

**The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:**

**Document Title: Evaluation of a Comprehensive Approach to Reducing Gun Violence in Detroit**

**Author(s): Timothy S. Bynum, Eric Grommon, John D. McCluskey**

**Document No.: 244866**

**Date Received: February 2014**

**Award Number: 2004-IJ-CX-0022**

**This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant report available electronically.**

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.**



## **Table of Contents**

Abstract .....	3
Executive Summary .....	4
Introduction .....	11
Chapter 1: Program Theory/ Background.....	12
Chapter 2: The New Criminal Justice and Gun Violence Reduction .....	15
Chapter 3: The effect of gun violence reduction efforts on recorded gun violence .....	53
Chapter 4: Conclusions.....	64

## ABSTRACT

Increasingly criminal justice agencies are integrating “data based” approaches into their operational strategies. This “new” model of criminal justice suggests that analysis of data on recent crime and violence incidents can lead to a more focused and targeted effort than previous enforcement efforts. Through such efforts, individuals, groups, and locations that exhibit a high level of gun violence within a limited geographic area are identified and a variety of intervention are then implemented. These interventions typically include both enforcement as well as offender focused interventions. These efforts differ from prior enforcement strategies in that they emphasize the integration of a problem analysis component in which data analysis is used to identify the patterns of gun violence in a small target area and enforcement resources are concentrated in this area.

However, this approach also differs from previous “crackdown” enforcement strategies in that there are also community and offender intervention components that are integral to this model. The community component seeks to identify ways in which the community can be involved in working with law enforcement to reduce gun violence in this area. This is often through increased community meetings, and establishing more frequent and effective means of communication between the community and local law enforcement.

In addition, the enforcement strategies used in this model are data and intelligence driven. As such they are focused on identifying the most problematic locations, groups and individuals that are most responsible for gun violence in this community.

This report documents the implementation and outcomes of the implementation of Project Safe Neighborhoods in one of the jurisdictions in which this model was first implemented.

## **Executive Summary**

In recent years there has been a movement emphasizing increasing use of analytical techniques in the design and operation of crime and violence reduction strategies. These innovative approaches are often termed strategic problem solving. These models typically include partnerships with various law enforcement and correctional agencies along with community or neighborhood alliances working together to identify the most serious aspects of the local violence problem. Subsequent to this problem identification, a coordinated multi-agency and community involved strategy was designed to focus intensive enforcement and intervention efforts on the locations, individuals, and groups that are principally responsible for this problem. Project Safe Neighborhoods represented a major effort and commitment from the Department of Justice to address gun and violent crime through this innovative approach.

The Project Safe Neighborhoods initiative was implemented in each of the Federal Judicial Districts through a multiagency task force which included members from local, state, and federal law enforcement along with representatives from correctional agencies particularly probation and parole. Further, the community was to be significantly involved through coordinated outreach, intervention, and prevention project components.

There were five key principals of the Project Safe Neighborhoods model.

- Partnerships – collaborative relationships involving a partnership with other law enforcement and criminal justice agencies as well as social service agencies and community groups. In addition, each task force had a research partner as well.

- Strategic Plan – PSN involves a problem solving process focused on identifying the most serious areas and groups for focused enforcement, intervention, and prevention activities.
- Training - Extensive training was provided to task forces in a variety of topics including strategic problem solving, firearms law enforcement, gun prosecution, and community outreach strategies.
- Outreach – PSN involved various outreach efforts to spread the deterrent message of “hard time for gun crime” to the intended audience.
- Accountability – PSN was based on delivering a strong message of accountability to violent and gun offenders regarding the consequence of their continued involvement in gun crime. In addition, each district had to track its progress on several standardized measures and report these results to the Department of Justice. (McGarrell, 2005)

Each district participating in Project Safe Neighborhoods was required to identify a specify area for the intervention. Typically these “target” areas were those that had experienced among the highest level of gun violence in the jurisdiction.

In addition, to this task force model, a characteristic that was to distinguish this approach from previous crime control strategies was that it was to be “data driven”. Working closely with a research partner as well as law enforcement crime analysts, the Project Safe Neighborhoods task force was to design interventions that were consistent with focusing intensive efforts on the most problematic locations and offenders.

This report focuses on the implementation and operation of this project in one jurisdiction. This jurisdiction had previously participated in the Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI), a precursor to Project Safe Neighborhoods. This prior initiative followed similar principles regarding focused and targeted interventions and thus this jurisdiction was well suited to implement an intervention that coincided with the principals of Project Safe Neighborhoods.

The evaluation of this project was presented with many and significant challenges. In particular there were significant changes in the intervention throughout the study period. These changes included line personnel as well as law enforcement leadership.

These changes resulted in a variation in the level of intensity across the project period. In addition, at times during the project there were personnel changes that also resulted in different perspectives and commitment to the principles of the PSN initiative. However, the time frame for analysis presented in this report, is from the period of time in which there was the most consistent intervention of the PSN project principles.

Two aspects of this initiative were identified for analysis as representing the project components that were most consistently in operation during the project period. These were the case review component and the overall effect of this set of interventions on gun violence.

### **Case/ Incident Reviews**

One of the core components of Project Safe Neighborhoods is the case (or incident) review process (Klofas, J and N. Hipple, et. al., 2006). In this project component, individual criminal cases are systematically reviewed by not only prosecutors but also police officers who are part of the PSN enforcement team. These latter individuals have significant street knowledge

about the gun violence situation as well as the role of various individuals and groups with regard to gun violence in the target area.

At these meetings the characteristics of each arrest in the target area for an offense involving a firearm is reviewed by not only the state and federal prosecutors assigned to the unit but also by all members of the PSN enforcement team (typically a sergeant/ squad leader and 5-6 officers assigned to this unit along with representatives from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tax, and Firearms (ATF), and the state and federal prosecutors assigned to this initiative. Typically this involves a discussion not just of the details of the current incident and arrest, but also of the offender and his/her role in the gun violence situation in the target area or jurisdiction. Based on this discussion a determination of prosecution venue (state or federal) is made. However an equally important aspect of these reviews is the discussion of the incident and the role of the offender in drug distribution as well as involvement with guns and violence in the target area/ jurisdiction. In addition, intelligence regarding guns and violence that was obtained from a systematic debriefing of the arrestee is discussed. Thus while the manifest purpose of these meetings is to determine prosecution venue, an equally important aspect is the discussion of the gun/gang violence aspects of this individual and his group and the potential impact of prosecution of this case in state versus federal court.

Analysis was conducted on the case review process looking at the changes that occurred in how Carrying Concealed Weapons (CCW) cases were handled in 2006 and after the implementation of PSN in 2007. These dates do not coincide with exactly the implementation dates as project implementation occurred over a period of time and experienced frequent personnel changes until it became stabilized in late 2006 and early 2007. If PSN was working as intended we would expect that there would be a tightening of the case processing that would

result in fewer cases being dismissed and an increase in federal prosecution. Arrest data were obtained for CCW arrests that were made in the target area and these cases were then matched with the case prosecution filings with the court.

Analysis of these data over the two time periods, before and during the PSN intervention, indicated that the probability of charges being filed for a Carrying a Concealed Weapon offense did substantially rise over this period of time. In 2006, 46% of the CCW arrests were filed in court compared to 59% of the cases in the 2007. This is most likely due to the increased focus and systematic review of these cases along with the increased cooperation between the law enforcement and prosecution agencies during this period.

Thus, relative to the initial research question, there does appear to be a substantial increase in the likelihood of sanction for weapons possession offenses under the PSN model. A second consideration is did this increase in sanctions result in a decline in gun violence during this period of increased enforcement focus on gun possession offenses.

### **Impact on Gun Violence**

Data were obtained for all non-fatal shootings and homicides for the period of January 1, 2006 through the week of March 23, 2008. From these data, a file was created for weekly total of shooting victimizations in each of six patrol districts. Another district had implemented a different violence intervention program at various times during the study period and was excluded from this analysis. A total of 117 weekly observations were recorded from each district. Thirty-nine weeks between October 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007 constituted the intervention period.

Thus there were three different periods of time used for this analysis. A 39 week period between January 1, 2006 through September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2006 constitutes the pre project period. The period of time between July 1, 2007 and March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2008 represents the post PSN observation period.

There were three sets of analyses that were conducted on these data. First, a simple descriptive analysis describes the mean levels of gun violence in the intervention and non-intervention areas over the entire project period. Second, t-tests comparing the mean levels of gun violence across time periods provides insight into whether there were significant changes within the project area and if there were similar changes in other areas. Third, ARIMA analyses were conducted to examine the trends over time in each of these areas.

The initial analyses presented the mean number of shooting each week in the three different time periods; the Pre-PSN period, the PSN intervention period, and the post-PSN period. Comparisons were then made for each patrol area for each of these time periods. The district in which PSN was implemented had a reduction of 1.4 shooting victimizations per week compared to the pre-intervention period. During the post project period, shootings again increased, but not to the pre-project level. A series of t-tests revealed that the decline in fatal and non-fatal shootings was significant in the project period, while changes in other districts were not. However, analysis that included the post project period indicated that there was a decay of these effects over time to eventually return to near pre- intervention levels. It is important to note that when the project was operating at its peak levels of intensity, that there was on average a reduction over this 39 week period of one shooting per week.

The overall conclusion that can be drawn from this analysis is that the PSN gun initiative over the 39 weeks of observation had a small but statistically significant effect in reducing gun violence in this area. There was no similar pattern of shootings during this time in other areas of this jurisdiction. This suggests that there was a decline in gunshot victimization in the PSN area during the time that this project was most active. However, it also demonstrates the difficulty of maintaining these reductions after intensive enforcement activity.

## **Introduction**

Criminal justice agencies are increasingly working towards interdependent and cooperative relationships to combat crime. Partnerships among agencies and external collaborators such as Universities have begun to characterize routines across many local criminal justice systems (Klofas, McGarrell & Hipple, 2010). The intensity, duration, and effectiveness of these partnerships is an important element for consideration in crafting new criminal justice innovations. More precisely, programmatic efforts to measure how criminal justice works together, innovates, and adopts new structures, processes, and routines is part of the *New Criminal Justice*. As such the current report presents a snapshot of gun violence reduction efforts in the city of Detroit, Michigan.

To accomplish this, the report is divided into several topic areas. First, an examination regarding the role criminal justice agencies can play violence reduction efforts is considered. Next, an outline of the nature of the project as implemented in Detroit is presented. This is followed by a discussion of the implementation of the project in terms of routines and processing of gun cases that were established and the intensity and duration of those changes are assessed. Data on case processing were drawn from criminal justice records to gauge the nature and extent of changes in the local criminal justice landscape vis-à-vis gun violence processing.

After the nature and extent of the intervention have been established, consideration of its impact on the problem at hand, namely gun violence, is the next issue under consideration. To test for the effect that these changes had on gun violence, a series of intervention analyses were conducted to establish whether a significant reduction in gun violence was observed in the experimental area. Timing of the intervention is drawn from the evaluation of changes in process in the handling and focus on gun cases in Northwest Detroit.

## **Chapter 1: Program Theory/ Background**

The problem of crime and the apparent ineffectiveness of criminal justice responses are not new (nothing works, KCPPE, 1974). Much has been made of the fact that police alone may have limited effect on crime. However, recently there have been promising results from interventions based upon an approach based that has become known as “strategic problem solving” (McGarrell, et.al, 2005). This approach was the basis of Project Safe Neighborhoods upon which this initiative was based. This approach typically involves a multi-agency collaborative effort involving an intelligence/data driven strategy focused on the most serious gun violence issues including specific individuals or groups as well as locations that are significantly involved with incidents of gun violence.

These initiatives built upon the foundation established by the Boston Ceasefire Project, Richmond’s Project Exile, and the Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI) which was implemented in ten jurisdictions across the country. Each of these approaches emphasized a multi-agency, intelligence driven approach. Typically this model involved the selection of a specific target or intervention area that was of moderate size in which intensive and focused enforcement and prosecution activities were conducted along with the implementation of additional activities emphasizing community engagement and involvement. In addition, a media campaign was also conducted in many jurisdictions emphasizing prevention as well as deterrence messages. In the SACSI model a research partner was also involved. The research partner worked closely with the project task force to provide data analysis and information to determine patterns in gun violence incidents, develop strategies for targeting and

focusing the enforcement as well as intervention components, and monitor the progress and impact of these initiatives.

There were five core components that were central to the Project Safe Neighborhood Initiative:

**Partnerships** – In each district the PSN initiative was based on a collaborative program that was conducted through a partnership involving law enforcement and correctional (local and state) agencies, social service agencies, city or other local government, community organizations, and a research team.

**Strategic Plan** – The Project Safe Neighborhoods approach is based on a problem solving strategy in which the PSN core team designs the specific elements of their strategy to address gun violence through data analysis designed to identify the individuals, places, and groups that driving gun violence in the project area. Ongoing data analysis is conducted throughout the implementation and operation of the various components of PSN in order to monitor the progress of the various components so that modifications can be made where and when such changes are needed.

**Training** - Another core aspect of Project Safe Neighborhoods was ongoing training for task forces to assist in the implementation of various project components. These training opportunities were conducted across the country to allow members of local task forces to participate as a team representing their district.

**Outreach** – Both local and national outreach efforts were involved in Project Safe Neighborhoods. Significant efforts were placed on a local outreach component to spread a deterrent message to potential offenders regarding the enhanced sanctions that awaited offenders through the use of a variety of local media.

**Accountability** – Accountability was emphasized both in the sense of holding offenders accountable for their behavior as well as an overall project accountability in that participating districts were responsible for accounting for their implementation of processes and interventions in full accord with the Project Safe Neighborhoods model.

The implementation of Project Safe Neighborhoods in Detroit was consistent with this model. A task force was formed representing all the principal local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies. Overall leadership and coordination was provided through the US Attorney’s Office which played a central role in both the overall project leadership as well a major role in the prosecution of felons with firearms in federal court.

## **Chapter 2: The New Criminal Justice and Gun Violence Reduction in Detroit**

Criminal justice processes and routines vary across jurisdictions. This is not a revolutionary observation, as Wilson (1968) hypothesized that political culture yielded variations in criminal justice structures. In that work he identified three police styles of legalistic, watchman, and service approaches, linked to the larger political culture. His student, Martin Levin, extended the consideration of political culture to the influence on how courts process individuals in different cities (Levin, 197x). The idea that local criminal justice varies in its priorities and processes in the United States is now an area of theory and speculation (Duffee and Maguire, 2007).

Recently, Klofas, McGarrell, and Hipple (2010) coined the term “the new criminal justice” to explore how recognition of local variation plays an important role in crafting solutions to problems in the local environment. In this context, the current action research grant (TNCJ, 2010 author: Mock) was launched to provide a working partnership between academics at Michigan State University and the local Detroit criminal justice system. The principal agency in the project was the Detroit police department and partners included federal law enforcement (BATF, FBI), federal prosecution, Wayne county prosecution, and the community supervision (parole) personnel from the Michigan Department of Corrections. Leadership and coordination of this project was provided by the US Attorney’s office.

### **Implementing Project Safe Neighborhoods in Detroit**

The central element of the Project Safe Neighborhoods Initiative in Detroit was the case review process. At the core of this project component was the principle that offenses with a firearm particularly those involving felons in possession of a firearm should be vigorously

enforced. Prior to the initiation of Project Safe Neighborhoods in Detroit, this jurisdiction had participated in the Strategic Approaches to Community Safety Initiative (SACSI). This precursor to PSN, implemented in ten jurisdictions across the country also had a focus on gun violence, however, through the PSN initiative there was a more systematic case review process established. In this project component, all arrests involving a firearm in the target area were reviewed on a weekly basis. This review was conducted by representatives from the US Attorney's office, the local prosecutor's office, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF), and members of the enforcement team from local law enforcement agencies. These individuals were assigned full time to the project from their respective local or state law enforcement agencies. In addition, there was an agent from ATF who was also assigned to work full time with this unit. This group was responsible for gathering intelligence regarding individuals and groups in the target area and conducting enforcement actions aimed at disrupting drug selling in these neighborhoods and arresting and prosecuting those involved. Although law enforcement agencies had worked cooperatively prior to this project, this initiative represented a greater level of cooperation and information sharing in that members of this unit were collocated and worked fulltime in this assignment over a considerable period of time.

A meeting was held each week to discuss the arrests of the previous week. These case review meetings involved a discussion of each of the arrests for a gun offense, typically a felon in possession of a firearm offense. While a principal purpose of this discussion was to determine the most appropriate prosecution venue (state or federal), another important purpose was to exchange information and intelligence regarding the role of the arrestee with guns and gangs in the target area. This meeting was attended by not only the local and federal prosecutors assigned to this group but by all members and supervisors of the enforcement unit. In addition, the

research partner attended these meetings on a regular basis. Based on the discussion of these cases and the role of each arrestee in guns and gangs a prosecution venue was determined.

In addition to determining the most appropriate prosecution venue, these meetings played a key role in determining future enforcement actions and strategies. An additional principal purpose of this discussion was to exchange intelligence about guns and gang activity in the target area. One member of the task force was assigned the duty of interviewing each individual arrested for a gun offense in the target area. From these interviews significant information and actionable intelligence was generated regarding the groups and individuals who were most involved in gang activity and gun violence in the target area. This information formed the core of this intelligence driven intervention that was a cornerstone of the Project Safe Neighborhoods approach.

These weekly meetings were attended by all members of the enforcement unit, including the intelligence officer and crime analyst, the research partner, along with the state and federal prosecutors who were assigned to this responsibility. In addition, there was often a representative from the Department of Corrections at this meeting as well. This individual contributed considerable information about individuals who were currently on parole in the target area who may either be involved with active gangs or who could provide information about active offenders and groups in the area.

The agencies who were active participants in this project included the US Attorney's Office, Eastern District of Michigan, the Wayne County Prosecutors Office, the Detroit Police Department, the Michigan Department of Corrections, and the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. In addition, there were community groups also involved including the Detroit Community Justice Partnership and Weed and Seed.

## **Case Review Summary and Analysis**

The primary and sustained effort to deal with gun carrying involved gun reviews which were most active from October 2006 through June of 2007. To examine how processing changed in the Northwest District (NWD) we examined the treatment of cases of “carrying concealed weapons” (CCW) from 2006 and 2007 to capture the nature of the initiative in this period. Local criminal justice changes of this sort are consistent with *The New Criminal Justice* outlined by Klofas, McGarrell, & Hipple (2010). Individual cases were screened by a working group of Detroit police, local prosecutors and federal prosecutors. Details regarding the nature of this interaction are captured in the preceding qualitative discussion.

Here we examine the cohort of CCW arrestees in 2006 and compare them with those apprehended in 2007 to offer some sense of the quality of criminal justice processing that changed across these periods. If the program, when operational, was working as intended greater attention to the CCW issue in the NWD should have led to a tightening of the processing of these offenders. For example, we would expect greater federal attention for some subset of cases and perhaps an increase in formal processing at the local level. This is partially testable with a set of cases compared across the two years.

The primary effect and vigor of the working group was identified as overlapping these two years (late 2006, most vigorous until approximately June 2007) but for tracking purposes the two years are examined separately as the awareness of CCW issues likely took some time to percolate into the criminal justice system processes and likewise it also is reasonable that the effort persisted for some period after the cessation of the most vigorous efforts in June 2007. This makes the comparison of 2006 cases with 2007 a defensible choice for analysis.

Finally, an examination of those individuals who, in 2007, were identified for further Federal consideration are examined with regard to the seriousness of prior records and case

outcomes. The identification of serious offenders for extensive consideration and special processing is part of the overall case review approach and those identified for consideration for federal prosecution should, on balance, represent serious offenders if the program is to be effective. Knowledge of effective dose and duration, at this juncture, is sparse. The theory behind the idea of focusing on serious offenders, however, is consistent with prior research and current policy recommendations (Wolfgang, Figlio & Sellin, 1972; Sherman & Martin, 1986, Sherman, 2011, c.f. Walker, 2004).

### *Data Sources*

In the following analyses, several data sources were search and merged to obtain the current perspective on CCW offenders and their prior records in the NWD. First DPD arrest data were obtained for the two years and isolated for those arrestees in the NWD. These data were then matched with the local court database known as CRIM. This database indicates if charges were filed, when complete, what the final status of the case is in terms of outcome (trial, plea, conviction, etc.) and sentencing information. Due to the separation of platforms across organization, the search process requires a case by case lookup approach. Additional information is gleaned from the Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN) which will have a more expansive summary of prior arrests and convictions for each offender in the arrest database. Again, this entails an individual arrest history lookup process and data outside of the state of Michigan may be incomplete and data from within the state also may only be partially complete.

Below we make some assumptions about cases not found in the various systems and the existence of clean records for those individuals (i.e., no prior arrests). While this assumption may be weak in light of data issues just addressed, they present identical problems for any

process which seeks to determine prior records of individuals. The inadequacy, flaws, and gaps in data collection are not understudy here, but is an issue for consideration in program execution relying on such information.

#### *CCW Arrestees in 2006*

The total number of CCW arrestees logged for 2006 in the NWD is 632. There were 13 arrestees with more than one entry (determined by same last name, first name, middle name, and date of birth). Five of the 13 arrestees with multiple entries have variable arrest dates (i.e., one arrest date earlier in the year and one later in the year). Removal of these 8 duplicates reduces the number of CCW arrestees for 2006 to 624.

#### *Preliminary 2006 Case Flow*

Forty-six percent (n=286) of the 624 arrestees had accessible court information in CRIM. Charges were filed for these individuals and court proceedings were undertaken. Dispositions for these individuals may include dismissals in addition to specified outcomes. The remaining 54% (n=338) were not found in CRIM. We assume that these latter arrestees had their charges dropped since they were not found in CRIM.

#### *Criminal History.*

Criminal history record information was captured from two sources: LEIN summaries from DPD departmental files and CRIM, a remote database that provides information on district and circuit court processing. There were problems associated with these two data sources. LEIN summaries provide information primarily on arrests. Conviction information is often missing or has not yet been updated (pending court disposition information to the state police). CRIM primarily provides conviction information. Arrest information is not provided, but one can

assume that a prior conviction was associated with an arrest. If charges were not filed in court, the court disposition information has not yet been updated, or if the court proceedings were outside of the local jurisdiction, the court information will not be available (and by implication either will the arrest associated with the court proceeding).

Table 1 provides information on the criminal history background of the arrestees with CCW charges filed in court. Seventeen percent of the arrestees had prior weapons arrests and 16% had prior violent crime arrests. Thirteen percent had prior weapons offense convictions, 11% had prior drug offense convictions and 10% had prior violent offense convictions. Ten percent of the arrestees had served a prior prison sentence and 9% had served a prior jail sentence. The overall means for the criminal history backgrounds are low due to the inclusion of the entire population in the calculation of the mean (those with and without criminal history information).

Table 2 presents criminal history information in collapsed categories. Forty-two percent of the arrestees had at least one prior felony arrest, while the remaining 58% did not have prior felony arrests. Thirty-two percent of the arrestees had at least one prior felony conviction.

Table 1: Criminal History Backgrounds for 2006 Arrestees with Charges Filed (n=286).

	Proportion of Total	Overall Mean (s.d.)	Minimum Values	Maximum Values
Violent Crime Arrests	16%	.21 (.55)	0	3
Violent Crime Convictions	10%	.11 (.34)	0	2
Property Crime Arrests	12%	.17 (.55)	0	5
Property Crime Convictions	9%	.12 (.44)	0	4
Drug Crime Arrests	14%	.21 (.61)	0	5
Drug Crime Convictions	11%	.14 (.46)	0	4
Weapons Crime Arrests	17%	.20 (.48)	0	3
Weapons Crime Convictions	13%	.14 (.37)	0	2
Misdemeanor Convictions	4%	.05 (.25)	0	2
Prior Prison Sentences	10%	.13 (.41)	0	3
Prior Jail Sentences	9%	.13 (.42)	0	1

Table 2: Criminal History Categories for 2006 Arrestees with Charges Filed (n=286).

	Frequency	Percent
At Least One Felony Arrest	121	42%
At Least One Felony Conviction	91	32%
At Least One Misdemeanor Conviction	12	4%
At Least One Prison Sentence	30	11%
At Least One Jail Sentence	27	9%

KEY: At least one felony arrest/conviction is a combination of violent, property, drug, and weapon offense arrests/convictions.

*Case Disposition.* Tables 3 through 5 present information on the case disposition patterns and sentences arrestees:

- Sixty-five percent of the arrestees pled guilty to their charges in court. Eighteen percent of the arrestees had their charges dismissed via court proceedings and 6% were found guilty in a jury trial (from Table 3).
  
- Consolidating the sentence types to the most serious type, the most frequently occurring sentence is probation (33% of total, 43% of adjusted total)<sup>1</sup>. Prison is the next most frequently occurring sentence (20% of total, 27% of adjusted total), followed by jail (7% of total, 10% of adjusted total) and fines (6% of total, 8% of adjusted total) ( from Table 4).

---

<sup>1</sup> The consolidation strategy prohibits combinations or overlaps of sentences (e.g., probation plus fine, prison plus probation, etc.). Instead, one sentence is given contingent upon the most serious sentence type in the combination. Prison is considered the most serious sentence and is followed by jail, probation, and fine in decreasing order of seriousness.

- In terms of the most serious sentence type, those who pled guilty or were found guilty by a bench trial were significantly more likely to receive a probation sentence. A prison sentence was the next most frequently occurring sentence for those who pled guilty. Those who pled no contest or were found guilty by a jury trial were significantly more likely to receive a prison sentence. All of those arrestees who pled no contest were sentenced to prison (from Table 5).

Table 3: Case Dispositions (n=286).

	Frequency	Percent
Pled Guilty	186	65%
Dismissed	51	18%
Jury Trial – Guilty	18	6%
Disposition Pending	11	4%
Bench Trial – Guilty	7	2%
Jury Trial – Not Guilty	5	2%
Pled No Contest	4	1%
Bench Trial – Not Guilty	3	1%
Suspended	1	<1%

NOTE: disposition pending category is used to describe cases in which a disposition is lacking (cannot determine the conclusion of a trial or whether a plea was made).

Table 4: Sentences by Most Serious Sentence Type (n=286).

	Frequency	Percent	Adj Percent (n=215)
Probation	93	33%	43%
Prison	58	20%	27%
Jail	21	7%	10%
Fine	18	6%	8%
Missing	96	34%	(25) 12%

NOTE: categories by most serious sentence disposition, with prison being the most serious followed by jail, probation, and fine.

Table 5: Dispositions by Most Serious Sentence Type (n=215).

	Probation	Prison	Jail	Fine	Missing
Pled Guilty	86 (46%)	41 (22%)	21 (11%)	16 (9%)	22 (12%)
Jury Trial – Guilty	3 (17%)	12 (67%)	0	1 (6%)	2 (11%)
Bench Trial – Guilty	4 (57%)	1 (14%)	0	1 (14%)	1 (14%)
Pled No Contest	0	4 (100%)	0	0	0

\*differences across sentence types are statistically dependable  $p < .05$ .

NOTE: categories by most serious sentence disposition, with prison being the most serious followed by jail, probation, and fine. Caution is needed with statistically dependable results in cells with null entries. The difference may be more of a product of a null value than a true difference across sentence types.





















































































