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PSN grants are allocated to each Federal district

94 federal districts across the U.S. & territories
- 31 states, D.C., or territories have 1 district each
- 12 states have 2 districts each
- 9 states have 3 districts each
- 3 states have 4 districts each

93 US Attorneys (Guam & Northern Mariana Islands share 1)
- Appointed by the President
- The chief federal law enforcement officer in their district
  - prosecute criminal cases brought by the federal government
  - prosecute or defend civil cases where the United States is a party
PSN History & Key Elements

- Initially launched in 2001
  - Initially a formula grant program
    - Prior national evaluation (McGarrell et al. 2010)
    - Some districts received competitive PSN grants in 2015, 2016 and 2017

- “Enhanced” model (PSN 2.0) was introduced late 2017
  - “Formula grant” awarded annually to all 93 US Attorneys Offices (USAO)
  - 5 key elements
    - Leadership by the USAO
    - Partnerships with law enforcement & community groups
    - Targeted & prioritized enforcement using data & technology
    - Prevention of additional violence through varied efforts
    - Accountability of the USAO to produce results
  - The focus of this evaluation, funded by the National Institute of Justice
2021 Updates to Key Elements

- The administration **updated the elements** in mid-2021 based on successful violent crime reduction initiatives:
  - Community engagement
  - Prevention and intervention
  - Focused and strategic enforcement
  - Accountability

- An important aspect of PSN remains **using research and analysis to inform decision-making** on violence reduction strategies

- More broadly, the administration’s violence reduction strategy expands upon PSN:
  - Stemming the flow of firearms used in crime
  - Supporting successful reentry
  - Community violence interventions
  - Perceptions of police legitimacy
PSN Varies Greatly in Local Practice

- **Target Enforcement Area(s)**
  - The entire USAO district – which can be an entire state!
  - 1 or more entire cities
  - Specific neighborhoods in 1 or more cities

- **Types of crime**
  - Most target firearm-related violent crime
  - Some focus on specific types of crime (domestic violence, gang involved)

- **Approaches**
  - Law enforcement is usually central – local, state & Federal
  - Prosecution: coordination among Federal, state, tribal & local prosecutors
  - Targeting the most violent offenders is common
  - Variety of community organizations & models
  - How PSN fits into the array of other crime & violence reduction efforts
PSN National Evaluation

**Goal:** to develop & disseminate evidence of the effectiveness of PSN in reducing violent crime and the factors that influence effectiveness

**Objectives:**

1. Conduct *implementation* and *outcome evaluations* at the national level and in 10 selected sites
2. **Develop findings, materials, and reports** that benefit federal personnel who administer PSN and local PSN practitioners
3. **Disseminate findings** to practitioners, policymakers, and researchers through scholarly products and presentations; and
4. Submit all resulting data sets and supporting *documentation for future replication and reanalysis* by other researchers

The evaluation is anticipated to run through 2023.
Overview of the PSN National Evaluation

Evaluation includes two tiers

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT

• All 94 USAO Districts in the U.S. & territories
• Broad, relatively high-level look at the PSN program nationally

CASE STUDY

• In 10 districts selected in collaboration with DOJ
• Intensive, detailed look at examples of local PSN programs
• Not considered as necessarily representative of all PSN programs

With these complementary tiers, the evaluation can study PSN both broadly & deeply
What do the two tiers have in common?

Focused on the **enhanced PSN model** introduced in late 2017 (and changes introduced in 2021)

**Implementation**: How PSN is implemented locally, particularly regarding the 5 key principles of the enhanced model:

- Leadership by the U.S. Attorney
- Partnerships with law enforcement & community groups
- Targeted & prioritized enforcement using data & technology
- Prevention of additional violence through varied efforts
- Accountability of the U.S. Attorney to produce results

**Outcomes**: Changes in violent crime & prosecutions

- Pre/post the enhanced model: trends in 2015-17 vs. 2018 & later (and 2021 & later in subsequent analyses)
- Using available data to account for contextual influences

Analyzing implementation & outcomes together to identify approaches that lead to better outcomes
How do the two tiers differ?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Assessment (94 districts)</th>
<th>Case Studies (10 districts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Data Sources</td>
<td>- Materials provided to DOJ by Task Forces</td>
<td>- Monthly Calls with PSN Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interviews</td>
<td>- Semi-annual site visits &amp; stakeholder interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Web surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Data Sources</td>
<td>- FBI Uniform Crime Reporting Program Data</td>
<td>- Incident-based, geo-coded crime data from LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prosecutions: EOUSA filings &amp; sentencing data</td>
<td>- Calls-for-service data in some districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Resident surveys (under consideration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of Analysis</td>
<td>- USAO district</td>
<td>- Target enforcement areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Target enforcement areas, if possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to What?</td>
<td>- Pre/post enhanced PSN</td>
<td>- Similar comparison areas (if possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Areas within districts, where possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Findings from the Case Study Component

Christine Lindquist, RTI
Recap of case study goal and research questions

**Goal**

– assess the implementation and impact of the enhanced PSN model in an in-depth manner among select PSN sites

**Research questions**

– Within each case study TEA, how were the core PSN principles implemented? What partnerships, strategies, and activities were leveraged?

– Within each TEA, how did PSN affect violent crime…
  
  ▪ over time (pre- and post- enhanced PSN)?
  ▪ compared to trends in comparable, non-PSN areas?
  ▪ compared to trends in crimes not targeted by PSN?
Case study site selection

Site selection criteria

- ability to offer a strong test of the enhanced PSN model
- availability of incident-level crime data for the TEA(s)
- USAO interest in participating

Sites and TEAs selected

- 10 USAO districts (14 TEAs) selected through a rigorous process & in collaboration with PSN Evaluation Working Group
- not necessarily representative of all PSN initiatives
- collectively offer some geographic and programmatic diversity
Case study sites: 14 TEAs in 10 USAO districts
Case study site visits

Methods

– First round held virtually (May-September 2021)
– 1 hour, video interviews covering:
  ▪ district’s history with PSN
  ▪ TEA context
  ▪ Partnerships
  ▪ implementation of 5 principles
  ▪ challenges and innovations
– 145 PSN stakeholders interviewed across the 10 districts

Stakeholders interviewed
  ❖ USAO staff
  ❖ local LEA partners
  ❖ State LEA partners
  ❖ federal LEA partners
  ❖ District Attorney’s office partners
  ❖ corrections partners
  ❖ community- and faith-based organizations
  ❖ research partners
Case study analysis

– Site-specific reports and logic models produced
  - Provided to sites
– Findings synthesized by evaluation team to identify
  - cross-site similarities
  - site-specific themes

Focus of today’s presentation:
- Community context
- Implementation of enhanced PSN principles
  - USAO leadership
  - Partnerships
  - Targeted enforcement efforts
  - Prevention of additional violence
  - Accountability
- Challenges
- Innovations
Case study framework: high level “PSN” logic model

**Community Context**
- Violent crime trends (rates, offender characteristics, gang-involvement, weapon involvement, geographic concentration)
- Key issues facing the community (e.g., racial segregation, poverty, opioid epidemic)
- Community-law enforcement relationships

**Inputs and Resources**
- DOJ guidance re: violence reduction strategies (PSN pillars, other guidance)
- Funding (federal and other)
- Training & technical assistance (federal and other)
- USAO leadership (Principle 1)
- Partnerships (Principle 2)
- Other resources and process for developing and overseeing PSN strategy in district (e.g., PSN Working Group, research partner, strategic planning activities)

**Key PSN Strategies and Activities**
- Targeted enforcement efforts (Principle 3)
  - Identifying highest priority people and places and sharing this information with all stakeholders (e.g., shoot reviews)
  - Ensuring successful prosecution of the highest priority cases (increased prosecution resources, strategic decision making, enhanced investigation and evidence collection, efforts to enhance victim/witness cooperation)
- Prevention of additional violence (Principle 4)
  - Focused deterrence efforts (e.g., offender notification/reentry programs, youth violence prevention efforts)
  - Victim/witness-focused efforts
  - Primary prevention (CPTED, community forums)
  - Awareness-raising activities
- Accountability for results (Principle 5)
  - Defining and monitoring outputs and intended outcomes
  - Using such data to refine strategy

**Outputs and Intended Outcomes**
- Law enforcement outputs (e.g., evidence gathered, # arrests, clearance rates)
- Prosecution outputs (e.g., number of cases screened or referred)
- Number of individuals served through prevention efforts
- Number of community outreach events held

- Increased victim cooperation
- Increased community engagement
- Improved prosecution outcomes (e.g., convictions, sentence length)
- Reductions in violent crime (firearms violence)
Community context in TEAs

- Violent crime (especially firearm-related violence) increasing in all TEAs
  - More youthful and gang-involved offenders
  - In some sites, crime now becoming more disbursed geographically
  - Proliferation of guns in many communities

- Strained relationships between community members and law enforcement in most TEAs
  - Has reduced victim/witness cooperation and clearance rates

- Influence of the pandemic
  - Associated with the increase in crime
  - Has impacted PSN activities (formerly in-person activities either suspended or implemented virtually)
In almost all sites, USAO leadership is perceived to be very strong and central to the district’s violent crime reduction strategy.

- Key activities: convening stakeholders/partners, mediating disputes among partners, identifying and leveraging federal resources, guiding (but not dictating) strategic planning.

Main sources of variation:
- PSN coordinator’s tenure with the initiative and time available for the position
- U.S. Attorney commitment to PSN
- In some sites, very little institutional knowledge of PSN and or limited bandwidth
Partnerships (Principle 2)

- In almost all sites, partnerships with law enforcement agencies (federal and local) perceived to be very strong
  - Examples: inter-agency task forces, leveraging shared resources, data sharing agreements

- In almost all sites, partnerships with community-based organizations were perceived to be much weaker
  - A number of challenges to developing formal partnerships were identified
  - Enhancing these partnerships was identified as a priority in some sites
  - A few sites already had very strong partnerships with community-based organizations
Targeted enforcement efforts (Principle 3)

- Most sites have robust data-/tech-driven processes to identify the most significant offenders, groups, and places
  - Typically done by local LEA crime analysts
- Most sites have structured processes in place to share and discuss this information with other PSN stakeholders
  - Example: shooting reviews
  - Main sources of variation: whether community-based organizations are included in these reviews, extent of mitigation efforts (e.g., outreach/resource provision to victims and witnesses, place-based interventions) resulting from reviews
- Decision making re: the level of prosecution is typically less structured, involving informal communication with state and federal prosecutors
Prevention of additional violence (Principle 4)

- Most common activity: offender notification programs
  - notifying high risk offenders (usually reentering) of negative consequences and providing services and resources to help
  - But these activities occur infrequently in most sites

- Other activities
  - victim/witness-focused interventions to prevent further violence and increase cooperation with prosecution
    - very intensive efforts in some sites
  - social media monitoring for prevention
  - place-based interventions (e.g., CPTED)
  - community awareness raising activities re: PSN
  - agency involvement in existing community activities (e.g., youth violence prevention, community forums)
Accountability (Principle 5)

- In most sites, activities under this principle were limited to sharing of data
  - Examples: sharing daily crime reports, number of cases prosecuted

- Uncommon for sites to use such data to refine the PSN strategy or foster accountability for outcomes
  - Some activities of the research partner (e.g., tracking outputs and outcomes) were considered to provide accountability

- Many stakeholders noted the difficulty of identifying appropriate indicators of effectiveness
  - Examples: long-term impact of their strategic decisions on safety, whether the highest risk individuals are changing their behavior
  - Crime rates dependent on many other factors
Challenges to implementing key PSN principles

- Effectively engaging the community (formalized partnerships)
  - **Specific challenges:** identifying and vetting partners, finding meaningful involvement, limited resources, lack of community interest in having USAO involved

- Limited resources and personnel

- Turnover in key roles (e.g., police chiefs, PSN coordinator, U.S. Attorney)
  - creates instability and threatens collaborations

- COVID-related restrictions on in-person activities

- The number of overlapping violence reduction initiatives in the district
Perceived innovations

- Collaboration among stakeholders was noted in most sites as the most innovative aspect of their PSN activities.
- Other, site-specific activities were noted:
  - victim/witness coordinator position
  - mentoring component
  - hospital-based victim program
  - NIBIN program
  - co-locating certain personnel
  - county crime analysis centers
  - USAO in-house investigators
Concluding thoughts from first round of site visits

- PSN activities are taking place under very challenging conditions in each case study TEA
- The diversity in community context and PSN strategies among the case study sites will allow for very interesting findings
- USAO leadership in violence reduction strategies is very strong across the case study sites
  - The role of the PSN coordinator is critical to success
- Most districts have very strong targeted enforcement efforts to focus investigation and prosecution resources on the most significant offenders and groups
- Most districts could benefit from developing stronger community partnerships
  - This will likely be addressed as USAOs refine their PSN strategy to reflect new design pillars
Preliminary Findings from the National Assessment of PSN

Lynn Langton, RTI
**Goal and Key Research Questions**

**Goal:** assess the nationwide implementation and impact of the enhanced PSN model

**Key Research Questions:**

1. How were the 5 **PSN principles** implemented across districts?
2. How did PSN impact **violent crime rates** nationwide?
3. To what extent were **violent crime outcomes** related to how the 5 **principles** were implemented?
**Unit of Analysis:** US Attorney Districts (excluding territories)

- District-level focus is driven by underlying goals of PSN and availability of crime/prosecution data
- Some districts have multiple Target Enforcement Areas (TEAs), which are aggregated for analysis

**Time Periods of Interest:**
- 2015 - 2017 – **Baseline** period (competitive PSN funding)
- 2018 - 2020 – Initial **Intervention** period (PSN 2.0)
- Mid-2021 - 2023 – **Revised** PSN
The implementation assessment will focus on central tenets of PSN
- Interested in ALL PSN activities, not just those funded by DOJ grants

Analysis of reports and information collected by DOJ
- Semi-annual reports (FY18 – 1st half FY19)
- Strategic plans

Annual interviews with PSN Coordinators
- Beginning in 2022

Annual web-based surveys of key PSN stakeholders (Task Force members/partners) in each District
- Following the PSN Coordinator Interviews
Implementation Assessment Methodology

- Descriptive statistics on variations in implementation of the 5 principles

- Within each principle, using Item Response Theory (IRT) factor analysis to determine how best to group measures/responses related to each PSN principle

- Using higher order LCA to identify groups of districts with similar configurations of implementation
  - Moving beyond individual implementation elements to view the various PSN approaches more holistically
Leadership by the US Attorney to convene all partners

In majority of districts, PSN task forces met at least monthly.
### Partnerships at all level of law enforcement and with the community

#### PSN Partnerships, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Type</th>
<th>Percent of Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State or local prosecutors</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local law enforcement agencies</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State law enforcement agencies</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal law enforcement agencies</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections or community corrections</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups or service providers, faith-based groups,...</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court or pretrial agencies</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, local, or tribal leadership</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime prevention programs</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research partner</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based victim services</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K–12 schools</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical or mental healthcare or substance use providers</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and technical assistance provider(s)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protective services</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services or some other entity</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal criminal justice agencies</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSN Partnerships, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partnerships at all level of law enforcement and with the community

Average number of PSN partners, 2019
Implementation Analysis: Select Findings

Targeted and prioritized **enforcement** efforts that identify the offenders driving violent crime rates in the district.

PSN Enforcement Activities/Strategies, 2019

- Case screening for federal prosecutions
- Field interrogations
- Stricter prosecutorial policies for felons
- Criminal incident review
- Comprehensive crime gun tracing
- Most violent offender list
- Directed patrols
- Social network analysis
- Worst of the worst
- Violent fugitive roundups
- Probation/parole sweeps
- Other technology-based strategies
- Domestic violence programs
- Drug courts
- Juvenile gun violence reduction strategies
- Gunshot detection technology
- Public housing strategies
- Truancy strategies
- Anti-Gang ordinances/civil injunctions
- Other

Percent of districts
Targeted and prioritized enforcement efforts that identify the offenders driving violent crime rates in the district

![Average number of PSN enforcement activities стратегий used, 2019](chart)
Prevention of additional violence through public awareness, offender notification, and local prevention and reentry efforts

PSN Prevention Activities, 2019

- Neighborhood development or community building/engagement programs
- Media strategies or PSAs
- Outreach efforts/campaigns
- Crime awareness, self-defense, or other education programs
- Law enforcement/community trust building
- Working with or utilizing reentry programs
- School-based prevention or youth programs
- Offender notification/call-ins
- Employment or vocational training programs
- Substance use programs
- Mentoring programs
- Programs involving former gang members
- Prison-based strategies
- Hospital trauma center outreach
- University based programs

Percent of districts
Prevention of additional violence through public awareness, offender notification, and local prevention and reentry efforts
Accountability for results based on analysis of outcomes rather than outputs

Types of data used to track PSN outcomes, 2019

- Local police call, crime, and arrest data
- Federal law enforcement intelligence and data
- State law enforcement intelligence and data
- National Integrated Ballistics Intelligence Network (NIBIN)
- Intelligence from confidential or other informants
- Federal prosecution data
- FBI UCR data
- Court data
- Corrections data
- State, local, or tribal prosecution data
- Internal agency complaint data
- Youth-focused data
- Public health data
- Social service provider data
- Community data
- Focus group data
- Client risk assessments
- Systematic observations of places by trained observers
- Survey data
- Tribal law enforcement intelligence and data
Implementation Analysis: IRT and LCA

- IRT analysis suggest a one- or two-factor solution for each of the individual principles
  - Generally, in terms of partnerships, enforcement, prevention, and data analysis, districts are distinguished not by which types of efforts/activities they are engaged in but by how many

- Next steps: Running the higher order LCA model to identify classes of districts based on PSN implementation
The **outcome assessment** will focus on the impact of PSN on violent crime rates nationwide

**Primary Sources of Data**

**Public crime data**
- **2015 - 2020** - FBI UCR Summary Reporting System (aggregated to District)
- **2021 - 2023** – NIBRS + ??

**Prosecution data**
- **2015 - 2023** – EOUSA filings and sentencing (PSN flag added in 2018)
Using **Multilevel longitudinal growth models** (MLLGM) to examine trends in crime across several periods:

- 2015 – 2017 Baseline period
- 2018 – 2020 PSN 2.0 Intervention
  - Initial analyses exclude 2020
- 2021 – 2023 PSN 2.1 Intervention
  - Not reflected here

Splitting districts into **two** groups based on whether they received **competitive** PSN funding during the baseline period enables assessment of:

- Effect of PSN 2.0 on crime in districts that did NOT get federal PSN funding in baseline period (**orange**)
- Effect of PSN 2.0 on crime in districts that DID receive federal PSN funding in baseline period (**blue**)
- Difference in slopes of two groups in the intervention period (**orange** vs. **blue**)

![Illustrative Crime Outcome Trajectories by Group and Phase](image-url)
 Outcome Assessment Methodology

Preliminary Analyses:

- 2016-2019 **monthly** UCR SRS data
  - Excludes agencies that reported annually only (<10%)
- Focused on reporting from local **police** departments and **sheriffs**
- Agencies nested within districts (n=87, excluding territories)
- Based on **counts** rather than rates
- Select crime types
  - All violence – murder, rape/sexual assault, robbery, aggravated assault
  - Murder
  - Robbery with a firearm
• Trend is flat during baseline period for both groups
• Significant decrease in intervention period for PSN 2.0 only group (orange)
• Nonsignificant decrease in intervention period for competitive funding group (p=.06) (blue)
Outcome Assessment: Preliminary Findings

- Trend is flat in baseline period for both groups
- Significant decrease in intervention period for PSN 2.0 only group (orange)
- Nonsignificant decrease in intervention period for competitive funding group (blue)
- Significantly larger relative decrease during intervention period for PSN 2.0 only group (1.75X)
Outcome Assessment: Preliminary Findings

Robbery with a firearm

- Significant decrease in both periods for both groups
- Larger (but nonsignificant) relative decrease during intervention period for both groups
  - 1.5X for PSN 2.0 only group (orange)
  - 1.8X for Competitive funding group (blue)
National Assessment Next Steps

- Running additional models for other crime types, using crime rates rather than crime counts, considering moving averages
- Modeling the effects of implementation on violent crime outcomes
  - Outcome and implementation data analyzed together to understand impact of differences in PSN implementation on outcomes
- Incorporating community factors and characteristics into the models to control for variations across districts and over time
- Incorporating federal PSN prosecutions and sentence lengths into models
- Continuing to assess how best to measure PSN outcomes given the retirement of the FBI’s UCR Summary Reporting System
Data Challenges: Implications of Changes in Crime Data Reporting in the FBI’s UCR Program

Roger Przybylski, JRSA
Importance of crime data for the PSN evaluation

- Reductions in violent crime and firearms violence are key outcome goals for PSN
- Measures of both are needed for the national assessment as well as for each case study
  - Geographically, data are needed at multiple levels of aggregation
    - District, Target Enforcement Area(s), and comparison areas
  - Temporally, data are needed pre- and post- enhanced PSN
    - 2015 through at least year-end 2022
- Data pertaining to other crimes not targeted by PSN are needed as well
Data collection decision making

- Decision making about the best data sources and collection methods to use are influenced by several factors
  - Evaluation project timing and resource constraints
    - Data collection must be economical and efficient
  - Data quality and completeness are paramount concerns
    - Consistently reported data over time to support interrupted time series analysis
    - Consistently reported data across jurisdictions and multiple levels of aggregation to support comparative analyses
Data sources to be used

- Incident-level crime data will be obtained directly from local law enforcement agencies for the **case study sites**
  - Through secure FTPs or RTI’s CFS Analytics platform
- Using a similar approach for the **national assessment** is not feasible
  - 18K+ local law enforcement agencies nationwide
- Best alternative is to use data collected through the FBI’s Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) program
  - Single, central source of data
  - Theoretically consistent reporting across time and jurisdictions
Characteristics of UCR crime data

- Administered by the FBI since 1930
- Nationwide, cooperative effort of more than 18,000 law enforcement agencies to voluntarily report data on crimes brought to their attention
  - Serious violent and property crime
  - Not all crimes are reported to law enforcement
- Nationwide reporting
- With few exceptions, consistent definitions used across time and jurisdictions
- Can be aggregated/disaggregated to multiple levels
Characteristics of UCR crime data

- Traditionally reported as summary statistics (SRS)
  - “Part 1” violent and property crimes
  - Time lag between reporting and when data are released
- Blueprint for transition to National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) rolled out in late 1980s
- Key differences between NIBRS and SRS
  - Incident rather than summary reporting
  - Far more detailed data on crimes known to law enforcement
    - Characteristics of the crime incident, victims and offenders (if known)
- Small number of states and law enforcement agencies began NIBRS reporting in 1990s, more have followed in subsequent years
FBI imposed sunset of the SRS

- FBI stopped accepting SRS data at year-end 2020
  - Only NIBRS data accepted beginning January 2021
- Only about one half of the nation’s 18K+ LE agencies were capable of reporting NIBRS data in January 2021
  - Accounts for about 55% of the nation’s law enforcement agencies and 50% of the nation’s population
  - Several major cities currently are not accounted for in NIBRS
    - New York City, Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Phoenix
Implications for the PSN evaluation

- The sunset of SRS presents a major challenge for the PSN evaluation
  - Interrupts the series of data needed for the national assessment outcome evaluation
  - The number of additional law enforcement agencies reporting NIBRS will increase, but incrementally

- FBI UCR program cannot be used as a single source of crime data unless numerous USA Districts and/or TEAs are left out of the national assessment
Addressing the Challenge

- Two key lines of inquiry are being pursued to potentially mitigate the impact of the UCR change
  - In-depth analysis of NIBRS coverage to determine precisely which PSN TEAs are covered by NIBRS reporting agencies
    - 205 TEAs; 65 covered (32%), 98 not covered (48%), 42 maybe (20%)
  - Inventory of state UCR programs to determine which will continue to accept SRS data from agencies in their state
    - Some state programs will continue to accept SRS data from agencies that have not yet fully transitioned to NIBRS
Addressing the challenge

- By using NIBRS data available through the FBI and any SRS data available through state UCR programs we hope to close the “missing” data gap
  - NIBRS data can be converted to SRS data to support trend analysis
- Using the FBI and state UCR programs as data sources keeps crime data collection practical and economical
  - Keeps data sources limited
  - Expands geographic and temporal coverage beyond what is available when relying solely on NIBRS coverage
The challenge of non-fatal shooting data

- Accessing valid data on non-fatal shootings presents another challenge
  - Both SRS and NIBRS data identifies whether a firearm was involved in a crime, but not whether an actual shooting occurred
  - Several sources of non-fatal shooting data exist, but the available data does not meet the evaluation’s temporal or geographic requirements
  - Non-fatal shooting data does exist at the local hospital/ER level, but using these as sources nationwide is not feasible
- The evaluation team continues to explore emerging datasets with the fallback of using firearm involvement in a crime as a limited proxy
National Evaluation of Project Safe Neighborhoods – Looking Ahead

November 29, 2021
Looking Ahead – Challenges & Solutions

 Obtaining crime data after UCR-SRS “sunsetted” at end of 2020
 • Explore two-pronged approach
   • Use NIBRS data from FBI where available
   • Augment with data from states

 Addressing 2020 “shock”
 • Explore options, e.g., comparing results with & without 2020 in analysis

 Incorporating 2021 shift in key elements
 • Analyze crime trends in 3 segments
   • 2015-17, 2018-20, & 2021 on
Looking Ahead – Data Collection & Analysis

Case Studies
• Continue to obtain incident-based crime data
• Explore conducting resident surveys
• Analyze crime data & resident survey data, if conducted
• Conduct qualitative analysis of implementation & use to help explain outcomes

National Assessment
• Finalize initial analyses
• Obtain & analyze crime data
  • Using Census data for contextual factors
• Conduct PSN Coordinator interviews & stakeholder surveys & analyze data
• Add “middle tier” to make use of incident-based data where available
  • To supplement National Assessment & Case Studies
Reports to DOJ & Case Study Sites
• Site-specific reports to case study sites
• Reports to DOJ on findings & recommendations

Broader Dissemination
• Practitioner & research publications & conferences
• Future events such as this

Archive Data (with safeguards)
• To support additional analysis & provide added value to NIJ’s investment
National Evaluation of Project Safe Neighborhoods

November 29, 2021

Discussant

Ron DeWald,
Assistant US Attorney &
PSN Coordinator
Northern District of Illinois
Thank you!

- **DOJ & NIJ** for supporting the evaluation & hosting this webinar
- **People involved in PSN** – USAO staff & their partners – for providing their insights through interviews & surveys
- **YOU** for attending today

- If you would like to contact the evaluation team, please email us at **PSNEvaluation@rti.org**