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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Durham Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative (CAGI)

The Durham Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative (CAGI), a 3-year gang prevention and reduction initiative, was developed to reduce gangs and the underlying causes that support them. The Durham Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative adopted the combined strategies of law enforcement, prevention-intervention, and reentry, outlined by the U.S. Department of Justice, to address gangs and gang-related violence within the Bull’s Eye area of Durham, North Carolina.

Component 1: Suppression by law enforcement: The goal of this component was to reduce the occurrence of violent gang-related incidents in the Bull’s Eye area through the use of reactive and proactive strategies. Strategies of this component included:

a. Utilizing new intelligence software, specifically i2 Analyst Notebook, and i2 iBridge to link the DPD’s Report Management System (RMS) and Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) to Gang-Net, which is a statewide gang intelligence program.

b. Utilizing SunGuard HTE Link Analysis software to allow investigators and officers to construct intelligence diagrams of RMS data in their investigations by structuring the information in an organized format.

c. Continuing a partnership with the North Carolina Department of Community Corrections in conducting court approved searches of probationers, with a direct focus on gang members within the target area.

d. Continuing the monthly Gun Review Meetings whereby all gun arrest cases from Durham County are reviewed by the Law Enforcement Task Force made up of members from the DPD, Durham County Sheriff’s office, Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco Firearms and Explosives, North Carolina Department of Community Corrections, Durham County District Attorney’s office and the United States Attorney’s Office (Middle District).

e. Instituting the High Point Drug Market Initiative in the Bull’s Eye area in order to address street level drug activity and violent crime.

f. Providing training for law enforcement partners in the area of gang investigation in order to arm them with the necessary knowledge to conduct successful gang investigations.
g. Increasing police visibility and proactive policing efforts in the Bull’s Eye area by adding additional law enforcement personnel with the use of overtime funds.

**Component 2: Prevention and intervention services by public/non-profit community agencies**—the goal of this component was to reduce the occurrence of youth gang-related incidents and increase positive outcomes for youth at high risk of gang involvement through targeted, evidenced-based gang prevention. Community-based agencies had the opportunity to seek funding for addressing prevention/ intervention activities within the Bull’s Eye area. The strategies of this component included:

a. Expanding the use of the North Carolina Child Response Initiative (NCCRI). This service uses a system of care approach with a focus on acute stabilization and assessment with evidence based treatments for victims. The aim of this mental health service approach is to stabilize children in crisis, assess trauma symptoms, increase service access and coordination and avert further victimization. These services are delivered on the scene.

b. Expanding the role of faith-based organizations to increase services to youth victims and offenders. The Religious Coalition for Non-Violent Durham collaborates with other local faith-based organizations in the targeted area to increase services to youth victims and offenders.

c. Increasing referrals of the most troubled youth to address quality of life issues within the community and to foster positive behavior among youth living within the targeted area.

**Component 3: Reentry services offered by local governmental entities**—the goal of this component was to increase public safety by reducing recidivism rates for high-impact gang-involved offenders returning to the community after incarceration, through the use of vouchers, mentors and community organizations for the delivery of services and treatment. Strategies of this component included:

a. Targeting 15 to 20 offenders per year

b. Developing a system to identify Security Threat Group (STG) inmates prior to release

c. Hiring a case manager

d. Identifying other potential CAGI participants who do not come through the North Carolina Department of Correction’s channels

e. Identifying service providers who would deliver services to offenders at no cost

f. Identifying service providers who would offer services through vouchers and enter into contracts with the Durham County Criminal Justice Resource Center
Evaluation Framework

This report presents the findings of the evaluation of the Durham Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative. The original aim of the evaluation was to determine to what extent, the CAGI project achieved its overall goal of reducing gangs and the underlying causes that support them? However, after a closer assessment of the project by the evaluation team, it was determined that the performance measures were not specific to the overall initiative but were component (suppression, prevention/intervention, reentry) and organization specific (e.g. Durham Police, Communities-in-Schools, Religious Coalition) and that the evaluation had to focus on the extent to which each component achieved its objective. The evaluation was undertaken with a second objective: to develop a best practice document on effective strategies and approaches to address gangs and gang-related problems. The best practice document can be found in Appendix G.

Evaluation Findings

The major findings of the evaluation are summarized across the three components of the Initiative —suppression/law enforcement, prevention/intervention, and reentry.

Suppression/Law Enforcement Component

One of the major objectives of this component was to reduce the number of violent gun crimes in the Bull’s Eye area within two years of project implementation. The evaluation findings revealed that there was a statistically significant decrease (39.1%) between baseline and Year Two of project implementation and a statistically significant decrease (nearly 57%) between baseline and Year Three of project implementation in the number of violent crimes committed with a firearm in the target area (Bull’s Eye).

A comparative analysis of violent crime (committed with a firearm) trends in the Bull’s Eye area relative to the buffer area (a 1000 ft.) buffer surrounding the target area) and to the rest of the city demonstrated that the overall decrease between baseline and Year Two was more substantial in the target area than in the buffer area and the rest of the city—39.1% in the Bull’s Eye area, 22.8% in the buffer area, and 10.8% in the rest of the city. Similarly, the overall decrease in violent crimes was more substantial in the target area relative to the buffer area and to the rest of the city between baseline and Year Three—56.5% in the Bull’s Eye area, 40.4% in the buffer area, and 17.0% in the rest of the city.

In light of these findings, we believe that the suppression component of Durham-CAGI was meaningful, and that there was an association but not necessarily causation between the intervention and reductions of violent crimes committed with a firearm in the buffer area. However, the evaluation team was not able to examine or determine which strategies or interventions of the suppression component were associated with the reduction in violent crimes.

Prevention/Intervention Component
Community-based agencies had the opportunity to seek funding to provide prevention/intervention activities within the Bull’s Eye area. The City of Durham contracted with the following agencies/initiatives: Community Helping Adolescents Make Positive Strides(CHAMPS), Communities-in-Schools(CIS), Education, Development, Growth, and Employment(EDGE), North Carolina Child Response Initiative(NCCRI), and the Religious Coalition for a Non-Violent Durham. (RCND)

**CHAMPS**—Eleven youth who were at risk of dropping out of high school or who were affiliated with gangs participated in the program. The program was designed to engage at-risk students and/or gang-affiliated youth enrolled at Holton Resource and Career Center in Durham, NC, in pro-social activities (via community and career mentoring and a paid internship with the City of Durham) that could directly influence decisions that may have an impact on their future employability. Each of the 11 program participants participated in pre-employment skills training and was mentored by a community and a career mentor. Eight students completed the necessary requirements to have a paid internship with the City of Durham.

**CIS**—conducted five (5) cycles of Incredible Years parent skill development groups to forty families whose children attended Eastway Elementary School or lived in the Bull’s Eye area. The Incredible Years program emphasized parenting skills known to promote children’s social competence and reduce behavior problems, such as how to play with children, helping children learn, effective praise and use of incentives, effective limit setting, and strategies to handle misbehavior. Parents reported an increase in the use of appropriate discipline and positive verbal discipline; and a decrease in the use of harsh and inconsistent discipline and physical punishment.

**EDGE**—provided General Education Development (GED) services to 150 gang-involved youth, resulting in 80 gang-affiliated youth acquiring their GED by June 2011.

**NCCRI**—provided mental health services to 138 children and their families who were at risk of gang-involvement. In addition, NCCRI provided general follow up services to the parents of referred children. During conversations with these parents, NCCRI made recommendations regarding effective parenting strategies to implement at home and provides information regarding appropriate community resources to address the specific needs of referred children and their families.

**RCND**—hosted 12 monthly roundtable luncheons on violence; six of the 12 luncheons focused specifically on gangs. Participants from social agencies who attended the Religious Coalition monthly luncheon sessions reported that as a result of attending the luncheon roundtable sessions they had become more aware of the violence and gang problems and had increased knowledge to do their job in the community.
Reentry Component

The goal of this component was to increase public safety by reducing recidivism rates for high-impact gang-involved offenders returning to the community after incarceration through the use of vouchers, mentors and community organizations for the delivery of services and treatment. A total of 53 participants have enrolled in the CAGI Reentry program. Of the 53 CAGI cases, 10 cases remain active and 43 cases have been closed. Fourteen participants completed the program successfully. Twenty-two participants were terminated from the program. Of those who were terminated from the program, nine (9) had new charges, two (2) of which were gang-related. The nine (9) re-offenders returned to prison. The remaining 13 were terminated due to noncompliance after acceptance into the CAGI program.

Many of the CAGI participants reported never having been employed before. As a result, employment and vocational services became cornerstones of the CAGI-Reentry Program. These services included structured job searches, job search techniques, interviewing skills, completing applications, creating resumes, and job etiquette. Twenty-nine (29) participants received employment services from CJRC. CJRC reported that eleven (11) participants enrolled in thirteen (13) vocational training programs and five (5) enrolled in post-secondary educational institutions.

In addition, four (4) CAGI participants were partnered with Faith Teams, nine (9) participants were matched with mentors, and 29 CAGI participants attended the reentry group—a group that focused on issues that were specific to participants’ transition to the community.

In the next section of the report, we present a snapshot of additional evaluation findings. The findings are summarized in the Table below.
## Snapshot of Select Evaluation Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIES/INTERVENTIONS</th>
<th>EVALUATION QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law Enforcement Component</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute the High Point Drug Market Initiative Model</td>
<td>Was the High Point Drug Market Intervention implemented? If so, did the initiative target drug offenders or gang related drug offenders?</td>
<td>The Durham Police Department adopted the DMI (High Point, North Carolina) as a strategy to address street level drug activity and violent crime in the Bull’s Eye area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner with Durham Public Schools and other community agencies to address student behavior and student performance to include life skills, mediation, conflict resolution, and mentoring.</td>
<td>Was there a formal plan in place? If so, what did it entail?</td>
<td>No formal plan in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a Gang Hotline – Set-up a gang hotline that is monitored 24 hours a day.</td>
<td>Was a gang hotline set-up?</td>
<td>A stand-alone gang hotline was not established. Through CAGI funding, the City of Durham funded an existing initiative, Project Build, whose primary focus is on gang and potential gang members. Project has an existing hotline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add additional law enforcement personnel with the use of overtime funds.</td>
<td>How many additional law enforcement personnel were added to the Bull’s Eye area?</td>
<td>With the use of CAGI funds, six officers were assigned to patrol the Bull’s eye area on Friday and Saturday for 6 hours (8pm-2am) beginning the end of 2009 and ending the beginning of 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize new intelligence software i2 Analyst Notebook to i2i Bridge DPD’s (RMS) and (CAD) to Gang-Net</td>
<td>Was activity completed – Yes or No?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a computer bridge linking the Durham Police Department’s database with the Durham County Sheriff Department’s database</td>
<td>Were activities completed – Yes or No?</td>
<td>No. The computer bridge between the Durham Police Department and the Durham County Sheriff Department was not built because of incompatibility between the two department’s computer systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize SunGuard, HTE Link Analysis software to allow investigators and officers to construct intelligence diagrams of RMS data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct court approved searches of probationers, with a direct focus on gang members within the target area</td>
<td>Number of searches conducted</td>
<td>During the grant period, 14 probation searches were conducted. These searches still continue within the Bull’s Eye area, but on a smaller scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Was activity completed – Yes or No?</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue the monthly gun review meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>The formal monthly gun review meetings concluded in April 2010. However, task force members speak with representatives of the U.S. District Attorney’s Office on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide training for law enforcement partners in the area of gang</td>
<td>Number of partners trained.</td>
<td>A total of 160 law enforcement officers received 40 hours of gang awareness and enforcement training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use surveillance equipment (whether rented, purchased or acquired from</td>
<td>Was activity completed – Yes or No?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISS) to track gang members’ movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase computer hardware/electronic equipment to assist gang-related</td>
<td>Was activity completed – Yes or No?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase computer hardware/electronic equipment to assist the prosecuting</td>
<td>Was activity completed – Yes or No?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Attorney’s creation and delivering of computer video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>presentations in superior court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prevention/Intervention Component**

Expand use of the North Carolina Child Response Initiative – partner with provider to deliver on scene acute mental health services.

| How were the services provided by the North Carolina Child Response Initiative expanded? | How were the services provided by the North Carolina Child Response Initiative expanded? | Through Durham-CAGI funding, NCCRI Hired an additional full-time clinician to provide direct acute counseling, trauma focused assessment and case management services; Provided in–service trainings to Durham Police Department; Coordinated and participated in weekly meetings with Durham Police Department and Department of Social Service; and Participated in weekly ride-a-longs with officers of the Durham Police Department NCCRI clinicians averaged six rides per week (totaling 20 hours per week); half of those ride-a-longs occurred in the Bull’s Eye area. |


Expand the role of the faith based organizations through the Religious Coalition for a Non-Violent Durham—The Religious coalition will engage and involve 71 congregations located within the Bull’s Eye area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of faith based organizations engaged</th>
<th>The Religious Coalition engaged 71 faith based organizations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reentry Component**

Need incarcerated gang members to learn about and participate in a comprehensive reentry program designed to help them

| How did incarcerated gang members learn about the CAGI Reentry Program? How many gang involved offenders returning to the community participated in the CAGI Reentry program. | The Durham County Criminal Justice Resource Center developed a system to identify gang involved offenders returning to the community prior to release through its long standing relationship with the North Carolina Department of Correction and the Post-Release Supervision Commission. Fifty-three (53) gang involved offenders participated in the CAGI Reentry program. |
Recommendations

Overall, our findings show that the suppression component of Durham-CAGI was meaningful, and that there was an association between the intervention and reductions of violent crimes committed with a firearm in the Bull’s Eye area. We were not able to examine or determine which strategies or interventions of the suppression component were associated with the reduction in violent crimes. In addition, we were not able to determine if the prevention-intervention and reentry components contributed to reduction of violent crimes because the prevention-intervention and reentry components did not provide their services and activities exclusively to the target area. In light of the evaluation’s findings, lessons learned, and extant research, the following recommendations are being made:

**Overall Recommendations**

Recommendation 1: Conduct careful strategic planning in the development, implementation, and management of future anti-gang initiatives.

Recommendation 2: Partner with researchers to design and measure gang enforcement initiatives.

Recommendation 3: Develop a protocol for sharing information between and across all three components that protects confidentiality and advances the efforts of anti-gang initiatives.

**Component Recommendations**

**Suppression Component**

Recommendation: Continue to provide law enforcement officers with specialized law enforcement training on how gangs generally operate. (See Best Practices section, Appendix G, for other suggestions that may improve the use of suppression to reduce gang activities)

**Prevention and Intervention Component**

Recommendation 1: Provide stronger implementation and coordination of prevention and intervention components to the Bull’s Eye area.

Recommendation 2: Incorporate programs that include obtaining GED (e.g. EDGE or other educational programs that contribute to improving the quality of life for a young person.)

Recommendation 3: Develop an interview protocol for capturing the long term outcomes of children and youth who receive prevention/intervention services.

Recommendation 4: Obtain support from administrators of the Durham Public School System and include them in the planning of future anti-gang initiatives.
Recommendation 5: Explore ways and develop a service delivery model to engage youth and their families that would be ongoing in the Bull’s Eye area.

Recommendation 6: Continue to build public awareness of violence and gang activity, and design programs that directly reduce violence and address gangs and gang-related issues.

Reentry Component

Recommendation 1: Explore ways to develop a service delivery model that will address the barriers to engaging high-impact gang-involved offenders when they return to the community after incarceration.

Recommendation 2: Explore types of specialized treatment that can effectively deal with impediments to programming efforts for gang-affiliated offenders (Schram & Gaines, 2005).

Best Practices

There are a number of models and strategies used in various locations regarding police suppression methods with gangs that have been researched that the City of Durham may want to explore further. Below is information on some of the models and strategies that warrant mention.

I. Model Strategies of Disruption, Displacement and Destabilization in Working with Gangs

Organizations often find it helpful to reassess specific goals and objectives periodically. It is recommended that the gang enforcement goals and objectives be reformulated within the context of disruption, displacement or destabilization.

*Disruption* This is essentially a short-term strategy designed to reduce gang-related street-level crime immediately. It is important to be aware that there are no long-term gains associated with disruption because gangs will adapt to law enforcement strategies. Perhaps the best method of combating the gang members’ adaptation to police initiatives is the use of Randomized Anti-Gang Enforcement (RAGE) strategies.

Gang members are often able to identify patterns of enforcement initiatives such as neighborhood canvassing, knock and talks or buy-busts. Gang members approach these enforcement initiatives by varying their criminal behavior in either time or location. Typically enforcement initiatives have a two week life span before they are discontinued or changed to another initiative. Randomized Anti-Gang Enforcement (RAGE) strategies are enforcement techniques implemented in various locations, for indeterminate lengths of time and in non-discriminable patterns. RAGE techniques give the appearance of random enforcement and make gang adaptation nearly impossible. It is difficult for gang members to identify a given pattern because the actual pattern is based on statistical randomness. During the period in which the gang is first confronted with the RAGE enforcement and is attempting to identify a given pattern,
their members are more susceptible to detection and arrest. This combination of confusion and increased susceptibility to arrest severely disrupts the gang’s criminal activities.

Displacement- This strategy combines both short-term and limited long-term strategies for the purpose of promoting a self-initiated relocation of gangs. Crime is ultimately reduced as a result of the self-initiated gang relocation. The reduction in crime is more stable over the long-term; however, it is not permanent.

The displacement effect is achieved by simultaneously disrupting the gang through RAGE strategies and ‘target hardening’ through the use of North Carolina Continuing Criminal Enterprise (CCE) prosecution (NCGS 14-7.20). Target Hardening is the process of making individual locations more difficult for criminals to victimize (Clarke, 1983). Violation of NCGS 14-7.20 is a felony and would allow the Durham Police Department and prosecutors to seek longer jail sentences. While the penalties are not as severe as federal statutes, the North Carolina CCE laws are strict enough to help promote the gang’s voluntary relocation to a jurisdiction that is not prosecuting under the CCE statute. Partnering with local prosecutors will be necessary to insure that the gang prosecutions are systematic.

Destabilization This strategy is designed to produce the most permanent anti-gang results. In order to accomplish the goal of destabilization, the department must partner with federal prosecutors and incorporate federal Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organization (RICO) prosecutions as well as implementing both short-term and long-term strategies.

Destabilization is commonly confused with dismantling. There is an important conceptual difference. Dismantling a criminal organization involves actually severing the collaborative bonds of that organization. Traditionally, it is thought that by sending members of a gang to prison for their illegal acts would effectively dismantle the gang. However, the advances in communication technology and evolution of gang structure and hierarchy have made this incapacitation-dismantling theory obsolete. Evolved enforcement models must instead focus on gang destabilization. The most effective way to destabilize gangs is by using Title 18 U.S.C. section 1961-1968, Racketeering Influenced and Corrupt Organization (RICO) prosecution.

RICO prosecution allows law enforcement officer the ability to target the entire gang for enforcement. Having the ability to remove entire gangs from a jurisdiction creates environmental deprivation; a situation in which the gang cannot operate. Despite the obvious utility of RICO prosecution, local law enforcement agencies seldom employ the strategy. One reason cited for not using systematic RICO prosecution centers around the inordinate length of time needed to collect evidence in RICO cases. However, Detective Ed DeVelasco of the Miami Dade Sheriff’s Office developed a streamlined version of RICO prosecution in 2000 that has shown promise. The Miami Model of RICO only charges gang members with sections 1962(c) and 1962(d) of Title 18. Conviction on these charges leads to entire gangs being incarcerated from 20-30 years in federal prison. The most interesting facet of the Miami Model is the community impact after the implementation of the Miami Model. While directing the Miami taskforce in one district, a Miami model RICO case was completed every 6 months (DeVelasco, 2000). During the taskforce operation, there were approximately 200 arrests, 253 crimes charged, 116 gang members plead guilty and 80 gang members were convicted (the whereabouts of the remaining 4
gang members is not known) (Ibid, 2000). The Miami Model of RICO was so successful that it was studied by two university researchers.

Dr. William Blount of the University of South Florida conducted community surveys in the area where the Miami Model of RICO had been used. Dr. Blount found that 71% of the people in the area reported feeling safer after the RICO prosecutions and 65% said that gangs were less of a problem (DeVelasco, 2000). Additionally, there were 55% gun shots in the area and the percentage of residents who felt the police were not doing a good job decreased from 22.5% to just 4.1% (Ibid, 2000). The community impact was so remarkable that it was also studied by Dr. G. Robert Blakely of Notre Dame University School of Law.

Additionally, other scholars (Knox, 2000) have examined the long-term impact of using RICO prosecution against gangs. After Federal authorities used RICO prosecution against the Gangster Disciples gang in operation HEADACHE, subsequent follow-up analyses revealed that the gang membership was demoralized and the overall structure of the gang had been destabilized (Knox, 2000). Researchers also noted that there was both a deterrent effect to the RICO prosecutions and citizens exhibited an increased confidence in law enforcement (Knox, 2000). It is important to note that this operation also produced a displacement effect whereby other gang attempted to claim the Gangster Disciples territory. This ‘in-tide’ effect is indicative of the need to use RICO prosecution as part of a long-term, goal-specific strategy and not simply as a stand-alone strategy.

Disruption, Displacement, and Destabilization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Short-Term Strategy</th>
<th>Long-Term Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption</td>
<td>Temporary reduction in street-level crime due changing enforcement patterns.</td>
<td>RAGE Strategies</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>Self-initiated relocation of gang, thereby reducing criminal activity.</td>
<td>RAGE Strategies</td>
<td>Limited State-Level CCE Prosecutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destabilization</td>
<td>Systematic incarceration of entire gangs, thereby reducing criminal activity.</td>
<td>RAGE Strategies</td>
<td>Systematic RICO Prosecution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Model to implement scientific measurement and to assess the goals and objectives

The Durham Police Department may want to partner with researchers to design and measure its gang enforcement initiatives for future work with gangs.

The Department is situated in a unique location. Duke University, North Carolina Central University, North Carolina State University, Meredith College, Shaw University, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and St. Augustine’s University are all within a 30 minute radius of the police department. Additionally, there are independent research centers such as Research
Triangle Institute (RTI) located in the Research Triangle area which is mostly in Durham County. The benefit of being in proximity to these types of institutions is the almost unlimited access to doctoral-level researchers with whom the Durham Police Department could collaborate. The research collaborations between the Durham Police Department and local researchers could extend not only to measurement of departmental enforcement initiatives but also designing new progressive enforcement strategies and grant applications. Some scholars (Takata & Tyler, 1994) argue that this community-university partnership offers the most promise for smaller jurisdictions. (See Appendix G-Best Practices for a more detailed literature review of gangs publications, research and findings)

Research on Gang Interventions

Successful Strategies: Unfortunately, this is the shortest subsection of the findings. Some researchers (Stinchcomb, 2002) argue that there has never been a completely successful gang intervention program. There are, however, a few gang intervention programs (Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.), Operation Hammer and Operation Hardcore) that have been classified as effective primarily because they accomplished a goal; albeit the wrong goal. These programs do not actually promote gang desistance but rather changes in other tangentially-related gang issues such as: more positive attitudes toward police, fewer positive attitudes about gangs, improvement in grades and school attendance, successful selective prosecution, and more resistance to peer pressure, aggressive curfew and truancy enforcement (Howell, 2000; NCGCC 2008a).

A more positive attitude toward police does not constitute a success unless more positive police perception was the program goal. However the reality of empirically tested gang intervention is not quite as bleak. An extensive review of the literature on gang prevention programs revealed that there is support for some intervention programs such as mentoring and service learning.

Holmes et al. (2003) found that some mentoring programs were effective for addressing gangs but only when the mentoring programs had both an effective training infrastructure and support available to both the mentors and the students. Similarly, service learning interventions were found to be successful in addressing gang problems. However, the service learning models suffered from the same problems discussed earlier; they achieved goals that were only tangentially gang-related. Service earning programs were found to be effective at promoting positive social outcomes such as better self-esteem, increased school attendance, lower violent behaviors and increased sensitivity to diversity (Holmes et al., 2003).

Recommended Strategies: The literature on gang intervention is replete with recommendations for interventions that may be effective in reducing gang-related crime and membership. Interestingly, it appears as though many of the recommended strategies are theoretically valid yet untested or lack empirical evaluation. Many of the untested strategies are stated in very broad terms. These recommendations lack the level of specificity needed to implement them and would require a great deal of program design to make them useful. Some of the broad recommendations for success are to tailor the gang intervention to the specific jurisdiction where it will be implemented (Boerman, 2001; Stinchcomb, 2002), the need for comprehensive community programs (Houston, 1994; Anderson & Dyson, 1995; Sorrentino, 1995; Stinchcomb, 2002 ) the need for Nurturing Models (Jackson et al. 2005), the need for school-based models (Batsis, 1997;
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Knox, 1997) and the need to shift the focus of gang intervention to cultural change rather than individual change (Palumbo et al., 1992). Other recommended but untested strategies appear to be derived from previous studies about gang behavior.

- The driver’s license enforcement model argues that law enforcement agencies could use rolling license checks as a method of gang suppression due to study findings that showed 77% (n= 383) of gang members did not have valid driver’s licenses (Henkel & Reichel, 2002). While innovative, this intervention strategy has a design flaw in that it assumes the gang members without valid driver’s licenses will continue to drive. Other studies have also found links between bullying and later gang membership (Holmes & Brandenburg-Ayer, 1995) and even increased mental health problems (Corcoran et al., 2005). One of the more innovative ideas is the Corporate Gang Intervention strategy which argues that corporations should become more involved with gang intervention (Wang, 2000).

- The Corporate Gang Intervention strategy is based on findings from a corporate survey which show that 90% of corporations surveyed had mission statements that included some ‘community involvement’ with an additional 69% of corporations extolling community involvement as one of its values (Wang, 2000). Of course the stated interest in community involvement may not extend to the gang phenomenon. Each of these studies seems to, at least indirectly; imply possible gang intervention models that focus on some corollary behavior or situation.

**Unsuccessful Strategies:** There seems to be no shortage of literature when discussing gang intervention programs that have been ineffective.

- Programs such as Scared Straight, Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.), Operation Hammer and Operation Hardcore are only a few examples of programs that have been ineffective at reducing gang violence (Cole, 2003; Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino & Buehler, 2003; Hansen & McNeal, 1997; Rosenbaum & Hanson, 1998; NCGCC, 2008; Palumbo et al., 1992) or desistance from gang membership. However, a wide variety of ineffective gang programs can be found across different disciplines.

- Peer mediation programs (Holmes et al., 2003) as well as almost all suppression programs (Houston, 1994; Henkel & Reichel, 2002; Stinchomb, 2002) have consistently been found to have no effect on gang intervention. Even school-based programs like Project Care and Project New Turf, which are implemented in elementary schools by neighborhood coalitions, have shown little impact on gangs (Palumbo et al., 1992). Perhaps the most problematic issue facing these ineffective programs is the lack of empirical evaluations to lend insight into the nature of the ineffective interventions.

Ultimately, some scholars (Houston, 1996) have resorted to simply asking gang members themselves what intervention strategies would have been effective at preventing them from joining a gang.

Gang members who agreed to give interviews to researchers stated that while they did not think educational programs like DARE or GREAT were useless, that these programs would not have prevented them from joining gangs (Houston, 1996). The gang members stated that jobs and job
training programs had the most potential for stopping them from becoming gang members (ibid, 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure-3 Gang Intervention Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICO Prosecution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-University Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver’s License Suppression Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared Straight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project CARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project New Turf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW OF THE DURHAM COUNTY ANTI-GANG INITIATIVE AND THE EVALUATION STRATEGY

In response to nationwide concerns regarding violent gangs and gang-related problems, the United States Department of Justice (2001) "enacted a comprehensive plan across its many components to effectively fight and limit the impact of gang violence nationwide. This plan includes two primary elements: 1) prioritize prevention programs to provide America’s youth, as well as offenders returning to the community, with opportunities that help them resist gang involvement; and 2) ensure robust enforcement policies when gang-related violence does occur (Department of Justice, 2008). This approach is based on the premise that there is a critical need for the Department of Justice to continue to work hand-in-hand with state and local law enforcement and local community groups.

The Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative (CAGI) is an expansion of the Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) initiative which evolved out of the Department of Justice’s comprehensive plan. The purpose of CAGI is to develop new strategies to counteract the effects of gangs on neighborhoods. The CAGI model is a three pronged model that includes suppression by law enforcement, prevention and intervention by public/non-profit community agencies, and reentry services offered by local governmental entities or non-profit community agencies.

The US Department of Justice, as part of its Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative, funded twelve sites across the country to support local efforts aimed at improving communities that had been seriously affected by gangs and violent crimes activities. The North Carolina site, which comprised Durham and Wake Counties, was one of 12 geographical sites awarded 2.5 million dollars over a three-year period. The grant to Durham and Wake Counties was divided equally with each county receiving $1,250,000.00. The period of the grant was from October 1, 2007 to September 30, 2010. During this period the Governor’s Crime Commission requested a no-cost extension of the grant from the US Department of Justice. The extension was granted expanding the CAGI grant period from October 1, 2010 to December 31, 2011.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of Durham’s Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative. First, we outline the demographic population of Durham and the estimated number of gangs in Durham. Second, we discuss how Durham CAGI was organized and governed. We conclude with an overview of the evaluation framework that undergirds the Durham Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative.

Durham Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative

The County of Durham encompasses approximately 286 square miles of Durham County. Durham County North Carolina, population 267,587, is located on the eastern border of the Middle District. Durham is an urban, racially diverse community with Caucasians comprising 42.1%, African-Americans, 37.5%, Latinos, 13.5%, Asians, 4.6%, and Others, 2.3%, of the population (US Census, 2010).
Gangs in Durham

According to Durham-Wake CAGI’s grant application (2007), gangs in Durham “have been involved in a range of violent crimes, such as murder, aggravated assault, armed robbery, weapon violations, and several high profile shootings on or near the City of Durham’s buses. In 2004, Durham’s per capita homicide rate was the highest in North Carolina with gang members involved in nearly a third of the 2004 and 2005 homicides. Despite a Part 1 UCR crime reduction of 14.5% in 2005, Durham experienced a 9% increase in homicides and a 16% increase in aggravated assault. In 2006, the number of homicides decreased to 15, however, one-third (5) of those was gang-related. In addition, there were a total of 939 gang-related incidents recorded in 2006 (Durham/Wake CAGI Application, 2007, p 7). The data in the application goes on to indicate that traditional affiliation of gangs such as Bloods, Crips, Folk Nation, etc., was over 1,000 individuals. It was estimated by law enforcement that this still represented only a small percentage of gang members in the community.

Selection of the Target Area

The Crime Analysis Unit (CAU) of the Durham Police Department (DPD) conducted a city-wide study on the number of shots-fired calls for service and the number of violent crimes committed with a firearm. Data were compiled for a one year period (May 1, 2006 to April 30, 2007). Findings revealed that the highest percentage of shots-fired calls (17.15%), gang member residences (18.56%), and violent crimes committed with firearms (19.81%) were concentrated in a geographical area located in the northeast area of the city that encompasses only two square miles. Consequently, this area, named the Bull’s Eye, was identified as the target area (A map of the targeted area is provided below in Figure 1.1). The CAU also compiled data on calls for services related to quality of life issues such as prostitution and drugs/narcotics in this two square mile area. Their findings revealed that prostitution accounted for 50.56%, drug/narcotics violations accounted for 20.14%, and violent gun crimes accounted for 18.29% of calls for services.

Figure 1.1 Map of the Target (Bull’s Eye) Area
Organization and Governance of CAGI

Durham CAGI Oversight and Executive Committee

The CAGI grant was governed by an Oversight and Executive Committee. This committee consisted of high level officials that represented law enforcement, county and city government, juvenile and criminal justice, the faith community, the courts, the US Attorney’s office, Middle and Eastern districts. The Oversight Committee specifically governed the Durham CAGI grant and was comprised of Durham officials and representation from the US Attorney’s office of the Middle District. The Executive Committee was a shared committee with officials from both Wake and Durham Counties and representation from the US Attorney’s Office, both districts.

Several months before the CAGI grant was fully implemented, Durham had established a Gang Reduction Strategy Steering Committee. This committee was appointed by a joint body of City/County government officials to prioritize and address the implementation of the 45 recommendations that resulted from the Gang Assessment Survey Report done by Weisel and Howell (2007). This committee was composed of the various public and community agencies. To avoid duplication, representatives from the Oversight Committee met with the Gang Reduction Strategy Steering Committee, and it was decided that the Oversight Committee would be the sole governing body of the CAGI grant. The Gang Reduction Strategy Steering Committee which dealt with overall gang activity in Durham would report to the Oversight Committee and get approval for anti-gang activities that it planned to implement.

Program Administrator of Durham-CAGI

The role of the Program Administrator of Durham-CAGI was to implement programmatic strategies consistent with the goals adopted by the Durham CAGI Oversight Committee, coordinate the three components (law enforcement, prevention and re-entry) of the Initiative, and provide status reports to members of the Oversight Committee. Additional responsibilities of the Program Administrator included:

- Initiating and maintaining the collection of program information required for evaluation
- Preparing progress and financial reports and a strategic plan based on the outcome of the project
- Identifying all new and existing resources for anti-gang violence program
- Monitoring contracts, conducting site visits, and reporting program status to the steering committee
Evaluation Goals and Strategies

A process and outcome evaluation, funded by the Department of Justice, Office of Justice Program, Bureau of Justice Assistance, 2007 Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative, #2008-PG-BX-004, through the North Carolina Governor’s Crime Commission grant #032-1-08-001-BS-930, undergirds the Durham CAGI project. One of the requirements of the CAGI grant specified that an independent evaluation be conducted. In 2008, North Carolina Central University’s Juvenile Justice Institute was selected as the evaluator.

The original aim of the evaluation was to determine to what extent did the CAGI project achieve in its overall goal of reducing gangs and the underlying causes that support them. However, after a closer assessment of the project by the evaluation team, it was determined that the performance measures were not always specific to the overall initiative, but were component (suppression, prevention/intervention, re-entry) and organization specific (e.g. Durham Police, Communities-in-Schools, Religious Coalition) and that the evaluation had to focus on the extent to which each component achieved its objective. Therefore, the overall evaluation was guided by the following questions:

1. How was each component of the Initiative carried out?
2. Were the components and subcomponents of the Initiative carried out in the prescribed manner?
3. Was the target population reached?
4. How did the Initiative address the identified barriers or obstacles to gang prevention:
   - Lack of knowledge of gangs and gang investigative techniques among law enforcement officers
   - Lack of sufficient resources to place additional officers in the Bull’s Eye area
   - Insufficient dissemination and implementation of evidence-based approaches to gang prevention
   - Challenges with engaging multi-problem, at-risk youth in traditional services
5. What are the outcomes of each component of the Initiative?

Additional research questions for the various components of the Durham-CAGI project are presented in the subsequent chapters of this report.
Strategies of the Evaluation

Given that the performance measures of the CAGI Project were component (suppression, prevention/intervention and reentry) and organization specific (i.e., Durham Police Department, Criminal Justice Resource Centers), we used a number of evaluation designs, including quasi-experimental, program monitoring, survey, and correlational. We conducted a process evaluation to determine if the components of the CAGI project were implemented as designed and if the contracted agencies provided services as planned. The process evaluation provides a context for interpreting outcomes. We conducted an outcome evaluation, albeit limited, to determine if the Initiative accomplished what it set out to do.

Data Collection

Multiple data collection methods were used. Data collection for the process evaluation included debriefings, notes from evaluation team meetings, interviews with stakeholders, staff interviews, project reports, and process notes from Durham CAGI-related meetings. Data collection for the outcome evaluation included violent criminal incident data, shots-fired calls for service data, surveys, standardized instruments and customer/client satisfaction questionnaires.

Key Evaluation Design and Data Analysis Issues

Evaluating multi-component initiatives are challenging because they raise a number of issues with respect to planning, implementation, study design, and data analyses (Straw & Herrell, 2002). Three primary issues emerged as challenges in the evaluation of the Durham Comprehensive Anti-Gang Initiative: project design, assessment, coordination of the project’s components (suppression, intervention/prevention, and reentry).

Organization of the Report

In the subsequent chapters, we present descriptions of each component of the Initiative, and each of the component’s core research questions, measures, sample, and analytic methods. Chapter 2 examines the law enforcement component. Chapter 3 examines the prevention and intervention component. Chapter 4 examines the reentry component. Chapter 5 concludes the evaluation with a summary of lessons learned, findings, and recommendations.
CHAPTER 2: SUPPRESSION COMPONENT

The suppression component of the Durham CAGI project was carried out by the Durham Police Department in partnership with the Durham County Sheriff’s Office, Durham District Attorneys’ Office and North Carolina Community Corrections. The goal of this component was to reduce the occurrence of violent gang-related incidents in the Bull’s Eye area through the use of reactive and proactive strategies. These strategies included the use of real-time intelligence, community outreach, intelligence gathering and sharing, and law enforcement training in the area of gang investigation.

In this chapter, we present the findings of our evaluation of the law enforcement component of the Durham CAGI project. First, we outline the objectives of the law enforcement component and the corresponding evaluation questions. This is followed by an account of the procedures used to collect and analyze the data. We conclude with the findings and limitations of the analysis.

Process Evaluation Questions

Objective 1: Use crime data and real-time intelligence

Evaluation Questions:

a. What type of intelligence software was used and how was it used to track and investigate crimes in the Bull’s Eye area?

b. How was the new intelligence used to build a computer bridge?

c. In terms of the computer bridge, what type of information was shared between DPD and the Sheriff’s Department?

Objective 2: Implement the Drug Market Intervention Strategy in the Bull’s Eye area

Evaluation Questions:

a. Was the DMI implemented? If not, why?

b. How was the DMI implemented? What modifications or changes occurred?

c. What components of the DMI were the easiest and most difficult to implement?

d. What components of the Model were the most and least effective?
Objective 3: Provide Training to 180 Officers

Evaluation Questions:

a. How many law enforcement officers received training? Of those who participated in the training(s), how many patrolled or were assigned to the Bull’s Eye area?
b. Who provided the training? How was the training provided?
c. What were the frequency and duration of trainings?
d. What topics were covered or what courses were provided?
e. Were pre and post tests given to the officers who participated in trainings?

Objective 4: Increase Police Visibility

Evaluation Questions:

a. How many additional law enforcement officers were added to the Bull’s Eye area? How many officers patrolled the target area prior to CAGI?
b. Describe the proactive policing efforts that were used in the Bull’s Eye area?

Objective 5: Develop and Continue Partnerships

Evaluation Questions:

a. Did the DPD continue its partnership with the NC Department of Community Corrections? If so, how many times did police officers assist probation officers with home visits and searches?
b. Did the DPD partner with Durham Public Schools and other community agencies to address school suspensions, truancy, and drop-out? If so,
   i. How many and which schools did DPD partner with?
   ii. What was the extent of the partnership; what did the partnership entail?
   iii. What services were provided to students?

Objective 6: Continue the Monthly Gun Review

Evaluation Question:

a. Did the monthly Gun Review Meetings continue? If so, what did they entail?

Outcome Evaluation Questions:

Objective 1: Reduce the occurrence of violent incidents in the Bull’s Eye area?

Evaluation Question:
a. Was there a reduction in the number of violent incidents in the Bull’s Eye area?

Objective 2: Reduce the number of shots-fired calls

Evaluation Question:

a. Was there a reduction in the number of shots-fired calls for service in the Bull’s Eye area?

Method

For the process component of the evaluation, the Durham Police Department responded to the process evaluation questions with a written response. For the outcome component of the evaluation, a quasi-experimental design was used to address the following research questions: 1) Was there a reduction in the number of violent incidents committed with a firearm in the Bull’s Eye area; and 2) Was there a reduction in the number of shots-fired calls for service in the Bull’s Eye area.

Definition of Gang-related-Crime

The Durham Police Department defines gang-related as member based or motive based. A member-based crime is a crime in which a gang member or members are either the perpetrators or the victims, irrespective of motive. A motive-based crime is a crime committed by a gang member or gang members in which the underlying reason is to further the interest and activities of the gang.

Data Description and Analysis

The data in the current analysis were provided by the Durham Police Department. The datasets contained 3,450 violent criminal incidents committed with a firearm and 11,153 shots-fired calls for service. These data were collected from police incident reports by the Durham Police Crime Analysis Unit between 2006 and 2010. The variables examined in this analysis are: shots-fired calls and total violent offenses (homicide offenses, aggravated assault offenses, robbery-individual offenses, robbery-commercial offenses). These offenses include crimes that gang membership is known to facilitate.

The offenses and shots-fired calls were analyzed over four different time periods: baseline (period prior to the CAGI project—May 1, 2006 to April 30, 2007), Time-1 (year 1 of CAGI—August 1, 2007 to July 31, 2008), Time-2 (year 2 of CAGI—August 1, 2008 to July 31, 2009), and Time 3 (year 3 of CAGI—August 1, 2009 to July 31, 2010). We examined changes in aggregate levels of violent crimes committed with a firearm and shots-fired calls for service over time within the following geographic areas of the City of Durham: the target area (Bull’s Eye), the buffer area (a 1000’ circular buffer established around the target area), and the rest of the
city. We compared violent crimes committed with a firearm and shots-fired calls for service in the Bull’s Eye area with the buffer area and with the rest of the city. We used Poisson analyses\(^1\) to generate incidence rate ratios and to determine if the differences were significant.

**Results**

**Process Evaluation Component**

*Crime Data and Real-Time Intelligence*

In 2004, the Durham Police Department and the Durham County Sheriff’s office purchased Gang-Net, a gang-intelligence program and repository for all gang intelligence information in Durham County. However, Gang-Net is limited to gang intelligence information only. Officers investigating gang-related crimes had to search multiple databases because the databases were not linked together (CAGI grant application, 2007). With CAGI funding, the Durham Police Department purchased link analysis software and built a database, which stored crime and offender records. The software facilitated the identification of links between cases and suspects in the Bull’s Eye area, which, according to law enforcement officials, had not been possible prior to the CAGI project. Durham law enforcement officials attribute numerous investigative leads and case clearances to the use of this software.

As part of its data coordination effort, a computer bridge linking the Durham Police Department’s databases (PD’s RMS, CAD, and Gang-Net) with the Durham County Sheriff office’s databases (RMS, CAD and Gang-Net) was to be developed. This would have facilitated the sharing of information between the two departments and would have linked criminal and gang intelligence information. The computer bridge between the Durham Police Department and the Durham County Sheriff Department was not built because of incompatibility between the two department’s computer systems.

**Implement the Highpoint Drug Market Intervention (DMI) in the Bull’s Eye area**

The Durham Police Department adopted the DMI (High Point, North Carolina) as a strategy to address street level drug activity and violent crime in the Bull’s Eye area. The DMI uses a highly focused deterrence strategy coupled with a police community partnership to target drug dealers, drug suppliers, and street level drug sales; notify them of the consequences of continued illegal activity, and provide supportive services through a community based resource coordinator (Hipple, Corsaro & McGarrell, 2010). The Highpoint DMI Model consists of the following key steps:

- Step 1: Crime Mapping
- Step 2: Survey
- Step 3: Incident Review
- Step 4: Undercover Operations
- Step 5: Mobilize the Community
- Step 6: Contact the offender’s family

\(^1\) Poisson analyses are used to analyze count data.
How was the DMI implemented? What modifications or changes occurred? The Durham Police Department implemented the DMI as designed, but not in the same order. The DMI instituted the community component prior to the operation component, whereas Durham Police Department instituted the operation component prior to the community component.

What components of the DMI were the easiest and most difficult to implement? Durham law enforcement officials asserted that one of the easiest parts of the model to implement was making the hand to hand drug buys and preparing cases for prosecution. The most difficult part of the model to implement was getting extensive community involvement and getting offenders to call in because it was voluntary.

What components of the DMI were the most and least effective? The most effective component of the model was arresting those involved in drug sales. Forty-four (44) offenders were arrested in the operation. The least effective component of the model was the call-in due to offenders not showing up and very few being qualified for a second chance because of their extensive criminal history. Fifteen offenders were afforded the opportunity to respond to the call-in. However, only six offenders took advantage of the opportunity.

Provide Training to 180 Officers

Lack of knowledge of gangs and gang investigative techniques among law enforcement officers were identified as barriers or obstacles to gang prevention in Durham. To minimize these barriers, a total of 160 law enforcement officers received 40 hours of gang awareness and enforcement training. The Institute of Police Technology and Management conducted these trainings. The training topics included the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional and non-traditional gangs</td>
<td>Gang violence investigations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and economic factors conducive to gang affiliation</td>
<td>Recruitment of gang members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence gathering and tracking</td>
<td>Current trends in social and economic factors conducive to gang affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification through graffiti, hand signs and rituals</td>
<td>Survival tactics for gang encounters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial markings and inter-gang conflicts</td>
<td>Advanced graffiti analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in drug trafficking and other crimes</td>
<td>Advanced gang intelligence gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing and staffing gang units</td>
<td>Conducting advanced gang interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer safety particular to gang investigations</td>
<td>Gang prevention strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing and staffing gang units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Increase Police Visibility

How many additional law enforcement officers were added to the Bull’s Eye area? How many officers patrolled the target area prior to CAGI? Prior to the implementation of Durham CAGI, the only officers who patrolled the Bull’s Eye area were those assigned to beat cars; four beat cars were assigned to the area. However, those officers could be dispatched outside the Bull’s eye area to respond to calls for service. Because beat cars are call-driven, there were limited proactive strategies in the Bull’s Eye area prior to CAGI. With the use of CAGI funds, six officers were assigned to patrol the Bull’s eye area on Fridays and Saturdays for 6 hours (8pm-2am) beginning the end of 2009 and ending the beginning of 2011. These cars were not call driven, which allowed for more proactive activities to be conducted.

The proactive policing efforts included the following:

1. **High visibility proactive patrol** included traffic stops, license checks, and foot patrols.
2. **Buy/Bust operations** involved the use of the drug market intervention operation, which included hand-to-hand drug buys from street corner dealers followed by either an immediate arrest or by an officer/officers making identification and arresting individuals at a later date.
3. **Prostitution operations** involved undercover officers picking up prostitutes and undercover female officers targeting customers.
4. **Search warrants** involved controlled buys and/or surveillance which resulted in the attainment of search warrants to raid drug houses.
5. **Knock and talks** involved knocking on the doors of suspected drug houses wherein complaints had been received and either did not rise to the level of a search warrant or officers used it as the initial investigative tool. (A total of 55 knock and talks were conducted).

Develop and Continue Partnerships

One of the strategies outlined in the grant proposal was that the Durham Police Department would continue its partnership with the North Carolina Department of Community Corrections in conducting court approved searches of probationers, with a direct focus on gang members within the target area (Durham-Wake CAGI application, 2007). During the grant period, 14 probation searches were conducted. These searches still continue within the Bull’s eye area on a smaller scale.

Did the DPD partner with Durham Public Schools and other community agencies to address school suspensions, truancy, and drop-out? Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T) Officers do not handle issues related to truancy or school suspensions, and there
was no partnership with other agencies or the schools to address school suspension or truancy. However, patrol officers would address the issue of truancy by returning a child to school or contacting a parent of a child who was encountered during school hours.

**Continue the Monthly Gun Review**

*Did the monthly Gun Review Meetings continue? If so, what did they entail?* The formal monthly gun review meetings concluded in April 2010 due to the inability of the U.S. Attorney to continue to make the formal meetings. However, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms and the US Attorney’s Office maintained contact on a regular basis (2-3 times per week discussing cases). Task force members speak with the District Attorney’s Office on a regular basis as well. In addition, Project Safe Neighborhoods sends a monthly synopsis of all gun crimes (and recoveries) to the unit.

**Outcome Evaluation Findings**

**Violent Gun Crime Trends**

One of the goals of the law enforcement component was to reduce the number of violent gun crimes in the Bull’s Eye area within two years of project implementation. As shown in Figure 2.1 below, there was a decline in the number of violent crimes committed with a firearm between baseline and Year Two. The figure also shows a steady decline in the number of violent crimes committed with a firearm in the Bull’s Eye area over the course of project implementation. Figure 2.1 shows trends for the buffer area and the rest of the city. As indicated in Figure 2.1, there was an increase in the number of violent crimes in the buffer area from baseline to Year One of project implementation. There was a decrease between baseline and Year Two, and a decrease between baseline and Year Three. For the rest of the city, there was a steady decline in the number of violent crimes committed with a firearm from baseline to Year Three.

**Figure 2.1: Number of Violent Crimes Committed With a Firearm**

![Graph showing number of violent crimes committed with a firearm by year and area.]
To determine if the steady decline in violent crimes in the Bull’s Eye area was statistically significant, we conducted Poisson analyses. Table 2.1 presents the results of the Poisson analyses. The incidence rate ratio suggests that there was a statistically significant decrease (29.3%) in the number of violent crimes committed in the Bull’s Eye area between baseline and Year One of project implementation (p=.0024); a statistically significant decrease (39.1%) between baseline and Year Two (p <.001); and a statistically significant decrease (nearly 57%) between baseline and Year Three (p <.001).

Table 2.1 Results of Poisson Analyses: Violent Crimes Committed with a Firearm in the Bull’s Eye

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Incident Rate Ratios</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P &gt; Z Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 1</td>
<td>-29.3%</td>
<td>0.71**</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 2</td>
<td>-39.1%</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 3</td>
<td>-56.5%</td>
<td>0.44**</td>
<td>16.2481</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** <.01, *<.05

We also conducted Poisson analyses to determine if there were significant differences in the number of violent crimes committed with a firearm in the buffer area and the rest of the city. For the buffer area, as indicated in Table 2.2, there was a significant increase (38.6%) in the number of violent crimes in the buffer area between baseline and Year One, and a nonsignificant decrease between baseline and Year Two (22.8%). In addition, there was a significant decrease in the number of violent crimes committed with a firearm between baseline and Year Three (40.4%), p=0.016.

Table 2.2 Results of Poisson Analyses: Violent Crimes with a Firearm in the Buffer Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Incident Rate Ratios</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P &gt; Z Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 1</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>1.39**</td>
<td>11.66</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 2</td>
<td>-22.8%</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 3</td>
<td>-40.4%</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** <.01, *<.05

For the rest of the city, as indicated in Table 2.3, there was a non-significant decrease (6.7%) in violent crimes committed with a firearm between baseline and year one (p= 0.207), a statistically significant decrease (10.8%) between baseline and year two implementation, p <.01; and a statistically significant decrease (17.0%) between baseline and year three of project implementation, p <.01.
Table 2.3 Results of Poisson Analyses: Violent Crimes with a Firearm in the Rest of the City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Incident Rate Ratios</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P &gt; Z Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 1</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>36.47</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 2</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
<td>0.89**</td>
<td>36.08</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 3</td>
<td>-17.0%</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>35.48</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** **< .01, *<.05

**Shots-Fired Calls for Service Trends**

Another objective of the law enforcement component was to reduce the number of shots-fired calls for service in the Bull’s Eye area within two years of project implementation. As indicated in Figure 2.2 below, there was a slight decrease in the number of shots-fired calls between baseline and Year Two of project implementation. Figure 2.2 also shows a slight increase in shots-fired calls for service in the Bull’s Eye area between baseline and Year One of project implementation and a steady decrease between Year One and Year Three of project implementation.

For the buffer area, there was a decrease in the number of shots-fired calls between baseline and Year Two. As indicated in Figure 2.2, there was a slight increase in the number of shots-fired calls for service between baseline and Year One and a steady decrease in the number of shots-fired calls from Year One to Year Three. In terms of the rest of the city, there was an increase in the number of shots-fired calls for service between baseline and Year Two. Figure 2.2 also shows that there was a steady decrease in the number of shots-fired calls from Year One to Year Three.
To determine if the decline in shots-fired calls for service in the Bull’s Eye area was statistically significant, we conducted Poisson analyses. Table 2.4 presents the results of the Poisson analyses. The incident rate ratio indicates that there was a nonsignificant increase (0.44%) in the number of shots-fired calls for service committed in the Bull’s Eye area between baseline and Year One of project implementation (p=.0.947); a statistically significant decrease (24.8%) between baseline and Year Two (p <.001), and a statistically significant decrease (nearly 50%) between baseline and Year Three (p <.001).

Table 2.4 Results of Poisson Analyses: Shots fired calls in the Bulls Eye Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Incident Rate Ratios</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P &gt; Z</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 1</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>30.19</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 2</td>
<td>-24.8%</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>28.23</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline -- Year 3</td>
<td>-49.9%</td>
<td>0.50**</td>
<td>26.13</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** < .01, *< .05

As shown in table 2.5, the incident rate ratio indicates that there was a non-significant increase (20.54%) in the number of shots-fired calls for service between baseline and Year One; a non-significant decrease (9.19%) between baseline and Year Two and a significant decrease (48.7%) in shots-fired calls for service between baseline and Year Three in the buffer area (p<.001).
As shown in table 2.6, the incident rate ratio indicates that there was a significant increase (18.3%) in the number of shots-fired calls for service between baseline and Year One (p < .0101); a non-significant increase (1.69%) between baseline and Year Two; and a non-significant decrease (5.9) in shots-fired calls between baseline and Year Three in the rest of the city.

Overview of Findings

Our findings revealed that overall there were substantial reductions in violent crimes committed with a firearm in the target area (Bull’s Eye) over the course of the grant period. Statistically significant decreases in violent crimes committed with a firearm in the Bull’s Eye area were observed between baseline and Year One of the grant period, between baseline and Year Two, and between baseline and Year Three of the grant period. For the buffer area, there was a statistically significant increase (38.6%) in the number of violent crimes in the buffer area between baseline and Year One of the anti-gang initiative and a non-significant decrease between baseline and Year Two of the grant period. A statistically significant decrease was observed in the buffer area between baseline and Year Three of the anti-gang initiative, but the overall decrease was less substantial than the decrease in the target area—40.4% in the buffer area compared to 56.5% in the Bull’s Eye area. Statistically significant decreases were observed in the rest of the city between baseline and Year Two and between baseline and Year Three of
the anti-gang initiative. For the rest of the city, the overall decrease between baseline and Year Two was less substantial than the decrease in the target area—10.8% in the rest of the city compared to 39.1% in the Bull’s Eye area. Similarly, the overall decrease for the rest of the city between baseline and Year Three was less substantial than the decrease in the target area—17% in the rest of the city compared to 56.5% in the Bull’s Eye area.

In terms of shot-fired calls for service, significant decreases were observed in the Bull’s Eye area between baseline and Year Two of the grant period. Although there was a reduction in the number of shot-fired calls for service in the buffer area between baseline and Year Two of the grant period, the reduction was not significant. For the rest of the city, there was a nonsignificant increase in the number of shot-fired calls between baseline and Year Two of the grant period. There were reductions in the number of shot-fired calls for service in the Bull’s eye area, the buffer area, and the rest of the city from Year One to Year Three of the grant period. Increases in the number of calls were observed between baseline and Year One of the grant period in the Bull’s eye area, the buffer area, and the rest of the city. The increase in shot-fired calls between baseline and Year One was less substantial in the Bull’s Eye area relative to the buffer area and relative to the rest of the city 44% in the target area in comparison to 20.5% in the buffer area and 18.3% in the rest of the city. For all three areas, there were significant reductions in the number of calls between baseline and Year Three of the grant period. The decrease was slightly more substantial in the Bull’s Eye area (nearly 50%) than in the buffer area 48.7%, and more substantial in the Bull’s Eye area relative to the rest of the city nearly 6%.

**Analytic Limitations**

In light of our findings, one would say that the suppression component of Durham-CAGI had some impact (not necessarily a causation) on reductions of violent crimes committed with a firearm and shots-fired calls for service in the Bull’s Eye area. Greater declines were observed in the target area relative to that of the buffer area, and relative to that of the rest of the city. Our findings, however, must consider the following limitations:

The evaluation was based on a quasi-experimental, simple time-series non-randomized design and not a randomized controlled area design, and when this kind of design is be used, it is difficult to rule out other factors that may have contributed to the decline in violent crimes committed with a firearm and shots-fired calls for service in the Bull’s Eye area.

We were not able to examine or determine which strategies or interventions of the suppression component were associated with the reduction in violent crimes. In addition, the evaluation was unable to answer the following questions, which are important questions to ponder:

1. Which strategies or interventions of the suppression component, if any, were associated with the reduction in violent crimes committed with a firearm in the Bull’s Eye area?
2. Are the observed decreases in violent crimes in the Bull’s Eye area short-term or long lasting?
3. Is the suppression effect of the law enforcement component inherently short term?
It should also be noted that alone “police gang suppression activities may not affect gang membership or the conditions that create gangs” (Fritsch, Caeti, & Taylor, 1999, p. 129). It is important for other components of anti-gang initiatives, particularly the prevention/intervention component, to address factors that contribute to gang membership.

In the next chapter, we present the findings of the prevention component of Durham-CAGI, which is designed to prevent and reduce the occurrence of youth gang-related incidents and increase positive outcomes of youth at high risk for gang-involvement.

CHAPTER 3: PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION COMPONENT

The prevention-intervention component of the Durham-CAGI was designed to prevent and reduce the occurrence of youth gang-related incidents and increase positive outcomes of youth at high risk for gang involvement who reside in the Bull’s Eye area. To address these aims, the City of Durham partnered with Community Helping Adolescents Make Positive Strides (CHAMPS), Communities-in-Schools, Education, Development, Growth and Employment (EDGE), the North Carolina Child Response Initiative (NCCRI), and the Religious Coalition.

A description of each organization/initiative is provided in the subsequent sections. In section 3a, we provide a brief overview of CHAMPS and present the results of its pre-employment training. In section 3b, we provide a brief overview of Communities-in-Schools of Durham and present the results of its Incredible Years Parenting Program and the Incredible Years Teaching Program implemented at Eastway Elementary.
In section 3c, we provide a brief overview of EDGE and present the results of a survey conducted with EDGE participants. In section 3d, we describe the program model of North Carolina Child Response Initiative (NCCRI), which expanded its services within the Bull’s Eye area to children and their families who are victims of violence, and we present findings on the demographic characteristics of the families and children referred to NCCRI and the characteristics of the referred incident. And in section 3e, we provide an overview of the Religious Coalition and present findings of a survey conducted with 50 individuals who participated in the monthly roundtable luncheons hosted by the Religious Coalition.

3a: Community Helping Adolescents Make Positive Strides

For the Durham-CAGI Project, the City of Durham (City Manager’s Office and the Office of Economic Workforce Development) collaborated with Holton Career Resource Center to develop an initiative entitled Community Helping Adolescents Make Positive Strides (CHAMPS). CHAMPS targeted 15-19 year old male and female students enrolled at Holton Career Resource Center (vocational training) who were identified as at risk of dropping out of high school and/or were affiliated with a gang.

- Holton Resource Center offers programs that provide both training and instruction focused on traditional and new emerging industries
- Provides students the opportunity to earn industry standard certifications or significant progress towards completion of certification requirements
- Is an extension of the regular high school programs
- Allows students to maintain their affiliation with their home high schools while completing courses at the Career Center
- Features classes that are taught from midday into the evening hours
- Provides a challenging academic environment and unique learning opportunities

The purpose of this section of the report is to present findings on the CHAMPS Program. First, we begin by outlining the evaluation questions. Second, we describe the program implementation of CHAMPS. We conclude with the results of the evaluation. The following questions were examined:

1. What were the criteria for participation?
2. How were participants selected?
3. How was CHAMPS Implemented?
4. How many students participated in the program?
5. How many students completed the program successfully?
6. What challenges and successes were encountered in the implementation of CHAMPS?

Results

Criteria for Participation and Selection of Participants

Potential participants were screened based on the following criteria:

- Enrolled at Holton Career Resource Center (vocational training)
- 15- 19 year old males and females
Identified as at–risk of dropping out of high school or possibly having gang affiliation

As part of the recruitment activities, the principal of Holton Career Resource Center held an orientation session. All enrolled students of Holton Career Resource Center were invited to attend the orientation session. Between 40 and 45 students attended the orientation session. After orientation, the next phase in the recruitment process was the completion of Holton Career and Resource Center’s Employment form, which required parental consent, a written essay, and an interview. Of the 19 students, 11 students completed the application process. Once students were selected, an orientation session was held with the selected students and their parents.

**Implementation of CHAMPS**

CHAMPS was implemented in three phases: Phase 1 (pre-employment training), Phase 2 (mentorship), and phase three (work experience). Each phase is described below:

**Phase 1: The Pre- Employment Training**

During Phase 1, students attended a 20 hour, six week pre-employment skills training provided by Sales and Service Training Center (April 11, 2011 – May 20, 2011). The training was designed to prepare students for their paid internship with the City of Durham. The training consisted of teaching students *soft skills*, which consisted of how to present oneself in an interview and work environment, and how to communicate, relate to others, and solve problems. (The syllabus of the pre-employment skills training and the training schedule are attached; see Appendix B).

Student performance was determined by attendance, class participation, and engagement in class exercises. The breakdown of the points is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance (10 classes @ 10 points ea.)</th>
<th>100 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On time (10 classes @ 10 points ea.)</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business attire (10 classes @ 10 points ea.)</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism (10 classes @ 10 points ea.)</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation (10 classes @ 10 points ea.)</td>
<td>100 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**500 points total**

Students who earned 450 points or more received a letter of recommendation from the Sales & Service Training Center.

**Phase 2: Mentorship**

Following the pre-employment training, each student was connected with a community mentor and a career mentors (April 18, 2011- June 17, 2011). The community mentors, who were college students, met with their assigned student on a weekly or biweekly basis to expose the
student to college life and discuss general high school and life issues. The career mentors met with their assigned student on four or more occasions to discuss careers that the student may be interested in pursuing, and to introduce and expose students to various career opportunities. Students had an opportunity to job shadow their respective mentors.

Phase 3: Work Experience

During the work experience phase (June 13, 2011 – July 22, 2011), students had the opportunity to showcase interpersonal skills acquired through pre-employment training and mentorship. Students were assigned a work placement related to their area of interest and skill level. Students worked 20 hours per week for six weeks, earning $8.00 per hour.

Student Enrollment, Retention, and Completion

A total of 11 students participated in the CHAMPS Program. For the Sales and Service Training (Phase 1), the average student attendance (over the course of six weeks) was 75%, with a range of 55% - 100%. Six (of the 11) students attended 82% or more of the classes. Each of the 11 program participants was mentored by a community and a career mentor (Phase 2). Eight students completed the necessary requirements (providing proper identification, taking a drug test) to have a paid internship with the City of Durham (Phase 3). Three of the 11 students did not complete the requirements to have a paid internship.

Challenges of the CHAMPS Program

The pre-employment skills training sessions were conducted at Holton Career Center. Because of technical problems largely related to accessing the internet, the Career Center trainers had to substitute activities requiring the use of computers with alternate activities. In addition, because of these kinds of technical difficulties, students were not able to develop career passports. Two students, however, were able to take the industry certification exam in order to earn a Professional Certification in Customer Service.

Successes of the CHAMPS Program

The reported successes of CHAMPS include:

Overall Program

- 72% (8 of 11) of CHAMPS participants completed the pilot program successfully

Sales and Service Training

- 80% completed the Sales and Service Training with satisfactory performance
- As a result of the training, students were able to:
  - Set realistic and achievable goals with respect to career development
  - Develop an employment resume and sample cover letter
An evaluation of the Sales and Service Training Program was done by its participants.

One of the questions asked was:

*What one thing did you learn over the past 11 sessions that is helping you portray yourself so you are taken more seriously, can assist you in performing more effectively, changing your attitude, or giving you more confidence?* The following responses were given:

- How to make introductions in a work situation
- Workplace skills
- How to open up more with my peers and speak in public
- How to make a good first impression—and then maintain it
- How to meet and approach people properly in a work setting

Students were also asked: *What learning experiences were most effective?* Their responses were as follows:

- How to make introductions in a work situation
- Workplace skills
- How to open up more with my peers and speak in public
- How to make a good first impression—and then maintain it
- How to meet and approach people properly in a work setting

In addition, students were asked to rate the value of training on the following item: *How well do you think this class prepared you to take advantage of the Internship opportunity by prepping you to make a great impression?* Students responded by using a 5 point scale ranging from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). The rating was 4.8.

**Mentoring**

- 80% of CHAMPS career mentors received five hours of career mentoring training
- Career mentors provided their respective mentee with job shadowing experiences
- Students/Mentees were engaged and received relevant advice from their career mentors
- Career mentors assisted student mentees in planning for employment/careers and provided student mentees with feedback regarding program/career mentoring
- Career mentors provided student mentees with a letter of recommendation and/or agreed to serve as an employment reference

**Internship**

- Eight students secured a City of Durham paid internship
- All completed the first week of the apprenticeship successfully
Recommendations of the CHAMPS Coordinator to Improve the CHAMPS Program

1. Because CHAMPS was designed, originally, to target and engage gang-affiliated youth in Durham, NC, it is recommended that CHAMPS, if funded in the future, target gang-affiliated youth specifically to determine if the program would be effective with this population.
2. The recruitment of career mentors should be started early in order to widen the pool of professional male mentors.
3. The program needs to provide career mentors, particularly those who are new to mentoring, with additional training. This recommendation is made because “those who had been mentors in the past were better prepared and needed less training than those who were new to mentoring.”
4. Seek alternative sites to ensure that trainers and students have access to the internet in order to complete training activities that require the use of the internet.

3b: Communities-in-Schools (CIS) of Durham

The City of Durham contracted with Communities-in-Schools (CIS) of Durham—an organization that connects children and families with the resources and relationships they need to be successful—to provide two empirically validated programs at Eastway Elementary School: The Incredible Years Parenting Program and The Incredible Years Teaching Program. Both programs are designed to promote emotional and social competence and to prevent, reduce, and treat behavioral and emotional problems in young children. Specifically, the City of Durham funded CIS to 1) provide five (5) cycles of Incredible Years parent skill development groups to a minimum of forty families whose children attend Eastway Elementary School or live in the Bull’s Eye area; and 2) provide training to a minimum of ten (10) Eastway Elementary teachers.

The purpose of this section of the report is to present findings on the outcome measures of CIS’s Basic Incredible Years parenting intervention and its Incredible Years teacher workshop intervention. First, we begin by outlining the evaluation questions. Second, we describe how the interventions were implemented. Third, we present the outcomes of the Incredible Years Parenting Program and Incredible Years Teaching Program. This information is described in the Method section below. We conclude with limitations of the analyses.

Evaluation Questions

1. Did parents’ scores on the Parenting Practices Interview subscales change in the expected direction between pretest and posttest?
2. What challenges and successes were encountered in the implementation of the Incredible Years programs?
Method

Description of the Interventions: Parent Training Groups and Teacher Workshops

Parent Training Groups

Between March 1, 2009 and February 2010, CIS conducted five cycles of 14-week group sessions with parents of students who attended Eastway Elementary school or parents who lived in the Bull’s Eye area, using the Basic Incredible Years parenting curriculum. The intervention was delivered in a group format, 2.5 hours per week. These sessions were led by facilitators who were trained in the use of the Incredible Years curriculum.

The aim of the Incredible Years Parent Basic Training Program is to support parents and caregivers in preventing aggressive, oppositional behavior in their children, thereby avoiding long term problems like drug abuse, crime, and gang involvement. The 14-week parenting program, “emphasized parenting skills known to promote children’s social competence and reduce behavior problems, such as how to play with children, helping children learn, effective praise and use of incentives, effective limit setting, and strategies to handle misbehavior” (Webster & Stratton, 2008). Over the course of 14 weeks, the facilitators introduced a sequence of topics: parent–child play, praise, incentives, limit-setting, problem-solving and discipline. The facilitators used video clips to illustrate different strategies parents use to manage children. It should be noted that children did not participate in the group sessions, but were provided with supervised child care.

Teacher Training Workshops

The Incredible Years Teaching Training Workshop was provided to a total of 15 teachers. The training was delivered in five day-long workshops offered monthly. Incredible Years Training for Teachers focuses on the development of effective classroom management skills, such as the effective use of teacher attention, praise, and encouragement; the use of incentives for difficult behavior problems; proactive teaching strategies; how to manage inappropriate classroom behaviors; the importance of building positive relationships with students; and how to teach empathy, social skills, and problem solving in the classroom (Webster & Stratton, 2008).

Measures

\[ A \text{ one-group pretest-posttest design was used in this study to evaluate the outcomes of parents who participated in the parenting intervention and teachers who participated in the teacher workshop intervention.} \]
**Parenting Practices Interview (PPI).** PPI is a questionnaire adapted from the Oregon Social Learning Center’s discipline questionnaire and revised for parents of young children. The six summary scores used in the current evaluation were *Appropriate Discipline* (12 items including, *when child fights how likely to punish; parents who check up are too anxious*), *Harsh and Inconsistent Discipline* (15 items including, *punishment depends on your mood, show anger when disciplining*), *Positive Verbal Discipline* (9 items including, *when child completes chores how likely to praise; important to praise*), *Monitoring* (5 items including, *percent of time you know where your child is; give child lots of unsupervised time*), *Physical Punishment* (6 items including *slap or hit child*), *Praise and Incentives* (11 items including, *believe in rewards; should not have to reward*), and *Organization* (6 items including, *I place inattentive or easily distractible children close by me*). Items were scored by using a 5-point scale ranging from 1(never) to 5 (consistently).

**Incredible Years Parent Program Satisfaction Questionnaire** is a questionnaire used to evaluate the Incredible Years Basic Parent Program.

**Incredible Years Teacher Workshop Evaluations** is a questionnaire used to evaluate the Incredible Years Teacher Workshop. Some of the questions include: *I found the group discussion to be* (not helpful, neutral, helpful, very helpful); *Suggested classroom activity assignments were* (responses ranged from extremely useless to extremely useful).

**Results**

**Parents**

Descriptive statistics were conducted to examine the extent to which parenting practices changed between pre-intervention and post-intervention assessments as a result of the Incredible Years Parenting intervention. Sixty-seven (67) parents/caregivers completed the PPI pretest and thirty-nine (39) parents or caregivers completed the posttest. However, once the PPI was converted into summary scores (Appropriate Discipline, Harsh and Inconsistent Discipline, Positive Verbal Discipline, Monitoring, Physical Punishment, and Praise and Incentive, there were 66 pretests and 33 posttests with completed scores across the six subscales. The results of the 66 pretests and the 33 posttests are presented below.

Table 3b-1 presents the means and standard deviations of the Parenting Practices Interview subscales. As shown in Table 3b-1:

- Parents’ use of appropriate discipline increased between pretest and posttest. The mean difference was .58, indicating slight improvement (higher scores=appropriate discipline).
- Parents’ use of harsh and inconsistent discipline decreased between pretest and posttest. The mean difference was -.44, indicating slight improvement (higher scores=harsh and inconsistent discipline).
- Parents’ use of physical punishment decreased between pretest and posttest. The mean difference was -.39, indicating slight improvement (high scores=harsh and inconsistent discipline).
Parents’ use of positive verbal discipline, appropriate monitoring, and praise and incentives increased between pretest and posttest, indicating positive changes in these areas (high scores=positive verbal discipline, more monitoring, and positive praise and incentives). Mean difference score between pretest and posttest scores for positive verbal discipline was .83, monitoring .98, and praise and incentives 1.14.

Table 3b-1 Pre and Posttest Parenting Behavior *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPI Subscales</th>
<th>Pretest N=66</th>
<th>Posttest N=33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Discipline**</td>
<td>3.75 1.44</td>
<td>4.33 1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harsh and Inconsistent Discipline ***</td>
<td>2.98 1.19</td>
<td>2.54 .93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Verbal Discipline**</td>
<td>4.16 1.51</td>
<td>4.99 1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring**</td>
<td>4.91 2.12</td>
<td>5.89 1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Punishment ***</td>
<td>2.06 1.26</td>
<td>1.67 1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praise and Incentives**</td>
<td>4.09 1.52</td>
<td>5.23 .78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores Range from 1 to 7; **higher scores indicate more positive parenting; ***higher scores indicate more negative parenting

Successes and Challenges in the Implementation of the Incredible Years Program

As stated previously, the facilitators used video clips to illustrate different strategies parents use to manage children. According to reports, “the program facilitators were struggling with the video section of the program and their parent weekly evaluations reflected that the parents were not finding the videos very helpful.” Consequently, the facilitators attended an Incredible Years coaching session. The coaching session provided the facilitators with new ways to incorporate the videos into the group sessions, resulting in the parents rating the video sections of the group sessions as being more helpful. Some of the successes of the Incredible Years Parenting Program are illustrated by the following comments:

- *I found the lesson on ignoring to be very helpful. I am going to try it as a new way of reacting towards negative behavior. I’m sure it’ll work because thus far I’ve been arguing/fussing with the boys less often.*
- *I will try timeout a different way. I’ve already been using it, but not very effectively. This was a good lesson...I may even try timeout for myself to manage my anger.*
- *I learned how to better talk to my child and listen.*
- *This group is something a parent really needs.*
- *The Incredible Years really helped me understand my children’s behavior and taught me to become a better parent.*
- *This program was so helpful to me and my family because now we are working together.*
- *The Incredible Years class is well worth the time. It teaches you how to celebrate your child’s differences.*
• This group helped me to calm my temper.
• I learned how to put down the belt as well as more about my kids.

Other successes include the following:

• All 15 teachers completed the Teacher Training Workshop successfully
• 100% of the teachers found the content of the training workshops very helpful
• 80% of teachers reported that after completing the workshops they were very confident that they would be able to manage current behavior problems in their classroom; 20% reported that they were confident that they would be able to manage current behavior problems in their classrooms
• 54% of teachers reported that student problem behavior which they had tried to change had improved; 20% reported that the student problem behavior that they had tried to change had improved greatly.

In summary, our findings revealed that parents’ behavior changed in the expected, positive direction between pretest and posttest and that teachers increased their confidence in managing problem student behavior. The majority of teachers reported that students’ problem behavior improved after they applied strategies and approaches learned in the training workshops. Although these findings are promising, we recommend that future anti-gang initiatives target parents, teachers, and children. For the Durham CAGI Project, only parents and teachers were targeted. It is important to conduct interventions with elementary school-aged children, because “elementary school is a primary setting in which children can be exposed to interventions designed to alter maladaptive beliefs, schema, scripts, rules, and skills that accrue in early childhood” (Fraser et al., 2005).
3c. Education, Development, Growth, and Employment (EDGE)

EDGE is a GED program located in the Bull’s Eye that prepares dropouts and non-engaged youth between the ages of 16-21 for the future in a results-oriented, disciplined environment promoting education, leadership and personal responsibility. The City of Durham contracted with EDGE to enroll and provide GED services to gang-involved youth referred by school, court, and probation/parole officials.

EDGE offers its GED program through Durham Technical Community College. Per Durham Technical Community College’s requirement, EDGE students: 1) must be at least 18 years of age or older (students who are age 16 may be accepted with parental signature on a notarized consent form); 2) must be a resident of North Carolina; 3) must have withdrawn from a regular high school program for at least six months; and 4) must not be a high school graduate. All 16 year-old admits are required to make a one year commitment, and all judicial, Department of Corrections, juvenile justice referrals and gang members are given special consideration.

Since its inception in 2006, EDGE has instructed over 400 youth. Many of its students have been gang-affiliated or at risk of gang involvement. In 2009, EDGE was awarded a contract with the City of Durham to enroll 100 gang-affiliated individuals from the Bull’s Eye area and to instruct and train 50 youth. The other objectives of the EDGE with respect to the CAGI Project were as follows:

- Ensure that a minimum of 50% of the program participants achieve their GED.
- Ensure that a minimum of 80% of the program participants who enter the program below the 9th grade level will improve their grade level by more than two grades by the completion of the program.

Over the contracted period, EDGE enrolled and instructed 150 gang-affiliated youth, which resulted in 80 (53.3%) gang-affiliated youth acquiring their GEDs. And, according to the Executive Director of EDGE, 75% of the students who entered the program below the 9th grade level improved their grade level by more than two grades at the completion of the program.

In the following section of the report, we examine the effectiveness of EDGE’s intervention strategies used to reduce gang activity and promote pro-social attitudes and behavior among its participants. We obtained completed surveys from four different cohorts of students enrolled in the EDGE program. There were four cohorts surveyed between December 2009 and June 2011. The first two cohorts contained 69 participants (53 and 16, respectively). There were 47 graduates from this group and all received their GED. The third and fourth cohorts totaled 74 (44 and 30, respectively). There were 33 graduates, all of them received GEDs.

Participants were asked to complete the survey across three time periods during their participation in the program. The first time was during registration for the program, the second time was six months after enrollment in the program (this time period varied based on the date of a participant’s registration), and the final time was after graduation from the program. It should be noted that not all participants who registered for the program completed the survey across all three phases. Some left the program before completing the final survey because they returned to
school, sought employment, graduated from the program or relocated to another city. Therefore, the results reported represent 80 participants who completed and graduated from the program with a GED. This creates some limitation to EDGE’s data in that some of the participants who did not complete the survey may have made substantial changes in behavior and attitude that could not be included in the findings due to lack of information about them.

The participants who took the survey were between the ages of 16-21. However, the majority of the participants were between the ages of 17 and 18. The ethnic composition was 88% African American, 5% Caucasian, 2% Latino, and about 5% were classified as Other.

The evaluation team developed a 92 question survey. The data obtained from EDGE participants (see questionnaire in Appendix A) addressed the following areas:

1. demographics (race, age, etc.)
2. delinquent activity of students
3. victimization by and of students
4. pro-social activities
5. anti-social per association
6. gang ideology and activities
7. relationship building
8. pro-social norms

Survey Results

Promotion of Pro-Social

Pro-social activities include physical activity, organized sports, and cultural and religious activities. Involvement in such activities is seen as protective factors that often serve to help youth to avert criminal and gang activities.

In analyzing the survey data, we found that students, after being enrolled at EDGE for six months, provided survey responses that suggested positive change in attitudes and behavior. Nearly 95% of students responded in the positive to questions such as: Do you enjoy going to school? (This represented a 10% increase in positive responses about school. There were also positive responses to the use of illegal drugs. A total of 36% of students reported discontinued use of marijuana for the last six months; this was up from the initial report of 23%. Also, 100% of participants who completed the survey reported not using heroine, methamphetamines, cocaine, and ecstasy. In addition, students also reported a decrease in the sale of drugs. As many as 12% reported that they had sold drugs six months prior to the program, but only 9% admitted to selling drugs after attending EDGE.

Other areas in which students reported reductions since attending EDGE were to questions concerning use of alcohol (Have you ever drunk alcohol such as beer, wine, or hard liquor in
the last six months?, Have you physically attacked someone, cheated in school, or bullied others and done crazy things?). Many of the students also reported increased interest and involvement in team sports, volunteer services and other extra-curricular activities.

**Anti-Social Peer Association and Gang Affiliation**

**Peer Associations**

Because association with delinquent peers is a risk factor for youth getting involved in criminal and gang activities and is a precursor to ongoing delinquency problems, the survey asked students for responses about anti-social associations. The majority (75% of the students) indicated that they had anti-social associations. Those surveyed also indicated that they did not have brothers or sisters who drink beer, wine, hard liquor, smoke marijuana, take handguns to school, or have ever been expelled from school. However, 57% knew an adult who smoked marijuana.

**Gang Affiliation**

While a large percent (50%) indicated that they had friends who were involved in gangs, an even larger percent (55%) said that they have family members who are affiliated with gangs, and that gangs are present in their neighborhood. At least 20% of the participants acknowledged their affiliation with a gang when they started the EDGE program, but currently only 10% indicated that they were still considered a gang member. For EDGE participants, gangs seemed to be a dominant factor in their lives: 66% had gangs in their schools; another 67% of those surveyed had become a member of a gang between the ages of 11-15, while 33% became a gang member as early as age 10.

**Challenges and Successes of EDGE**

One of the major challenges, according to the Executive Director, was limited funding, resulting in the reduction and/or elimination of certain services. For example, toward the end of the contracting period, EDGE no longer had funds to enroll students in college and vocational programs.

Despite funding challenges, the EDGE program shows real promise as an anti-gang strategy: 1) EDGE, through its partnerships with Durham Housing Authority and St. Augustine’s College, tracked former students to determine if they secured jobs, housing, or acclimated to college life; 2) former students volunteered as motivational speakers on Leadership Friday. The leadership training program is designed to help students develop decision-making skills. In addition, the activities of the leadership program included preparing students for the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), and enrolling students in college or vocational training; and 3) a documentary entitled "On the Edge" chronicled the EDGE program and the lives of students enrolled in the EDGE program; 4) former students provided math tutoring to enrolled students; and 5) former students referred family and friends to the EDGE program.
The student responses and evaluation of the EDGE program, and the program’s success with young people (over 50% of its participants obtained their GED), suggests this type of service may hold real promise as an anti-gang strategy.

3d: North Carolina Child Response Initiative

The North Carolina Child Response Initiative (NCCRI) is a collaborative effort of the Center for Child & Family Health (CCFH), the Durham Police Department, and Project Safe Neighborhoods to improve safety and security among children and their families who are affected by violence and trauma. The City of Durham contracted NCCRI to expand services in the Bull’s Eye area to children and their families who are victims of violence, as well as siblings of identified gang members. The services were to include:

1) Hiring an additional full-time clinician to provide direct acute counseling, trauma-focused assessment and case management services;
2) Providing a minimum of two 3-hour in-service trainings a year to Durham Police Department;
3) Coordinating and participating in weekly meetings with the Durham Police Department, and the Department of Social Service;
4) Participating in weekly ride-alongs with officers of the Durham Police Department.

The mission of NCCRI is to reach children and families impacted by violence. NCCRI is dedicated to reducing the effects of violence and trauma for children and their families in Durham County, and one of its goals is to intervene with children on a destructive path toward delinquent behavior and gang involvement. Research indicates that youth who have been exposed to traumatic events such as sexual and physical victimization, family and community violence, and who have been a witness to violence are at greater risk of gang involvement than youth who have not been exposed to such events. The question then becomes: How does trauma increase a youth’s risk for gang involvement? The National Child Traumatic Stress Network (2009) hypothesizes that gang’s appeal to traumatized youth because they can provide a sense of safety, control, and structure, as well as serve as a venue for traumatized youth to repeat learned patterns of behavior such as violence.

The purpose of this section of the report is to present findings on the demographic characteristics of gang-related cases referred to NCCRI, the characteristics of the referred incidents, and the types of services provided. First, we begin by outlining the evaluation questions. Second, we describe the program model of NCCRI. The description of the program model is followed by an account of the procedures and methods that were used to collect and analyze data. We conclude with limitations of the analysis and practice implications. The following questions were examined:

1. How many trainings were provided to G.R.E.A.T officers on the effects of trauma on children?
2. How many gang-related cases were referred to NCCRI?
3. What were the demographic characteristics of the families and children (gang-related cases) referred to NCCRI?
4. What were the types of incidents for which the families and children were referred?
5. What types of services did the families and children receive?
6. Based on clinical judgment, how do the profiles of CAGI cases and non-CAGI cases differ?
7. What were some of the challenges that NCCRI experienced with respect to the CAGI project?

Program Model of NCCRI

NCCRI is based on the national Child Development Community Policing Partnership Model—a model of a collaborative alliance among law enforcement, juvenile justice, domestic violence, medical and mental health professionals and child welfare, school, and other community agencies. The Child Development Community Partnership brings these systems together to provide cross-systems training, consultation and support, and to collaborate on behalf of traumatized children and families (Marans & Berkman, 1997).

In Durham, the “NCCRI protocol provides families with education about the effects of childhood exposure to violence and trauma, as well as diagnostic assessment completed by the team at the district substations or CCFH offices. Officers and clinicians coordinate their activities to increase children's sense of physical safety and psychological security in the wake of their exposure to violence and other crimes” (NCCRI, 2011). Officers and clinicians meet once a week to review cases.

For Durham-CAGI, NCCRI provided general follow up services to the parents of referred children who are at risk of gang-involvement. During conversations with these parents, NCCRI made recommendations regarding effective parenting strategies to implement at home and provided information regarding appropriate community resources to address the specific needs of referred children and their families.

Method

Procedure

Between July 13, 2009 and January 31, 2011, NCCRI staff collected and stored referral data in the NCCRI—CAGI/Gang Database, a database containing information on the nature of the referral/incident, referring police division, demographic characteristics of children referred (i.e., gender, age, and race/ethnicity), and services provided.

Database Variables

The database created for the CAGI Project included the following types of information:
Durham CAGI-Evaluation Report

Gang-related case- A gang-related case was defined as follows: 1) younger siblings of gang members and youth living in close proximity to those with gang affiliation; 2) youth who were either suspected of or known to have gang affiliation; and 3) youth identified by the GREAT (Gang Resistance Education and Training) officers in Durham County Schools who were demonstrating behavioral concerns or who were at risk of gang affiliation in the school setting.

Child and family demographics- Child demographics measures included gender, age, and race/ethnicity. Gender was defined as male or female. Age was defined as the child’s age in years at the time of the referral. Ethnicity was defined as African American, Caucasian, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, Multi-ethnicity, or Other.

Person primary role- The primary role as listed on the police report, which was coded as follows: primary victim (person against whom crime was directed, survivors of homicide, children of DV victims), secondary victim (non-primary victim receiving services as a result of his/her own reaction or needs resulting from a crime directed against primary victim), offender, witness, not present at event, or other.

Nature of the incident- Nature of the incident as listed on the police report. The nature of the incident was coded as follows: accidental injury, accidental death, aggravated assault, arson/fire, simple assault, breach/disorderly/riot, stalking/threatening, motor vehicle accident, property crime, sexual assault, risk of injury, fire, homicide, juvenile offense, or other.

Basic-level services- Basic-level services were defined as an assessment and a follow-up visit with a clinician and an officer. Basic-level services included: therapeutic assessment, crisis counseling, advocacy, assistance with victim compensation, follow-up contact, telephone contact, or other service.

Enhanced service- Enhanced services were defined as: 1) a thorough, in-clinic psychosocial assessment; 2) 5-6 brief, therapeutic sessions in the clinic or a referral to longer-term treatment as determined by the assessment; and 3) case management and/or linkages to community services as needed by the families.

Results

Definition of Gang-Related Cases

As stated in the Method section above, a gang-related case was defined as follows: 1) younger siblings of gang members and youth living in close proximity to those with gang affiliation; 2) youth who were either suspected of or known to have gang affiliation; and 3) youth identified by the GREAT (Gang Resistance Education and Training) officers in Durham County Schools who were demonstrating behavioral concerns or who were at risk of gang affiliation in the school setting.

---

3 Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS 19. Descriptive statistics were used to examine the demographics of gang-related cases, characteristics of the referred incident, and types of service provided.
**Hiring of Clinician and Trainings Provided to GREAT Officers**

With Durham-CAGI funding, NCCRI hired a clinician. The clinician was trained to respond to cases where children were victims of violence as well as those children who were at risk for gang involvement. The clinician assisted with training officers within the five police districts as well as specialized units working with youth at risk for gang involvement, including the Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT) officers and officers riding with HEAT teams targeting suppression of gang activity. Some of the key content covered in the training addressed questions such: What is trauma? What is the officer’s role in mediating trauma? What are some of the actions and strategies officers can use with traumatized children and families, and what types of treatment are available to these children? (The topics covered in the training sessions are described in Appendix D).

In addition, NCCRI staff provided patrol officers with informal trainings during police ride-along drives. NCCRI clinicians had ride-a-longs with regular units and specialized units (HEAT). The staff averaged six rides per week (totaling 20 hours per week); half of those ride-alongs occurred in the Bull’s Eye area.

**Gang-Related Cases Referred to NCCRI**

Of the 674 cases referred to NCCRI between July 1, 2009 and January 31, 2011, 98 (or 14.5%) were classified as a gang-related case. The total number of children in those 98 cases was 138. The majority of NCCRI gang-related referrals were from the Durham Police Department’s GREAT officers, who routinely referred children exhibiting antisocial or aggressive behavior.

**Demographic Characteristics of Gang-Related Cases**

The majority of the 138 children were African American (67%) and the remainder was Hispanic (10%) and Caucasian (5%). Sixty-nine percent of the children were male (69%); the children ranged in age from five to 18, with a mean age of 12.61 (SD=3.27). As indicated in Figure 3d-1, 62 (or 45%) of the 138 children were identified as the offender in the incident, 52 (or 38%) were identified as the victim, 12 (or 9%) as other (i.e., sibling, runaway, or behavioral problems at school), 6 (or 4%) were witnesses, and 6 (or 4%) were not present at the incident.

*Figure 3d-1 Primary Role in Incident*
What were the types of incidents for which the families and children were referred?

As indicated in Figure 3d-2, the most common incident for which gang-related cases were referred to NCCRI was *other* (49%), which included incidents such as statutory rape, shoplifting, school behavioral concerns, neglect, domestic violence, and child in need of service. The second most common incident was simple assault (22%), followed by juvenile offense (13%), and aggravated assault (10%).

![Figure 3d-2 Percentage of Families Referred to NCCRI by Incident Type](image)

Types of Services Families and Children Received

Sixty-six (67%) of the 98 families referred to NCCRI received basic level of service, which included 3-4 clinician and officer follow-up visits. Eleven families (11%) received enhanced
level of service, which included a thorough, in-clinic psychosocial assessment, brief, therapeutic sessions in the clinic or a referral to longer-term treatment as determined by the assessment, and case management and/or linkages to community services as needed by the families. Twenty-one families (21%) were not able to be reached.

In terms of the 138 children who comprised the 98 families, 110 (80%) received basic services, and 11(8%) received enhanced services. Of the basic services, thirty-nine children (or 28%) received a therapeutic assessment; 8 (6%) received crisis counseling; 4 (3%) received advocacy services; 26 (or 19%) were provided with information and referrals; 20 (or 15%) were provided with a safety plan; and 109 (or 79%) received safety psycho-education.*

*(Some children received more than one service)

Examples of services provided by NCCRI

The services provided by NCCRI can also be illustrated in the following case examples:

- NCCRI partnered with the parents of one 15-year-old male, assisting them to enroll their child in the project Building Uplifting and Impacting Lives Daily (BUILD), a local gang-prevention program. The child’s parents spoke only Spanish, so NCCRI was instrumental throughout the referral and enrollment process, serving as both liaison and interpreter during the child’s initial assessment and in subsequent communications. After the child’s enrollment in Project BUILD, NCCRI also assisted in interpreting during a meeting between a lieutenant of the Durham Police Department and the child’s parents. The lieutenant provided extensive information to the child’s family, impressing on them the level to which their child was already involved and the steps they should take to assist him in extricating himself from the gang’s grasp.

- NCCRI learned of a mental health agency already working with a referred child. NCCRI met with the child’s therapist and suggested additional resources, including gang prevention services that could assist the child’s family in decreasing the likelihood of further antisocial behavior and possible future gang involvement. Ongoing communications between NCCRI, the child’s therapist, and the child’s family ensured that the child would continue to receive services appropriate to the child and his family’s changing needs.

Qualified for Enhanced Services

How many cases qualified for enhanced services? NCCRI clinicians reported that there were no specific qualification criteria for enhanced services at the time of referral. All families were approached (via the basic level of service) and were offered the option of the enhanced service (in-clinic assessment and referral for treatment). Eleven children and their families received enhanced services. Of the 127 children who did not receive enhanced services, 62 ( or 49%) did not respond to NCCRI’s outreach efforts, 37 ( or 29%) were already in treatment (i.e., already
had services in place), 14 (11%) refused further services from the program, 13 (or 10%) were unable to be located, and 1 (or 1%) lacked clinical necessity for further services.

NCCRI did not track specific reasons as to why families declined services. However, based on anecdotal reports or clinical judgment, families generally expressed that they either were not interested in services (i.e., did not think that services were needed) or that they were already enrolled in services elsewhere.

Profiles of CAGI (Gang-Related) cases compared to Non-CAGI cases

Gang cases were more likely than non-gang cases to include incidents of robbery, parent-child domestic problems, and child psychiatric crises. Gang-related incidents were more likely to occur in schools (25% gang vs. 1% non-gang) or on the street (20% vs. 12%), while non-gang-related incidents most frequently occurred in the family’s home (67% non-gang versus 36% gang). Gang-related cases often consisted of youth who were already recognized in the mental health or legal system as having difficulties.

In terms of referring police divisions, both groups had strong referrals from general patrol (25% non-gang, 30% gang), while non-gang cases were more likely to be referred from domestic violence investigations (26% non-gang vs. 4% gang) and gang cases were more likely to be referred from GREAT officers (26% gang versus 0% non-gang). The largest portion of non-gang cases were referred for domestic violence (41% of the non-gang cases compared with 3% of the gang cases), whereas the largest portion of gang cases (41% of the gang cases compared with 14% of the non-gang cases) were classified as “other” incidents, which included school behavior problems, juvenile offenses (e.g., shoplifting), runaways, etc.

Percentage of families and children residing in the Bull’s Eye

NCCRI did not have the capability to track whether or not incidents or referrals occurred in the Bull’s Eye area.

Challenges and Successes

One of the initial challenges that NCCRI clinicians faced was engaging families who were already involved in other services. To minimize this challenge, NCCRI clinicians developed a multi-step process for speaking with families of referred children who were engaged in other services. Steps included the following: 1) congratulating/praising parents for already having taken steps toward addressing their child’s behavioral or emotional regulation problems; 2) conducting an informal assessment of parents’ satisfaction with existing services; 3) educating families regarding the difference between types of mental health services (e.g. therapy, medication management, community support, intensive in-home treatment, etc); and 4) offering free mental health assessments conducted by NCCRI.
NCCRI clinicians hoped that by discussing the above listed points with parents of referred children, parents would be more likely to consider taking advantage of NCCRI’s services, with the eventual outcome of children receiving services targeted to their specific mental health needs.

**Discussion, Analytic Limitations, and Conclusion**

We presented findings on the demographic characteristics of gang-related cases referred to NCCRI, the characteristics of the referred incident, and the types of services provided. Our findings revealed that African Americans comprised the majority of cases referred to NCCRI. In nearly half of the gang-related referrals, children were identified as the offender. The most common incident for which gang-related cases were referred to NCCRI was *other* (50%), which included incidents such as statutory rape, shoplifting, school behavioral concerns, neglect, domestic violence, and child in need of service. Not surprisingly, the majority of the gang-related cases referred to NCCRI were received from GREAT officers. This finding may be attributed to the training the GREAT officers received from NCCRI clinicians on the effects of trauma and making appropriate referrals.

Our findings revealed that gang-related cases differed from non gang-related cases. For example, gang-related cases were more likely to include incidents of robbery, parent-child domestic problems, and child psychiatric crises. Gang-related incidents were more likely to occur in schools (25% gang vs. 1% non-gang) or on the street (20% vs. 12%). In light of these findings, it appears that NCCRI should coordinate with Durham Public Schools in its efforts to decrease children’s risk for gang involvement.

Given the type of data collected by NCCRI for the Durham-CAGI project and the descriptive nature of the analysis, the following evaluation questions could not be answered: Did NCCRI influence children’s mental health status? Did NCCRI prevent or reduce the occurrence of youth gang-related incidents among children and youth who received NCCRI services? Thus, the long-term outcomes of children and youth who received services are unknown. This underscores the need to develop a protocol for capturing the long-term outcomes of gang-related cases. For example, the national CD-CP consultation service “has developed an interview protocol for a retrospective study of children seen in the first 4 years of the consultation service, which examines children’s general developmental status, post-traumatic responses, exposure to additional episodes of violence, children’s subjective general developmental status, post-traumatic responses, and exposure to additional episodes of violence” (Marans & Berkman, 1997, p.4). This type of interview protocol may be useful for capturing the long-term outcomes of gang-related cases.
Section 3e: Religious Coalition

The RCND is a nonprofit organization comprised of individuals, *who as an expression of their faith and goodwill, actively seek an end to the violence that is plaguing Durham neighborhoods. Its mission is to prevent and rectify the injustice of violence that segregates the city of Durham and diminishes its citizens’ humanity.*

The City of Durham’s RCND provides a monthly venue to educate the community on crime prevention issues related to gangs; makes referrals of youth to gang prevention programming, and coordinates outreach efforts to 71 public, private, nonprofit, and faith-based organizations that provide services to survivors of violence. Because of their community work, the City enlisted the support of RCND in its efforts to address the gang and violence problem in the Bull’s Eye area. This partnership also aimed to assist youth who have been identified as being involved in gang activity by law enforcement agencies, community groups, and/or faith-based organizations.

Through CAGI funding, the RCND hosted twelve monthly luncheon roundtable sessions, and six of those roundtable sessions would focus specifically on gangs or gang-related issues or problems. In this effort, the Religious Coalition also engaged its 71 faith-based organizations. RCND also developed a number of faith based teams to work with offenders who completed CAGI’s reentry program provided by the CJRC. Data on the effectiveness of this program were not available for this evaluation.

The findings highlighted in the section below are from a survey of 50 individuals who participated in the Religious Coalition’s monthly roundtable luncheon session(s). The survey consisted of 15 questions (see Appendix E). Participants answered questions about their organizational affiliations and their experience as a participant of the Religious Coalition’s monthly luncheon(s).

**Survey Results**

**Organizational Affiliation**

The majority of the respondents who attended the monthly luncheon roundtable(s) attended as a representative of an organization 36 (or 72%); 12 (or 24%) attended as a non-representative of an organization; two attendees’ did not indicate their organizational affiliation (4%). Of the respondents who attended the luncheon(s) as a representative of an organization (n=36), the majority represented a nonprofit organization (11 or 32%) and a government agency (11 or 32%); 9 (or 7%) represented a faith-based organization; 2 (or 6%) represented an advocacy group; 2 (or 6%) represented *other* (e.g., political action committee), and 1 (or 3%) represented an educational institution.

Thirty-seven (37) participants responded to the following survey question: “If you work in a service profession, what population(s) do you serve?” Table 3e-1 shows that twenty-six reported that they work for an organization that serves the general community; 21(57%) answered that
at-risk youth is one of the populations that their organization serves; and 11 (30%) reported that gang members are a population that their organization serves.

**Table 3e-1** If you work in a helping profession, what population(s) do you serve? Check all that apply. (n=37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At-risk youth</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Members</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General community</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health population</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abusers</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 answered question 37

*Some respondents answered more than one question or answered only once*

**Reason for Attending the Luncheon Roundtable**

Fifty-five percent of the respondents (n=33) reported that they attended five or more monthly luncheons. As shown in table 3e-2, the majority of the participants (13 or 39%) indicated that they attended the roundtable luncheon(s) because someone they knew recommended them to attend. Thirteen (39%) respondents reported that they attended the luncheon(s) as a networking opportunity.

**Table 3e-2** Why did you decide to attend the luncheon? (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone you know recommended you attend</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking general information</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting a new program</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunity</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 answered question 37

*Some respondents answered more than one question or answered only once*

**Benefits of Attending the Monthly Roundtable Luncheons**

As shown in Table 3e-3, 76% (n=47) of the participants reported that as a result of attending the luncheon(s) they have an increased awareness of available programs and have made new contacts. Twenty-six (53%) reported that as a result of attending the luncheon(s) they have a better understanding of the gang problem in Durham.
Table 3e-3 Benefits of attending the luncheon (n=47)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have increased my awareness of available programs</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I made new contacts</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more resources and information to do my job</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve been able to secure funding for my organization</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have new ideas for my own program or organization</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/we have decided to start a new program or modify an existing program</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a better understanding of the gang problem in Durham</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I secured speakers for future events at my organization</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some respondents answered more than once*

Needs of Participants Attending the Luncheons

As shown in Table 3e-4, 18 (45%) participants reported having a need for greater awareness of available programs; 17 (43%) a need for more contacts or networking; and twelve (30%) reported having a need for greater understanding of Durham’s gang problem.

Table 3e-4 Needs of Participants (n=40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A need for greater awareness of available programs</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for more contacts or networking</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for more resources and information to do my job</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for more funding for my organization</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for ideas for my own program or organization</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for greater understanding of Durham’s gang problem</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A need for speakers for future events at my organization</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some respondents answered more than once*

Rating of Luncheon Roundtable(s)

Participants were asked to rate the value of the luncheon roundtable on a series of items: value of information, as a fellowship opportunity, networking value, food, and location. Participants responded to items by using a 10 point scale ranging from 1 (low value) to 10 (high). The average for each item is listed below:

- The rating for *value of information* was 8.65
- The rating for *value as a fellowship opportunity* was 8.33
- The rating for *networking value* was 8.55
- The rating for *food* was 7.60
- The rating for *location* was 8.54

Participants’ Comments or Recommendations
Participants were asked to provide any comments or recommendations they would like to share. Ten participants wrote the following comments:

- As the mother of a murdered son, The Religious Coalition saved my sanity and gave me a way to turn my grief from something negative to positive by being a part of team trying to turn this tide of violence and murder around and trying to make this city a safer place for all of its citizens. They also try to give recognition and respect to communities that believe they are not as good as other communities, of which I have been and am still a part. THANK YOU!

- It is very good to hear what the speakers are trying to do for Durham, violence, etc. I hear people working on problems I would never be made aware of otherwise.

- I enjoy attending these roundtable luncheons, and very much appreciate that they run to schedule, as my work day is busy, and this is all the time I can afford in the middle of the day. I have learned much from the sessions I have attended about resources in our community for dealing with gang and violence problems.

- These luncheons have provided our program an opportunity to get to know people and agencies at a local level. Much of our work is at the state level. It's also nice to be a bit more aware of the implications and impact of violence. This helps us to do our work better. Sometimes we are too far removed from the effects of violence at the local level.

- The luncheon is helpful as a way to bring people together, but it is very frustrating to see how powerless we all are.

- This must be working for some because it's a large group that shows up. Observations: (1) "non-violent" and "peace" are less effective than "against violence" in marketing to gang target audiences; (2) unique "parents of murdered children" group isn't getting the play it deserves (3) at-risk individuals who want to engage past RCND aren't being directed / supported outward (e.g., members of parent group whose vision can be fulfilled in other existing agencies).

- Outstanding presentation.

- I think that this is a wonderful group.

- I loved the people.

- Many thanks.

As indicated by the survey results and by participants’ comments, the monthly luncheon roundtables provided public awareness of gangs and violence in Durham, NC, and provided participants with added information on programs designed to reduce violence and address gangs and gang-related issues.

**CHAPTER 4: REENTRY COMPONENT**

The Durham County Criminal Justice Resource Center’s Reentry Services (CJRC) implemented the reentry component of the Durham-CAGI project. CJRC’s mission is to provide a wide array of services to criminal justice stakeholders, as well as adult and juvenile offenders. The aim of its
Reentry services is to reduce offender recidivism through the provision of highly structured programs where offenders learn to modify behavior patterns that lead to criminal activities.

The goal of the Durham CAGI’s reentry component was to increase public safety by reducing recidivism rates for high-impact gang-involved offenders returning to the community through the use of vouchers, mentors, and community organizations for the delivery of services and treatment. The program targeted gang-affiliated offenders leaving prison who continued on post-release supervision in Durham County. The following groups of inmates received priority selection:

- STG inmates who completed the 9-month gang program at Foothills Correctional Institution.
- STG inmates released from prison on post-release supervision with an address in the Bull’s Eye area.
- STG inmates released from on post-release supervision to an address anywhere in Durham County.
- Split or dual sentence cases released from County jail with Community Threat Group (CTG) probation supervision.

In this chapter, we present the findings of our evaluation of the reentry component of the Durham CAGI project. First, we outline the objectives of the reentry component and the corresponding evaluation questions. This is followed by an account of the procedures used to collect and analyze the data. We conclude with the findings and limitations of the analysis.

**Objectives and Strategies of Durham-CAGI**

The program objectives and strategies of the Durham-CAGI Reentry Program were as follows:

**Process/Activities Objectives**

1. Target 15 to 20 offenders per year
2. Develop a system to identify STG inmates prior to their release
3. Identify other potential CAGI participants who do not come through the Department of Corrections channels
4. Identify service providers who would provide services to offenders at no cost
5. Identify service providers who would offer services through vouchers and enter into contracts with CJRC

**Outcome Objectives for Participants**

1. Program participants would complete supervision requirements
2. Program participants would not be arrested for new crimes or have their post-release supervision revoked
3. Program participants would maintain or gain employment while in the program
4. Program participants would utilize offered substance abuse treatment, mentoring, and housing services
Evaluation Questions

In light of the aforementioned objectives and strategies, we examined the following questions:

**Process Objectives**
1. Was a system developed to identify STG inmates prior to release? What did it entail?
2. Was a system developed to identify other potential CAGI participants who did not come through the Department of Corrections channels? What did it entail?
3. How were recruitment and screening implemented?
4. How many individuals were recruited?
5. How many met the criteria and opted not to participate?

**Impact Objectives**
   a. How many program participants completed supervision requirements?
   b. Have any program participants been arrested for new crimes or had their post-release supervision revoked?
   c. How many participants maintained or gained employment while in the program?
   d. How many participants utilized offered substance abuse treatment, mentoring, and housing services?
   e. Was there an association between program completion and re-offending?
   f. Were there differences between participants who completed the program and participants who did not complete the program?
   g. Were there differences between program participants who reoffended and participants who did not reoffend?
   h. What challenges and successes were encountered in the implementation of the CAGI-Reentry program?

Results

**Process Objective Findings**

**Develop a System to Identify STG Inmates**

Because CJRC has had a long-standing relationship with the NC Department of Corrections (DOC) and the Post-Release Supervision Commission, staff approached the DOC for assistance in identifying all individuals in DOC scheduled to be released to Durham County within a certain time frame. After much discussion, DOC staff agreed to develop a report that allowed CJRC to identify inmates at least six months prior to release. CJRC staff contacted the prisons where the inmates with post-release supervision were housed and scheduled interviews. After interviews were held, staff contacted the Commission requesting specific conditions be included in the release paperwork. This step was later dropped as mandatory participation in CAGI was no longer a condition of supervision. To reach inmates who were scheduled to leave prison without post-release conditions, CJRC staff developed brochures and contacted the inmates and the prison case managers to introduce CAGI. Those inmates who were interested in CAGI could contact CJRC prior to or after release to learn more about the program.
The staff in CJRC’s STARR Program in the Durham County Jail identified possible referrals in the jail. Once identified, staff would meet with the inmate in the jail, conduct a needs assessment and discuss the CAGI Program and Services. In addition, CJRC notified the local office of the Division of Community Corrections about the CAGI program and its criteria. Officers assigned to supervise the CTG (Community Threat Group) caseload were contacted frequently and reminded of the CAGI program. Referrals from them were limited though as not all their caseload had served active time. Additionally, based on a decision by the US Attorney for the Middle District of North Carolina, participants had to enroll in CAGI within 60 days of release to be eligible for the program.

During Year One, participants were enrolled in CAGI as a condition of supervision. However, due to the lack of interest by many participants in CAGI services, the Oversight Committee recommended in Year Two to focus CAGI resources on voluntary participants.

**Hire a Case Manager**

CJRC hired a case manager in 2008 to provide services to CAGI participants, prepare reports, provide information to the grant administrator and the evaluators, and seek out and recruit potential CAGI participants.

**Service Providers**

Over the course of the grant period, CJRC identified several service providers who delivered services and resources at no cost to the Durham-CAGI grant. Some of these services or resources included housing, substance abuse and mental health treatment, and clothing. CJRC provided in-house services and resources at no cost to the grant, which included employment skills and placement assistance, housing, cognitive behavior therapy, substance abuse treatment, and clothing. In addition, conflict resolution, housing, and employment skills training were continued through voucher programs originated from previous RFPs. CJRC offered participants faith teams, through the Religious Coalition for Nonviolent Durham, for long term support. However, it was reported that few clients were interested in or appropriate for the service.

**Target 15 to 20 Offenders per Year**

CJRC reached its overall goal of serving 50 individuals. As of the writing of this report, a total of 53 participants have enrolled in the CAGI Reentry Program.

**Recruitment and Screening**

As stated previously, DOC established a link for CJRC staff to identify potential clients. CJRC staff utilized this link regularly and sent outreach letters to inmates informing them of the program and offering a visit from the team to discuss services. In addition, officers assigned to supervise the CTG (Community Threat Group) caseload were contacted frequently and reminded of the CAGI program. Referrals from CTG officers were limited because not all their caseload had served active time. CJRC also received referrals from local entities, including the District
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Supervision Requirements, Arrests, and Revocation of Post-Release Supervision

Nearly all the 53 CAGI participants were subject to a curfew requirement, with all participants returning from prison monitored via electronic monitoring. In addition, all participants were drug screened regularly while in the program. Twenty-seven (27) participants tested positive at least once. Sanctions were imposed for infractions ranging from missed curfews, positive drug screens, and missed classes. CJRC used an incentive program to reward participants who had perfect attendance, obtained various achievements, and who complied with treatment recommended by CJRC.

Of the 53 CAGI cases, 10 cases remain active and 43 cases have been closed. According to a CJRC report, fourteen participants completed the program successfully. Twenty two (22) participants were terminated from the program. Of those who were terminated from the program, nine (9) participants had new charges, two of which were gang-related. All 9 re-offenders returned to prison. The remaining 13 were terminated from the program for being noncompliant with the CAGI program.

Education and Employment

Many of the inmates released from the North Carolina Department of Correction had received a GED prior to or during incarceration. For those CAGI participants who had not obtained a GED, CJRC encouraged them to work towards obtaining a GED. Fifteen (15) participants were enrolled in GED Classes, eleven (11) at CJRC, three (3) at Durham Technical Community College, one (1) at the Center for Employment Training (CET). In addition:

- One (1) participant was enrolled in a Degree Curriculum Program at Durham Technical Community College.
- One (1) participant was enrolled in tutoring to improve literacy.

Many of the CAGI participants reported never having been employed before. Consequently, employment and vocational services were cornerstones of the CAGI-Reentry Program. These services included structured job searches, job search techniques, interviewing skills, completing applications, creating resumes, and job etiquette. Twenty-nine (29) participants received employment services from CJRC. CJRC reported that ten (10) participants enrolled in vocational training programs. Below is a list of the places to which participants were referred (some received more than one referral to a training program).

- Two(2) participants were referred to the Center for Employment Training (CET) for building maintenance
- One (1) participant was referred to Park West for Barber School
- Two (2) participants were referred to Durham Tech Community College for Brownfields Training
One (1) participant was enrolled in a degree program at DTCC for Automotive Technology
- One (1) participant was enrolled in a degree program at DTCC for BioWorks
- Three (3) participants were referred to DERC for warehouse skills and on-the-job training
- Two (2) participants were sponsored to attend Fiber Optics Training at Triangle Citizens

In addition, another five participants enrolled in post-secondary educational institutions.

Seventeen (17) participants reported obtaining employment. Participants who were not employed were asked: *What is stopping you from finding work?* Several major barriers challenged participants’ job seeking activities—criminal record, felony conviction, no identification (driver’s license, state identification, social security card, and/or birth certificate). Among the greatest of these barriers was having a felony conviction/criminal record.

**Utilization of Mentoring and Housing Services and Substance Abuse Treatment**

Without employment and frequently without family support many participants were in need of housing rental assistance and various forms of supportive services. Twenty-one (21) participants received housing assistance:

- Five (5) participants resided at CJRC’s transitional house
- Thirteen (13) participants were placed in other transitional or halfway houses: three (3) were placed in Durham Short-Term Transitional Living, eight (8) were placed in *Just a Clean House* and two (2) were placed in *Rainbow of Hope*.
- Two (2) participants received rental assistance with private providers: Ralph J. Hester, Thomas & Audrey Williams, and V.S Rich Property Services Inc.

With respect to supportive services, four (4) participants were successfully matched with faith teams and nine were matched with mentoring teams. Faith teams and mentors worked with clients to develop healthy relationships and boundaries. It was reported that faith teams and mentors also served to replace the criminal peers of participants with more positive influences. The following case notes on three of the four participants who were matched with faith teams illustrate how faith teams have been instrumental in the lives of CAGI participants.

- **Participant #33 has been connected to his Faith Team since December 2009. When he was first introduced to his team, he told them he was “not looking for a faith team, but for a family”. The team has supported and remained with the participant through a number of challenges and life situations: the murder of a cousin, the birth of a child, and a very difficult relationship with the child’s mother. They have helped him find employment and housing, develop a budget, and learn to live within his means. As the one year point approached, both the participant and the team agreed to continue the partnership because of the client’s struggles. At a recent presentation, one team member**
spoke about how meaningful the partnership has been and how it has enriched everyone’s life.

- Participant #19 was connected to a faith team in January 2010. The participant had already completed post-release supervision, but was struggling with family and sobriety issues while continuing to work with CJRC. Staff felt he could benefit from the support of a team. The team was working to assist with job leads, housing, and relationship issues. Team agreed to suspend involvement when client became non-compliant with CJRC. Continued drug use presented a potential safety concern for client and it was apparent that the team was working harder on his employment search than client was himself. The client changed his residence and cell phone number without informing the team, and it became apparent that he was not committed to the partnership. The partnership was suspended at the end of March at the request of CJRC.

- Participant #39 was referred to RCND in May 2010. He appreciated the partnership and support while struggling through issues concerning his family (death of a family matriarch, birth of a child), housing, and employment. RCND and the team provided financial support to the client and his family on several occasions, e.g. birthdays, Christmas. When the client was charged with Felony Breaking and Entering, the team maintained regular contact with him and provided (especially emotional) support until his post-release supervision was revoked in May 2011 upon conviction on those charges.

In terms of substance abuse services, twenty-seven (27) participants were in need of and received substance abuse treatment services. Eighteen (18) participants with a substance abuse diagnosis were placed in an intensive outpatient program for substance abuse treatment. Nine (9) participants were placed in regular outpatient programs for substance abuse treatment. Placement in intensive and regular outpatient programs indicated a substance abuse diagnosis or a substance dependence diagnosis in remission.

In addition to the aforementioned services, participants were provided with counseling services, mental health services, and services that addressed their basic needs:

- Thirteen (13) participants attended a CBI (Cognitive Behavioral Interventions) program. According to the staff of CJRC, CBI works to assist the client with identifying errors that have led to criminal activity in the past and to replace faulty thinking with new thinking to increase the likelihood of positive outcomes.
- Twenty-nine (29) participants attended CJRC’s reentry group. Although the reentry group was based on a cognitive behavioral perspective, the group focused on issues that were specific to the participants’ transition to the community.
- Three (3) participants received mental health services.
• Two (2) participants were unable to work and received assistance in applying for Social Security Disability.
• One (1) CAGI participant was referred and received medical care.
• Four (4) participants received Food Assistance (not eligible for Food Stamps) 
• Twelve (12) participants received clothing
• Two (2) participants received clothing required for employment or training purposes
• Thirty-four (34) participants received bus tickets
• One (1) participant received gas cards for transportation to work
• Eight (8) participants received hygiene packs

In the following section of the report, we present the results of a questionnaire completed with 43 individuals who comprised the 43 closed cases of the CAGI Reentry Program. The questionnaire, which is attached in Appendix E, was administered by the CAGI case manager. The questionnaire included basic demographic data, questions related to drug use, employment, family relationships, gang affiliation, services provided by CJRC, and services provided by CAGI funding. The case manager administered the questionnaire to participants upon their entry into the program, at three months and six months into the program, and/or after the participant had completed all program requirements or had exited the program for other reasons. It should be noted that some of the questions had to be completed by the case manager (e.g. participant program completion, participant reoffended, participant tested positive for controlled substances).

We used the data from the questionnaire to compare the psychosocial characteristics of participants who completed the program with the characteristics of participants who did not complete the program. Similarly, we compared the psychosocial characteristics of participants who reoffended with those participants who had not reoffended.

Results of Questionnaire

Demographics of CAGI Participants

The majority of the 43 participants were men (41 or 95.3%) and of African-American descent (40 or 93.0%). The average age of participants was 23.7 (ranging in age from 18 to 38). The average age of gang membership was 14.4 (ranging in age from 8 to 23). Eleven (25.6%) of the 43 participants completed the Durham-CAGI reentry program, and 32 (74.4%) did not complete the program. Fourteen participants reoffended (32.6%). Of the participants who reoffended, three
participants committed a new gang offense (4.6% or 3 of 14). Twelve (27.9%) of the 43 participants’ post-release supervision was revoked.

Program Completers Compared to Non-Completers

Association between Program Completion and Reoffending

Of the 43 participants, eleven (11) completed the program and thirty-two (32) did not complete the program. Of the participants who completed the program, one (9%) person reoffended. Of the participants who did not complete the program, 13(41%) reoffended. Those who did not complete the program had a higher rate of reoffending compared to those who completed the program.

Age and Age of Gang Membership

The average age of participants who completed the program was 25.5 (sd=5.85), and the average age of participants who did not complete the program was 23.03 (sd=3.64). The average age of gang membership of participants who completed the program was 14.56 (sd= 1.88). The average age of gang membership of participants who did not complete the program was 14.37 (sd= 5.84). There were no significant differences between the two groups with respect to age and age of gang membership.

Living Arrangements

Upon entry into the CAGI Reentry Program, the majority of the participants resided with a parent or relative. As indicated in table 4.1 below, 72.7% of participants who completed the program and 68.8% of participants who did not complete the program resided with a parent or relative. A higher proportion of participants who did not complete the program (5, or 15.6%) resided in a halfway house, as compared to participants who completed the program (1, or 9.1%). Three, or 9.4%, of the participants who did not complete the program resided with a significant other. None of the program completers reported residing with a significant other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Living Arrangement</th>
<th>Program Completers (n=11)</th>
<th>Program Non Completers (n=32)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Apartment, Room, or House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone Else’s Apartment, Room, or House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential treatment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Relative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Descriptive statistics were calculated on the results. Chi-square and t-test statistics were conducted to examine differences between program completers and non-program completers and between re-offenders and non-reoffenders on demographic, drug use, employment, and service provided variables. In some instances, when chi square test statistics were not appropriate, Fisher’s exact tests were conducted.

With an alpha level of .05, there was not an association between program completion and reoffending (p=.07). However, with an alpha level of .10, the Fisher’s exact test indicated an association between program completion and reoffending. Those who did not complete the program had a higher rate of reoffending compared to those who completed the program.

Independent group t tests were conducted to determine if there were any differences between the two groups on the variables of age and age at gang membership. With an alpha level of (.05 or .10), the t test procedure indicated that there were no significant differences between the two groups on these variables.

### Lifetime Drug Use

Participants were asked about their lifetime use (have you ever used) of the following drugs: methamphetamine, powder cocaine, crack cocaine, prescription drugs and heroin. They were also asked: Did you use drugs or alcohol while you were incarcerated? As indicated in Table 4.2 below, there were no significant differences between those who completed the program and those who did not complete the program for lifetime use of methamphetamine, with a prevalence of 12.5% (1 of 8) for completers, compared to 5.3% (1 of 19) for non-completers. There was not a significant difference between those who completed the program and those who did not complete the program for lifetime use of powder cocaine, with a prevalence of 33.3% (3 of 9) for completers, compared to 42.1% (8 of 19) for non-completers. For lifetime use of prescription drugs, there was a significant difference between completers and non-completers, with a prevalence of 100% (9 out of 9) for completers compared to 68.4% (13 out of 19) for non-completers. There was a significant difference between the two groups for the lifetime use of crack cocaine with a prevalence of 22% (2 of 9) for completers, compared to 0% (0 of 19) for non-completers. Both groups reported no lifetime use of heroin. There was not a significant difference between those who completed the program and those who did not complete the program for the use of drugs or alcohol while incarcerated, with a prevalence of 45.5% (5 out of 11) compared to 56.0% (14 of 25) for non-completers.

### Table 4.2 Lifetime Drug Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Drugs</th>
<th>Program Completers (n=11)#</th>
<th>Program Non-Completers (n=32)#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methamphetamine</td>
<td>1 (n=8) 12.5%</td>
<td>1 (n=19) 5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder Cocaine</td>
<td>3 (n=9) 33.3%</td>
<td>8 (n=19) 42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Drugs</td>
<td>9 (n=9) 100.0%</td>
<td>13 (n=19) 68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>0 (n=8) 0%</td>
<td>0 (n=19) 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Drugs while Incarcerated</th>
<th>2 (n=9)</th>
<th>22.2%</th>
<th>0 (n=19)</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#The bracketed (n=) denotes the number of respondents who answered the question.
*Significance at the .05 level, **Significance at the .01 level

**Employment**

Participants who completed the program reported a higher rate (36.4% or 2 of 11) of employment as compared to participants who did not complete the program (14.3% or 4 of 28). The difference was not significant.

**Service Needs**

With respect to CJRC’s standard in-house services, nearly all of the 43 participants received case management services (100% of program completers and 90% of non-program completers). As indicated in table 4.3 below, participants who did not complete the program were significantly more likely to have received GED/Adult Basic Education services as compared to participants who completed the program. Participants who completed the program were significantly more likely to have received transportation services and referrals, as compared to participants who did not complete the program. There were no significant differences between the two groups in the receipt of employment readiness services, outpatient substance abuse treatment, family counseling, cognitive behavioral interventions, and bus passes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3 Service Needs: CJRC’s In-House Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CJRC’s Standard Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED/Adult Basic Education*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Substance Abuse Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of CAGI services, as indicated in Table 4.4, participants who completed the program were significantly more likely to have received vocational training (40% or 4 of 10) as compared to participants who did not complete the program (3.6% or 1 of 28). Although no statistical differences were observed, participants who completed the program had a higher rate, as compared to participants who did not complete the program, of receiving the following CAGI services: Housing/rent assistance (33.3% compared to 28.6%); financial assistance (33.3% compared to 10.7%); and clothing (33.3% compared to 14.8%). Participants who did not complete the program, as compared to participants who completed the program, had a higher rate of receiving the following services: faith team services (11.1% compared to 14.3%); mentoring (17.9% compared to 11.1%); food assistance (17.9% compared to 0%); and bus passes (89.3% compared to 70.0%). However, these differences were not significant.

### Table 4.4 Service Needs: CAGI Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Services</th>
<th>Program Completers* (n=11)</th>
<th>Program Non-Completers* (n=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAGI Voucher Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training**</td>
<td>4(n=10)</td>
<td>1(n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Teams</td>
<td>1(n=9)</td>
<td>4(n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>1(n=9)</td>
<td>5(n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing/Rent Assistance</td>
<td>3(n=9)</td>
<td>8(n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Assistance</td>
<td>0(n=9)</td>
<td>1(n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>3(n=9)</td>
<td>3(n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>3(n=9)</td>
<td>4(n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>0(n=9)</td>
<td>5(n=23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The bracketed (n=) denotes the number of respondents who answered the question.

** Significance at the .05 level, *** Significance at the .10 level
Family Contact

Participants were asked about family contact (e.g., how often do you communicate with your parents, siblings, significant other, extended family, and children). As indicated in Table 4.5, the majority of the participants who responded to the questions, irrespective if they completed the program or not, reported that they communicated with their parents often six (6) months prior to prison. At three (3) month and 6 (6) month time periods (after incarceration), the majority of respondents who answered the questions reported that they communicated with their parents often. Similarly, at these three time periods, the majority of respondents who answered the questions stated that they communicated with their children, siblings, and significant others often.

Six months prior to incarceration, the majority of the participants who completed the program reported that they communicated with their extended family sometimes. The majority of participants reported that they communicated with their extended family rarely. At three months and 6 months into the CAGI Reentry Program, the majority of program completers reported that they communicated with their extended family often. At three months into the CAGI Reentry Program, the majority of program non-completers reported that they communicated with their extended family rarely. At six months into the CAGI Reentry Program, the majority of program non-completers reported that they never communicate with their extended family.

Reoffenders Compared to Non-Reoffenders

In this section of the report, we compare participants who reoffended with those who did not reoffend while enrolled in the CAGI-Reentry Program. Fourteen (32.6%) of the 43 participants reoffended and 29(67.4%) did not reoffend. Of those who reoffended, three had a new gang offense.

Age and Age of Gang Membership

The average age of participants who reoffended was 23.29 (sd 3.54), and the average age of participants who did not reoffend was 23.86 (sd=4.78). The average age of gang membership of participants who reoffended was 13.78 (sd= 3.35). The average age of gang membership of participants who did not reoffend was 14.74 (sd= 2.78). There were no significant differences between the two groups with respect to age and age of gang membership.

---

7 Independent group t tests were conducted to determine if there were any differences between the two groups on the variables of age and age at gang membership. With an alpha level of (.05 or .10), the t test procedure indicated that there were no significant differences between the two groups on these variables.
Living Arrangements

As indicated in table 4.6 below, 92.9% of participants who reoffended and 58.6% of participants who did not reoffend resided with a parent or relative. None of the participants who reoffended lived in a halfway house; 20.7% of the non-reoffenders lived in a halfway house. One (7.1%) participant who reoffended lived in his/her own apartment, room, or house. None of the non-reoffenders reported living in their own apartment, room, or house.

Table 4.6 Type of Living Arrangement upon Program Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Living Arrangement</th>
<th>Reoffenders#</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (n=14)</td>
<td>N (n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Apartment, Room, or House</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone Else’s Apartment, Room, or House</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway House</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (20.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential treatment</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent/Relative</td>
<td>13 (92.9%)</td>
<td>17 (58.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant Other</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>2 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Housing</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>2 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#Some participants had more than one type of living arrangement. Therefore, the total number of living arrangements equals 16.

Lifetime Drug Use

Participants were asked about their lifetime use (have you ever used) of the following drugs: methamphetamine, powder cocaine, crack cocaine, prescription drugs, and heroin. They were also asked: Did you use drugs or alcohol while you were incarcerated? As indicated in Table 4.7 below, there were no significant differences between those who reoffended and those who did not reoffend for lifetime use of methamphetamine, with a prevalence of 9.1% (1 of 11) for reoffenders, compared to 6.3% (1 of 16) for non-offenders. There was no significant difference between those who reoffended and those who did not reoffend for lifetime use of powder cocaine, with a prevalence of 36.4% (4 of 11) for offenders, compared to 41.2% (7 of 17) for non-offenders. There was no significant difference between those who reoffended and those who did not reoffend for lifetime use of crack cocaine, with a prevalence of 9.1% (1 of 11) for reoffenders, compared to 5.9% (1 of 17) for non-offenders. Both groups reported no lifetime use of heroin.

For lifetime use of prescription drugs, there was no significant difference between reoffenders and non-reoffenders, with a prevalence of 81.8% (9 of 11) for reoffenders compared to 76.5% (13 of 17) for non-reoffenders. There was no significant difference between those who reoffended and those who did not reoffend for the use of drugs or alcohol while incarcerated, with a prevalence of 58.3% (7 of 12) for reoffenders compared to 50.0% (12 of 24) for non-reoffenders.

Table 4.7 Lifetime Drug Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reoffenders</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug Type</th>
<th>N (n=14)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N (n=29)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methamphetamine</td>
<td>1 (n=11)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1 (n=16)</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powder Cocaine</td>
<td>4 (n=11)</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>7 (n=17)</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Drugs</td>
<td>9 (n=11)</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>13 (n=17)</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>0 (n=11)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0 (n=16)</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crack Cocaine</td>
<td>1 (n=11)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>1 (n=17)</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Drugs while Incarcerated</td>
<td>7 (n=12)</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>12 (n=24)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some respondents did not answer all questions, or answered more than once.

Employment

Participants who reoffended reported a lower rate (7.7% or 1 of 12) of employment, as compared to participants who did not reoffend (26.9% or 7 of 19). The difference was not significant.

Service Needs

With respect to CJRC’s standard in-house services, nearly all of the 43 participants received case management services (92.9% of reoffenders and 92.6% of non-reoffenders). As indicated in Table 4.8 below, participants who did not reoffend were significantly more likely to have received transportation services and clothing assistance, as compared to participants who reoffended.

Participants who reoffended had a higher rate of receiving GED/adult basic education services, family counseling, outpatient substance abuse treatment, cognitive behavioral intervention, and undergoing drug testing as compared to participants who did not reoffend. The differences, however, were not significant. Conversely, participants who did not reoffend had a higher rate of receiving employment readiness services, transitional living services, referrals and bus passes as compared to participants who reoffended. The differences, however, were not significant.

Table 4.8 Service Needs: CJRC’s In-House Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Services</th>
<th>Reoffenders (n=14)</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJRC’s Standard Services</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management</td>
<td>13 (n=14)</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED/Adult Basic Education</td>
<td>5 (n=14)</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Readiness</td>
<td>6 (n=14)</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Substance Abuse Treatment</td>
<td>9 (n=14)</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Counseling</td>
<td>2 (n=14)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Behavioral Interventions</td>
<td>5 (n=14)</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Living</td>
<td>2 (n=14)</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation*</td>
<td>1 (n=14)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of CAGI services, as indicated in Table 4.9, reoffenders had a higher rate of receiving utility and food assistance as compared to non-reoffenders. The differences, however, were not significant. Conversely, non-reoffenders had a higher rate of receiving vocational training, faith team supportive services, mentoring, housing/rent assistance, financial assistance, clothing assistance, and bus passes, as compared to reoffenders. The differences, however, were not significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Services</th>
<th>Reoffenders# (n=14)</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders# (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAGI Voucher Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training</td>
<td>0(n=13) 0%</td>
<td>5(n=25) 20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Teams</td>
<td>1(n=13) 7.7%</td>
<td>4(n=24) 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>1(n=13) 7.7%</td>
<td>5(n=24) 20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing/Rent Assistance</td>
<td>3(n=13) 23.1%</td>
<td>8(n=24) 33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Assistance</td>
<td>1(n=13) 7.7%</td>
<td>0(n=24) 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistance</td>
<td>2(n=13) 15.4%</td>
<td>4(n=24) 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td>1(n=12) 8.3%</td>
<td>6(n=24) 25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>2(n=13) 15.4%</td>
<td>3(n=24) 12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Passes</td>
<td>10(n=13) 76.9%</td>
<td>22(n=25) 88.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#The bracketed (n=) denotes the number of respondents who answered the question.

**Family Contact**

Participants were asked about family contact (e.g., how often do you communicate with your parents, siblings, significant other, extended family, and children). As indicated in Table 4.10, the majority of the participants who responded to the questions, irrespective of if they reoffended or not, reported that six (6) months prior to prison they communicated with their parents **often**. At three (3) month and six (6) month (after incarceration) time periods, the majority of respondents who answered the questions reported that they communicated with their parents **often**. Similarly, at these three time periods, the majority of reoffenders and non-reoffenders who answered the questions stated that they communicated with their children, siblings, and significant others **often**. In terms of extended family, the majority of reoffenders reported that (6) months prior to prison they communicated with their extended family **sometimes**. At three (3) month and six (6) month (after incarceration) time periods, the majority of respondents who answered the questions reported that they communicated with their extended family **sometimes**.

Six of twenty non-reoffenders reported that six months prior to incarceration they communicated with their extended family sometimes, and six of twenty non-offenders reported that they communicated with their extended family rarely. At three months into the CAGI Reentry Program, the majority of non-reoffenders reported that they never communicate with their extended family. At six months into the CAGI Reentry Program, three of ten non-reoffenders
reported that they communicated with their extended family *often*; three reported that they *rarely* communicated with their extended family; and three reported that they *never* communicate with their extended family.

Table 4.10 Family Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you communicate with your parents?</th>
<th>Reoffenders (n=14)</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months prior to incarceration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you communicate with your child or children?</th>
<th>Reoffenders (n=14)</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months prior to incarceration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you communicate with your siblings?</th>
<th>Reoffenders (n=14)</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months prior to incarceration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you communicate with your significant other?</th>
<th>Reoffenders (n=14)</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months prior to incarceration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you communicate with your extended family?</th>
<th>Reoffenders (n=14)</th>
<th>Non-Reoffenders (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six months prior to incarceration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three months into the CAGI program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Six months into the AGI program

|       | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 10 |

Success and Challenges

Overall, this component of CAGI did experience some successes. Many of these successes were outlined in the aforementioned sections of this chapter. For example, the CJRC was able to accomplish all five of its activity objectives. It exceeded the number of offenders it identified it would serve (projected to serve 50, but served 53), developed a system to identify STG inmates prior to their release, selected other participants who came through channels other than the Department of Corrections, and identified several service providers who offered services through vouchers, contracts, or at no cost to the Durham-CAGI grant. Some of these services included housing, substance abuse and mental health treatment, and clothing. Twenty-nine (29), more than 50%, of the participants received employment services from CJRC. Eleven (11) participants enrolled in vocational training programs and five enrolled in post-secondary educational institutions. The obtaining of services and leveraging local resources to strengthen the service capacity of this component is a tribute to the CJRC management of this component.

CJRC, however, did have challenges meeting its outcomes as indicated by the evaluation findings. The program could not get a significant number of participants to successfully complete the program (only 26%); many of the participants had motivational and social problems. For instance, over 50% of participants in the program used illegal drugs at some point during the program and had to receive substance abuse services. It also could not be determined what the significant differences were between those who re-offended and those who did not or between those who completed the program and those who did not, making it a challenge for staff to determine how to better match offenders with the best services for their success.

One major challenge that CJRC faced was engaging CAGI participants. According to CJRC staff, it was difficult to engage CAGI participants for some of the following reasons:

- **This population had very low motivation to change specific behaviors, such as marijuana use. Many reported not wanting to continue gang involvement but still wanted to maintain a certain social status within their communities, which seemed to require that they maintain some type of gang association.**

- **They had a great need for immediate gratification. While frequently they reported wanting to go to programs or classes, they rarely could stay focused long enough to follow-up with those goals. CJRC had very stringent steps to follow to request monies or pay for services, and often this did not happen fast enough to suit clients.**

- **In comparison with other populations that CJRC has served over the years the overall difference is that this population was younger and most had simply not hit any type of 'rock bottom' that would motivate them to change. Serving prison time was**
just an expected outcome to the life they were living. They had not lost anything of value to them that had made them change their behavior. These of course are generalities and did not apply to all.

CJRC may want to explore how it can better address some of the factors that its staff observed as barriers to engaging participants (e.g. levels of motivation, involvement with gangs, maturity, and speedier access to services). CJRC may in its future planning want to consider how to begin addressing these issues with a participant while he/she is still incarcerated.

In addressing what works with this population, CJRC could also consider the use of alternative methods that are geared toward treatment modalities based on levels of gang involvement (Schram & Gaines, 2005), and on the psychosocial risk profile of the participant. The necessary intervention for participants could range from less to more intensive depending on the psychosocial profile of the participant.

Chapter 5: Lessons Learned and Recommendations

In this concluding chapter, we present key lessons learned and recommendations based on the evaluation findings.

Lessons Learned

There have been a number of lessons learned from the implementation of the CAGI Project. Hopefully, being cognizant of these lessons can serve to improve the planning, design, and evaluation of projects undertaken in the future.

- Evaluation Plan

Although there were early attempts to develop a detailed evaluation plan on which both Durham/Wake and the evaluators could concur, this did not occur until the project was mid-way into implementation. An assessment during the first year of the project by the evaluation team revealed that the CAGI Project was output oriented and lacked coordination of the various project components, but the lengthy contract negotiations on how to best address this problem and how to best involve the service providers was not worked out until late in the second year of the project. This process limited the amount and quality of data available for evaluation purposes. In projects with various components such as CAGI, these details need to be worked out and agreed on preferably within the first year of the project’s operation. Had this occurred in CAGI, this would have made for a more robust evaluation.

- Objectives and Outcomes Aligned

Projects must have inputs and outputs clearly aligned with measureable outcomes in order to measure accomplishments adequately. The chosen activities (input and outputs) should be clearly related to the stated outcome so that it can easily be seen how this activity could influence or bring about the change as stated in the outcome. The
outcomes in all three CAGI components were written in output terms, often making it challenging to establish a relationship between inputs and outcomes. Examples of this are the challenge to measure the impact on gang reduction and violence that results from luncheons and community vigils on violence held by the faith-based community or how to accurately measure the impact on gang violence due to ride-a-longs with police and trauma services offered by the North Carolina Child Response Initiative.

- **Writing of Measureable Objectives**

In the CAGI Project very few objectives written in the three components were written in terms that would allow for clear measurement of impact on stated goals or outcomes (e.g. the monthly Gun Review Meetings whereby all gun arrest cases in Durham are reviewed by a committee of law enforcement representatives) You can count the meetings, but you should be able to measure by how much it will impact the outcome. Advice with writing outcomes in measureable terms would also help to determine the type and data that needs to be collected in order to substantiate results.

- **Coordination of the Components of a Project to Ensure Success**

Although there was a clear attempt by the CAGI Project to provide good coordination by having an oversight committee and a project administrator, it did not consistently yield the results anticipated. Each component still appeared to be run separately (the re-entry component even had a separate contract with the Governors Crime Commission for the same project) with few incidents of overlap found that focused on improving the quality of life in the target area or its population. The mentoring program that provided after care services to the re-entry population provided by the Religious Coalition was an exception. Although the program administrator was to coordinate the various components, his role did not seem effective, and much of his time seemed spent in monitoring initiatives in the prevention/intervention component of the project.

When there are various components in a project, they need to be developed in a planned manner so they complement and help achieve the stated outcomes. In the case of CAGI, the project components appeared to be disjointed and independent of one another (e.g. many participants did not reside in the Bull’s Eye community). This was further exacerbated by the CAGI components being continuations from their previous service in the community and some being tailored to the project as single add-ons in an attempt to achieve CAGI outcomes (e.g. Religious Coalition and CHAMPS).

In summary, as outlined by other researchers (Chapin Hall, 2005) a “full-scale implementation of any major initiative would seem prudent only if the effort fully addresses the following questions:

- *Is there enough validity and strength in the ideas underpinning the initiative to accomplish its goals and meet its objectives?*

- *Does the initiative articulate a clear pathway for achieving objectives and milestones for documenting progress? In other words, is there a road map guiding the implementation?*
Does the initiative provide criteria for strategically prioritizing objectives in order to maximize impact?

Does the initiative have clearly defined requirements for gathering information about the effectiveness of the strategies chosen and a well-articulated plan for using what is learned to improve implementation?

We concur, “if a proposed initiative does not explicitly address the aforementioned questions, the odds of achieving full implementation and robust findings are severely compromised.”

Conclusion and Recommendations

Overall, our findings show that the suppression component of Durham-CAGI was meaningful, and that there was an association between the intervention and reductions of violent crimes committed with a firearm in the Bull’s Eye area. We were not able to examine or determine which strategies or interventions of the suppression component were associated with the reduction in violent crimes. In addition, we were not able to determine if the prevention-intervention and reentry components contributed to reduction of violent crimes because the prevention-intervention and reentry components did not focus its services and activities exclusively within the target area. In light of the evaluation’s findings, lessons learned, and extant research, the following recommendations are made:

Overall Recommendations

**Recommendation 1**: Conduct careful strategic planning in the development, implementation, and management of future anti-gang initiatives.

**Recommendation 2**: Partner with researchers to design and measure gang enforcement initiatives.

**Recommendation 3**: Develop a protocol for sharing information between and across all three components that protects confidentiality and advances the efforts of anti-gang initiatives.

Component Recommendations

**Suppression Component**

**Recommendation**: As part of strategic planning efforts, continue to provide law enforcement officers with specialized law enforcement training on how gangs operate generally. (See Best
Practices section for other suggestions that may improve the use of suppression to reduce gang activities.

**Prevention and Intervention Component**

**Recommendation 1**: Provide stronger implementation and coordination of prevention and intervention components. This recommendation is made in light of lessons learned and extant research. As mentioned in the Lessons Learned section of this report, the prevention/intervention component of Durham-CAGI was not consistently carried out in a way that could have resulted in clear and possibly lasting quality of life changes in the Bull’s Eye area. Research on gangs indicates that members involvement with gangs often stem from trying to meet social needs. This is illustrated by the following assessments:

Two recent North Carolina gang assessments found that juveniles reported joining a gang primarily due to ‘need-based’ motivators. Findings showed that 36.8% (n= 91) of gang members joined because they needed money and only 35.9% (n= 89) reported joining for protection. Conversely, 47.0% (n=116) joined a gang for a sense of belonging. This statistic is dwarfed by the finding that 68.3% (n=168) of the gang members in this study joined the gang for excitement. When disaggregating the data, one county showed that 72.6% of their gang members joined the gang for excitement (Perry et al., 2010). A further analysis of these findings led researchers (Parker et al, 2011) to agree with previous research (Spergel, 1992; Spergel & Grossman, 1997; Jackson et al., 2005) that supports the idea of gangs being addressed from a social work perspective.

**Recommendation 2**: Incorporate programs that include obtaining GED (e.g. EDGE or other educational programs that contribute to improving the quality of life for a young person.

**Recommendation 3**: Develop an interview protocol for capturing the long term outcomes of children and youth who receive prevention/intervention services.

**Recommendation 4**: Obtain support from administrators of the Durham Public School System and include them in the planning of future anti-gang initiatives. School is an important part of a young person’s life, and therefore schools need to be involved early in the planning of future gang-initiatives to facilitate services, and to contribute to improving the quality of life for a young person. Furthermore, research indicates that poor school achievement and attachment are predictors of gang membership (Hill, Howell, Hawkins & Pearson, 1999).

**Recommendation 5**: Explore ways and develop a service delivery model to engage youth and their families that would be ongoing in the Bull’s Eye area.

**Recommendation 6**: Continue to build public awareness of violence and gang activity, and design programs that directly reduce violence and address gangs and gang-related issues.

**Reentry Component**

**Recommendation 1**: Explore ways and develop a service delivery model to engage high-impact gang-involved offenders returning to the community after incarceration.
**Recommendation 2:** Explore types of specialized treatment that recognizes gang membership may be an impediment to programming efforts (Schram & Gaines, 2005). However, because “gang affiliation at any level may not be an impediment to rehabilitation programming” it is important to develop treatment modalities based on the level of gang involvement (Schram & Gaines, 2005, p.13) and psychosocial risk profiles (suggesting that it may be necessary to provide interventions that range from less to more intensive).
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