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Agenda

• Evolution of Institutionalization with the LPD
• Practices and Principles of Institutionalization
• Developing a Plan
• Sustaining the Plan
• Challenges
Evolution of Institutionalization within the LPD

Test Strategies

Incorporate Training

Reorganization
Practices and Principles of Institutionalization

• Embedding the evidence-based practices (Smart Policing) within the organization.

• Smart Policing as a concept and not a project.

• Updating policies and institutionalized practices.
## Development of a Plan

### Questions to ask yourself while building a plan:

1. Are you relying too much on outside funding while testing concepts?
2. Do your line level officers know the concepts?
3. Do your supervisors know and understand the concepts?
4. Who is your driving force?
Sustaining the Plan

When do you start thinking about sustainability?
Challenges

Officer Resistance
- It’s just another project

Timing
- Leadership changes
- Changes take time

Technology
- Delays in implementation
- Does not work as planned
PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM A MULTI-AGENCY FOCUSED DETERRENCE APPROACH

Operation RASOR – Cambridge SPI
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1) Prevent future victimization and social harm of the offenders;
2) Reduce crime within the three cities of Cambridge (CPD), Everett (EPD), and Somerville (SPD); and
3) Determine whether the modified focused deterrence approach is a successful strategy.
Operation RASOR

- Cross-Jurisdictional
- 3 District Courts
- Data Driven
- Social Harm
- Limited leverage
- Complete partnership with services providers
- Police assist with service delivery & case management

Pulling Levers

- Single Jurisdiction
- 1 District Court
- Officer identified
- Violent crimes
- Complete leverage
- Separate messages from providers & law enforcement
- Police typically focus on traditional enforcement efforts only
FIVE PHASES OF INTERVENTION

1) Identification
2) Outreach
3) Notification Meeting
4) Resource Delivery
5) Relentless follow up
IDENTIFICATION PHASE

- Regional database combined RMS for CPD, SPD, and EPD
- Over 300,000 unique individuals
- Over 5,000 are a defendant/suspect and cross jurisdictional
- Algorithm used to determine social harm score
  - offense weight, role of individual, gang involvement, use of firearm, drugs, and the time lapse between the incident and the present
SOCIAL HARM
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OUTREACH PHASE

- Crime analysts, police officers, and detectives develop detailed case profiles
- Each candidate is assigned a police case manager who notifies candidate of status as an impact player
- Candidates provided invitation to the notification meeting
- Case manager attempts to engage the family or friends of candidate
NOTIFICATION MEETING PHASE

- Candidates informed of the harm they are causing to communities
- Partnership between agencies are available to assist in change behavior
  + Substance abuse programs, employment opportunities, housing options, and other available services
- Continued criminal behavior will resort in a combined effort to hold candidate accountable
  + Arrests, prosecutions, and enhanced sanctions
  + Risk of punishment is higher because they are being watched
RESOURCE DELIVERY PHASE

- Participants meet with the social service provider coordinator for an assessment.
- Develop goals and an action plan
- Social service coordinator and police case manager provide follow up with participant
Case managers track participants
+ work with the probation, parole, prosecutors, judges, and federal law enforcement agencies to ensure adherence to desisting from criminal activity or providing necessary information for enhanced enforcement efforts

Crime analysts present information at roll call briefings and through bulletins to officers within three cities and the broader metropolitan region
A randomized controlled trial (RCT)

Randomized block design and stratified allocation for top 150 offenders on list

Top 1-50 in database randomly assigned to Treatment & Control groups

allows for equal numbers of treatment and control groups for each notification meeting
OFFENDER CANDIDATES

- Not in-custody or wanted – were invited to meetings by mail and in-person visits
- Outstanding arrest warrants – police conducted warrant sweeps and if arrested and held for arraignment these offenders were invited to meeting
- In-custody – were in jail or prison so case managers arranged individual notification meetings prior to (when feasible) or upon release
THREE NOTIFICATION MEETINGS HELD

Treatment candidates self-select into two groups:

- **Participants** – those who chose to participate
  - Completed intake assessment & develop treatment/action plans
  - Met regularly with their case management team

- **Non-participants** – those who chose not to participate (or are removed)
  - Received more intensive enforcement efforts through a plan developed for each offender by case management team
75% male
Average age is 32 yrs
80% of candidates met with police case managers prior to notification meeting
44% of candidates attended notification meeting
56% of candidates received enhanced enforcement efforts
32% of candidates are serving jail/prison time
28% of candidates are in treatment
Police case managers worked an average of 12 hours per candidate
PARTICIPANT 1

- Chronic offender, about 50 arrests prior to involvement in the program.
- A&Bs, larcenies, domestics, A&B with a dangerous weapon, B&Es, resisting arrest, etc.
- Homeless (staying in shelters or street)
- Case management team persuaded court to keep her in jail on a $5000 bail bond, with an expedited trial, and sentence to prison
PARTICIPANT 2

- Chronic offender, over 70 arrests prior to involvement in program
- Several restraining orders, A&Bs, domestics, intimidation, disorderly conduct, B&Es, larceny, and others
- He and his wife attended the meeting
- They were crying and hugging each other after the meeting saying, “somebody cares about us.”
- He has not worked in over 30 years and is currently working, no new arrests, and looking for housing
PARTICIPANT 3

- Chronic offender, gangs, A&Bs with a dangerous weapon, intimidation, restraining order, etc
- being investigated by the FBI and Boston’s Special Investigation Unit
- six months pregnant
- very cooperative with all the investigations and helped to solve some cold cases
- She has since had her baby, is working a job, taking parenting classes, and doing well
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The Las Vegas metropolitan statistical area had a population of 1,967,721 in 2011.
Research Questions

In high-crime Las Vegas neighborhoods, what are the racial and ethnic differences in the perception of both major crime and minor crime in their neighborhoods?

How do these perceptions differ (or not) from official crime data?

How might factors such as English-language fluency and nativity status explain Hispanic differences in perceptions of crime and police effectiveness?
Hispanic Growth Patterns in Las Vegas

- One of the highest domestic net migration rates in the country during the early 2000’s (Perry 2006).

- In 2012, Las Vegas had a Hispanic/Latino population that represented 30% of the total metropolitan area.

LVMPD “Saturation” Team

Directed Patrol

‘Hot Spot’ Analyses

Order Maintenance

Policing of Disorder

The unit is proactive

Officers are urged to use discretion

Focus is on managing minor offenses
Data Collection

24 high crime sector beats in Las Vegas
- Matched Pairs Design
  - 12 received saturation “treatment”
  - 12 served as control areas
- 60-day saturation treatment
- Four Waves of 60-days each
- Collect Official Crime Data
- Collect Residential Survey Data

Official Crime Data
- Calls for Service Data
  - Person stops
  - Vehicle stops
  - Disorder Calls
  - Weapons Calls
  - Violent Calls

Residential Survey
- N=12 areas (n=821 residents)
- 6 treatment & 6 control groups
- Waves 2, 3, & 4
- Survey took place within 5 days after the 60-day period
Table 2. Residential Survey Time Period, Dates, and Sample Sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Time Period</th>
<th>Saturation Dates</th>
<th>Survey Dates</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wave 2 Saturation*</td>
<td>May 1 to June 30, 2012</td>
<td>July 1, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #1 Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #2 Treatment Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 3 Saturation</td>
<td>July 1 to August 31, 2012</td>
<td>September 1, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #3 Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #4 Treatment Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #5 Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #6 Treatment Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave 4 Saturation</td>
<td>September 1 to October 31, 2012</td>
<td>November 2, 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #7 Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #8 Treatment Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #9 Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #10 Treatment Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #11 Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood #12 Treatment Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Wave 2 residential survey was our pilot test and some surveys took place outside the 1-week post-saturation period.
Research Question 1: In high-crime Las Vegas neighborhoods, what are the racial and ethnic differences in the perception of both major crime and minor crime in their neighborhoods?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5. Perceptions of Specific Crimes by Racial and Ethnic Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much of each activity seems to be taking place in your neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Break-Ins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Break-Ins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Assaults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 254 \quad 106 \quad 57 \quad 404 \]
Generally, Hispanics are more likely to perceive crime as more frequent in their neighborhoods than Whites and Blacks.

The racial and ethnic disparity between Hispanics and other groups is largest for vandalism, gang activity, drug activity, and robbery.

Drug activity is the neighborhood crime with the strongest perception from Hispanics.
## Research Question 2: How do these perceptions differ (or not) from official crime data?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Crime Data</th>
<th>% Hispanic/Latino</th>
<th>Overall Crime</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Domestic Assault</th>
<th>Drug Activity</th>
<th>Feel Very Unsafe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 7</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 8</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 11</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 12</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 17</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 18</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 21</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 22</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 23</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood 24</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resident perceptions of crime in their neighborhood are not consistent with official crime data.

Neighborhoods that are largely Hispanic have the largest gap between real crime and perceptions of crime.

The neighborhood with the lowest official crime rate (among our 24 neighborhoods) is perceived to be one of the highest crime neighborhoods.
Research Question 3: How might factors such as English-language fluency and nativity status explain Hispanic differences in perceptions of crime and police effectiveness?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic Perceptions of Specific Crimes</th>
<th>Nativity Status</th>
<th>Language of Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native Born</td>
<td>Foreign Born</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much of each activity seems to be taking place in your neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
<td>70.07</td>
<td>65.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
<td>29.93</td>
<td>34.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorderly Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
<td>67.15</td>
<td>68.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
<td>32.85</td>
<td>31.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Break-Ins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
<td>86.86</td>
<td>84.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>15.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Break-Ins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
<td>82.48</td>
<td>89.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
<td>17.52</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Assaults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
<td>81.75</td>
<td>91.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
<td>71.53</td>
<td>70.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
<td>28.47</td>
<td>29.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
<td>52.55</td>
<td>50.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
<td>47.45</td>
<td>49.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat/Not Very Often</td>
<td>70.80</td>
<td>77.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Often/All the Time</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>22.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Native-born and Foreign-born residents are similar in their perceptions of crime, except for home break-ins, domestic assault, and robbery.

Spanish-speaking residents have different perceptions of neighborhood crime – less likely to perceive vandalism and gang activity as serious problems.

Spanish-speaking residents are twice as likely to perceive car break-ins than English-speaking residents.
We find strong evidence for racial and ethnic disparities in perceptions of crime in Las Vegas.

Las Vegas residents living in high-crime neighborhoods perceive crime much differently from real crime.

Regression models indicate that Hispanic residents differ significantly from others in perceptions of gang activity.
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Targeted Problem

• High percentage of violent crime committed by repeat offenders in the late 2000s.

• Escalation in violent offenses for individuals arrested for misdemeanor gun crimes.

• Violent crime was concentrated in specific areas of the city (Downtown and Central Precincts).
Savannah SPI

• Focused on two primary strategies:
  – (1) Identify hot spots and create holistic solutions in partnership with other state and local agencies to address those specific problems;
  – (2) Identify repeat violent offenders and decrease their recidivism by providing intensive monitoring, including electronic monitoring in some cases, and services.

• Implemented through the Savannah Impact Program
  • Multi-agency, police-funded program which provides intensive monitoring and services to high-risk offenders.
Evaluation

• Focus of the evaluation centered on:
  – (1) Evaluating the overall impact of the SPI by examining crime trends pre- and post-implementation;
  – (2) Assessing whether individuals in the Top 100 who received services at SIP committed fewer violent crimes;
  – (3) Interviewing SIP personnel, including employees of the SCMPD, parole, probation, DJJ, Juvenile Court, and service providers.
Crime Impact Analysis

• Compared Savannah’s violent crime percentage change (pre- and post-implementation) with similar sized city in GA (Columbus), cities with populations of 100,000 to 249,000, and nationally

• Did not support that SPI had an impact on violent crime, robberies, and aggravated assault
Crime Impact Analysis

- Percentage change in raw count for Central District indicated impact on both the overall amount of violent crime as well as robbery.

**Violent Crime: Precincts Comparison**

**Robbery: Precincts Comparison**
Top 100 Analysis

• SIP examined 2,872 offenders released from GA prisons (2008-2010) and were believed to have returned to Chatham County.

• Top 100 list (really 83) based on point system (seriousness of conviction), leading to older clientele and a re-entry program.

• Treatment group (n = 43):
  – Individuals who expressed interest in the program who did and did not receive services;
  – 60.5% (n = 26) received some form of service from SIP.

• Control group (n = 40):
  – Had intel file;
  – Not chosen randomly; consisted of individuals who were placed into that group for different reasons;

• Comparison group (n = 64):
  – Created to match the treatment group, not services group.
Top 100 Analysis

• Dependent Variables Sources:
  – Arrest data for county through 9/30/13 (up to 30 months);
  – Suspect/never arrested (limited to SCMPD).

• Independent Variables:
  – Background
    • Race; age; release type; probation; crime type; points.
  – Interventions:
    • Whether intel file was created;
    • Treatment oriented: (for 6, 12, 18, 24, and 30 month time periods);
      – Whether received any service within that total time period (overall and for employment);
      – How many time periods they received services (overall and for employment).
Top 100 Analysis

• Univariate analyses did not indicate treatment and service groups committed fewer crimes than the control and comparison groups.

• Difference of proportion tests:
  – Treatment group that received services appeared to do better than non-services treatment group but was only significant at one time point (24 month).
  – Treatment group fared worse than other groups (more so for control group than comparison group).

• Correlations:
  – No service measure (regardless of measurement) was significantly correlated with any offending measure at any stage.
Top 100 Analysis

• Separate logistic regression models ran for each time period (6, 12, 18, 24, and 30 months), for each combination of dependent measure (arrest, violent crime arrest, combined, and combined arrest) and service measure (service, dichotomized service, employment service, and dichotomized employment service)

• Findings:
  – Age, sentence (parole), probation, and Intel not sig.
  – Generally saw that individuals who had been incarcerate for violent offense were less likely to be arrested in the future.
  – Providing treatment services reduced future offending at certain time periods if using one-tailed test of significance.
**Interview Analysis**

- Interviewed SIP personnel (30-60 minutes long) in January and November 2013.
- **General consensus:**
  - Effective program because it consists of multiple agencies, balances treatment with enforcement, and was successfully able to provide services to high-risk offenders;
  - Believed that providing services to clients improved views;
  - Officers/detectives’ lack of awareness about SIP changing;
  - Agencies loved SIP;
  - SIP improved relationships between agencies;
  - Provided possible issues for police administration to examine;
  - Considered the Smart Policing components sustainable because of effectiveness and because integral parts of SIP.
Conclusions and Recommendations

• Final report has advice for other agencies wanting to create Top 100 lists in order to provide services.
• Final report has advice for other cities or agencies wanting to create collaborations similar to SIP.
• SIP is an innovative program that brings multiple agencies together to better the community by monitoring and providing services to Savannah’s highest risk offenders.
• It is an example of how police departments can experiment with new ideas on how to provide better services to its community members before implementing them more fully at the departmental level.
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Examples of Barriers to Organizational Reform

• The Influence of Tradition
• The Influence of the Paramilitary Organization
• Institutional Arrogance
Key Components to Organizational Reform

• Identification
• Leadership
• Organizational Goals and Core Values
• Identify and Involve Stakeholders & Partners
• Evaluation
• Sustainability
Input and Observation from Panel