University of Chicago Crime Lab found that the program significantly reduced violent crime arrests and increased graduation rates among participants.
12. "Practice Profile: Focused Deterrence Strategies," National Institute of Justice, accessed January 26, 2017, <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=11>.
13. The Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission has become a prominent model for interagency, multilevel, data-driven collaboration to reduce fatal and nonfatal shootings. Its 2015 annual report contains data on homicides and nonfatal shootings in the city (MHRC, n.d.).
14. "Program Profile: Milwaukee (Wis.) Homicide Review Commission (MHRC)," National Institute of Justice, accessed January 26, 2017, <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=354>.
15. G.F. McCarthy and D.P. Rosenbaum, "From CompStat to RespectStat: Accountability for Respectful Policing," *Police Chief*, August 2015, http://illinoiscenterofexcellence.org/assets/pdf/Ideas%20and%20Insights_Aug%202015.pdf.
16. K. Kindy, "FBI to Sharply Expand System for Tracking Fatal Police Shootings," *Washington Post*, December 8, 2015, https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/fbi-to-sharply-expand-system-for-tracking-fatal-police-shootings/2015/12/08/a60fbc16-9dd4-11e5-bce4-708fe33e3288_story.html?utm_term=.86fee5918c32.
17. T. Waitt, "DOJ Awards \$3.3M for Research to Reduce Firearms Violence," *American Security Today*, October 27, 2016, <https://americansecuritytoday.com/doj-awards-3-3m-research-reduce-firearms-violence/>.

References

- Bennett, R.R. 1982. "The Effect of Police Personnel Levels on Crime Clearance Rates: A Cross-National Analysis." *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice* 6 (3): 177–93.
- Bieler, S., K. Kijakazi, N. La Vigne, N. Vinik, and S. Overton. 2016. *Engaging Communities in Reducing Gun Violence*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Blumberg, S.J., and J.V. Luke. 2007. "Coverage Bias in Traditional Telephone Surveys of Low-Income and Young Adults." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 71 (5): 734–49.
- Braga, A.A. 2010. *Gun Violence among Serious Young Offenders*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Braga, A.A. 2016. "Long Term Trends in the Sources of Boston Crime Guns." Paper presented at The Underground Gun Market: Implications for Regulation and Enforcement, New York, April 28–29.

- Braga, A.A., R. Apel, and B.C. Welsh. 2013. "The Spillover Effects of Focused Deterrence on Gang Violence." *Evaluation Review* 37 (3-4): 314-42.
- Braga, A.A., A.V. Papachristos, and D.M. Hureau. 2010. "The Concentration and Stability of Gun Violence at Micro Places in Boston, 1980-2008." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 26 (1): 33-53.
- Brown, A. 2015. *The Unique Challenges of Surveying U.S. Latinos*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.
- Buka, S.L., T.L. Stichick, I. Birdthistle, and F.J. Earls. 2001. "Youth Exposure to Violence: Prevalence, Risks, and Consequences." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 71 (3): 298-310.
- City of Chicago (City of Chicago Office of the Mayor and the Chicago Police Department). 2014. *Tracing the Guns: The Impact of Illegal Guns on Violence in Chicago*. Chicago.
- DeFina, R., and L. Hannon. 2009. "The Impact of Mass Incarceration on Poverty." *Crime and Delinquency* 59 (4): 562-86.
- Eberhardt, J.L., P.A. Goff, V.J. Purdie, and P.G. Davies. 2004. "Seeing Black: Race, Crime, and Visual Processing." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87 (6): 876-93.
- Fagan, J., and G. Davies. 2000. "Street Stops and Broken Windows: Terry, Race and Disorder in New York City." *Fordham Urban Law Journal* 28 (2): 457-504.
- Flannery, D.J., M.I. Singer, and K. Wester. 2001. "Violence Exposure, Psychological Trauma, and Suicide Risk in a Community Sample of Dangerously Violent Adolescents." *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry* 40 (4): 435-42.
- Hartney, C., and L. Vuong. 2009. *Created Equal: Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the US Criminal Justice System*. Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Holbrook, A., J.A. Krosnick, and A. Pfent. 2008. "The Causes and Consequences of Response Rates in Surveys by the News Media and Government Contractor Survey Research Firms." In *Advances in Telephone Survey Methodology*, edited by J.M. Lepkowski, C. Tucker, J.M. Brick, E. de Leeuw, L. Japac, P.J. Lavrakas, M.W. Link, and R.L. Sangster, 499-528. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- Institute of Medicine of the National Academies. 2013. "Priorities for Research to Reduce the Threat of Firearm-Related Violence." Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.
- Irvin-Erickson, Y., B. Bai, A. Gurvis, and E. Mohr. 2016. *The Effect of Gun Violence on Local Economies*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Krivo, L.J., and R.D. Peterson. 1996. "Extremely Disadvantaged Neighborhoods and Urban Crime." *Social Forces* 75 (2): 619-48.
- Krysan, M., H. Schuman, L.J. Scott, and P. Beatty. 1994. "Response Rates and Response Content in Mail Versus Face-To-Face Surveys." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 58 (3): 381-99.
- La Vigne, N., P. Lachman, S. Rao, and A. Matthews. 2014. *Stop and Frisk: Balancing Crime Control with Community Relations*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Mauer, M. 2001. "The Causes and Consequences of Prison Growth in the United States." *Punishment and Society* 3 (1): 9-20.
- MHRC (Milwaukee Homicide Review Commission). n.d. *Annual Report 2015: Homicides and Non-Fatal Shootings*. Milwaukee, WI: Milwaukee Health Department, Office of Violence Prevention.
- New York State Office of the Attorney General. 2013. *A Report on Arrests Arising from the New York City Police Department's Stop-and-Frisk Practices*. New York: New York State Office of the Attorney General.
- Oliva, J.R., R. Morgan, and M.T. Compton. 2010. "A Practical Overview of De-Escalation Skills in Law Enforcement: Helping Individuals in Crisis While Reducing Police Liability and Injury." *Journal of Police Crisis Negotiations* 10 (1-2): 15-29.
- Papachristos, A.V., and C. Wildeman. 2014. "Network Exposure and Homicide Victimization in an African American Community." *American Journal of Public Health* 104 (1): 143-50.

- Payne, B.K. 2001. "Prejudice and Perception: The Role of Automatic and Controlled Processes in Misperceiving a Weapon." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 81 (2): 181–92.
- Police Executive Research Forum. 2000. *Reducing Illegal Firearms Trafficking: Promising Practices and Lessons Learned*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- Richardson, L.S., and P.A. Goff. 2013. "Implicit Racial Bias in Public Defender Triage." *Yale Law Journal* 122 (8): 13–24.
- Sampson, R.J., and S.W. Raudenbush. 2004. "Seeing Disorder: Neighborhood Stigma and the Social Construction of 'Broken Windows.'" *Social Psychology Quarterly* 67 (4): 319–42.
- Schwartz, D., and A.H. Gorman. 2003. "Community Violence Exposure and Children's Academic Functioning." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 95 (1): 163–73.
- Sparrow, M.K. 2015. *Measuring Performance in a Modern Police Organization*. NCJ 248476. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Stachelberg, W., A. Gerney, and C. Parsons. 2013. "Blindfolded, and with One Hand Tied Behind the Back: How the Gun Lobby Has Debilitated Federal Action on Firearms and What President Obama Can Do About It." Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Tyler, T.R., and J. Fagan. 2008. "Legitimacy and Cooperation: Why Do People Help the Police Fight Crime in Their Communities." *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 6 (231): 231–75.
- Tyler, T.R. 2005. "Policing in Black and White: Ethnic Group Differences in Trust and Confidence in the Police." *Police Quarterly* 8 (3): 322–42.
- GAO (United States Government Accountability Office). 2014. *Managing for Results: Implementation Approaches Used to Enhance Collaboration in Interagency Groups*. Washington, DC: United States Government Accountability Office.
- Weisel, D. 1999. *Conducting Community Surveys: A Practical Guide for Law Enforcement Agencies*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Weitzer, R., and S.A. Tuch. 2004. "Race and Perceptions of Police Misconduct." *Social Problems* 51 (3): 305–25.
- Wells, W. 2007. "Type of Contact and Evaluations of Police Officers: The Effects of Procedural Justice across Three Types of Police–Citizen Contacts." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35 (6): 612–21.
- Wilson, D.K., W. Kliewer, L. Plybon, J. Zacharias, N. Teasley, and D.A. Sica. 1998. "Violence Exposure and Ambulatory Blood Pressure in African-American Adolescents." *International Journal of Rehabilitation and Health* 4 (4): 223–32.
- World Health Organization. 2010. *Reducing Violence through Victim Identification, Care and Support Programmes*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- Wright, M.A., G.J. Wintemute, and D.W. Webster. 2010. "Factors Affecting a Recently Purchased Handgun's Risk for Use in Crime under Circumstances that Suggest Gun Trafficking." *Journal of Urban Health* 87 (3): 352–64.

Acknowledgments

This report was a collaborative venture among the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, the Joyce Foundation, and the Urban Institute. The project was funded by the Joyce Foundation. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine our research findings or the insights and recommendations of our experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at www.urban.org/support.



ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The nonprofit Urban Institute is dedicated to elevating the debate on social and economic policy. For nearly five decades, Urban scholars have conducted research and offered evidence-based solutions that improve lives and strengthen communities across a rapidly urbanizing world. Their objective research helps expand opportunities for all, reduce hardship among the most vulnerable, and strengthen the effectiveness of the public sector.

The Joyce Foundation

ABOUT THE JOYCE FOUNDATION

The Joyce Foundation invests in solutions to pressing economic and social challenges that influence the quality of our lives, the vitality of our communities, and the fairness of our society. The Foundation seeks quality education for all children, expansion of economic opportunity, and a truly representative democracy that serves the public interest. The Foundation supports strategies to reduce gun violence, clean up and restore our natural environment, and enrich our communities with diverse, thriving arts and culture.



ABOUT THE JOINT CENTER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

Founded in 1970, the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies produces high-quality research and solutions that inform innovative elected officials at every level of government who serve communities of color. The Joint Center provides a platform for officials and experts to work together in key research and policy areas, such as criminal justice, gun violence prevention, workforce development, civic engagement, technology, entrepreneurship, financial services, education, and tax and fiscal policy.

Copyright © January 2017. Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.