A Review of Violence Intervention Programs

Presentation to the LCSO CVIPI Planning Team

Kaylee Noorman & Dr. Kim Davidson

PI: Dr. Thomas Blomberg
Co-PIs: Dr. Emma Fridel & Dr. Kim Davidson

Tallahassee Demographics and Crime Statistics in 2020

- Population: 197,00 (385,000 metro)
  - Race/Ethnicity: 50% White, 36% Black, 7% Hispanic, 3.5% Two or More Races
  - Age: 17% under 18, 10% over 65, Median 27.2
  - Poverty: 25%
- Crime Rate (per 100,000):
  - Violent Crime: 770
  - Property Crime: 2,937
  - Total Crime: 3,707

Literature Review Methods

- Searched CrimeSolutions.gov and peer-reviewed journals for interventions targeting gun violence and violent assaults.

  - Largely focused on interventions that have been deemed effective or promising.

  - For each intervention, the review focused on the 1) intervention activities, 2) methods used for identification of the target population for intervention, 3) intervention effects on gun violence and violent offending behaviors, and 4) barriers to intervention implementation.

- For each intervention site, demographic and crime statistic data were collected for the intervention year.

  - This will be used to inform which intervention strategies may be a good fit based on similarities between Tallahassee's demographics and those of successful intervention sites.

Intervention Strategies

- Identified intervention strategies encompass a range of intervention levels:
  - Law enforcement-based
  - Partnership-oriented
  - Community-based
  - Hospital-based
  - Youth-focused

- Specific programs and projects within these interventions can focus on different specific crimes or different target populations, such as homicide, gun violence, drugs, gangs, or youth.

- Specific programs can be implemented independently or mixed with other intervention strategies.

Law Enforcement-Based Interventions

- **Law enforcement-based interventions** are those which are primarily implemented by local law enforcement agencies.

- Identified programs include Hot Spots Policing, Problem-Oriented Policing, and Focused Deterrence Strategies.

- Although each are distinct programs, law enforcement agencies often incorporate multiple strategies such as a mix of Hot Spots Policing with Problem-Oriented and/or Community-Oriented Policing.

Hot Spots Policing

- **Hot Spots Policing** focuses police resources on micro-geographic locations with high concentrations of crime, particularly drug and gun violence.
    - Police departments typically use a range of tactics within these hot spots such as direct patrol, enhanced traffic stops, foot patrol, and increased surveillance operations.[1, 2]
- Hot spots policing has been found to produce small but significant overall reductions in crime, having the largest reduction effect on drug crimes, followed by disorder outcomes, property outcomes, and violent crime outcomes.[3]
- Hot spots programs that also engage in Problem-Oriented Policing interventions have been found to generate much larger crime control impacts relative to those that simply increased traditional police crime prevention actions such as directed patrol and drug enforcement.[1, 2, 3, 4]

[1]Braga, A. A. (2016). The science and practice of hot-spots policing. In T. G. Blomberg, J. M. Brancale, K. M. Beaver, & W. D. Bales (Eds.), *Advancing criminology and criminal justice policy* (pp. 139-149). Routledge.
[2]National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Proactive policing: Effects on crime and communities.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
[3]Braga, A. A., Turchan, B., Papachristos, A. V., & Hureau, D. M. (2019). Hot spots policing of small geographic areas effects on crime. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*(3).
[4]Rosenfeld, R., Deckard, M. J., & Blackburn, E. (2014). The effects of directed patrol and self-initiated enforcement on firearm violence: A randomized controlled study of hot spots policing. *Criminology, 52*(3), 428-449.

Hot Spots Policing

- Common Pitfalls
  - Officers are often given extensive discretion about which proactive activities to engage in and evaluations of hot spots policing programs often fail to measure which types of activities officers are engaging in within their hot spot locations, making it difficult to know which activities are affecting the outcomes.[1, 2, 3]
  - Among hot spots programs that also engage in Problem-Oriented Policing, the problem analysis engaged in by officers is generally weak, with officers having limited time and data resources to adequately diagnose the problems, resulting in less nuanced interventions.[2, 4]
  - Intervention dosage varies by the level of officer buy-in and has shown to decay over the life of the intervention.[2, 3]
  - Most analyses focus on the immediate impact of hot spots interventions, thus long-term effects are unclear.

[1]Rosenfeld, R., Deckard, M. J., & Blackburn, E. (2014). The effects of directed patrol and self-initiated enforcement on firearm violence: A randomized controlled study of hot spots policing. *Criminology, 52*(3), 428-449.
[2]Taylor, B., Koper, C. S., & Woods, D. J. (2011). A randomized controlled trial of different policing strategies at hot spots of violent crime. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7,* 149-181.
[3]Schaefer, B. P., Hughes, T., & Stelzig, W. C. (2021). Hot spots across the metropolis: Evaluating hot spots directed patrol at city and suburban locations. *Justice Quarterly, 38*(1).
[4]Braga, A. A., & Bond, B. J. (2008). Policing crime and disorder hot spots: A randomized controlled trial. *Criminology, 46*(3), 577-607.

Problem-Oriented Policing

- **Problem-Oriented Policing (POP)** seeks to identify the underlying causes of crime problems and to frame appropriate responses using a wide variety of methods and tactics.[1]

  - POP uses the SARA model (scanning, analysis, response, and assessment) to identify problems, carefully analyze the conditions contributing to the problem, develop a tailored response to target these underlying factors, and evaluate outcome effectiveness.[2]

  - Responses to problems can draw upon a variety of tactics and practices, ranging from arrest of offenders and modification of the physical environment to engagement with community members.[1, 2]

- Problem-oriented policing has been found to significantly reduce overall crime and disorder; however, it appears to be more effective in reducing property crime and disorder offenses, while reductions in violent crime were often not significant.[1, 2, 3]

[1]National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Proactive policing: Effects on crime and communities.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
[2]Hinkle, J. C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., & Petersen, K. (2020). Problem-oriented policing for reducing crime and disorder: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 16*(2).
[3]Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., Waring, E. J., Mazerolle, L. G., Spelman, W., & Gajewski, F. (1999). Problem-oriented policing in violent crime places: A randomized controlled experiment. *Criminology, 37*(3), 541-580.

Problem-Oriented Policing

- Common Pitfalls
  - Programs are often characterized by partial implementations of the SARA model.[1, 2, 3]
    - Problem analyses were often small-scale, with little formal analysis or assessment.
    - This may be attributed to a lack of training/understanding of the SARA model and sufficient resources to fully engage in problem analysis.
  - Programs may also be hindered by a lack of intervention buy-in.[1]
    - Some police departments expressed little interest regarding the intervention, thus provided little administrative support and police training.
    - Resistance from stakeholders, community partners, and community residents unwilling to cooperate with the proposed interventions.

[1]Hinkle, J. C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., & Petersen, K. (2020). Problem-oriented policing for reducing crime and disorder: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 16*(2).

[2]Eck, J. E., & Gallagher, K. (2016). Problem-oriented policing: Evidence v. framing in implementation success. In T. G. Blomberg, J. M. Brancale, K. M. Beaver, & W. D. Bales (Eds.), *Advancing criminology and criminal justice policy* (pp. 129-138). Routledge.

[3]Cordner, G., & Biebel, E. P. (2005). Problem-oriented policing in practice. *Criminology & Public Policy, 4*(2), 155-180.

Focused Deterrence

- **Focused deterrence** programs are designed to change the behavior of chronic offenders and violent groups through partnerships between law enforcement, social services, and community organizations.[1]

  - Focused deterrence programs use activities consistent with POP's SARA model to identify key offenders/groups of offenders for intervention and understand the underlying violence-producing dynamics and conditions.

  - Focused deterrence programs use offender notification strategies to send target offenders/groups a double message, pairing offers of assistance with threats of punishment.

- There are three main operational variations of focused deterrence: 1) Group Violence Intervention; 2) Drug Market Intervention; 3) Individual Offender Strategies

- Focused deterrence programs have been found to produce an overall statistically significant, moderate crime reduction effect; however, program effect sizes varied by program type, with group violence intervention strategies generating larger crime reduction impacts, high-risk individual programs generating moderate effects, and drug market interventions producing the smallest effect.[1, 2, 3]

[1]Braga, A. A., & Kennedy, D. M. (2021). .*A framework for addressing violence and serious crime: Focused deterrence, legitimacy, and prevention* (Elements in Criminology). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[2]Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies effects on crime: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*(3).
[3]National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Proactive policing: Effects on crime and communities.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Focused Deterrence

- **Group Violence Intervention (GVI)** strategies are a type of focused deterrence solution to gun violence centered around the insight that the vast majority of gun violence is perpetrated by incredibly small and easily identifiable segments of a given community.[1]

    - GVI works by identifying individuals and groups most at risk for gun violence, inviting these individuals to a "call-in" consisting of local community members, law enforcement officers, and social service providers to convey a powerful message that gun violence must stop.

    - During call-ins, social service providers also connect at-risk individuals with needed resources to reduce violent behavior.

    - If the gun violence does not stop, then law enforcement will use all available legal action against the groups and individuals responsible.

- Operation Ceasefire, the Group Violence Reduction Strategy (GVRS), and the Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership (IVRP) are examples of successful GVI strategies to reduce gun violence.[2]

[1]Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. (2016). *Healing communities in crisis: Lifesaving solutions to the urban gun violence epidemic.* San Francisco, CA.
[2]Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies effects on crime: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*(3).

Group Violence Intervention

- **Operation Ceasefire** involves a partnership between law enforcement and community organizations to reduce gang-related gun violence using a "pulling levers" focused deterrence strategy.[1]
  - The focused deterrence strategy is designed to prevent violence by reaching out directly to gangs with the message that violence will not be tolerated, and every legally available sanction will be used should violence occur.
  - Community organizations work simultaneously with law enforcement to offer services and other help to gang members.
- Evaluations of Operation Ceasefire in Boston, Massachusetts[1,2] and Oakland, California[3] have found significant reductions in gun assault incidents, gun homicides, and gang-involved shootings.
  - Boston's initial implementation of Operation Ceasefire in 1996 resulted in a statistically significant 63% decrease in the monthly number of youth homicides, a 25% decrease in the monthly number of citywide gun assault incidents, a 32% decrease in monthly number of citywide shots-fired calls, and a 44% decrease in monthly number of youth gun assaults in a high-risk police district.[1]
  - In Oakland, monthly gun homicide counts were significantly reduced by 31.5% and treated gangs/groups experienced a significant 27.0% reduction in shootings relative to untreated gangs/groups.[3]

[1]Braga, A. A., Kennedy, D. M., Waring, E. J., & Piehl, A. M. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 38*(3), 195-225.

[2]Braga, A. A., Hureau, D. M., & Papachristos, A. V. (2014). Deterring gang-involved gun violence: Measuring the impact of Boston's Operation Ceasefire on street gang behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 30*(1), 113-139.

[3]Braga, A. A., Barao, L. M., Zimmerman, G., Brunson, R. K., Papachristos, A. V., Wood, G., & Farrell, C. (2019). *Oakland Ceasefire evaluation: Final report to the City of Oakland.*

Group Violence Intervention

- ## Common Pitfalls
  - ### Operation Ceasefire
    - Challenges in sustaining initiatives over an extended period of time resulting from instability in program leadership and lack of resources.[1, 2, 5]
    - More research is needed on the specific program mechanisms responsible for observed outcomes.[3, 4, 6]
    - More research is needed on the effects of the intervention on individual behavior.[1, 6]

[1]Braga, A. A., Hureau, D. M., & Papachristos, A. V. (2014). Deterring gang-involved gun violence: Measuring the impact of Boston's Operation Ceasefire on street gang behavior. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 30*(1), 113-139.

[2]Braga, A. A., Barao, L. M., Zimmerman, G., Brunson, R. K., Papachristos, A. V., Wood, G., & Farrell, C. (2019). *Oakland Ceasefire evaluation: Final report to the City of Oakland*.

[3]Braga, A. A., Kennedy, D. M., Waring, E. J., & Piehl, A. M. (2001). Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 38*(3), 195-225.

[4]Braga, A. A., Zimmerman, G., Barao, L., Farrell, C., Brunson, R. K., & Papachristos, A. V. (2019). Street gangs, gun violence, and focused deterrence: Comparing place-based and group-based evaluation methods to estimate direct and spillover deterrent effects. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 56*(4), 524-562.

[5]Circo, G. M., Krupa, J. M., McGarrell, E., & De Biasi, A. (2021). Focused deterrence and program fidelity: Evaluating the impact of Detroit Ceasefire. *Justice Evaluation Journal, 4*(1).

[6]Circo, G., Krupa, J. M., McGarrell, E., & De Biasi, A. (2020). The individual-level deterrent effect of "call-in" meetings on time to re-arrest. *Crime & Delinquency, 66*(11), 1630-1651.

Group Violence Intervention

- **Group Violence Reduction Strategy (GVRS)** targets violence disproportionately driven by gangs and groups.[1]
  - GVRS deploys "call-in" meetings where known gang members meet with representatives from law enforcement, the community, and social service providers to receive an antiviolence message.
  - Attendees are told to inform their other gang members to stop the violence, and if they don't, then law enforcement action would be taken against the whole gang.
- GVRS has shown to have promising effects on reducing gang violence and gun violence, significantly reducing shooting victimizations, firearm homicides, and firearm assaults.[1]
  - Chicago GVRS,[2] New Orleans GVRS,[3] and Kansas City No Violence Alliance (NoVA)[4] are examples of promising GVRS programs.

[1]Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies effects on crime: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*(3).
[2]Papachristos, A. V., & Kirk, D. S. (2015). Changing the street dynamic: Evaluating Chicago's group violence reduction strategy. *Criminology & Public Policy, 14*(3), 525-558.
[3]Corsaro, N., & Engel, R. S. (2015). Most challenging of contexts: Assessing the impact of focused deterrence on serious violence in New Orleans. *Criminology & Public Policy, 14*(3), 471-505.
[4]Fox, A. M., & Novak, K. J. (2018). Collaborating to reduce violence: The impact of focused deterrence in Kansas City. *Police Quarterly, 21*(3), 283-308.

Group Violence Intervention

- **The Indianapolis Violence Reduction Partnership (IVRP)** aims to address homicide and gun assault problems using a focused deterrence strategy that targets illegal gun carrying and use among known groups of chronic offenders, often involved in the drug trade.[1,2]

  - A key element of this strategy involves face-to-face meetings with groups of high-risk probationers and parolees, where criminal justice officials and community members provide a deterrence message and explain the severe penalties for continuing to engage in firearm crimes.

  - Probationers and parolees are also urged to take advantage of a range of social services and opportunities.

- IVRP has been found to produce substantial reductions in city-wide homicides and gang homicides.

  - At the time of the intervention, IVRP produced an immediate 34.3% reduction in the number of homicides per month.[1]

  - Gang homicides experienced a statistically significant decline of 38.1% following intervention, while non-gang homicides experienced a non-significant decline of 8.6%.[2]

[1]McGarrell, E. F., Chermak, S., Wilson, J. M., & Corsaro, N. (2006). Reducing homicide through a "lever-pulling" strategy. *Justice Quarterly, 23*(2), 214-231.
[2]Corsaro, N., & McGarrell, E. F. (2009). Testing a promising homicide reduction strategy: re-assessing the impact of the Indianapolis "pulling levers" intervention. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 5*, 63-82.

Group Violence Intervention

- **Common Pitfalls**
  - **GVRS**
    - Some evidence of a decay effect over time.[4]
    - Mechanism(s) unclear (e.g., incapacitation, deterrence, social service utilization)[1]
  - **IVRP**
    - Reductions concentrated among gang-related homicides with a non-significant reduction among non-gang-related homicides.[5,6]

[1]Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies effects on crime: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*(3).
[2]Papachristos, A. V., & Kirk, D. S. (2015). Changing the street dynamic: Evaluating Chicago's group violence reduction strategy. *Criminology & Public Policy, 14*(3), 525-558.
[3]Corsaro, N., & Engel, R. S. (2015). Most challenging of contexts: Assessing the impact of focused deterrence on serious violence in New Orleans. *Criminology & Public Policy, 14*(3), 471-505.
[4]Fox, A. M., & Novak, K. J. (2018). Collaborating to reduce violence: The impact of focused deterrence in Kansas City. *Police Quarterly, 21*(3), 283-308.
[5]McGarrell, E. F., Chermak, S., Wilson, J. M., & Corsaro, N. (2006). Reducing homicide through a "lever-pulling" strategy. *Justice Quarterly, 23*(2), 214-231.
[6]Corsaro, N., & McGarrell, E. F. (2009). Testing a promising homicide reduction strategy: re-assessing the impact of the Indianapolis "pulling levers" intervention. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 5*, 63-82.

16

Focused Deterrence

- **Individual Offender Strategies** are aimed at preventing repeat offending by high-risk individuals.[1]
  - These strategies generally address the most dangerous offenders with a wide range of legal tools, warn offenders that their "next offense" will bring extraordinary legal attention, and focus community "moral voices" on such offenders to set a clear standard that violence is unacceptable.[1]
  - These strategies also provide social support services, connecting individuals to treatment, housing, employment, and educational opportunities.[2]
- Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) and the Rockford Area Violence Elimination Network (RAVEN) are examples of individual offender strategies that show promise for reducing violent crime.

[1]Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D., & Turchan, B. (2019). Focused deterrence strategies effects on crime: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 15*(3).
[2]Clark-Moorman, K., Rydberg, J., & McGarrell, E. F. (2019). Impact evaluation of parolee-based focused deterrence program on community-level violence. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 30*(9), 1408-1430.

Individual Offender Strategies

- **Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN)** is a federally funded anti-gun crime initiative that brings together law enforcement with researchers and community organizations.[1]
  - U.S. Attorneys' Offices are tasked with creating task forces involving local, state and federal law enforcement, local prosecutors, probation and parole, local government, service providers, neighborhood leaders, & the faith community.
  - These task forces emphasize deterrence and incapacitation through the threat of federal prosecution for illegal gun possession and violent, gang, and drug related offenses involving a firearm.

- A national evaluation of PSN found cities that received PSN treatment experienced a 4.1% reduction in violent crime compared to non-PSN cities.[1]

- PSN has also been found to reduce total homicides and gun homicides in Chicago, Illinois[2]; Tampa, Florida[3]; and Lowell, Massachusetts[4].
  - An evaluation of Tampa's PSN program found PSN was associated with a raw reduction of 24.4% in violent crime and 24.0% in gun crime rates in the pre- (2013-2015) and post-test (2016-2018) periods.[3]
  - An evaluation of Chicago's PSN program found the offender notification meetings component to be the most effective in reducing homicides and recidivism.[2]

[1]McGarrell, E. F., Corsaro, N., Hipple, N. K., & Bynum, T. S. (2010). Project safe neighborhoods and violent crime trends in US cities: Assessing violent crime impact. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 26*, 165-190.

[2]Grunwald, B., & Papachristos, A. V. (2017). Project safe neighborhoods in Chicago: Looking back a decade later. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 107*(1), 131-159.

[3]Fox, B., Allen, S. F., & Toth, A. (2022). Evaluating the impact of Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) initiative on violence and gun crime in Tampa: Does it work and does it last? *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 18*, 543-567.

[4]Braga, A. A., Pierce, G. L., McDevitt, J., & Bond, B. J. (2008). The strategic prevention of gun violence among gang-involved offenders. *Justice Quarterly, 25*(1), 132-162.

Individual Offender Strategies

- **Rockford Area Violence Elimination Network (RAVEN)** is a program targeting firearm violence among recently released parolees and probationers at risk of being involved in future violence.[1]
  - RAVEN utilizes call-in meetings to welcome parolees back to the community and provide a message about their opportunity to contribute positively to society and avoid crime.
  - Parolees are also given an enforcement message noting the steps that law enforcement agencies are taking to monitor high-risk parolees and reduce gun crime.
  - RAVEN also has a social support component, connecting parolees to educational and employment opportunities.
- An evaluation of RAVEN found significant reductions of 20.52% in gun robberies, 15.89% in gun assaults, and 29.08% in non-gun robberies; however, gun homicides, non-gun homicides, and non-gun assault did not experience significant declines.[1]

[1]Clark-Moorman, K., Rydberg, J., & McGarrell, E. F. (2019). Impact evaluation of parolee-based focused deterrence program on community-level violence. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 30*(9), 1408-1430.

Individual Offender Strategies

- Common Pitfalls
  - Project Safe Neighborhoods
    - The processes used to identify prolific offenders subject to intervention vary greatly and are often not evidence-based, relying on subjective assessments of police reports, offending histories, and criminal associations.[1]
    - The effects of PSN may decay over time.[1, 2, 3]
    - More research is needed on the specific program mechanisms responsible for observed outcomes.[2, 4]
  - RAVEN
    - There were challenges enrolling participants in case management and social support.[5]
    - Not clear what mechanisms underlie the impact of the RAVEN intervention on violence.[5]

[1]Fox, B., Allen, S. F., & Toth, A. (2022). Evaluating the impact of Project Safe Neighborhoods (PSN) initiative on violence and gun crime in Tampa: Does it work and does it last? *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 18*, 543-567.
[2]McGarrell, E. F., Corsaro, N., Hipple, N. K., & Bynum, T. S. (2010). Project safe neighborhoods and violent crime trends in US cities: Assessing violent crime impact. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 26*, 165-190.
[3]Grunwald, B., & Papachristos, A. V. (2017). Project safe neighborhoods in Chicago: Looking back a decade later. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology, 107*(1), 131-159.
[4]Braga, A. A., Pierce, G. L., McDevitt, J., & Bond, B. J. (2008). The strategic prevention of gun violence among gang-involved offenders. *Justice Quarterly, 25*(1), 132-162.
[5]Clark-Moorman, K., Rydberg, J., & McGarrell, E. F. (2019). Impact evaluation of parolee-based focused deterrence program on community-level violence. *Criminal Justice Policy Review, 30*(9), 1408-1430.

Partnership-Oriented Interventions

- **Partnership-oriented interventions** involve a stronger focus on partnerships between law enforcement and community and/or business partners working together to prevent crime and disorder.

- Identified programs include Third-Party Policing and Community-Oriented Policing.

Partnership-Oriented Interventions

- **Third-party policing** leverages the actions of nonpolice third parties in deterring and reducing the opportunities for targeted offenders or criminal conduct.[1]
    - Police engage residents, landlords, business owners, regulators, inspectors, licensing authorities, and others, encouraging them to help prevent crime and violence in hot spots through the use of civil remedies such as fines, civil orders, injunctions, and evictions.
    - Third-party policing may target certain categories of people (e.g., young people, gang members, or drug dealers) or specific places (e.g., crime hot spots).

- Evaluations of third-party policing programs have found statistically significant short-term reductions in overall crime and disorder, however, there is more limited evidence of long-term impacts.[1]
    - Oakland's Beat Health Program is an example of third-party policing that has been shown to significantly reduce service calls for drug-related crime in treatment areas; however, other categories of service calls were not significantly reduced.[2]

[1]National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Proactive policing: Effects on crime and communities.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
[2]Mazerolle, L., & Roehl, J. (1999). *Controlling drug and disorder problems: Oakland's Beat Health program.* Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Partnership-Oriented Interventions

- **Community-Oriented Policing (COP)** emphasizes bringing the police and community together to make communities safe. Police work with community members to identify and understand the social issues driving crime, disorder, and fear.[1, 2]

    – These programs often use a more holistic crime reduction approach that target whole communities and involve partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem-solving.

    – COP activities may include community meetings, foot patrols, crime newsletters, door-to-door visits, responding to social and physical disorder, and forging positive relationships with residents, among others.

- Evidence on the effectiveness of COP programs to prevent crime is mixed due to various definitions and implementation strategies across locations.[1, 2, 3]

    – A meta-analysis of COP programs found limited effects on reducing crime, though the findings suggest a slightly larger reduction in violent crimes than property crimes.[1]

    – Independent evaluations of COP programs produce similar results, finding moderate reductions in violent crime, mixed effects on property crime, and limited effects on drug crimes.[4, 5]

    – COP programs have shown positive effects on citizen satisfaction, perceptions of disorder, and police legitimacy.[1, 3]

[1]Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 10*, 399-428.
[2]Reisig, M. D. (2010). Community and problem-oriented policing. *Crime and Justice: Review of Research, 39*, 1-54.
[3]Gill, C., Weisburd, D., & Telep, C. (2016). Community policing. In T. G. Blomberg, J. M. Brancale, K. M. Beaver, & W. D. Bales (Eds.), *Advancing criminology and criminal justice policy* (pp. 119-128).
[4]Uchida, C. D., Forst, B., & Annan, S. O. (1992). *Controlling street-level drug trafficking: Evidence from Oakland and Birmingham.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
[5]Connell, N. M., Miggans, K., & McGloin, J. M. (2008). Can a community policing initiative reduce serious crime? A local evaluation. *Police Quarterly, 11*(2), 127-150.

Partnership-Oriented Interventions

- Common Pitfalls
  - Third-Party Policing
    - All parties involved must reach a consensus about the appropriate civil remedies to use, and some residents and third parties may find some approaches unacceptable.[1]
      - The use of coercive mechanisms to influence business and housing owners may raise privacy concerns and produce unintended harmful consequences for community members.[2]
    - More attention is needed to long-term maintenance after initial civil interventions are applied.[3]
  - Community-Oriented Policing
    - There are no criteria or set guidelines for implementing community policing.[4, 5] The specific tactics deployed under community policing vary substantially and many have not been rigorously tested.[4, 5]
    - Community policing as a philosophy is often not fully adopted by police departments.[5, 6]

[1]Mazerolle, L., & Roehl, J. (1999). *Controlling drug and disorder problems: Oakland's Beat Health program.* Research in Brief. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
[2]National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Proactive policing: Effects on crime and communities.* Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
[3]Mazerolle, L. G., Price, J. F., & Roehl, J. (2000). Civil remedies and drug control: A randomized field trial in Oakland, California. *Evaluation Review, 24*(2), 212-241.
[4]Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 10*, 399-428.
[5]Gill, C., Weisburd, D., & Telep, C. (2016). Community policing. In T. G. Blomberg, J. M. Brancale, K. M. Beaver, & W. D. Bales (Eds.), *Advancing criminology and criminal justice policy.*
[6]Uchida, C. D., Forst, B., & Annan, S. O. (1992). *Modern policing and the control of illegal drugs: Testing new strategies in two American cities.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Community-Based Interventions

- **Community-based violence interventions (CVIs)** aim to reduce violence using evidence-informed strategies through tailored community-centered initiatives.[1]
  - Tailored, community-centered initiatives engage individuals and groups to prevent and disrupt cycles of violence and retaliation, establish relationships between individuals and community assets to deliver services, and bolster community resources to improve community conditions.
  - The CVI approach actively engages community residents and stakeholders to gain insight into violence in the community and build trust.
  - CVI relies on community collaboration between partners with complimentary missions and skill sets to provide needed services.
- CVI strategies typically focus on high-risk individuals, gang and gun violence, and historical and structural challenges contributing to community violence.
- Common CVI strategies that show promise for reducing gun violence include Street Outreach programs, Place-Making Strategies, and Therapy-Based Programs.[2, 3, 4]

[1]Bureau of Justice Assistance. (2022). *Community based violence intervention and prevention initiative implementation checklist.*
[2]Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. (2016). *Healing communities in crisis: Lifesaving solutions to the urban gun violence epidemic.* San Francisco, CA.
[3]Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC). (2017). *Connecting crime reduction and neighborhood revitalization: BCJI sites build safe communities.* Bureau of Justice Assistance.
[4]Feucht, T., & Holt, T. (2016). Does cognitive behavioral therapy work in criminal justice? A new analysis from crimesolutions.gov. *NIJ Journal, 277*, 10-17.

25

Community-Based Interventions

- **Street Outreach** programs seek to mediate violent disputes (resolving them before they turn deadly), connect potentially violent individuals to services, and change norms and attitudes about violence using media campaigns.[1]

- Street outreach programs typically involve the following components:[2]

  - Violence interrupters – engage with the community to identify potentially violent conflicts and then mediate those conflicts into a peaceful resolution.

  - Outreach workers – identify high-risk individuals and connect them to appropriate social services.

  - Mobilization of the community to change social norms surrounding the use of violence; promote messages to end gun violence.

- Examples of promising street outreach programs include:

  - Cure Violence,[2] Safe and Successful Youth Initiative (SSYI),[3, 4] Gang Reduction and Youth Development (GRYD)[5]

[1]Abt, T. (2019). *Bleeding out: The devastating consequences of urban violence-and a bold new plan for peace in the streets.* New York: Basic Books.
[2]Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. (2016). *Healing communities in crisis: Lifesaving solutions to the urban gun violence epidemic.* San Francisco, CA.
[3]Petrosino, A., Turner, H., Hanson, T. L., Fronius, T., Campie, P., & Goold, C. C. (2017). The impact of the Safe and Successful Youth Initiative on city-level youth crime victimization rates: Substantive results and implications for evaluation. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation, 13*(9), 8-15.
[4]Campie, P. E., Vriniotis, M., Read, N. W., Fronius, T., & Petrosino, A. (2014). *A comparative study using propensity score matching to predict incarceration likelihoods among SSYI and non-SSYI youth from 2011-2013.* Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services. Boston, MA.
[5]Branttingham, P. J., Sundback, N., Yuan, B., & Chan, K. (2017). *GRYD intervention incident response & gang crime 2017 evaluation report.* Los Angeles, CA: The Los Angeles Mayor's Office of Gang Reduction and Youth Development.

Community-Based Interventions

- **Place-Making Strategies** involve cosmetic improvements to hot spots, improving high-crime areas by addressing low occupancy, vacant lots and buildings, and restoring and improving public services and areas.[1, 2]

- The overall effectiveness of these "cleaning and greening" programs remains inconclusive.[2, 3]

  – In Philadelphia, fixing up abandoned buildings and vacant lots reduced firearm violence in nearby areas by 39%.[3]

  – The use of CCTV and improved street lighting have also been shown to effectively reduce crime.[2]

  – The Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation (BCJI) program helps to address crime in hot spots by employing diverse crime prevention, resident engagement, and neighborhood revitalization and has shown to reduce crime in revitalized communities in Milwaukee, WI; Evansville, IN; Philadelphia, PA; and Dayton, OH.[1]

[1]Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC). (2017). *Connecting crime reduction and neighborhood revitalization: BCJI sites build safe communities.* Bureau of Justice Assistance.
[2]Guerette, R. T., Johnson, S. D., & Bowers, K. (2016). Situational crime prevention. In T. G. Blomberg, J. M. Brancale, K. M. Beaver, & W. D. Bales (Eds.), *Advancing criminology and criminal justice policy* (pp. 104-114). Routledge.
[3]Branas, C. C., Kondo, M. C., Murphy, S. M., South, E. C., Polsky, D., & MacDonald, J. M. (2016). Urban blight remediation as a cost-beneficial solution to firearm violence. *American Journal of Public Health, 106*, 2158-2164.

Community-Based Interventions

- **Therapy-Based Programs**, such as cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) and functional family therapy (FFT), are widely used with delinquents and young adult offenders to reduce recidivism and address problematic behavior.[1, 2]

- Therapy-based programs that focus on highest-risk offenders and are stand-alone or the primary feature of the program are found to be most effective.[2, 3]

- Promising therapy-based programs that have been evaluated for their effects on violent crime include:

  - Functional family therapy for reducing gang violence,[3] Chicago's Becoming a Man (B.A.M.),[4] Roca, Inc.[5]

[1]Fagan, A. A. (2016). Opportunities for public policies to strengthen families and prevent crime. In T. G. Blomberg, J. M. Brancale, K. M. Beaver, & W. D. Bales (Eds.), *Advancing criminology and criminal justice policy* (pp. 82-91). Routledge.

[2]Feucht, T., & Holt, T. (2016). Does cognitive behavioral therapy work in criminal justice? A new analysis from crimesolutions.gov. *NIJ Journal, 277*, 10-17.

[3]Gottfredson, D. C., Thornberry, T. P., Slothower, M., Devlin, D., Kearley, B., & Fader, J. J. (2018). *Reducing gang violence: A randomized trial of functional family therapy.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

[4]Prochaska, M. (2014). Statistically speaking: Evaluation of Becoming a Man (B.A.M.) program in Chicago. *Children's Legal Rights Journal, 34*(3), 339-343.

[5]Abt Associates. (2021). *Final report: Implementation evaluation of Roca, Inc.* Cambridge, MA.

Community-Based Interventions

- Common Pitfalls
  - Street Outreach
    - Targeting high-risk individuals can increase incarceration risk without adequate provision of services.[1]
    - Some programs focused only on high-profile, gang-related violence (e.g., Gang Reduction and Youth Development).[2]
  - Place-Making Strategies
    - Concerns regarding gentrification and displacement of residents.[3]
    - May displace violence/crime to nearby areas.[3]
  - Therapy-Based Programs
    - Often conducted through school, which can miss high-risk youth (possible reason for observed increases in graduation rates but no reduction in violent behavior).[4, 5]

[1]Campie, P. E., Vriniotis, M., Read, N. W., Fronius, T., & Petrosino, A. (2014). *A comparative study using propensity score matching to predict incarceration likelihoods among SSYI and non-SSYI youth from 2011-2013.* Massachusetts Executive Office of Health and Human Services. Boston, MA.
[2]Branttingham, P. J., Sundback, N., Yuan, B., & Chan, K. (2017). *GRYD intervention incident response & gang crime 2017 evaluation report.* Los Angeles Mayor's Office of Gang Reduction and Youth Development.
[3]Branas, C. C., Kondo, M. C…, & MacDonald, J. M. (2016). Urban blight remediation as a cost-beneficial solution to firearm violence. *American Journal of Public Health, 106*, 2158-2164.
[4]Prochaska, M. (2014). Statistically speaking: Evaluation of Becoming a Man (B.A.M.) program in Chicago. *Children's Legal Rights Journal, 34*(3), 339-343.
[5]Abt Associates. (2021). *Final report: Implementation evaluation of Roca, Inc.* Cambridge, MA.

Youth-Focused Strategies

- **Youth-focused strategies** are those that target young adults, adolescents, and children most at risk of criminal involvement.[1]
  - These strategies are typically prevention focused, aiming to prevent at-risk youth from becoming involved in the criminal justice system.
  - Often incorporate other strategies such as family therapy and cognitive behavioral therapy.
- Promising youth-focused strategies include:
  - School-Based/Early-Childhood Interventions
    - Perry Program,[2] Seattle Social Development Project,[3] Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T.)[4]
  - Youth Work Programs[5,6]

[1]Farrington, D. P. (2016). Juvenile delinquency prevention programs. In T. G. Blomberg, J. M. Brancale, K. M. Beaver, & W. D Bales (Eds.), *Advancing criminology and criminal justice policy* (pp. 69-81).
[2]Parks, G. (2000). *The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
[3]O'Donnell, J., Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Abbott, R. D., & Day, L. E. (1995). Preventing school failure, drug use, and delinquency among low-income children: Long-term intervention in elementary schools. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 65*(1), 87-100.
[4]Esbensen, F., Osgood, D. W., Peterson, D., Taylor, T. J., & Carson, D. C. (2013). Short- and long-term outcome results from a multisite evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program. *Criminology & Public Policy, 12*(3), 375-411.
[5]Heller, S., Pollack, H., & Davis, J. M. V. (2017). *The effect of summer jobs on youth violence.* Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
[6]Modestino, A. S. (2017). *How can summer jobs reduce crime among youth? An evaluation of the Boston summer youth employment program.* Washington, DC: Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program.

Youth-Focused Strategies

- Common Pitfalls
  - Many evaluations are dated (1980s-1990s)
  - Not specifically targeting violence/gun violence.[1, 2, 3, 4]
    - Variety of outcomes and primarily focused on educational attainment, school attachment, graduation, employment, etc.
  - School-based interventions can miss highest risk students.[1, 4]
  - Challenges of parental involvement/consent.[4]
  - Difficult to target multiple outcomes.[4]
    - Gang Resistance Education and Training reduces gang involvement but not offending

[1]Farrington, D. P. (2016). Juvenile delinquency prevention programs. In T. G. Blomberg, J. M. Brancale, K. M. Beaver, & W. D Bales (Eds.), *Advancing criminology and criminal justice policy* (pp. 69-81). Routledge.

[2]Parks, G. (2000). *The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

[3]O'Donnell, J., Hawkins, J. D., Catalano, R. F., Abbott, R. D., & Day, L. E. (1995). Preventing school failure, drug use, and delinquency among low-income children: Long-term intervention in elementary schools. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 65*(1), 87-100.

[4]Esbensen, F., Osgood, D. W., Peterson, D., Taylor, T. J., & Carson, D. C. (2013). Short- and long-term outcome results from a multisite evaluation of the G.R.E.A.T. program. *Criminology & Public Policy, 12*(3), 375-411.

Mentoring Programs

- **Mentoring programs** provide a one-on-one relationship between at-risk youth and caring adults, with the goal of promoting positive youth development and preventing negative outcomes.[1, 2]

- Mentoring programs serve a wide range of age groups and populations with diverse needs and risk factors and encompass a wide range of approaches based on the age of the mentor (e.g., older peers vs. adults), volunteer vs. paid mentors, format (e.g., one-to-one vs. group), and location (e.g., school vs. community).[2]

- Mentoring programs have generally shown to be effective for both preventing and reducing delinquent behavior.[1, 2, 3, 4]

  - Mentoring programs that include targeted, skills-based approaches have a much larger effect on positive outcomes than non-specific relational mentoring approaches.[5]

[1]Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., Bass, A., Lovegrove, P., & Nichols, E. (2013). Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews.*
[2]DuBois, D. L. (2021). Mentoring programs for youth: A promising intervention for delinquency prevention. *NIJ Journal, 283*, 1-11.
[3]Raposa, E. B., Rhodes, J., Stams, G… & Hussain, S. (2019). The effects of youth mentoring programs: A meta-analysis of outcome studies. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 48*, 423-443.
[4]DuBois, D. L., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J. E., Naida, S., & Valentine, J. C. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12*(2), 57-91.
[5]Christensen, K. M., Hagler, M. A., Stams, G., Raposa, E. B., Burton, S., & Rhodes, J. E. (2020). Non-specific versus targeted approaches to youth mentoring: A follow-up meta-analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 49*, 959-972.

Mentoring Programs

- **Adolescent Diversion Project** diverts youth from juvenile court to intensive supervision alongside individualized behavioral interventions & services.[1]

  – Reductions in officially measured recidivism but not in self-reported delinquency/offending.

- **Advance Peace** identifies individuals who are highly-influential in local gun violence and engages them in intensive mentoring and individualized action plans through Neighborhood Change Agents.[2]

  – Reductions in gun homicides and assaults in implementation zones. Most participants have no new gun charges, but 54% are rearrested.[3]

- **Big Brothers Big Sisters** matches youth to volunteer mentors who spend time with their mentee in social/recreational activities several times per month.[4]

  – Reductions in illegal drug and alcohol use but not in self-reported delinquency/offending or arrest.[4, 5]

[1]Davidson, W. S., Redner, R., Blakely, C. H., Mitchell, C. M., & Emshoff, J. G. (1987). Diversion of juvenile offenders: an experimental comparison. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *55*(1), 68.

[2]Corburn, J., Boggan, D., Muttaqi, K., Vaughn, S., Houston, J., Thibodeaux, J., & Muhammad, B. (2021). A healing-centered approach to preventing urban gun violence: the Advance Peace model. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *8*(1), 1-7.

[3]Corburn, J., & Fukutome-Lopez, A. (2020). Outcome evaluation of advance peace Sacramento, 2018–19.

[4]Tierney, J. P., Grossman, J. B., & Resch, N. L. (2000). *Making a difference: An impact study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters.* Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures.

[5]DuBois, D. L., Herrera, C., & Rivera, J. (2018). *Investigation of long-term effects of the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based mentoring program: Final technical report for OJJDP.* Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Mentoring Programs

- Common Pitfalls
  - Most do not directly target violent behavior; rather, mentoring programs typically address antisocial behavior, delinquency, and educational outcomes.[1]
    - Some programs (e.g., Adolescent Diversion Project) exclude youth with serious person crimes.[2]
  - Studies often lack descriptions of the program design and mentoring activities, making it difficult to understand which specific mechanism(s) are contributing to youth outcomes.[1, 3]
  - Most evaluations focus on immediate effects; it is not clear what the long-term effects of mentoring programs are.[1, 3]
    - Most effects of Big Brothers Big Sisters are not sustained beyond one year.[4]

[1]Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., Bass, A., Lovegrove, P., & Nichols, E. (2013). Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, 10,* 1-148.

[2]Davidson, W. S., Redner, R., Blakely, C. H., Mitchell, C. M., & Emshoff, J. G. (1987). Diversion of juvenile offenders: an experimental comparison. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *55*(1), 68.

[3]DuBois, D. L. (2021). Mentoring programs for youth: A promising intervention for delinquency prevention. *NIJ Journal, 283,* 1-11.

[4]Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., Feldman, A. F., & McMaken, J. (2007). Making a Difference in Schools: The Big Brothers Big Sisters School-Based Mentoring Impact Study. *Public/Private Ventures.*

Hospital-Based Violence Intervention

- **Hospital-based violence intervention programs (HVIP)** focus on reducing gun violence by reaching high-risk individuals who have been recently admitted to a hospital for treatment of a serious violent injury.[1]

  - HVIP screens patients to identify those most at risk for reinjury and connects them with case managers who help connect high-risk individuals to a variety of community-based organizations and social services.

- Most evaluations find no impact on reinjury or recidivism, but many samples are small with low retention rates and/or non-randomized study samples.[2, 3, 4]

[1]Giffords Law Center to Prevent Gun Violence. (2016). *Healing communities in crisis: Lifesaving solutions to the urban gun violence epidemic.* San Francisco, CA.

[2]Affinati, S.., Patton, D., Hansen, L., Ranney, M., Christmas, A. B., Violano, P., Sodhi, A., Robinson, B., & Crandall, M. (2016). Hospital-based violence intervention programs targeting adult populations: An Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma evidence-based review. *Trauma Surgery & Acute Care Open, 1*, 1-7.

[3]Bonne, S., Hink, A., Violano, P., Allee, L., Duncan, T., Burke, P., Fein, J., Kozyckyj, T., Shapiro, D., Bakes, K., Kuhls, D., Bulger, E., & Dicker, R. (2022). Understanding the makeup of a growing field: A committee on trauma survey of the national network of hospital-based violence intervention programs. *The American Journal of Surgery, 223*.

[4]Juillard, C., Smith, R., Anaya, N., Garcia, A., Kahn, J. G., & Dicker, R. A. (2015). Saving lives and saving money: Hospital-based violence intervention is cost-effective. *Journal of Trauma & Acute Care Surgery, 78*(2), 252-258.

Hospital-Based Violence Intervention

- Common Pitfalls
  - Low retention among eligible participants.[1, 4]
  - Small sample sizes and lack of randomization in studies results in mixed results.[1, 2, 3, 4]
  - Inclusion and exclusion criteria vary widely (e.g., domestic violence victims).[1]
  - Service provision, involved providers/staff, and dosage vary widely between hospital programs.[1, 2, 3]

[1]Affinati, S.., Patton, D., Hansen, L., Ranney, M., Christmas, A. B., Violano, P., Sodhi, A., Robinson, B., & Crandall, M. (2016). Hospital-based violence intervention programs targeting adult populations: An Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma evidence-based review. *Trauma Surgery & Acute Care Open, 1*, 1-7.

[2]Bonne, S., Hink, A., Violano, P…, & Dicker, R. (2022). Understanding the makeup of a growing field: A committee on trauma survey of the national network of hospital-based violence intervention programs. *The American Journal of Surgery, 223*.

[3]Smith, R., Dobbins, S., Evans, A., Balhotra, K., & Dicker, R. A. (2013). Hospital-based violence intervention: Risk reduction resources that are essential for success. *Journal of Trauma & Acute Care Surgery, 74*(4), 976-982.

[4]Juillard, C., Cooperman, L., Allen, I., Pirracchio, R., Henderson, T., Marquez, R., Orellana, J., Texada, M., & Dicker, R. A. (2016). A decade of hospital-based violence intervention: Benefits and shortcomings. *Journal of Trauma & Acute Care Surgery, 81*(6), 1156-1161.

Summary

- There are many effective violence/gun violence interventions programs
- In selecting a program (or programs), important considerations include:
  - Targeted outcome(s)
  - Intervention population and size
  - Provider, partner, and community capacities and resources
- Analysis of LCSO and TPD data will guide these decisions
  - Presentation of these results in the September meeting
- Additionally, prior research and evaluation sites will be considered
  - It is important to note that most prior research was conducted in major cities (e.g., Baltimore, Chicago, Los Angeles) and may not be well-suited for Tallahassee

Questions?

Kaylee Noorman: kmfitzpatrick@fsu.edu

Kim Davidson: kdavidson@fsu.edu

Emma Fridel: efridel@fsu.edu

George Pesta: gpesta@fsu.edu